

More advance praise for

The Regulation of Desire: Queer Histories, Queer Struggles,

Revised Third Edition

“Gary Kinsman’s *The Regulation of Desire* has been setting the agenda for queer scholarship for decades now, in Canada and elsewhere. Kinsman’s academic work has always been distinguished by his deep involvement in a range of radical social movements, and the additions and revisions to this third edition reflect that long experience. They would not have been possible without Kinsman’s first-hand knowledge of organizing, mobilizing, coalition-building, and solidarity work. The book offers powerful lessons about the limitations of single-issue sexual politics, making clear the connections between sexuality and anti-colonial struggles, the politics of housing, the climate crisis, COVID-19, and a whole range of other pressing and persistent issues that shape the world in which desires emerge. What I like best about this new edition, especially when I think about how it can be used in the classroom, is Kinsman’s own obvious and constant willingness to learn, and to put his learning into practice. His critiques of earlier editions of the book allow us to see the transformation of his thinking and of the social movements and activism that ground it. In addition to being a sweeping and ambitious narrative of the history of sexuality in this place called Canada, the third edition is also a master class in the way that scholarship and activist practice can combine to support a complex and liberatory politics.” —Mary Louise Adams, School of Kinesiology and Health Studies, Queen’s University

“I remember, as an aspiring queer historian, eagerly reading *The Regulation of Desire* when it first appeared in 1987. Gary Kinsman’s pathbreaking book launched the history of sexuality as a field in this country. Over three decades later, this updated and expanded third edition remains as vital and necessary as ever. With a megaphone in one hand and a keyboard in the other, Kinsman gives us queer history in close conversation with the changing concerns of activist communities, be it resistance to the policing of sexual spaces in the 1980s, the AIDS activist movement of the ’90s, or, in our own time, the critique of ‘Pride, Inc.’ politics by a resurgent transgender/Black/Two-Spirit/queer-of-colour radicalism. This is queer history from and for the streets. Buy it, read it, be inspired by the past struggles it documents, and use it in the fight for a freer, fairer, and queerer future for us all.” —Steven Maynard, Department of History, Queen’s University / Co-Chair, Canadian Committee on the History of Sexuality

“Gary Kinsman has written a comprehensive historical account of the repression of queer and trans people, coupled with a cutting radical critique of colonialism, cis-heteropatriarchy, white supremacy, capitalism, and queer and trans respectability. *The Regulation of Desire* is an accessibly written indictment of not only the state that has endeavoured to surveil, control, and contain queer and trans communities, but also the neoliberal queers who are complicit with it. Kinsman maps resistance to repression, resisting ‘the social organization of forgetting’ and helping us situate ourselves in history and struggle. With growing attacks on queer and trans communities, *The Regulation of Desire* is the book we need for this moment.”—A.J. Withers, author of *Fight to Win: Inside Poor People’s Organizing and Disability Politics and Theory* (Revised & Expanded ed.)

THE REGULATION OF DESIRE

The Regulation of Desire

QUEER HISTORIES, QUEER STRUGGLES

Gary Kinsman

REVISED THIRD EDITION

Concordia University Press
Montreal

Unless otherwise noted, all text copyright
© Gary Kinsman. Foreword © OmiSoore
Dryden. Afterword © Tom Hooper.

Every reasonable effort has been made to
acquire permission for copyrighted material
used in this publication and to acknowledge all
such indebtedness accurately. Any errors and
omissions called to the publisher's attention
will be corrected in future printings.

Except for stylistic changes to improve
clarity, to correct typographical errors, and to
regularize spelling and punctuation, all texts
are printed as they were originally published.

Design: Garet Markvoort
Copy editing: Saelan Twerdy
Index: Natalie Greenberg
Proofreading: Saelan Twerdy

The Regulation of Desire is set in LfA
Alumina Original, Jim Parkinson's digital
version of W.A. Dwiggins's classic 20th-
century metal typeface, Electra. Throughout
his design process, Parkinson consulted
original Linotype drawings in the collections
of Letterform Archive and the Boston Public
Library. The resulting letterforms reflect the
metallic energy of Electra.

Printed and bound in Canada by Marquis
Book Printing, Montreal

This book is printed on Forest Stewardship
Council certified paper and meets the
permanence of paper requirements of ANSI/
NISO Z39.48-1992.

Concordia University Press' books are
available for free on several platforms. Visit
www.concordia.ca/press

First English edition published in 2024
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

978-1-98811-47-6 | Paper
978-1-98811-48-3 | E-book

*Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in
Publication*

Title: The regulation of desire : queer
histories, queer struggles / Gary Kinsman.
Names: Kinsman, Gary William. author.
Description: Revised third edition. | Includes
bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: Canadiana 20230540589 |
ISBN 978198811476 (softcover)
Subjects: LCSH: Homosexuality—Canada—
History. | LCSH: Homosexuality—Law
and legislation—Canada—History. |
LCSH: Gay rights—Canada—History. |
LCSH: Sex and law—Canada—History.
Classification: LCC HQ76.3.C3 K55 2023 |
DDC 306.76/60971—dc23

Concordia University Press
1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. W.
Montreal, Quebec H3G 1M8
CANADA

Concordia University Press gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the Birks Family Foundation, the Estate of Linda Kay, and the Estate of Tanneke De Zwart.

Dedication

For Amy Gottlieb (1953–2023), who passed just as I was finishing the final revisions for this book, for all her inspiration and love; and for George W. Smith (1935–1994); Greg Pavelich (1951–2003); Chris Bearchell (1952–2007); Allan Bérubé (1946–2007); Roxana Ng (1961–2013); Sharon-Dale Stone (1955–2014); Bob Gardner (1948–2014); Glen Brown (1958–2017); Mary-Jo Nadeau (1965–2021); Aziz Choudry (1966–2021); Philip Corrigan (1942–2021); Stuart Blackley (1955–2021); bell hooks (1952–2021); Dorothy Smith (1926–2022); Doug Sanders (1938–2022); and Brian De Matos (1987– 2023), who have influenced my life and work in varying ways; for Patrick and Mike Barnholden; and for all those who fight for queer and trans liberation everywhere.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	xi
Foreword by OmiSoore Dryden	xiii
Introduction to the Third Edition	xvii
Introduction to the Second Edition	lvii
1 The Creation of “Homosexuality” as a “Social Problem”	3
2 The Historical Emergence of Homosexualities and Heterosexualities: Social Relations, Sexual Rule, and Sexual Resistance	21
3 Sexualities in Canadian Histories—Problems of Sources and Interpretation	45
4 Sexual/Gender Colonization, Genocidal Practices, and Indigenous Resistance	51
5 Buggery and Sodomy in New France, Upper Canada, and the West	63
6 “These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species”: The Emergence of Homosexualities, Lesbianisms, and Heterosexualities	71
7 World War II, Coming Out, and Constructing Homosexuality as a National, Social, and Sexual Danger	101
8 The Struggle for Law Reform	153
9 Gay/Lesbian Liberation and Communities	217
10 Danger Signals: Moral Conservatism, the Straight Media, the Sex Police, and AIDS	247
11 The Emergence of the Neoliberal Queer: 1996–2023	283
12 Unmaking the Neoliberal Queer: From Resistance to Liberation	343
Afterword by Tom Hooper	409
Notes	419
Bibliography	581
Index	647

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book could never have been written without the support and love of many activists and friends. It is very much a product of discussions with others; more than fifty years of activism in queer, AIDS, anti-poverty, anti-racist, and anti-capitalist movements; the sharing of research at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) (where sections of the second edition emerged as a PhD thesis in 1989) and later at Laurentian University. It has been part of the collective rediscoveries of “Canadian” queer histories. Responsibility for mistakes or errors of interpretation are mine alone.

While I cannot individually thank all those who have assisted me in this long journey, I am particularly grateful to the following people and groups:

For first interesting me in the delights and pleasures of queer history, I thank Bruce Russell, the late James Fraser, Jonathan Ned Katz, Bert Hansen, Allan Bérubé, and Jeffrey Weeks. For support above and beyond the call of duty at various times: Deborah Brock, Robert Champagne, Ryan Conrad, Brian Conway, Chris Dixon, Patrizia Gentile, the late Amy Gottlieb, Ross Higgins, Tom Hooper, Ander Negrazis, Karen Pearlston, Alexis Shotwell, the late George Smith, A.J. Withers, Cynthia Wright, and especially Patrick Barnholden without whose love and support this book could never have been written. I also thank Mike, our son, for transforming my life. For inspiration and for teaching me about lived history, I thank many of those I have interviewed for this book project and for *The Canadian War on Queers* including: Barbara, Bernie, David, Lois, the late Doug Sanders, Bruce Somers, Herbert Sutcliffe, Jim Egan, Peaches Latour, and Sue. I am indebted to the ArQuives (formerly the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives) for invaluable assistance.

The following people offered insights and help in various ways for the first and second editions (and sometimes the third): Barry Adam, Mary Louise Adams, Katherine Arnup, Jeanette Auger, Himani Bannerji, Peter Birt, Varda Burstyn, the late Lina Chartrand, El Chenier, the late Philip Corrigan, Lynne Fernie, Maureen Fitzgerald, Blye Frank, the late Amy Gottlieb, John Greyson, Merv Henwood, Madiha Didi Khayatt, Julie Lee, Ian Lumsden, Steven Maynard, Heidi McDonell, Nancy McKinnel, Eric Mykhalovskiy, Nancy Nicol, the late Mary O’Brien, the late Greg Pavelich, Ruth Pierson, Becki Ross, the late Dorothy E. Smith, Lisa Steele, the late Sharon D. Stone, Kim Tomczak, Mariana Valverde, Lorna Weir, and John Wilson.

For this third edition I also thank: Beverly Bain, Shana Calixte, Walter T. Cassidy, the late Aziz Choudry, Peter Drucker, OmiSoore Dryden, Caelie Frampton, Richard Fung, the late Amy Gottlieb, Tracy Gregory, Laura Hall, Max Haiven, John Huot, Dan Irving, Jennifer Johnson, Christopher Karas, Alex Khasnabish, Punam Khosla, Natalie Kouri-Towe, Clarissa Lassaline, Susanne Luhmann, Jamie-Magnusson, Scott Lauria Morgenson, Todd McCallum, Tim McCaskell, Alexander McClelland, Robin Metcalfe, Vincent Mousseau, the late M.J. Nadeau, Scott Neigh, Laur O’Gorman, Jocelyn Piercy, Svend Robinson, Rebecca Rose, Reuben Roth, Valerie Scott, Alan Sears, Nandita Sharma, Eric Smith, Mercedes Steedman, Matthew Strang, Gökbörü Sarp Tanyıldız, Kate Tilleczeck, A.K. Thompson, Elise Thorburn, Ian Tian, Tom Warner, Rinaldo Walcott, Ardath Whynacht, Rafeef Ziadah, the organizing committee for the Anti-69 forum (Tom Hooper, Lara Karaian, Suzanne Lenon, Cassandra Lord, Karen Pearlston and River Rossi), and the informal gay and lesbian historians group (Patrizia Gentile, Tom Hooper, Steven Maynard).

Thanks to the students I taught before I retired and who challenged me at Nipissing University College, X University (now Toronto Metropolitan University), Memorial University of Newfoundland in St. John’s, Acadia University, OISE – University of Toronto, and Laurentian University. Also, thanks to those involved in the Sudbury Coalition Against Poverty where I learned so much, Queer Trans Community Defence, The We Demand an Apology Network, the AIDS Activist History Project, and the No Pride in Policing Coalition which reignited my abolitionist perspectives.

I also thank the three anonymous reviewers of this edition for their perceptive, detailed, and engaged reading. I have addressed as many of their concerns as I can and I have no doubt that their comments and challenges produced a better book.

For assistance on this third edition I thank River Rossi, Natalie Greenberg, Tom Hooper, and Charles Gonsalves. I thank River for providing indispensable aid when I encountered health issues in 2021–2022, especially with Chapter 4, the Introduction to the third edition, and Chapters 11 and 12.

Thanks also to Concordia University Press, especially Geoffrey Robert Little, Meredith Carruthers, Saelan Twerdy, Ryan Van Huijstee, Garet Markvoort for design, and Natalie Greenberg for her work on the index.

Thanks also to my mother Joan, and to my brother Grant for introducing me to the joys and horrors of computers.

Radical Alternatives: Refusing Inclusion

OmiSoore H. Dryden

More than twenty-five years since the second edition, this latest edition of Gary Kinsman's *The Regulation of Desire* is right on time. This book asks us to reflect on what it means to embrace sexual identities that defend colonialist, anti-Black, and capitalist state structures. It also asks us to reflect on the harm of performative inclusion and the discursive deployments of multiculturalism so that we can see through the state's hollow declarations and instead witness how it continues to discriminate and regulate.

A recent example: the theme of the 24th International AIDS Conference (IAC), held in Montréal in July 2022, was to "Re-engage and Follow the Science." It was hoped there would be an ability to "define future research agendas, shift latest evidence to action, and chart a new consensus on overcoming the HIV epidemic as a threat to public health and individual well-being."¹ And yet, the systemic racism of an AIDS conference held in Canada was evident in the lack of equitable funding and the denial of visas for those from the Global South, including International AIDS Society staff and leadership. In fact, there were a number of panels where the stage sat empty, as those scheduled to present were not granted entry into Canada to attend the conference. Activists protested, demanding "No more AIDS conferences in racist countries."

Canada's systemic anti-Indigenous and anti-Black racism is well documented and ongoing.² I reflect, briefly, on how this surfaced at the IAC panel I attended, titled, "Achieving health equity for 2SLGBTQI+ communities: Lessons learned from the HIV response in Canada." A panelist, a white gay man, presented a brief history of "gay activism," stating firmly, "I am only focusing on gay history here," and then proceeded to provide a list of single-framed white gay events and moments. This is not surprising, as the prominence of Canadian whiteness as a foundational element in lesbian and gay organizing and historical accounts often results in gay history only centring white gay accounts. Whether on a local or international stage, this normative single axis of assessment is misleading, disingenuous, and exasperating, and follows a longstanding pattern of bifurcated understandings of what counts as gay knowledge and the construction and oversimplification of significant gay moments. For example, the engagement of single-issue gay stories includes the federal government's 2019 commemoration of the "decriminalization" of homosexuality fifty years after reforms to the criminal code; and the 2022 Canadian Blood Services announcement of the removal of identity-based assessments and a move toward "behavioural"-based screening. Queer and trans people

are impacted by more than just the question, “Are you a male who has sex with another male even one time [during a period of time]?” Queer and trans people are also impacted by blood-services questions that target those born or residing in Canada, Black people, sex workers, and those who have been exposed to malaria. And yet, the single issue of gay stories would leave many to believe that the removal of the “gay question” now means the donor process is equitable, diverse, and inclusive. These assertions become components within and reinforcements of white-supremacist logics—logics that continue to harm queer and trans people through their alignment with colonialism, systemic racism (including anti-Black racism), and normative gender practices, ultimately occluding the complexity of queer politics, activism, and successes.

Equity, diversity, and inclusion is operated as a corrective philosophy that finds its premise in the belief that oppression happens solely through means of exclusion. Inclusion continues to be promoted as the antidote to many of the oppressions that hinder our material well-being. But what does it mean for queers to be included in a colonial, anti-Black Canadian state, either back in the day or now? Does being included now mean that past exclusions/wrongs/violences might be construed as forgiven, or worse, forgotten? And more so, does remembering the past, as well as calling for and demanding meaningful and measurable accountability, mean that we are ungrateful for these “new opportunities” for inclusion?

The practices of equity, diversity, and inclusion often conceal the existence of (anti-Black) racism and (anti-Black) homophobia/transphobia. EDI is often an attempt to move away from the reminders of exclusions/wrongs/violences and thus becomes a practice of failed/false repair. The respectable inclusion of the singular body/identity (“just gay”) is one that is willing to be deployed as a tool of a vacuous diversity. If the same state that continues to actively marginalize people claims to be diverse, we must ask, “What does this diversity do?” But if we think of diversity as dissimilarity, inclusion as embracing this bustling dissimilarity, and equity as transformative justice, what more could be made available for us complicated, incoherent, troubling queers?

Kinsman’s examination of “entry points,” his important and necessary term to help understand various events and forces at work, brings us together to reflect on queer and trans life through the relentless waves of the pandemic, the devastating recovery of the bodies of Indigenous children buried in mass, unmarked graves at mostly residential schools, the continued death of Black people from “encounters” with police (and calls to defund them), and the international movements in support of Black life. Through all of this, centred (again) is the work of abolition, transformative justice, and mutual aid. This is not the business of inclusion, but instead the labour of liberation. Inclusion and liberation do not occupy the same space. In *The Regulation of Desire* (Take 3), Gary Kinsman asks us to review who is considered and envisioned as the representational queer. This edition deepens his exploration of settler colonialism, racism, and climate destruction. Capitalism and colonialism, anti-Black racism and slavery, become the interlocking systems in need of dismantling. And as Gary states: “This provides a new and radical basis for a broad anti-capitalist activism that is also anti-racist, anti-colonial, for climate justice, and for queer and trans liberation” (xliv).

Liberation manifests by engaging in the disruption, disentanglement, and active refusal of white settler homonationalisms and, as also discussed, “homocapitalism.” The desire is not to figure out how to fit within those capitalist limits, but instead to explore the queer fullness of all that exceeds them. We cannot bargain with the neoliberal desires that support increased policing and police budgets, hyper-surveillance, increased homelessness, and decreased access to wellness, all of which are dependent upon and committed to the continued colonial and anti-Black project of the Canadian state. Systems of harm cannot be rectified through the performative apologies, review committees, and internal investigations. These gestures may variously appear to observers as extravagant, exaggerated, or sincere, but regardless of how they are perceived, they ultimately (re)produce no substantive change because no correction is possible through these colonial practices.

As this book so clearly demonstrates, it is necessary to interrogate how interlocking systems converge within our lives and upon our bodies. And we need new responses.

In the aftermath of the murder of George Floyd and the demand to defund and disarm police while increasing social supports, we instead witnessed a proliferation of equity, diversity, and inclusion statements, increased portrayals of “solidarity” through taking a knee when national anthems are sung, alongside a steady and domineering increase in police budgets. *Queers*, is this all there is? Is this the desired “good life”?

The labour, activism, and practices embedded in this latest edition of *The Regulation of Desire* are a necessary interruption in the landscape of Canadian queer and trans studies—one that refuses to be complicit in white-supremacist capitalist logics. Instead, this book urges us to seek anew and to think and *be* differently. It reminds us that it is necessary to renew our vigilance and our critical disruption of the continued emergence of the neoliberal queer and the capitalist social, racial, and class divides in queer and trans activism in Canada. This book incites us to think once again (if we haven’t already) about the limits—and, therefore, needed refusals—of inclusion, as well as the need to turn toward practices of accountability and liberation. Through these pages, we are pointedly reminded of the harms and violence created through homohegemonic bargains that persist and progress through the desire of inclusion for some at the expense of many others. The respectability politics of neoliberal queer desires will not disrupt these colonial and anti-Black systems of harm.

The Regulation of Desire reminds us that liberationist movements provide us with a framework to think of something different, to strive and to imagine different modes of relations with communities (instead of the state), and with each other. Engaging with the historical and contemporary design of white settler homonationalist desires clarifies the urgency of the demands for a more deliberate engagement with abolition: an “anti-all capitalism.” The stakes are high and rising, and we deserve to experience radically sustainable, livable lives.

Introduction to the Third Edition

Entry Points

In keeping with the format of the two previous editions, I start with entry points into current sexual/gender struggles—which are also very much racialized class struggles—in what is now called “Canada,” which I trouble, given its settler-colonial character. Following the feminist insight that “the personal is political,” I trace some of my personal political experiences through broader social relations.¹ I start with the most recent and go back to 2016. I note the general Toronto-centricity of many of these entry points, given my experience and knowledge as an important limitation, which I try to cut across where I can while at the same time recognizing that these same practices and relations can be found in differing combinations far beyond “Toronto”/Tkaronto.²

TAKE ONE, SUMMER/FALL/WINTER 2021/2023: NO RETURN TO NORMAL, INCLUDING NORMAL LGBT+ POLITICS!

I was finishing writing this third edition as there was expanding and continuing evidence of the recovery of the bodies of thousands of Indigenous children and young people who were killed in the residential “school” death camps;³ as the RCMP once again invaded Wet’suwet’en territories and Coastal GasLink drilled under the Wedzin Kwa (Morice) river; as the police violently cleared unhoused people from encampments in Halifax, Hamilton, Montréal, Ottawa, Toronto, Vancouver, and other centres;⁴ as at least three more police killings of Black men took place: Latjor Tuel (Calgary), Moses Erhirhie (Markham), and Taresh Bobby Ramroop (Jane/Finch Toronto); as the COVID-19 pandemic continued to spread around us but the official state and public health line increasingly became that we have “to learn to live with Covid,” with some now arguing that “the pandemic is over”; and as right-wing white supremacists with fascist connections took over downtown Ottawa and blocked border crossings in early 2022. In 2022 and 2023 many of these same right-wing white-supremacist groups were targeting drag story-time readings at public libraries and targeting trans and queer people. These right-wing protests were often welcomed by the police and were not met with the violence that Indigenous, Black, and unhoused people’s movements have faced.⁵

Various attempts to construct a “post-pandemic,” and now a during-the-pandemic return to “normality” were taking place, with the increasingly official lines that Covid is “endemic” and “we need to learn to live with it,” basically sentencing many elderly,

disabled, immune-compromised, and poorer people to death, infection, and more chronic illnesses, sicknesses, and disabilities. In a very different way, mainstream 2SLGBTQI (Two-Spirit, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, Queer, and Intersexed) groups like *Egale*,⁶ the LGBT Purge Fund (which emerged out of the class action settlement against the purge campaigns against queer people in the public service and military),⁷ and Pride Committees in larger centres attempted to return to a politics focused on the white middle class, forgetting what those of us who have survived the pandemic so far have learned from this experience and from the resistance movements against anti-Black racism and colonial genocidal practices.⁸ I investigate these organizations further in Chapter 11. These mainstream efforts attempted to shift our attention away from these genocidal and policing practices as part of forgetting what we could learn from resistance from 2020 to now, but it is precisely these moments that I start with, to contest the social organization of forgetting of these racist, genocidal and policing practices and the important resistances mobilized against them.⁹

No Pride in Genocide!

In 2021, Indigenous groups called for cancelling Canada Day celebrations and asserted “No Pride in Genocide” in the midst of the recovery of bodies from some residential school sites. On July 1, “Canada Day,” thousands of Indigenous people, including Two-Spirit people, and allies across the northern part of Turtle Island gathered and marched, bringing down colonial monuments in Winnipeg.¹⁰ Since 2020, these slogans have been combined with various Land Back struggles¹¹ as well as “Reconciliation is Dead” and “Shutdown Canada” as the RCMP again invaded the Wet’suwet’en yintah.¹² These struggles marked an important shift in popular perception, making it harder for settler “Canadians” to turn away from, and ignore the reality of, the genocidal violences inherent in Canadian settler colonialism. Canadian state formation¹³ is at root a settler-colonial project that has always been based on ongoing genocidal practices against Indigenous peoples, and there have also always been Indigenous-led resistances against it.

By “genocidal practices,” I refer to the destruction of lives and communities, cultural practices, and the social life of a particular group of people—not just the killing of a group of people but the wiping out of their social/cultural conditions of existence, including, for Indigenous people, their social relations to the land.¹⁴ These “residential schools” and associated day schools brought death, illness, and physical and sexual violence. They were based not only on forced assimilation and the taking away of Indigenous young people from their parents, families, and nations, crucially separating them from their connections to the land, but also on the attempt to annihilate their cultural practices,¹⁵ including Indigenous ways of doing gender (with three, four, or more gender groupings in some Indigenous cultures)¹⁶ and widespread gender/sexual diversity. In this edition, I often summarize this gender diversity using the more contemporary term “Two-Spirit,” but this is not intended in any way to wipe out the historical and social differences between different Indigenous cultures and nations and the different forms of resistance to colonialism in these areas. I realized that this edition must start

with Indigenous resistance to these genocidal practices and to prioritize Indigenous activity and resistance to the settler-colonial character of Canadian state formation.

I write after the 2021 RCMP invasion of Wet'suwet'en land to support the Coastal GasLink pipeline and the wave of rallies, marches, and blockades in opposition to this in the winter and then again in the fall of 2020, 2021 and, as this struggle continues, in 2022–2023. This has also included the Six Nations of the Grand River's 1492 Land Back Lane struggle, the fishery struggle in Mi'kma'ki, against logging at Fairy Creek, and the struggle against the TMX pipeline.¹⁷ Unfortunately, there has not been widespread white settler queer and trans support for these Indigenous struggles, and cultural support for Two-Spirit people remains separated from active opposition to settler colonialism and genocidal practices.

Given the character of “Canadian” state formation, I need to first locate myself as a white settler on Indigenous land. I have written this on Dish With One Spoon territory in Tkaronto, and also in N'Swakamok, the territories of the Atikameksheng Anishnawbek, the Wahnapiatae First Nation and other Anishnawbek people (“Sudbury” in settler-speak). In this book I attempt to learn to write in solidarity with Indigenous peoples and struggles as I also continue to learn from these struggles. But as a white settler I also attempt to take up a politics of responsibility towards Indigenous people by disrupting settler colonialism and racist practices from my locations within them.¹⁸ I therefore start this book with Indigenous resistance “against and beyond” these genocidal practices and Canadian state formation.¹⁹

While the slogan of No Pride in Genocide has everything to do with challenging Canada Day and Pride in “Canada,” I read and felt this, as did others, in the context of Pride Day and the No Pride in Policing slogan used by queer and trans activists wanting to keep the police out of Pride (see entry point two), as having queer and trans dimensions. It fundamentally challenges the very established identification of mainstream queer organizing with the Canadian state social form²⁰ as the road to rights and liberation (see Chapters 9, 11, and 12), pointing out that siding with racist, colonizing state relations is no place for any movement committed to social liberation to be. I am firmly against a return to the white settler-based agenda that is at the heart of a return to “normal” LGBT politics.

Opposition to these genocidal practices was a major focus of the No Pride in Policing Coalition and No More Silence-initiated Pride Day rally and march on June 27, 2021 in Toronto, with the theme of “We Must ‘Change Everything’: Creating Liveable Queer, Trans, and Two-Spirit Lives Without Police and Prisons.”

I was among more than five hundred people taking over Queen and Yonge Streets in protest. We gathered outside X University (now Toronto Metropolitan University) just north of Dundas and Yonge, sitting down and blocking College and Yonge—recreating the 2016 BLM Toronto protest that stopped Pride Toronto (see entry point four)—and gathering outside police HQ to name and remember those killed by racist police violence. I use “we” here specifically for being involved in the No Pride in Policing Coalition (NPPC). But more generally I do not use “we” to obscure social differences and social power relations between different social groups, which is a usage encountered a bit later

in this Introduction. Instead, I use it as John Holloway does to refer to working-class and oppressed people in struggle and to our various compositions of struggle. “We” is a project that people can come to be involved in and identify with.²¹ In 2022, I was in the Abolitionist Pride march organized by the No Pride in Policing Coalition and No More Silence, which also challenged genocidal practices in its tour of downtown historical sites of oppression and resistance.²²

This developed a broader abolitionist approach that moved beyond opposition to policing to opposition to prisons and carceral injustice, articulating a strategy for radical²³ social transformation as a shift towards social caring and social reproduction, as resources are transferred from police, prisons, and other carceral institutions to community-based programs directly addressing people’s needs. This moves beyond a limited rights-based perspective, which is based on letting us into already existing rights within existing institutions—a largely integrationist strategy that favours those already at the top within communities, not a strategy for social transformation.

In the first two editions, I largely adopted a left variant of the rights approach with some critiques of its limitations, largely drawn from Marx’s critique of the abstract character of these rights.²⁴ This was then, and is definitely now, no longer adequate. Perhaps one way to make this clear is to look at the question of trans people and imprisonment. A rights approach will address whether trans people are able to be imprisoned, given gender-segregation, in the prison appropriate to their gender identification. While this is important, an abolitionist approach asks more radical questions about why they are being imprisoned at all.²⁵ The rights approach accepts the social form of prisons while an abolitionist approach rejects this. Abolitionist approaches lead not to integration into existing oppressive social rules and institutions but to a breaking down of disciplinary and carceral state institutions in the present, focusing on transferring resources and building alternatives now. Abolitionism validates caring and social reproductive labour, work that is not always waged and often not seen as “productive” labour in capitalist relations.

Abolitionism is fundamentally an anti-capitalist/anti-racist politics of revolutionary social transformation that grasps that capitalism always has a racial character. As Ruth Wilson Gilmore puts it, speaking specifically about prison abolition in a way that is also more generally relevant, abolitionist politics “is a specific form of anti-capitalism, which is to say, prison abolition is a specific form of anti-*all* capitalism, all of which is racial capitalism.... Everything has to change.”²⁶ It is always racial capitalism; settler colonialism and anti-Black racism are central to the character of “Canadian” capitalist relations and state formation. Race and racism are not separate from capitalism but are always integral and defining of capitalist social relations. This position opposes claims by some “Marxists” and social movement/post-structuralist theorists that capitalism and racism exist independently of each other, as well as the position of orthodox, reductionist, class-first Marxism that racism is entirely determined by capitalism with no autonomy.²⁷ Racism is not simply an “effect” of capitalism. Racism is not external to or separate from but is instead integral to, and mediated with, the concrete historical character of capitalism.²⁸

For me, these foundational genocidal practices not only put “Canada” in question, they raise profound questions for any queer and trans politics that have any identification with Canada or with capitalist social relations. This also raises profound questions about the common separation of “cultural” support for Two-Spirit people among mainstream white and settler-based LGBT+ groups—who, using a limited conceptualization of “Indigeneity,” often reductively treat it as the Indigenous term for LGBT— from a deeper recognition of or struggle against the racist, capitalist, genocidal basis of settler colonialism (see Chapters 4 and 11).

No Pride in Genocide and similar struggles are therefore not for inclusion in this “Canada,” which has unfortunately been the history of mainstream queer and trans organizing but rather *against and beyond* this “Canada.” “Inclusion” into full Canadian citizenship, which has been the mainstream objective in LGBT organizing, must be troubled and instead requires disengagement from “Canadian” state formation.

This is a vital and necessary challenge to the formative Charter moment, in which the Charter of Rights come to be seen as the road to LGBT+ rights (Chapter 10). Instead, liberationist perspectives must be opposed to such nationalism and support the making of alternatives based on Indigenous sovereignty. In order to end the continuous generation of the relations of poverty at the centre of our social worlds, and to oppose the logic of private profit and exploitation (of land, resources, and workers), we must support the Land Back movement, restoring to Indigenous peoples the lands taken away from them through colonization and genocidal practices, and repairing crucial social relations with that land.

Resisting the Policing of Encampments

Meanwhile, police campaigns against unhoused/homeless people²⁹ (many of whom are Indigenous, Black, and queer and trans) in the midst of the pandemic continued across Canada, with police violence being used to clear encampments in Halifax, Hamilton,³⁰ and in Toronto at Lamport Stadium and Trinity-Bellwoods Park.³¹

I was present at the clearing of Lamport Stadium on July 21, 2021 that led to more than twenty-six arrests³² and I witnessed the mass police and security mobilization and police violence and brutality, with the police shoving and hitting encampment residents and supporters, using pepper spray, horses, drones, and more. Trying to not get arrested, I had to keep moving away from the advancing police lines. Falling behind could have led to police brutality and/or arrest. I saw people brutalized all around me including queer and trans-identified people. But this was not the only story—at the same time, community medics were looking after people, diluting and washing out pepper spray from people’s eyes, and others were keeping track of those arrested and where the police were taking them so they could be followed up with demands for their release. This was people taking care of people, mutual aid, beginning to prefigure what a caring society without police might look like.

That fall there were also arrests of Black encampment support activists in Hamilton on charges of “assault” and “obstruction of justice” as the police acted to undermine support for the encampments and to raise the stakes so that even just showing up for

encampment defence meant getting arrested.³³ They attempted to intimidate, weaken, and even to destroy encampment support organizations.

These encampments were much safer in the midst of the pandemic than the packed and overcrowded shelters (with little to no possibilities of physical distancing) where many Covid “breakouts” were taking place. Since we have known that Covid is airborne and being outside is often safer, local state policies directed police and public health opposition against people trying to survive in the encampments as part of exercising control over public space while also trying to drive homeless people out of public view. In shelters, the homeless are not visible. This was both based on the early public-health “stay at home” line from state officials, which failed to notice that many people do not have homes (the homeless or unhoused, the imprisoned and detained) and that home is not a safe place for many cis and trans women, as well as for many queer and trans youth, among others. “Home” is also a major site of transmission of Covid, as we have seen with students infecting their parents and vice versa. While a number of activists and observers reported that the encampment residents and defenders brutalized by police were often queer and trans-identified, mainstream LGBT+ groups said nothing. Pride Toronto, for instance, maintained its alliance with then Toronto mayor John Tory despite his very active support for these encampment raids. Apparently, these were not the “right” kind of queer and trans people. But these are struggles that queer and trans liberation activists cannot stand apart from.

From Many Waves to “Living with Covid” and Capitalism=Death!

It has been very painful living through the years of the pandemic with people I know getting sick, with a few dying, and some living with Long Covid, and knowing that the response could have been otherwise.³⁴ Living through the AIDS crisis as an activist, I know that things could have been very different with popular education, community organizing and mass and direct-action activism moving far beyond the limitations of public health and the profit orientation of pharmaceutical corporations.³⁵

As I am writing, according to low estimates more than 54,000 people in “Canada,” and more than seven million people globally have died of COVID-19 (some suggest the actual number is more than twenty million) and more than 4.7 million in “Canada” and more than 770 million world-wide have been infected with this virus. More than 65 million people are living with Long Covid. At the same time an increasingly official line is that Covid is now “endemic” (it will always be around) or that the pandemic is supposedly over and that we therefore need to learn to “live with Covid” and normalize it, with masks and other protections being lifted. This is basically a death and infection sentence for disabled, elderly, immune-compromised, and poor people, especially in the Global South who are, most often, racialized. As many people have characterized it, this is basically a eugenic response (culling the population so that only the “fit” survive), drawing on earlier “herd immunity” perspectives that treated people with immune-compromised bodies, with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as Black and people of colour, as expendable.³⁶

The pandemic has had and is having a major impact on precarious and low-waged workers and Black, Indigenous, and racialized people in Canada as well. Many of these groups are seen as “unproductive” for capital, so are seen as “disposable.” This is in contrast to many Indigenous views that, for instance, see elders as the holders of knowledge and wisdom. This is also based on the privileging of the need for profit and of the “economy” over people’s lives, without recognizing that it is people who socially produce the “economy” based on the exploitation of waged and unwaged labour. Talking about the “needs” of the economy is a reification of relations produced socially between people, which instead become a thing-like entity with agency over our lives. The new “living with Covid” position has now largely superseded the earlier “flatten the curve” public health line that was designed to prevent hospitals from getting overwhelmed.

At various points during the pandemic (and even though it has only been a little over three years, the pandemic has a *long* history), various groups have been identified as “expendable” and “disposable”: men having sex with men; Haitians, Africans, and other Black people; drug users; and sex workers were portrayed in this way earlier in the continuing AIDS crisis (Chapter 10). These groups were designated as “high-risk groups” who were supposedly a “risk” to white, heterosexual, and middle-class people.³⁷ They/we became “expendable” populations. But in the context of the Covid pandemic, “expendable people” included people of Asian backgrounds, who were early on identified as the source of “contagion” and had racist violence mobilized against them, even though being Asian had nothing to do with actual transmission patterns. It became clear that those with diabetes, cancer, HIV, heart conditions, immune system disorders, other disabilities, and those who are older are also more susceptible to the ravages of Covid, and lack of action also deemed them “expendable.” Many have also been affected by the long-term health impacts of Covid infection, which have not received the attention they require. Conservative estimates suggest that between twenty and thirty percent of people affected by Covid develop long-term disabilities and health problems.

At the same time, entirely forgetting the lessons of AIDS organizing and activism, AIDS and queer and trans groups, other social movements, unions, and left organizations have been largely unable to develop a “Zero Covid” or virus-suppression strategy from below, where the focus is on suppressing the virus and its rate of transmission,³⁸ and have therefore largely found themselves mouthing and supporting state and public health strategies from a slightly more critical perspective. But again, as in the AIDS crisis, we need to ask: which public and whose health is being protected? (See Chapter 10.) A very different possibility was suggested in the grassroots community safe-sex and organizing practices in the context of AIDS.

AIDS activism was based on refusing the social response of getting rid of “expendable” people and fighting instead against discrimination and stigmatization. Drawing some suggestions from this for addressing the pandemic means putting the needs of those most affected at the centre of the social response: health care for all; engaging in safer practices as everyone’s social responsibility, as were safe sex and practices in the AIDS crisis; providing support for people infected and sick (including those with

Long Covid); major funding for treatment and vaccine research; free and rapid access to safe and effective vaccines and treatments for those most directly affected, including in the Global South, and an end to vaccine and treatment apartheid; a major transfer of resources to countries in the Global South to fight the health crisis; and a major move from a health-from-above, defined by the medical elite and the pharmaceutical corporations, to a health-from-below informed by feminist health movements and AIDS organizing, in which people get to take more control over their own bodies and health.³⁹ This brings us back to AIDS activism and the Montréal Manifesto by AAN! and ACT UP NYC in 1989 for the Montréal World AIDS Congress where, to address the AIDS crisis, there needed to be a massive transfer of resources to the Global South.⁴⁰

In the intervening years since the height of AIDS activism and organizing, neoliberal individualism has worked over community-based practices of social responsibility, turning the tables and making only the people affected responsible. In the Covid pandemic, responsibility has also been shifted onto individuals from the communities most affected. As has become clear, it is the defence of capitalist relations which are paramount (both the profit rates of the pharma corporations, in particular, and capitalist relations of exploitation more generally) and this is why I suggest shifting the AIDS activist slogan of “Silence=Death!” to “Capitalism=Death!”⁴¹ Fortunately, the other AIDS activist slogan Action=Life, involving direct action, is still a crucial part of the solution.⁴²

Unfortunately, there has been a reliance on public health, state officials, and the police⁴³ to enforce health rules rather than the needed popular education and community organizing, as in the AIDS crisis. For instance, there were major problems early on with the public health guidelines pushing “social distancing” (as opposed to physical distancing) when we need the social more than ever to survive this pandemic—and we urgently need new forms of sociality, based on social justice and anti-oppression practices in the context of the pandemic, that can include mass protest and revolt, as we saw in 2020 and 2021.

It was clear early on that, despite the early framing of Covid as a respiratory infection you either died from or recovered from in a few weeks, that some people infected with Covid developed a long-term form of Covid with health problems and disabilities lasting for months and years. But this very limited initial social construction of knowledge of Covid has had a lasting impact on social responses in the pandemic, and this focus on respiratory infection now increasingly looks like only the surface or initial response of bodies to infection. Affected people had to fight to get a broader notion of Covid recognized and few official statistics were collected on this. The social organization of the statistical knowledge about Covid limited awareness and knowledge of the full impact of the pandemic.⁴⁴ And now even these limited statistics are not being collected in many jurisdictions, leading to a major lack of knowledge about the impacts of the pandemic in people’s lives. This is one of the reasons that the simplistic dictum to just “rely on the science” is not adequate, since all scientific knowledge is historical and social in character and science is a contested terrain of struggle. For instance, many public

health officials resisted for months (and some still don't accept) acknowledging that Covid is airborne, leading to many deaths and infections. I will say more about this reliance on "science" later in relation to climate justice. It is becoming increasingly clear that Covid is far more than a respiratory infection, and many get cardiovascular, brain, and other health complications from long-term Covid. It can be considered a vascular and neurotropic disease that can include cognitive decline.

The pandemic has also been addressed as a problem within nation-states and not as a *global* pandemic. Western and Northern states like Canada have addressed the problem to attend to the needs of their citizens and their capitalist class and not the needs of people in the Global South. This has prioritized the profit rates of the pharmaceutical corporations and the facilitation of the exploitation of labour (both paid and unpaid) over the needs of the most affected within the boundaries of the nation-state and especially of people in the Global South. As a result, Canadian state policies have played an integral part in the vaccine apartheid, which is especially devastating for poorer people in the Global South already ensnared in relations of neocolonialism, imperialism, and underdevelopment.⁴⁵ In March 2022, it was reported that while eighty percent of the people in "high-income" countries have been vaccinated, in "low-income" countries this is true for about thirteen percent. This meant that around three billion people were waiting for their first dose.⁴⁶ This also means that these areas provide sites for the continuing mutation of the Covid virus with new variants, despite vaccine developments, which can escape the regulatory impact of vaccines. While the vaccines developed with much public financial support and making major profits for the pharma corporations have been very useful in preventing deaths among those double-vaccinated and with booster shots, they were based on knowledge about the first variants of Covid and their effectiveness seems to be waning. To really address the pandemic on a global scale requires the ending of vaccine apartheid and making vaccines, treatments, masks, and other personal protective equipment freely available to people in the Global South, along with a massive redistribution of resources to the Global South more generally.

The official public health response did not engage in popular education or community organizing, relying instead on public health/state edicts, rules, and mandates from on high. Given the lack of grounding and engagement in safe practices in sustained popular education, support for safe practices regarding COVID-19 has not been very deeply rooted. Along with neoliberal individualism and the erosion of commitments to social responsibility, this provided an opening that was filled, in a conscious strategy, by existing white-supremacist and fascist groups,⁴⁷ who quickly merged with anti-masker and anti-vaxxer networks to organize against protections like wearing masks and accessing vaccines when they became available. As mentioned, our social movements, the unions, and "the Left" were unable to organize an opposing virus suppression strategy from the bottom up based on popular education and community organizing. The right wing, in contrast, organized regular and persistent rallies and demonstrations across the country in both larger and smaller centres and gained the support of various right-wing politicians and government officials in Conservative parties. Later, this led to

blockades and attacks on vaccination clinics, hospitals, health workers, and politicians. They also managed to shift the whole public discussion of responses to the pandemic in a right-wing direction.

The high points of right-wing organizing were the “Freedom” convoys that took over downtown Ottawa for more than three weeks and blockaded border crossings at Coutts, Alberta, and the Ambassador Bridge in Windsor in early 2022. The police initially cooperated with them, in contrast to how Indigenous, Black, and homeless/unhoused people’s actions have been addressed. For more than three weeks they were allowed to instil fear and terror in the everyday lives of people in downtown Ottawa. During these weeks, a mass base was built for white supremacy and fascist initiatives across the Canadian state that can now be mobilized around this and other right-wing issues, including attacks on drag story time events and trans and queer people. But networks of mutual aid and community safety soon developed in Ottawa and, on February 13, a dog-walking group and supporters of the Punch Up anarchist collective blocked a reinforcement convoy from reaching downtown.⁴⁸ Starting with just a dozen people, the battle of Billings Bridge grew to more than a thousand people, including a number of queer and trans community activists.⁴⁹ This began to turn the situation around. The next week, a community demonstration and more blockades of the “convoy” were planned. It was in this context that the federal state enacted the Emergency Act, even though the police already had the powers if they wished to use them to deal with the convoy. This set a very dangerous precedent for future Indigenous, Black, climate justice, and other movements.⁵⁰ Community-based anti-racist/anti-fascist movement organizing involving large numbers of queer and trans activists will hopefully be crucial in defeating this white-supremacist force.⁵¹ Unfortunately, as I write this this, right-wing movements have won almost all their demands from various levels of government as various forms of protection for people have been repealed.

The pandemic was also preceeded by, and is now intertwined with, a major toxic drug supply and deadly opioid⁵² crisis, in which drug users have been defined by ruling agencies as also “expendable.” The ending of the war on drugs, the decriminalization of drugs, harm reduction practices, safe drug supplies, and safe injection and other drug-use sites are urgently needed.

Developments in these three major areas—No Pride in Genocide organizing, resistance to encampment police repression, and to the pandemic—emerge out of long histories of colonialism, neocolonialism, imperialism, and racial-capitalist social relations. With the profit rates of the pharmaceutical industry at the centre, it is clear why capitalist relations and the defence of private profit are driving these problems—a phenomenon that also has parallels with climate change, as I will discuss. This is rooted in unequal relations and what has often been described as imperialism, rooted in the “Western” capitalist countries becoming “overdeveloped” based on the “underdevelopment” of the Global South.⁵³ This imperialism renders people in the Global South and poorer countries “expendable” in the pandemic, with little available treatment and very limited access to vaccines. Western and Northern countries do not prioritize the needs and concerns of poorer people in the Global South. But the contradiction now

is with the variants developing among the unvaccinated, often concentrated in the Global South, and how this comes to also haunt and affect people in the Global North, including those with vaccinations and boosters—even the newest ones. As suggested earlier, we need internationalist and not nationalist responses. Capitalism, colonialism/imperialism, and the need for an internationalist response are therefore key problems needing to be addressed by queer and trans liberation.

Along with the growing knowledge of the genocidal practices “Canada” is based on, this presents a profound challenge to the support for Canadian state formation and capitalist relations that mainstream LGBT organizing is based on. Much of this organizing is still largely frozen in the Charter moment established in the 1980s and 1990s (see Chapters 9 and 10) in which the Charter’s equality rights section, as part of a partial shift in legal state formation, came to be seen as the route to full rights and inclusion within a white and middle-class cis-dominated society. However, this also led to the identification of the Canadian state form—which is based on the colonization of Indigenous people, anti-Black racism, and carceral injustice—as the road to “our” rights. There is an important connection here with homonationalism, and settler homonationalism in particular.

This is more broadly related to Jasbir Puar’s theorization of homonationalism in the context of the “war on terror” and orientalist forms of privileging the West and North as the best defenders of LGBT+ rights.⁵⁴ It can be seen as an identification with the Western, “civilized” nation-state as the road to rights and liberation. This is a relational field of power where the binary between the “civilized” West and the “barbaric” East rests on those queers who have been otherized, expelled and placed in detention. In this book I attempt to trace out some of the historical social and material practices through which these relations have been established.

Support for the relations grounded in Canadian state formation is a homonationalism where the settler-colonial state form, based on racism and genocidal practices, becomes the only conceivable framework for LGBT+ rights.⁵⁵ In this mainstream view, “Canada” is seen as an “advanced” country on LGBT+ rights while, simultaneously, the settler-colonial character and genocidal practices at the root of Canadian state and social formation are either ignored, minimized, or explained away.

In contrast to mainstream LGBT support for Canadian state formation as the framework to rights and liberation, I argue that queer and trans liberation must instead adopt a clear critical approach opposed to colonialism, capitalism, anti-Black and other forms of racism, and the police as a social institution. I use the expression “queer and trans liberation” in this edition, realizing that “queer” is much more developed here, given my social experiences and practice, than are “trans” and “Two-Spirit.” But it is also crucial to name and learn from trans and Two-Spirit experiences, since they transform what queer politics is about, in both troubling the two-gender binary and challenging settler colonialism. At the same time, this critique of gender relations and the gender binary needs to be taken much further than I have been able to by others, especially by trans and Two-Spirit activists. I return to some of these questions later in this Introduction, in Chapter 4 and in Chapter 12.

I was among close to three thousand people attending an Abolish the Police rally and teach-in on Pride Day (June 28) in Nathan Philips Square in Toronto.⁵⁶ People were wearing masks, physically distancing, and using lots of hand sanitizer, given this was in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. The isolation and anxiety I felt in the pandemic was broken with the uprising against anti-Black racism and police violence and through helping organize this Pride Day action as part of this uprising.⁵⁷

Mostly Black, Indigenous, and people of colour voices, music and dancing filled the square. Many of the speakers were queer and trans, and it was very much an anti-racist, queer event. The NPPC launched the Defund and Abolish All Police statement at the event, calling not only for defunding but also abolishing the police.⁵⁸

Clear links were made between anti-Black and other forms of racism, the colonization of Indigenous people, the Stonewall riots, the resistance to the bath raids, the starting of Pride marches in the city, and the struggles of queer and trans Black people and people of colour as well as Two-Spirit people. Chants filling the air included “No Justice, No Peace! Abolish the Police!” It was my best Pride since the Black Lives Matter stoppage of the Pride parade in 2016, with the call for meeting community demands and for no institutional police presence within Pride parades and festivals (see Take Four).

The event was facilitated by the No Pride in Policing Coalition, a multi-racial organization, formed initially to support the demands of Black Lives Matter—especially the demand for no police participation within Pride—in 2018. With the global uprising against anti-Black racism and the police erupting in May 2020 after a series of police murders in the US (including of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Tony McDade) and of Black, Indigenous, and people of colour in “Canada” (including the death of Regis Korchinski-Paquet, and the murders of Chantel Moore, Rodney Levi, D’Andrew Campbell, and Ejaz Ahmed Choudry), new openings for struggles were created for developing an abolitionist approach.⁵⁹

The No Pride in Policing Coalition consulted a number of Black, Indigenous, and people of colour organizers in the city, who pointed out that we needed to go beyond defunding the police to an abolitionist perspective, including getting rid of the police’s legal ability to use “deadly force.” Demands for defunding and even abolishing the police that had been marginal suddenly became popular demands in the midst of the uprising.

With only ten days to go, in alliance with many other groups we organized the rally and teach-in. It was some of the most intensive organizing I have ever been involved in. It was exhausting but also an incredible learning experience.

Even though Pride Toronto did not support the Abolish the Police event (aside from providing ASL funding) it did alter the time of the virtual Pride march so that people could attend or watch the rally. But even this was too much for some mainstream white LGBT leaders. Douglas Elliot, associated with the Just Society Committee of Egale and the class action suit against the Purge campaign (who we will meet again) posted on Facebook on June 25, 2020:

It seems the transformation of Pride Toronto is now complete. It is now primarily, if not exclusively, an anti-racism organization. “This weekend is very much about race”—the anniversary of Stonewall. It appears that LGBT rights dare not be mentioned during Pride Month, not even on the anniversary of Stonewall or at least must take a back seat to anti-racism concerns. *We are to be erased.*⁶⁰

Elliot constructs Black, Indigenous, and racialized people as somehow outside the boundaries of “LGBT” (the “we” he constructs) and, correspondingly, white LGBT people seem to have nothing to do with race and racism, despite daily white LGBT participation in the practices of white hegemony, privilege, and supremacy. Being LGBT in this white imaginary view is violently abstracted away from raced and classed struggles and a false universal of LGBT as white and middle-class gets put in place.⁶¹ The social power of racism magically disappears. Elliot grossly exaggerates when he argues that Pride Toronto is now “an anti-racism organization,” which it is not. Elliot also forgets the history of the Black and people of colour, trans women, and drag queens who initiated fighting back at Stonewall, who were fighting against a combination of racism, heterosexism and what we now often call “transphobia” all bound up together.

When Elliot wrote, “We are to be erased,” we need to ask which “we” this is, since it seems to refer only to white LGBT people whom no one is suggesting be erased. This “we” has a clear white and middle-class LGBT location and other queer and trans people are excluded from it. This is a mobilization of white racism against queer and trans Black, Indigenous, and racialized people. And given social power relations and racism, we know it is actually queer and trans people of colour who have often been “erased.” But Elliot inverts this, suggesting that queer and trans people of colour somehow have all the social power and both *can* and actually *want to* “erase” white LGBT people from Pride.

What Elliot and others seem unable to grasp is that their racial and class alliances with police forces and state agencies reached a fundamental point of rupture with the global uprising and the later No Pride in Genocide organizing. They and other neoliberal queer forces now clearly stand on the other side of the divide in relation to the police and racism—and against racial and social justice—as racialized, class-based, and anti-colonial struggles are posed much more sharply. The forms of race and class relations that neoliberal queers are engaged in supporting stand directly against the lives of many Black, Indigenous, and people of colour.

The Abolish the Police rally was crucial in developing a queer and trans activism that is defined by and clearly stands on the side of Black, Indigenous, and racialized people. The approach can no longer be “let us into” the racist and oppressive institutions that are causing the deaths of Black, Indigenous, and other people of colour but instead for a radical transformation of social relations and a major rupture with the police and broader criminal injustice relations as we make alternatives based on social justice.

Official public health and state advice to “stay at home” was ripped open by the uprising and safe forms of mass and direct action exploded. Instead, we began to use public

and social space to build a collective masked and physically distanced revolt against racism and the police. The uprising was increasingly directed against the roots of racial capitalism itself.

The uprising resisted both repression and liberal strategies of containment. These strategies of containment include liberal and social democratic forces actively reworking defunding the police into limited police reform and severing it from disarming and abolishing the police; the diversion of energy into increased funding for body cameras, which are now being used as threats against those being attacked by the police; and trying to get moderate protesters to turn on other protesters who use a diversity of tactics to meet their objectives. They are defined by the police as not being “peaceful” despite the violence already saturating police actions, anti-Black racism, poverty, and more.⁶² The uprising continued unevenly on a global scale for months and opened up a lasting social and political space for demands for defunding and also abolishing the police. It began to be contained in the United States in the fall of 2020 as focus on the election battle between Biden and Trump was able to absorb much of the grassroots and community organizing, steering it back into mainstream electoral politics and, with the Biden victory in the elections, serving to channel it largely away from previous mass and community mobilizations.⁶³

Surviving this pandemic, already mentioned in the context of the more than eight waves in the first entry point, despite its specific features, requires learning from the uprising, community-based organizing against Covid, and from earlier waves of AIDS activism. This was perhaps most clear in the ways in which many long-term care facilities were turned into “death camps” not only in 2020, but also again in late 2021 and 2022 for older people, disabled people, and precarious support workers across the “Canadian” state.⁶⁴ Those who are homeless or in prison were also often considered expendable. Black and Indigenous people, based on the racialization of poverty, colonialism, and the lack of access to health and social services, were also rendered more vulnerable, as were precarious and migrant workers.⁶⁵

TAKE THREE, 2019: ANTI-69 VERSUS THE MYTHOLOGY OF THE '69 CRIMINAL CODE REFORM

Although this now seems so long ago, in pre-Covid times, the Canadian government celebrated the 50th anniversary of the 1969 Criminal Code Reform in 2019 as the “decriminalization of homosexuality.” In contrast, I was involved in the Anti-69 Network, which was against the state-sponsored and officially sanctioned mythologies generated regarding the '69 reform, pointing out that there was no decriminalization of “homosexuality” in 1969.⁶⁶ The government, for this “celebration,” provided funding to Egale to produce a film and exhibition,⁶⁷ to various Pride groups across the Canadian state including Pride Toronto,⁶⁸ and a celebratory coin from the Canadian mint—reading, in English, “1969 Equality 2019.” The response from the Anti-69 Network was: “There was no equality in 1969 and still no equality in 2019.”⁶⁹

Others, like Olivia Nuamah, then Executive Director of Pride Toronto, in their funding application to Canadian Heritage in fall 2018, wrote that, “As Canadians we value

diversity and inclusion, and decriminalization marks a significant period in Canadian history. It was also the first country in the 1st world to de-criminalize homosexuality...for which the rest of the developed world followed.”⁷⁰ This appeal to Canadian values was wrong on a number of counts since Canada was not the first state in the “developed” world to move towards the “decriminalization” of homosexuality.⁷¹ Pride Toronto received funding of \$250,000 from Heritage Canada to celebrate the ’69 reform, along with funding from Public Safety.⁷² Pride Toronto’s 2019’s theme, influenced by this funding, initially was to be “the 50th Year of Decriminalization of Homosexuality in Canada.” The leaked initial draft for this theme read:

In 1969 Canada decriminalized homosexuality, simultaneously in 1969 the Stonewall Riots took place at the Stonewall Inn in New York, which began the international fight for LGBTQ2+ rights around the world.... The 50th year of Decriminalization in Canada is significant. Canada is now considered the most LGBTQ2+ friendly nation in the world and took up the road to equality first and has come the furthest. Throughout June 2019 we want to ensure that the world knows to follow Canada’s lead and recognize everyone in our community as unique and deserving of the right to equality.⁷³

This draft alludes to earlier same-sex marriage and other rights struggles, which I come back to in Chapter 11. This statement is clearly informed by what Jasbir Puar calls homonationalism, which I outlined earlier. Here, this is very clear with the assertion that the Canadian state is the most advanced and friendliest regarding LGBTQ2+ rights and that everyone needs to know about and “follow Canada’s lead.” This serves to both construct Canada as more “advanced” than other countries, building support for Canadian state policies and eclipsing all that remains to be done to bring about rights and liberation in the Canadian context (see Chapters 11 and 12). Fortunately, mobilizing by the Anti-69 Network⁷⁴ and other activists got Pride Toronto to shift its theme from the ’69 reform to the Stonewall riots.⁷⁵

This celebration of the ’69 reform was in direct contradiction to what I learned when I wrote the chapter on “The Struggle for Law Reform” in earlier editions of *The Regulation of Desire* (and in “Wolfenden in Canada”⁷⁶ and “Not A Gift From Above”⁷⁷) and from what I learned being part of the Anti-69 Network. This sets up a rupture in my experience between what I know from my own experiences, research, activism, and interviews (including with Doug Sanders, Bruce Somers,⁷⁸ and Arnold Peters⁷⁹) and what the government and some sections of the mainstream LGBT movement—like Egale—were saying. This also occurred in the broader context of the “apology” moment, focusing on the decades-late 2017 apology for the national security purge campaigns against thousands of “homosexuals” and gender diverse people in the public service and military. The government used this to try to develop “patriotism” and “loyalty to Canada” among some white, middle-class queers.⁸⁰ More on this in Chapter 11.

I learned from new research by Tom Hooper,⁸¹ Karen Pearlston,⁸² and others how the 1969 reform provided only a partial exemption from criminalization for two of the offences used to criminalize sex between bodies largely identified as “male.” This has led

me to be critical of the work I did popularizing the '69 reform as the "partial decriminalization of homosexuality" in the Canadian context, including in the first two editions of this book.⁸³ The celebration of the '69 reform was both part of an attempt at constructing an official history of the '69 reform but was at the same time also the social organization of forgetting of our long resistance to sexual policing. This forgetting includes the privatization of our sexualities and the construction of some of us as "mentally ill" and no longer criminal, which the '69 reform and debate all participated in. Both this construction of "history" and this forgetting are central to the making of neoliberal queer history.⁸⁴ This shapes our historical memories and the contested terrains they become.

Neoliberalism is the capitalist strategy that developed in response to the global wave of social struggles in the 1960s—which began to put capitalist, racist, and patriarchal social relations in question—and is based on cuts to social programs and the social wage, the tightening up of borders and "law and order," and the expansion of carceral relations.⁸⁵ Despite those who argue that neoliberalism is based on "shrinking the state," it actually depends on an expansion of disciplinary state relations (including police, prisons, and carceral relations more generally) and facilitating mass incarceration, which is why abolitionist politics is key to opposition to neoliberal capitalism, and to an anti-capitalist perspective more generally. Abolishing these relations and building alternatives opens the way for different forms of social organization.⁸⁶ By the 1980s, neoliberalism became the ruling strategy in capitalist state formation, including in Canada. In this context the rights victories of queer organizing always had a double-sided character. They benefited some queers far more than others, leading to the emergence of new white, middle-class layers (mostly cis men) emerging to speak for our "community." "Privacy" was often for these queers only, often based on their private-property ownership and this became crucial to a particular racialized class relation. Others were excluded from this and left behind, and Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans people became particular targets of the police and prison-industrial complex.

As Peter Drucker demonstrates in *Warped*, neoliberal capitalism has led to the formation of pro-capitalist layers within queer communities. This "gay normalization" is characterized by Drucker beyond its white and middle-class character—and here I largely agree—through defining itself as a stable and distinct minority (in part through a popular essentialism that I return to in the conclusion), through tendencies towards gender conformity, through the marginalization of sexual and gender minorities including trans people, through integration into and identification with the nation-state (including homonationalism and orientalism), and through forming homonormative families through marriage.⁸⁷ Within Canadian social formation there is a shift in racialized class relations. As I detail in Chapter 7, in the 1950s and 1960s there was a distinction in cultural formation among men who had sex with other men between those who were "overt" and those who were "covert," which was loosely correlated with class divisions.⁸⁸ This has some relation to butch/femme lesbian cultural formation, in which butches were usually more out and visible.⁸⁹ It was largely impossible, in these years, to be out and to be part of the "responsible" and "respectable" white middle class. Ironically, it was the mass struggles against the police and for our rights in the 1970s and 1980s which

created possibilities for many of these kinds of men to now be “out” and to eventually become a generally accepted part of the white middle class.

This social layer, despite its white and middle-class character, used the mirage of a common or unitary “community” that is apparently raceless and classless to hide their racialized class politics, which accommodate them with neoliberal capitalist relations. This helped to produce a new white, middle-class, largely cisgender ruling elite that has engaged in a long and one-sided class struggle, attempting to remake our movements and communities in their own class, racial and social interests. These neoliberal queers struggle for integration into existing social forms and move us away from the politics of social transformation. They simply want to be let into existing constructions of spouse, family, marriage, the military, national security, and, for those wanting to enter the country, “immigrant” and “refugee.” These constructions are all tied into capitalist, patriarchal and racist state relations and white middle-classness.

These neoliberal tendencies are facilitated and extended into parts of the Global South by the emergence of what Rahul Rao describes as a “homocapitalism” that comes to inform the “development” policies of Western-dominated international financial institutions (IFIs). Homocapitalism signifies “the selective incorporation of some race-, class-, and gender-sanitized queers into capitalism and the disavowal of others through a liberal politics of recognition that obviates the need for redistribution” of resources, wealth and social power.⁹⁰ In “Global Homocapitalism,” Rao goes further in demonstrating how these pro-capitalist relations are facilitated through international financial institutions. He questions why leading institutions of global capitalism are increasingly taking up “homophobia” as an object of concern, often setting themselves up as benevolent forces against it. Rao looks at the ways that IFIs have taken up LGBT rights discourses against homophobia in ways that negate their own complicity in co-producing the material conditions responsible for these global injustices. By positioning themselves against certain LGBT injustices, and creating international initiatives and campaigns with strong stances against “homophobia,” Rao explains, IFIs are simultaneously obscuring the ways that homophobia is not solely a cultural disposition, but also a material consequence of global capitalism that these institutions themselves co-produce through relations of exploitation and underdevelopment as well as support for the social relations of heterosexism and the two-gender binary. Rao continues, “As long as IFIs fail to recognize their partial culpability for the very injustice that they claim to oppose, their efforts to inveigh against homophobia will only ever come across as disingenuous and ideological exercises in pinkwashing,”⁹¹ Pinkwashing is the practice of supporting aspects of LGBT rights to cover up forms of oppression that the state or institution engages in. This has been most clearly used regarding the Israeli state supporting aspects of LGBT rights for Israeli Jewish citizens while administering apartheid practices against Palestinians.⁹² When a certain pro-queer representational politics is emphasized, the role of these institutions in maintaining social inequality and social injustice is obscured.

Rao shows the various ways that “homophobia” is both a cultural phenomenon as well as a material consequence that is bound up with the impacts of international development, imperialism, colonialism, gay tourism and pinkwashing, neoliberal

globalization, austerity, and an ongoing global capitalist crisis—all of which IFIs are entangled with, not apart from.⁹³ The focus is on how this “homophobia” undermines the “productivity” for capital of LGBT/queer workers. LGBT workers are only useful for capital if they are “productive” (that is, able to be exploited, producing surplus value which can be realized as profit) and are loyal to their employers. The focus on productivity has major implications “for those who find themselves unable or unwilling to be “productive” within the terms of the market: the disabled, the unemployed, the elderly, the “development”-induced displaced,” and many people in the Global South. Further, Rao points out that “one consequence of the increasingly tight link between personhood and productivity is that public [state] support for welfare for the “unproductive” becomes increasingly difficult to sustain, especially in a climate of austerity.”⁹⁴ Rao suggests that, in the end, resistance to global homocapitalism will not come from the forms of pro-capitalist queer and trans life that are welcomed by IFIs nor will it “come from movements that have long struggled against the IFIs but within a largely heteronormative framework.”⁹⁵ I return to this in Chapter 12.

This neoliberal queer emerges among white, middle-class queers and a much smaller number of trans people who simply want to be accepted into the white middle class and come to take up neoliberal capitalist relations as the only road to rights. This also generates the grounds for a neoliberal queer history which views rights as basically coming from above and portrays the ’69 reform as the entire legalization or decriminalization of homosexuality, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms⁹⁶ (Chapters 9 and 10) as establishing our rights, and same-sex marriage as bringing about equality for queers (Chapter 11).⁹⁷ This reinforces the aim of neoliberal queers to be an accepted part of the responsible and respectable white middle class but also means that the needs of those who remain excluded from these rights—and who experience oppressions on the basis of race, class, gender, disability, age, and health status—are often denied.

State agencies and mainstream and neoliberal LGBT organizations look at the ’69 reform narrowly, as being about a “homosexuality” which they abstract away from other struggles and movements, breaking connections with interlocking forms of oppression. As a result, they do not also focus on the ’69 reform as being about reproductive rights, sex workers, and part of the broader attempt to annihilate Indigenous sovereignty—in the White Paper and the broader context of the “Just Society.”⁹⁸ There was a focus, in the rhetoric of the “Just Society,” on individual and not collective or social rights. This was also tied into anti-Black racism in the struggle at Sir George Williams University, the 1960s destruction of Africville, Nova Scotia, shifts in immigration policy, and the reconstruction of racism and white supremacy.⁹⁹ It is also the very beginnings of official multiculturalism, with its major limitations—which allowed for cultural and ethnic differences and festivals, but not for recognizing and dismantling the social and class roots of racism and white supremacy.¹⁰⁰

State funding (as noted above) attempts to reorganize relations within our communities and organizations towards support for state agencies. In the example of Pride Toronto, we can see how this state funding (from both Heritage Canada and Public Safety Canada) attempted to align Pride Toronto not only with Liberal government’s

celebrations of the '69 reform but also to attempt to get Pride Toronto to accept the police back in marching within the parade.¹⁰¹

This privileges groups like Egale and various Pride Committees in the contested attempts to construct pro-Liberal party and pro-police positions as hegemonic within our communities.¹⁰² But the better part of the story is that networks of activists have, for the most part, successfully resisted these efforts. I come back to this in Chapter 11 and Chapter 12.

TAKE FOUR, 2016: BLACK LIVES MATTER STOPS PRIDE TORONTO

I was at the intersection of College and Yonge Street in the Pride Toronto parade in 2016. As “allies”/“accomplices”/“co-conspirators,” Patrick (my partner) and I were assisting in ensuring that the Black Lives Matter-Toronto (BLM-TO) contingent, the honoured group for the parade, was kept safe. The BLM contingent had with it a large sound truck and the Rhythms of Resistance drum group. It was lively and noisy. When we stopped, Two-Spirit people came into this space to smudge and conduct ceremonies. We stopped the parade for close to thirty minutes to raise a series of demands about meeting the needs of Black, Indigenous, and South Asian communities that had been put forward by community groups. BLM-TO also demanded that there be no organized police presence within our Pride parades and festivals, given the racist police practices towards Black, people of colour, and Indigenous peoples (many of whom are queer and trans).¹⁰³ After this, there was an outpouring of anti-Black racism from certain white gay men, which was facilitated and amplified by much of the mainstream media.

Douglas Elliott, who we already met and who has long been a strong supporter of working with the police and of police involvement in Pride, spoke out vehemently against the BLM-TO action at the parade in 2016. He argued that this protest was “the most reprehensible thing I have seen” at Pride, that this “hijacking of the parade” was a “complete betrayal” and that “the homophobes have treated us better than this.”¹⁰⁴

This response, which viewed BLM-TO as somehow outside our communities—since in this white racial logic Black people apparently cannot really be queer—did not recognize the involvement of many queer, trans, and non-binary people as central to the group¹⁰⁵ and how they went out of their way to ensure that some of the movers and shakers in Black queer organizing in the city were present in their contingent. Later that summer when community forums were held, this was turned around, with more than eighty percent of the people attending supporting the demands of BLM-TO. The Pride Toronto Annual General Meeting in January 2017 overwhelmingly supported all the BLM-TO demands.¹⁰⁶ Support for BLM-TO came mostly from younger people identifying as queer and trans—and this includes both racialized and white people. We have been able to maintain this support since then, despite efforts by the Pride Toronto Executive Director, board members, state funding agencies and others to violate this decision.¹⁰⁷ More recently, we have heard from the current Pride Toronto Executive Director that the police will eventually be allowed back within the Parade and Pride Toronto has been involved in police training and collaboration with the police on “harm reduction.”¹⁰⁸

These successful struggles to keep the police out also built on the history of defending the right of the Palestine solidarity group, *Queers Against Israeli Apartheid* (QUAIA) to be able to participate in Pride Toronto parades from 2010 to 2014. This was against the mobilization of state funders and the Pride Toronto Board wanting to ban them from participating and the mobilization of orientalist forms of homonationalism against QUAIA, which portrayed Palestinians as somehow uniformly “homophobic” and the Israeli state as somehow pro-queer. More on this in Chapter 12.

BLM-TO and allies were up against racial capitalism and anti-Black racism but also the collaboration with the police, which has been crucial to the emergence of the neoliberal queer. From 1975 on, starting in Vancouver, liaison committees with the police engaged sections of LGBT communities in policing ourselves, especially as the law and police still criminalized consensual queer sex in state-defined “public” places and involving those under twenty-one until 1988.¹⁰⁹ With the development of gentrification and the emergence of white, middle-class, property-owning queers, this also tied sections of LGBT community formation into the development of real estate and property-based class interests. This has led to white, middle-class gay men engaging in campaigns against sex workers in Vancouver¹¹⁰ and Toronto and poor and unhoused/homeless people in Toronto and elsewhere (See Chapter 11). This collaboration with the police as key to the formation of neoliberal queers was centrally challenged by BLM-TO and BLM groups elsewhere.

Regarding the Toronto police, this was followed by the Marie Curtis Park “sting” operation with the arrests of men indicating they wanted to engage in consensual sex, which took place in fall 2016.¹¹¹ *Queers Crash the Beat* was formed to expose this operation and to provide support for the men who were charged.¹¹² This was alongside the racialized murders by serial killer Bruce McArthur, mostly of men of colour,¹¹³ and anti-trans and anti-sex worker harassment and violence.¹¹⁴ In the McArthur murders, the police denied there was a serial killer until the last minute, blamed people in our communities for not coming forward with information, and actively discouraged community action and mobilization, leaving some among us to be killed. There has also been continuing police harassment, entrapment, and arrests of men in the Montréal area wanting to have consensual sex in parks.¹¹⁵

These struggles against the police in Pride took place all across the country, including in Ottawa, Edmonton, Vancouver, St. John’s, and Sudbury.¹¹⁶ In St. John’s in 2021, the police tried to use sponsorship from the social work department at Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN) to get back into Pride events but there was major organizing against this, and uniformed officers were banned from participating within Pride.¹¹⁷ In contrast, Egale partnered with the very same Toronto police that had been barred from Pride Toronto, with Global Affairs Canada funding to engage in “inclusion” training of police in Ukraine in 2020–21.¹¹⁸

This powerful BLM organizing came to shape many forms of activism in Toronto and elsewhere. I was able to attend the demonstration of hundreds of people against Meghan Murphy, an anti-trans speaker who re-asserts a biological basis for gender—at

least for cis women—and claims that only cis woman are “real women,” who was brought into speak at the Palmerston Library in Toronto in the fall of 2019.¹¹⁹

A popular chant against the police—given they both protected this speaker and also trapped some trans supporters in the library, refusing to let them leave through the front door—was, “This is why you’re not at Pride!” Another major chant was, “Trans lives, they matter here,” which was always coupled with, “Black lives, they matter here,” popularized by Black Lives Matter. These chants were sometimes merged to become: “Black trans lives, they matter here.”

The effects of 2016 Black Lives Matter actions continued across a range of movements and organizing and extended in very profound ways with the global uprising against anti-Black racism and the police starting in May 2020.

Given struggles for inclusion and rights in the context of neoliberal capitalism there is now a new heterosexist common sense that can include normalized queers, but this also has a raced, classed, and cisgender character. Two major terms have been put forward to account for the emergence of this layer of queers supporting white, middle-class politics and neoliberal capitalist relations. These are the previously mentioned “homonationalism” and “homonormativity,”¹²⁰ where white, middle-class layers support “respectability,” “responsibility” and normalization in seeking entry into the white middle class. These terms are both insightful but require historical, materialist grounding in social practices and struggles. All too often these terms get used by people in ways that seem to be floating in the air in an ungrounded fashion, or they become moral epithets, like, “How homonationalist of you!” One of the projects of this book, as in that of Dryden and Lenon’s earlier collection, is to ground this homonationalism and the making and unmaking of the neoliberal queer in history and struggle.¹²¹ This development was socially organized, and always resisted. I raise this here and go into more detail in Chapter 11 and the new conclusion (Chapter 12).

These struggles over genocidal practices, anti-Black racism, and the police, over history, memory and homonationalism, provide a number of entry points into sexual/gender struggles that are also race and class struggles as we enter further into the 2020s. This sets the stage for this third edition of *The Regulation of Desire*. Let’s get going!

The Third Edition

Welcome to the third edition of *The Regulation of Desire*. A lot has changed in the twenty-six years since the second edition was published in 1996. I am very glad that Concordia University Press approached me about producing this new edition. It has a new Introduction, which you are currently reading, a substantial chapter update focusing on the making of the neoliberal queer (Chapter 11), as well as a rewritten conclusion focusing on the unmaking of the neoliberal queer that builds on but moves far beyond that of the second edition (Chapter 12). These chapters cover the emergence of the

neoliberal queer, “same-sex” marriage struggles, the expansion of trans organizing, the criminalization of HIV+ people, the “apology” moment, and the revolt of those left out of the rights revolution. Aside from this, I have generally tried to maintain the integrity of the content from the second edition published by Black Rose, trying to stick to updating references and adding in necessary changes in language to the main text. The main exception to this is a major rewriting and expansion of Chapter 4 to recognize the key character of settler colonialism in Canadian state formation with the addition of some new critical knowledge based on learning from Indigenous and Two-Spirit scholars and activists. Beyond this, I have been largely successful in avoiding temptations to change the sections from the second edition where my current thinking and analysis has changed. I am also delighted that OmiSoore Dryden has written a Foreword for this edition and Tom Hooper an Afterword. I have learned so much from both of them and I am delighted that their words illuminate this edition.

First, two clarifications. On the use of “queer”: in the second edition I noted both the insights and some of the limitations of using queer as a term.¹²² I continue to prefer the use of queer to that of the more cumbersome list of 2SLGBTQ+¹²³ (Two-Spirit, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and more) but I continue to note that queer has often been coded as male, white, cis, and middle-class. The particularities of gender, racialization, colonization, trans and working-class experiences, disability and more can often get submerged and lost within queer. This is why I now often refer to queer, trans, and Two-Spirit experiences to begin to broaden this out. But even this is not adequate. There are also those who wish to define queer as always having a “progressive” and “critical” character as opposed to more moderate LGBT identifications.¹²⁴ While understanding this, in some situations, I also point out that the use of queer, including in early queer theory and forms of queer nationalist activism, has often served to eclipse class relations and struggles.¹²⁵ I therefore use the expression “the neoliberal queer” to reference those queers committed to supporting neoliberal capitalist relations.

Secondly, some theorists, like Holly Lewis in her important *The Politics of Everybody*, argue that desire—which I continue to use in the title and more generally for this edition—is not only rooted in a postmodern or post-structuralist sense of language-play and identity that emerges from discourse (and not material social practices), but also has a neoliberal inflection.¹²⁶ Postmodernism can be seen as a mode of analysis that has moved past modernity and is often based on displacing class relations and struggles. Post-structuralism is theorizing after the explosion of structuralist forms and in the wake of a proliferation of diverse identities, which have replaced any unitary social structures. While noting these limitations, I continue to describe desire in relation to social bodies and the social practices of pleasure. I try to always use desire with a social, historical, and material grounding.

Very helpful in this regard has been work on the social and relational character of language and especially Dorothy Smith’s “Telling the Truth After Postmodernism.”¹²⁷ This approach allows us to not get lost in discourse but to always see language as embodied social practices. This is the way I try to use languages of desire and pleasure

in this third edition. I also try to always specify identity and identification as having a social and historical character related to class and racializing relations and struggles.¹²⁸

One area of critique I maintain from earlier editions—and hope to deepen—is the critical analysis of sexual and other forms of reification and fetishism.¹²⁹ This can be seen in the pervasive social processes in capitalist social relations which transform social relations between people into relations between things, and which can also be described as *thingification*. These “things” or “objects” then come to be fetishized with human social capacities and invested with agency and almost supernatural powers. A major illustration is the power and fetishism of money in capitalist societies,¹³⁰ but this also impacts the reification of sexuality and sexual identities as the “truth of our beings,” to borrow from Michel Foucault.¹³¹ This obscures the social practices involved in sexual and gender formation. In this edition I hope to continue and deepen the development of an anti-reification approach that is constantly disclosing social practices, doings, and relations and refusing to convert social relations between people into relations between things. Here I also draw on new resources including the work of John Holloway, Rosemary Hennessy, Kevin Floyd, Alan Sears and others.¹³²

In the book, I also maintain my view that all societies will have some social form of regulating eroticism or sexualities. The current state/legal/social forms this takes are intensely oppressive, often carceral in character, including being patriarchal, racist, heterosexist, cisgender, and capitalist in character. The challenge taken up here and returned to in the conclusion is to develop non-oppressive forms of regulation that are based on ending social oppression and which do not involve police, prisons, and carceral state relations. Regarding gender, my view is rather different since, while opposing all forms of gendered violence and harassment (and opposing carceral responses to them), I also note that gender binaries and dichotomies that are central to gender regulation need to socially wither away, along with the social power relations they are bound up with.

I also continue to use the language of liberation regarding queer and trans movements. While I understand that the politics of “liberation” can be complicated by naturalist readings of “liberation” as some underlying essence that just needs to be liberated,¹³³ my use of liberation moves beyond limited rights strategies that are trapped within racialized capitalist state relations and is always social and historical in character.

In this new Introduction I also address the limitations of the 1996 edition and provide theoretical updates for this third edition.

DEEPENING OPPOSITION TO SETTLER COLONIALISM, RACISM, AND CLIMATE DESTRUCTION

As mentioned previously, I aim to make opposing settler colonialism far more central in this third edition given the major inadequacies of the chapter on the colonization of Indigenous people in the second edition¹³⁴ (Chapter 4, second edition). This means troubling Canada and its settler-colonial character and continuing to disrupt

mainstream and official narratives of the northern part of Turtle Island. It means recognizing that assaults on Indigenous gender and erotic practices and the continuing murder and disappearance of Indigenous women, girls, and Two-Spirit people have been key to colonization and genocidal practices against Indigenous peoples.¹³⁵

Indigenous struggles are central struggles obstructing capitalist and state plans in Canada, especially relating to resource-extraction capitalism and other “development” plans.¹³⁶ Land Back struggles are key, as is the importance of land-based struggle and knowledge. These struggles are a crucial dividing line in movements and on the left, unfortunately, with much of the New Democratic Party—and especially the BC government—on the side of settler colonialism and resource capitalism, with much of the mainstream LGBT+ movements not engaging in any solidarity actions. For instance, banks like TD, who are heavily involved in sponsorship in many Pride Committees across the Canadian state, are also involved in many pipeline projects, including Coastal GasLink, that are denying the sovereignty of Indigenous nations. Sponsorship from banks and corporations supporting such projects against Indigenous people *must* be rejected by Pride Committees.

This can also be seen in official state positions on Two-Spirit people; support for Two-Spirit people can, in some cases, sit alongside ongoing, genocidal settler-colonial practices. For instance, consider statements made by Randy Boissonnault, then the Special Advisor to the Prime Minister on LGBT issues and now Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance. On April 23, 2019, I was in the audience at Toronto’s 519 Church Street Community Centre, along with other members of the Anti-69 Network, raising our concerns as he made a speech at the launch of the previously mentioned “equality loonie.” He stated:

The struggle for LGBTQ rights did not start in 1969. It started with Two-Spirit people here 15,000 years ago who were so valued by their communities—touched by the creator twice, with two spirits—that when the Two-Spirit person came to your home, your teepee, you made sure it was tidy because the creator was coming to visit you. That is the long history of LGBTQ struggle for recognition in this Turtle Island.¹³⁷

I was very taken aback by this statement, as its racist and colonizing assumptions were so clear. There are two major problems here. The first and most significant is the complete appropriation of Two-Spirit history *for* white LGBTQ settlers *and* the complete erasure of the racism, colonialism, and genocidal violence inflicted on Indigenous and Two-Spirit people.¹³⁸ The second is a seemingly queer-eye-for-the-straight-guy-inflected notion that Two-Spirit people in the past lived like stereotypes of white, middle-class gay men in the historical present, who are supposedly the arbiters of tidiness and fashion. (In this show, at least initially, fashion-conscious and very commercialized gay men were mobilized to try to improve the appearance and commercialized fashion-consciousness of heterosexual-identified men).¹³⁹

Boissonnault’s comments in 2019 resonate with his remarks in March 2022, when he and other state officials, in the context of announcing the winning team for construct-

ing the monument coming out of the LGBT Purge Fund, once again appropriated the cultural practices of Two-Spirit and Indigenous people, separating them from the settler-colonial and genocidal practices that these state officials are still responsible for.¹⁴⁰ We will see that a somewhat similar approach to Two-Spirit people appears in the *Just Society Report* Egale produced in 2016 in Chapter 11.

Links with current queer and trans liberation struggles (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) are even more significant since these genocidal practices were not only attempts to destroy Indigenous gender and erotic life but also to construct against them what can be called “modern” gender and sexuality. There is an important relationality in this historical and social process. This is what, in large part, produces the two-gender binary and the normalization of reproductive and, eventually, heterosexualities.

This raises profound questions about the emergence of “modern” settler gender and sexuality in response to Indigenous gender and erotic practices. Key to this is a broader global and historical context for the emergence of “modern” sexualities and genders, of the relational response of European-derived state and regulatory colonial and imperialist forces to “threats” from third and fourth genders (and sometimes fifth genders/sexes) and gender/erotic diversities around the world. This makes colonialism, racism, and imperialism even more important to this story. It is clear that colonialism, imperialism, and white settler cultures and nation-states in formation were challenged by the ways many people they encountered “did” gender and eroticism in very different ways than the dominant forms then being consolidated in Europe. The emergence and enforcement of “modern” sexuality and gender had major impacts on Indigenous peoples around the globe, but also within the colonizing countries themselves, in consolidating the two-gender binary, in socially and politically disempowering women, in enforcing marriage and monogamy, and in enforcing reproductive and, eventually, heterosexual forms of sexuality. This included: campaigns against third and fourth gender groups; the imposition of patriarchal relations on matrilineal societies; the imposition of Christianity; and the destruction of Indigenous cultural, gender, and erotic practices; residential and day schools based on the attempt to eradicate these practices; separating Indigenous peoples from their social relations with the land; and genocidal violence, both sexual and physical, and much more. Gender and eroticism were/are important territories for colonial, imperialist, and capitalist relations. Control over gender and sexuality was crucial to preparing the grounds for emerging racial, colonizing, and capitalist social relations.¹⁴¹ Nor is this process over. It continues to be crucial to the current waves of capitalist globalization, exporting and imposing heterosexuality as the majority sexuality—with homo and queer sexualities as a “deviance” or “minority” formation—against a diversity of ways of doing gender and eroticism beyond the gender binary.

In arguing this, I draw on what I learned from engaging with the work of Indigenous feminists like Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate academic and theorist Kim TallBear; Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar, writer, and artist Leanne Betasamosake Simpson; Indigenous Two-Spirit, queer (non-citizen) Cherokee scholar Qwo-Li Driskill; conversations with and reading the works of Two-Spirit people, including Billy-Ray Belcourt, a writer,

scholar, and poet from Driftpile Cree Nation; and with the work of anti-colonial white settler anthropologist Scott Morgensen.

Pre-contact Indigenous gender and erotic practices were socially organized in very different ways than dominant European gender and sexual practices. These practices and the social capacities and resistance based on them cannot be assimilated to current constructions of the gender binary or of homosexuality and heterosexuality. Instead, many Two-Spirit activists argue that 2S is not part of LGBTQ+ but is a “political and theoretical word that is a critique of, and a challenge to, white-dominated LGBTQ labels and taxonomies.”¹⁴² It situates and resists colonial violence in the context of Indigenous experiences of gender and eroticism. As Qwo-Li Driskill notes, Two-Spirit is not an essentialist move but instead an assertion “that Indigenous gender and sexual identities are intimately connected to land, community and history.”¹⁴³

As Dené scholar Glen Coulthard and others have pointed out, relationality to the land is central to Indigenous struggles. This relationality is both about the importance of concrete #LandBack struggles, like at Land Back Lane in Six Nations—so that Indigenous communities have more access to land, space, water and trees for the social, cultural and spiritual practices that were taken away from them—but also about land-based associative and relational forms of knowledge production and pedagogy.¹⁴⁴ As Mike Gouldhawke writes “land is not a thing in itself” but a “social relationship between all living and non-living beings” and this social relation is crucial to Indigenous struggles and perspectives.¹⁴⁵ This leads to care for and defence of the land and what lives and depends on it, as opposed to capitalist resource extraction and destruction. This has nothing to do with private property relations but is a connection with and relationality with the land and everything existing in association with it. Two-Spirit and gender/erotic-diverse Indigenous people need to always be thought about in relation to land-based knowledge, care, and struggles. This is one of the major problems with mainstream settler LGBT support for Two-Spirit people, as it exists abstracted away from the crucial social relations to the land and the violence of settler colonialism that separates them from it.

As Leanne Betasamosake Simpson describes:

Nishnaabeg society has a plurality of genders and sexual orientations that wasn't exceptional, because it was normal to respect diversity and live in a manner that supported individuals... This was visible to the colonizers and read as both a threat and a barrier to the exploitation of the land and natural resources; and so, it was queer Indigenous peoples that were first targeted for elimination. The state, working in cohort with the church infused our communities with a heteropatriarchy... Generations of Indigenous children were indoctrinated into this heteropatriarchy in residential schools.¹⁴⁶

Heteropatriarchal relations, a phrase which brings together heterosexist and patriarchal relations,¹⁴⁷ may be used here before it fully comes into historical existence, but the point is clear regarding the repression of third and fourth genders within the colonizing project, and the attempt to rip apart Indigenous social relations, with a focus

on imposing patriarchal (and, later, heterosexist relations), and to break Indigenous people's social relation with the land. This included through the residential "school" death camps and day schools, which were central to the practices of colonization and genocide, and in the major violence against Indigenous women, girls and Two-Spirit people. These were central to forcing Indigenous people off the land and attempting to destroy social and gendered practices. This was an attempt to destroy Indigenous cultures and land-based relations. In large part this is also what reserves, the Indian Act, and imposed treaties were about (See Chapter 4).

Morgensen elaborates this process in relation to the generation of "modern sexuality" which is also articulated as a "settler sexuality":¹⁴⁸

Modern sexuality arises in settler societies as a function of the biopolitics of settler colonialism. In the United States [and I add in "Canada"], the sexual colonization of Native peoples produced modern sexuality as "settler sexuality": a white and national heteronormativity formed by regulating Native sexuality and gender while appearing to supplant them with the sexual modernity of settlers.¹⁴⁹

"Biopolitics" is the harnessing of biology and populations to social power.¹⁵⁰ Morgensen continues that: "the biopolitics of settler colonialism was constituted by the imposition of colonial heteropatriarchy and the hegemony of settler society, which sought both the elimination of Indigenous sexuality and its incorporation into sexual settler modernity."¹⁵¹ Although I have concerns about whether it is premature, historically, to talk about heteronormativity as part of initial colonization, this also makes it clear that "modern" sexuality emerges out of the colonizing project in opposition to Indigenous gender and erotic practices. Morgensen goes on to say that: "The sexual regulation of Native peoples by the biopolitics of settler colonialism in the United States [and Canada] was a proving ground for producing settlers as subjects of modern sexuality"¹⁵² and that "modern sexuality became a method to produce settler colonialism, and settler subjects, by facilitating ongoing conquest and naturalizing its effects." As he argues, "Settler colonialism is a primary condition of the history of sexuality in the United States [and Canada]."¹⁵³

I would argue that this also had a major impact on the history of sexuality in "European" societies as well, as their "modern" sexualities were defined against the "barbaric" practices encountered in the colonized territories and the Global South. In a critique of much work in queer history Morgensen points out that "Queer histories of modern sexuality tend to study non-Natives without examining their formation within settler colonialism."¹⁵⁴ I take this to heart since this is a *major* limitation in the first two editions of *The Regulation of Desire*. I return to these questions throughout the book, in Chapter 4 and in the conclusion.

As mentioned earlier, the social relationality to water and land is central to Indigenous struggles, as is support for all our human and non-human relations. Support for the ecological networks we all depend on (and are part of) is key to our capacities for social reproduction and this is a key learning from many Indigenous cultures.¹⁵⁵ Nick

Estes concludes his important book *Our History is the Future: Standing Rock Versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* with this powerful statement:

The Water Protectors also ask us: What does water want from us? What does the earth want from us? *Mini Wiconi*—water is life—exists outside the context of capitalism. Whereas past revolutionary struggles have strived for the emancipation of labour from capital, we are challenged not just to imagine, but to demand the emancipation of earth from capital. For the earth to live capitalism must die.¹⁵⁶

This provides a new and radical basis for a broad anti-capitalist activism that is also anti-racist and anti-colonial, for climate justice and for queer, trans, and Two-Spirit liberation.

This limitation regarding Indigenous struggles in the first two editions of this book is wrapped up with the problems created by my focus on Canada as a nation-state. In the first edition the subtitle was even “Sexuality in Canada,” and in both previous editions the second section was titled “Toward a Queer View of Canadian History,” as I remained trapped within Canadian state and social formation, including the many exclusions it is built upon. This still carries over into this third edition since to rupture with it entirely I would have had to write a very different book. While noting this limitation, I hope to bring more of a subversion of the Canadian nation-state and its boundaries and borders to this third edition, since what we are actually addressing is much more a slice of broader global capitalist, colonial, and oppressive social relations.¹⁵⁷ This Canada is built on settler colonialism and needs to be constantly troubled and challenged. In doing so, I draw upon the “No One Is Illegal” and “No Border” analysis that directly challenges the borders and boundaries of the nation state.¹⁵⁸ We need a broader internationalist—and not a nationalist—framework and politics. I return to this need for internationalism in the conclusion.

We also need to put this third edition in the context of climate justice,¹⁵⁹ which is absent from the first and second editions. I have been inspired by the mass involvement of younger people in the climate justice strikes and I was pleased to be able to participate in the Grassy Narrows¹⁶⁰ support contingent in the Climate Justice march of more than sixty thousand in Toronto on September 27, 2019. Unfortunately, only several thousand of these people came out to support the wave of struggles supporting the Wet’suwet’en in the winter of 2020 in response to RCMP racist violence, and even fewer in the context of the pandemic in fall 2020 and 2021, with the intensified struggle on the Wet’suwet’en yintah, including Six Nations solidarity. At the same time, some climate justice activists have been crucial to a number of Indigenous solidarity direct actions. Climate justice and support for Indigenous struggles must be continuously linked together, and there have been some good signs here.

It is no longer simply a question of supporting climate science against the climate deniers, for this entails grappling with the social organization of “climate denial” itself.

There has been an unfortunate tendency within currents in the climate justice movement to rely on “climate science” as the authority, and to rely on “follow the science” as the main argument. This has also been replicated in the context of the pandemic. This position reifies “science” as “good,” obscuring how all science is socially and historically made and struggled over. The character and claims of science are always a contested terrain.¹⁶¹ We are now aware that many companies involved in fossil fuel production have known about how this industry causes climate change for decades, and that the rich and powerful are organizing forums where they discuss question like what parts of the planet will be least affected by climate change and how they can best protect themselves and their families.¹⁶² They have been fully aware of climate science for decades and have decided to do nothing substantial about it. With the growing sabotage by major states and a significant section of the capitalist class of even the limited climate-change measures they have agreed to, such as the Paris Accords, we have to recognize that this is actually a race and class war against most people and other species on the planet, and that the capitalist class can protect itself with its wealth and national armed forces (or mercenaries, if they need them). In this sense, they really do not care about most of us as we, like many animal species, have become “expendable,” in the same way as men who had sex with men, Haitians and other people of colour, drug users, and sex workers were in the early years of the AIDS crisis (Chapter 10), and various groups in the COVID-19 pandemic, as well.¹⁶³

Although there are differences and contradictions within ruling state and capitalist relations, they are largely united around their short-term interests in making profits, including through fossil fuel industries and resource extraction, and defending their racialized class power, including through ways that are destroying the planet for most of us. This is why I suggest that many of them have wanted right-wing regimes—like that of Bolsonaro in Brazil, or earlier, Trump in the United States (although many desired a more sophisticated version), and Boris Johnson, Liz Truss, and now Rishi Sunak in Britain—although in 2023 it is now clear that much the same has been accomplished under the Biden administration as under Trump. These regimes enact these forms of race and class war, not only doing nothing to fight climate change, but actively facilitating it. This is also the case with the Trudeau government in Canada—although with a more smiling face—and this is worsening with federal and provincial state attacks on Indigenous nations, with direct support for and from the oil and gas industries and the banking/financial sector. This raises the stakes for all of our struggles for social transformation and makes it clear that resisting climate change and supporting climate justice must be at the very centre of all our organizing.

REVOLTING AGAINST GENDER OPPRESSION AND THE GENDER BINARY

While working on the second edition of this book, I was becoming aware of the deep social and historical roots of the many revolts against gender that have taken place since World War II and the major attempts to reconstruct the gender binary after the war, in the 1950s and since. There have been feminist struggles against forms of patriarchal

social power but also the struggles of those who don't fit into this gender binary and whose needs and desires cannot be met within it. For many of us, our needs and desires simply no longer fit.

In the second edition, while I recognized the importance of feminist revolt and social power regarding gender relations, including varied responses to feminism by gay men and the emergence of lesbian cultures and politics, I did not yet recognize the centrality of trans liberation and struggles against the gender binary. "Trans" includes a spectrum of experiences, from transsexual to transvestite to genderqueer, non-binary, and gender non-conforming.¹⁶⁴ In this third edition, I create more space for the significance of trans struggles, including in the conclusion (Chapter 12), and I draw upon new resources.¹⁶⁵

This uneven and decades-long revolt against gender has been both managed and resisted. Ruling-class responses to feminism (as with responses to LGBT organizing) have attempted to rework it into a strategy that only benefits privileged, white, middle-class cis women, in part by violently abstracting gender away from race and class. Some of this reworking has been accomplished through a narrow rights approach that does not address race and class differences and struggles among cis and trans women.

The narrow, rights-based approach developed by the mainstream LGBT movement has been exported to trans organizing as white, rights-based trans activism is mostly single-issue. Here, it reproduces many of the same limitations as the rights approach does for LGB people. Dean Spade, moving beyond narrow rights approaches, focuses on administrative law and practices: the everyday social organization of gender and the two-gender binary and our revolts against it.¹⁶⁶ Transforming administrative and institutional practices of gender policing and regulation including the police (regarding sex work and gender), psychiatrizing practices, social assistance policies, and social work must be crucial to our organizing. Radical trans organizing is multi-issue and opposed to state relations. For instance, as mentioned earlier, rather than focusing on the rights of trans prisoners to be allocated the appropriate-gender incarceration site, it raises questions about why people are being imprisoned at all. This also raises questions about the formal rights of inclusion versus broader questions of social transformation.

The second edition was also not generally informed by the organizing of intersex people and I hope this edition is more defined by this. I have learned a great deal from intersex organizing and from Kessler's *Learning from the Intersexed* in particular.¹⁶⁷ Here we see that "physiological" differences from the gender binary are medically regulated and operated on surgically to create a social world of only two "biological" gender/sexes, for entirely social reasons. I am strongly against these operations without the consent of the people who are directly involved. This means that the world of two genders/sexes is socially produced even though, "physiologically," this binary does not exist, and social practices are required to shore up the two-gender binary. Learning from intersex people further undermines the "natural attitude" that there are two (and only two) sexes and genders.

Gender and sexuality, like class and race, are socially made. Gender and sexuality are actual social performances, involving a social relation between gender or sexual performance and the gender/sexual attributions we receive from the varied audiences

we perform for. This is not simply discursive in character, as genders/sexualities are based in material social practices and are continuous social accomplishments.¹⁶⁸ Shifts in genders/sexualities have to do with actual transformations in these social practices (including feminist and trans organizing) and not simply variations or slippages in their discursive iterations.¹⁶⁹ In the hegemonic ways of accomplishing gender within the gender binary, it matters which gender one is attributed. “Doing gender” is also doing gender inequality and the social relations of gender power. To be attributed the gender “woman” (whether cis or trans) is to be socially subordinated to those gendered as “men,” which is why we see major forms of transmisogyny and major problems of violence against trans women, especially Black trans women. Trans women are women and experience the social oppression of women. It is *social experience* that is central to gender, not the “physiology” one is born with. The social relations of gender power are key to this way of doing gender.

I remain committed, as in the first and second editions, to the social making of sexuality and gender. I continue to reject the resurgence of biological-determinist and reductionist notions of the causation of gender and “homosexualities,” but I now take this even further. I have found Anne Fausto Sterling’s *Sexing the Body* to be very useful. In articulating a feminist version of “developmental system theory,” she clarifies that what we call the “physiological” is lived socially, and that even the cells in our bodies have a social and historical character.¹⁷⁰ But in a very different way, currents among white gay men, which try to stabilize us as “real men” and as an essential minority, have also worked to shore up gender essentialism through the abandonment of any critical analysis of masculinities, including hegemonic forms (see Chapter 9). Some white gay cis men continue to forget how biological determinism has been used against women and Black and racialized people, and why we must resist it.¹⁷¹ Recently, all the “scientific” assertions of biological-determinist approaches to what causes “homosexuality” have been shown to be unable to account for the range of sexual and gender variation in our own societies.¹⁷² I hope this book further undermines these determinist and reductionist approaches.

Just like I use the terms homosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, LGBT+, or heterosexual in a concrete historical sense, I also use trans within specific historical conditions of existence.¹⁷³ Rather than fully explicating the social organization of genders where third and fourth genders have existed as a very different social organization of gender (and eroticism), Peter Drucker sometimes reads this as just another instance of transgender people, at one point referring to “transgendered berdaches.”¹⁷⁴ But there are no trans people outside history and the social, just as there is no universal or transhistorical gender or sexuality. There is also no transhistorical trans person, and “transgender,” like the homosexual, lesbian, bisexual, queer, and heterosexual, always has particular social and historical conditions of existence.

When addressing Two-Spirit people, my approach is similar but also different since the practices being reclaimed go back to pre-colonization and pre-capitalist times. These practices were hidden from the white settler gaze but also kept alive after colonization as part of Indigenous resistance to the imposition of heteropatriarchal

relations. Two-Spirit is both a reclaiming of, and transformation of, earlier gender and erotic diversities (including third and fourth genders) that has developed among Indigenous peoples in the last few decades. In this sense, this reclaiming is not simply about a frozen-in-time “tradition”—traditional Indigenous knowledge also has a social and historical character, being transformed in our historical present of resistance to settler colonialism and heteropatriarchal relations.¹⁷⁵

There are major problems in the organizing by women anti-trans activists who some describe as “Trans Exclusionary Radical Feminists” (TERFs). I prefer not to use this term since I feel it gives them too much power in suggesting they actually represent some form of “radical feminism.”¹⁷⁶ In my view, they are not radical feminists, and their position on gender is actually a pre-feminist regression back to essentialism. They also forge major links with those opposing trans people from very anti-feminist and anti-LGBT+ perspectives, with those opposed to sex workers, and, increasingly, with various right-wing, racist, and even fascist moral-conservative and anti-feminist groups.¹⁷⁷ In the last few years, attacks on trans people, including trans young people, have reached an intensity in the US that I characterize as a war against trans people. This is now central to far right and neoliberal moral-conservative attacks and spills over into “Canada,” as well, as anti-trans organizing also becomes key to right-wing organizing, including within the “Freedom Convoy” in Ottawa. It is also through this front that broader attacks on queer and trans people are being launched, as we see with the use of “anti-groomer” discourse by the right-wing.¹⁷⁸ In 2022/2023 we have seen the organization of right-wing and fascist protests against drag queen story hours in many centres across “Canada.” While threats led to some events being cancelled, in many, anti-fascist drag defenders successfully defended the events, isolating the anti-drag/anti-trans/anti-queer right-wing voices.

Trans, genderqueer, and people refusing the gender binary have made for a far more complex terrain of gender struggles, when there are now women without vaginas, men without penises, men who can get pregnant, women who can impregnate, and more people who reject these genders, defining their lives and adopting various non-binary and genderqueer identifications. This demonstrates even more strongly that gender and sex are socially made. There are also far more complexities here than the terms I used in the first two editions of this book ever could capture, which were “same-gender” and “different gender” sexualities.¹⁷⁹ While there are further challenges to the gender binary and the social relations of gender power, at the same time there are also various attempts to reconstruct “normative” gender relations. Resisting the medical and social management of trans experiences requires resisting attempts to fit people back into the gender binary, while continuing to transgress gender power and binaries.

TEACHINGS AND LEARNINGS SINCE 1996

I am no longer the same person I was when I wrote the edition published in 1996 and have learned a great deal from the struggles and people I have been involved with since then. This includes from Indigenous and Two-Spirit people, including Idle No More, especially while in Sudbury, and No More Silence, Toronto Indigenous Harm Reduction and others in Tkaronto, from Black feminists, other racialized people and

anti-racist activists, from Black Lives Matter, the No Pride in Policing Coalition, sex worker advocates, and from direct action anti-poverty organizing, especially in the Sudbury Coalition Against Poverty.¹⁸⁰ For some of my involvements and transformations over the decades see interviews with me by Deborah Brock, Alex Khasnabish, Brenna Bhandar, and Rafeef Ziadah.¹⁸¹

There are a number of *major* transformations from the 1996 edition I hope you encounter in this edition.

First, there is a thinking-through of sexual regulation more clearly in relation to racism, including anti-Black racism, and colonialism. In the second edition I still had not fully moved beyond a rather settler-based and white-centred framework. Even though I had a theoretical commitment to view social oppression as mediated and mutually constructed in practice, in the practical work of writing, relations of oppression remained largely and residually separate and not really fully made in and through each other.¹⁸² There was still a problem in the 1996 edition with false universals that tended to generate queer as white, and the violence of abstraction, whereby sexualities were abstracted away from their formation in race and class relations and struggles.¹⁸³ I did not adequately understand that settler colonialism and anti-Black racism rooted in slavery and its afterlives¹⁸⁴ shaped *all* social relations in Canada. For this edition I have tried to learn as much as I can from queer and trans histories de-centering whiteness and from reclaiming Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer, trans and Two-Spirit histories.¹⁸⁵ In part (but only in small part) this was/is a problem of language and the ways standard English, being anti-dialectical and anti-reflexive, separates different forms of oppression into discrete and separate categories. We need to develop new ways of speaking and writing to push beyond this. Genders and sexualities are always lived differently in relation to, and are formed and connected through, class, race, age, disability, health, linguistic, and other relations. I hope I have succeeded in making this much clearer this edition.

As detailed earlier, the second edition chapter on “The Historical Emergence of Homosexualities and Heterosexualities: Social Relations, Sexual Rule and Sexual Resistance,” where I focused on the interlinked and mediated social practices leading to the emergence of homosexualities, lesbianisms, and heterosexualities, is limited and must be placed in a broader historical/social context. The emergence and development of capitalist social relations, which was bound up with settler colonialism and the slave trade, also opened up spaces for same-gender eroticism and the resistance/accommodation of those who seized these spaces. The response of the regimes of sexual regulation to these erotic cultures all occurred in the broader context of the emergence of “modern” gender and sexuality in response to the gender and sexual diversities encountered by colonial powers as they tried to dominate the rest of the world. This makes much more crucial the impact of colonialism and racism in the emergence of “modern” sexuality and how this emerged against the “threat” of Indigenous gender and erotic practices around the globe.

This also relates to questions of the uneven and combined construction of sexualities and genders internationally.¹⁸⁶ On a global scale, there is a diversity of gendered and sexualized practices ranging from more than two ways of doing gender to same-sex/

gender eroticism not understood as “homosexuality” or any sort of distinct social identity, what can be characterized in a broad sense as sexualities involving an erotic orientation to two or more genders (“bisexuality” and even “pansexuality” are too Western, as expressions for this), as well as the generation of heterosexualities, homosexualities, and queer sexualities in parts of the Global South. This is an uneven process with a diversity of gendered and sexual practices, but this process is also combined with the imposition of identifications from the Global North that produce hybrid forms of genders/sexualities as well as some development of heterosexualities and homosexualities. Unfortunately, as Joseph Massad points out (in a rather one-sided fashion), and as Rao suggests (in a different way), much global LGBT organizing has been implicated in imposing the heterosexual/homosexual binary on the rest of the globe, even in contexts where it makes little sense in people’s lives.¹⁸⁷ This can also be seen in the Western refugee regimes regarding “LGBT” people, where there is often an enforcement of Northern and Western-derived sexual/gender identifications onto the social experiences of people coming from the Global South.¹⁸⁸

In this context, it is vital to insist that Western and Northern sexual/gender identifications are not the “future” for those on this planet and that people in the Global South are not framed paternalistically as “children” at an earlier stage of “development” compared to those in the West and North. I note that some of this was already mentioned in the second edition, but it needed to go further.¹⁸⁹ I return to this in the conclusion.

This ruptures with theories of sexuality and gender as stages of evolution or “development,” with LGBT or queer and coming-out as the “final” stage.¹⁹⁰ It is now clear that, with the diverse ways that sexualities are lived in people’s lives, that “coming out” is an experience that is limited to only certain social and historical conditions where a specific sexual identification, to again borrow from Foucault, becomes the “truth” of our being. There will be many social/historical situations in which sexuality will never be the “truth” of who we are, including in “future” forms of social and erotic life.

Here, we can find some guidance in the work of Karl Marx and activist scholars using a Marxist approach. It is worth remembering, despite the dogmatic assertion by some “Marxists” that all societies must pass through the stage of capitalism before any form of anti-capitalist society becomes possible, that Marx instead learned from the class and social struggles he was engaged in and that were taking place around him. In Marx’s later writing on Russian peasant communes, he saw the possibility of avoiding or jumping over the capitalist stage of “development” in Russia based on communal forms of organization, in a process that could be characterized as “permanent revolution.”¹⁹¹ Similarly, it is possible for people to become active in working-class-based class struggles without going through a process of “proletarianization”: of being made into and making themselves disciplined, organized workers. For instance, many feminists have pointed out that housewives are workers engaging in domestic, reproductive, and caring labour, producing the commodity of labour power, and can be seen as part of the working class without having to be “proletarianized.”¹⁹² The unemployed and people living in poverty are also part of the working class even though they also are not currently proletarianized. And Indigenous people can play key parts in class struggles

without being proletarianized, as we have seen in struggles in Canada, and with the Zapatistas in Mexico.¹⁹³ It is quite possible, then, to reject the notion that people have to go through any necessary “stage” of “development” where they have to pass through the “stages” of heterosexuality/homosexuality or the two-gender binary, and we need to resist this imposition on a global scale.

Thirdly, my focus in the 1996 edition was on the relational making of homo- and hetero-sexualities and on heterosexual hegemony, where force and consent are brought together as active social practices in enforcing institutionalized heterosexuality. This notion of hegemony is drawn from the important work of Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, where he brings together relations of force/coercion and the construction of consent in the relations of ruling.¹⁹⁴ I now find that this needs to be broadened out, since this focus sometimes worked against viewing the mediated and mutually made character of race, class, gender, sexual, and other relations, and the interconnected and mediated struggles growing out of these social contradictions. This includes, quite centrally, the construction of anti-trans practices and the two-gender binary. I suggest, in reading the second edition text contained within this third edition, to read “heterosexual hegemony” as describing social practices and struggles far broader than just a narrow sense of heterosexual hegemony per se, and as always also being made through race, class, gender and other forms of social power and resistance. I also now often find hegemony rather too statist a formulation,¹⁹⁵ centring state relations as the crucial terrain of struggle, when we need to break free from the state social form and make alternatives to it.¹⁹⁶ At the very same time, critical analysis of hegemony usefully directs our attention to the balance of social forces as a continuous social and historical accomplishment. It can assist us in opening up this set of social relations for critical investigation in a relational fashion, to focus on how ruling, as a social practice, is always a relation between ruling and resistance. In this way it helps illuminate the compositions of struggle we are engaged in.¹⁹⁷

Since 1996, there are also new theoretical influences that inspire me. In the second edition of this book and in the later *The Canadian War on Queers*, co-authored with Patrizia Gentile, I/we outlined the influence of E.P. Thompson’s history from below (which, for me, resonates with the Zapatistas’ from-below-and-to-the-left politics); the late Dorothy E. Smith’s social organization of knowledge and institutional ethnography approaches; a critical approach to the work of Michel Foucault and queer theory that both learns from them but also attempts to move beyond their limitations in developing a historical materialism for queers; and the mediated and mutually made character of sexual, race, gender, class and other social relations from the work of Himani Bannerji.¹⁹⁸ For this third edition I continue to learn from and draw on the work of Dorothy Smith, including, as I mentioned, on the social-relational character of language, as well as the work of George Smith (no relation) on political activist ethnography,¹⁹⁹ and I continue to learn from the work of Himani Bannerji on the mediated and mutual construction of social relations and struggles.

I have also learned a great deal about settler colonialism, anti-Black racism, and racist, capitalist heteropatriarchal relations from the work of Black and Indigenous feminists

including , Idil Abdillahi, Beverly Bain, Dionne Brand, Patricia Hill Collins, the Combahee River Collective, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Angela Davis, OmiSoore Dryden, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, Sadiya Hartman, the late bell hooks, El Jones, Mariame Kaba, Audre Lorde, Robyn Maynard, Christina Sharpe, Barbara Smith, Keeanga-Yamahтта Taylor, and Bonita Lawrence, the late Lee Maracle, Pam Palmater, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Kim TallBear, and Zoe Todd. I have also learned a great deal from other Indigenous and Black theorists and activists, including Glen Sean Coulthard, Nick Estes, Frantz Fanon, C.L.R. James, Cedric Robinson, Rinaldo Walcott, Desmond Cole, Robin D.G. Kelley, and Roderick Ferguson, about anti-Black racism, settler colonialism, and much more.²⁰⁰ The work of Darcus Howe and *Race Today* on Black autonomy and the particularity of differing classed and raced experiences has also been important.²⁰¹ These transformations and challenges continue as I still have a great deal to learn.

AUTONOMY AND AGENCY

What has perhaps not been elaborated as clearly is my rediscovery and learning from currents within autonomist Marxism and feminism.²⁰² One of the main features of this is an emphasis on the agency and struggles of workers and oppressed people. A major influence on the emergence of autonomist Marxism in Italy was the work of Mario Tronti. He argued that: “We too have worked with a concept that puts capitalist development first, and workers second. This is a mistake. And now we have to turn the problem on its head, reverse the polarity, and start again from the beginning: and the beginning is the class struggle of the working class.”²⁰³

Similarly, many critical investigations of sexual and gender politics still put the emphasis on broader social forces, institutions, and “structures” in bringing about social transformation²⁰⁴ rather than a focus on the struggles and agency of queers, trans, feminists, anti-racists, sex workers, and working-class and other people in making social transformation. For instance, Tim McCaskell often notes the impacts of our struggles in the narratives in *Queer Progress* while, in contrast, in his general or overall analysis, struggle and resistance tends to disappear in his portrayal of broader social forces like neoliberalism. In Drucker’s *Warped*, he generally ties shifts in the social form of what he describes as “same-sex formations” to shifts in the organization of capitalist accumulation regimes, which marginalizes struggle and movement.²⁰⁵ These are *major* differences in our analysis. In my view, class and social struggles are at the heart of these broader social forces which are based in social relations and struggles between people.

Autonomist Marxist and feminist approaches are characterized by the need to develop autonomy in struggle from capital, from unions, and from political parties. All of the oppressed sections of the working class—from Black people to women, to queers, to Indigenous peoples—also need to develop autonomous struggles that push forward the mediated particularity²⁰⁶ of their forms of oppression and composition of struggle.²⁰⁷ These autonomous approaches develop a broader notion of class that includes both waged and unwaged labour, including women (both cis and trans) and non-binary people engaging in non-paid reproductive and caring labour and people living in

poverty as part of the working class. They also place an emphasis on the importance of the “social factory,” where capital as a social relation has extended itself far beyond the factory walls to create many new terrains of class and social struggle—and on the importance of social reproduction²⁰⁸ in producing capitalist social relations—but also sites of class and social struggle and resistance. Our capacities for social reproduction include our capacities to reproduce our own lives, struggles, and movements. Gender and sexuality become important sites of struggle against capitalist and oppressive social relations and important terrains of struggle over social reproduction. Feminist, anti-racist, and Indigenous struggles become central to struggles against racial capitalism.

Rather than glorifying work and productive labour, this approach poses a struggle against work as central to the fight against capitalist exploitation of paid and unpaid labour. Against the intensification of the exploitation of surplus value from paid and unpaid workers, this approach centres the need for struggles against work as key to the fight against capitalism and as a means of decreasing the exploitation of labour and decreasing the profits of the capitalists. This links to the struggle against “productive” queer and trans workers who are loyal to their companies and instead fights for more time away from capitalist exploitation through sabotage, work-sharing, and expanding free time, including what can be called erotic or sexual time.

In my work, I have always tried to emphasize activity and agency on the part of the oppressed and exploited and have refused to accept the limitations of structuralist (where external structures or “systems” determine all) and political economic analysis (where a rather limited notion of the “economic” determines all). I have argued against determinism and against external structures causing people to do things. This builds on concerns that these dominant forms of theorizing can make people disappear from social analysis and struggle and builds forms of theorizing that actually disempower people struggling for radical social transformation by giving all power to capital or forms of oppression. I affirm that we need to move away from using “structure” in our analysis and theorizing. What we want to call “structures” are always produced through social struggles and people’s doings and we need to make this as visible as possible. Otherwise, we can facilitate only that moment of people’s experiences where they are dominated by these “structures” that they can’t see any way of changing. This is why I use the language of social practices and relations, a focus on people’s doings or social accomplishments. In my view, without using “social structure,” we can still write very clearly about how social practices get coordinated and are organized through institutional and social relations, and we, at the same time, theorize in ways that facilitates resistance and rebellion rather than constraining it.²⁰⁹ Our ways of thinking and theorizing need to open up possibilities for oppressed people to transform the world rather than limiting them from doing this.

I find that autonomist Marxist currents allow me to reinforce and to deepen these commitments and to focus on social relations, practices, and doings. This has also led me to be skeptical of the recent popularity of the expanded political economy currents who affirm the significance of social reproduction, calling it Social Reproduction Theory,²¹⁰ but at the same time do not really learn from the autonomist Marxist feminist

organizing and theorizing leading up to wages for/against housework in the 1970s and since.²¹¹ This autonomist Marxist feminism, rather than being invested in identity politics, emphasizes the need to address social power relations—including race, gender, and sexuality—within the working class and to develop autonomous forms of organizing within broader class struggles to address these particular forms of oppression.

I have especially been inspired by the emergence and development of the Zapatistas in Chiapas in Mexico who have developed an anti-capitalist synthesis drawing together Mayan, Marxist, and anarchist forms of insight and knowledge. They have also tried to support feminist, queer, and trans struggles as crucial within their vision of non-statist, anti-capitalist revolutionary transformation.²¹² Related to this, I have found the work of John Holloway very useful in suggesting how we can continue to engage in revolutionary social transformation without relying on any sort of fixation on taking over state power. Instead, we need to constantly crack open and extend fissures in capitalist and oppressive social relations and to link them together in broader projects of radical social transformation.²¹³ This approach can allow us to see how central to struggle today, within Canadian state formation, are Indigenous struggles against the tar sands and pipe-lines, and other “development” projects in defence of the ecologies that we are all part of and depend on, as the Wet’suwet’en, Secwepemc land defenders, and the 1492 Land Back at Six Nations struggles have made clear. These Indigenous struggles are crucial to obstructing the current plans of capital.²¹⁴ Black and anti-racist struggles, especially with the uprising against racist capitalism and policing and carceral injustice are also central.

Holloway also allows me to see that we must always struggle simultaneously within, against, and beyond capitalist and oppressive social relations.²¹⁵ Too many of our movements get trapped fighting only *within* these relations and we need to also struggle against them, especially in moving beyond them and making alternatives. For instance, regarding the police, a focus on struggling *within* leads to a terrain of limited reforms and instead, especially given the character of policing as an institutional state relation, we need an emphasis on struggling *against* and *beyond* the police, supporting defunding and abolishing the police campaigns and developing alternatives to policing to develop community safety.²¹⁶

Capitalism is not a thing, object, or structure that is external to us. It is instead a social relation which we both help to produce and also struggle against and beyond. In this sense, we need to realize that when we struggle to have our needs and desires met that we become the crisis of capital.²¹⁷ It is this that opens up liberationist possibilities for meeting our desires and needs. I return to this in the conclusion (Chapter 12).

A RADICAL LEFT BOOK: REJECTING RULING IDENTITY POLITICS AND STATE FORMATION

This remains a radical left book, as in the first two editions. Disputing a popular mythology, I am not getting more moderate as I get older. As before, this book (and its author) supports *revolutionary* social transformation. Much of the broad and social democratic left—but also parts of the more radical left—is mired in liberalism when it comes to

queer, trans, and other struggles. Much of their politics regarding our struggles were formed in the same-sex marriage struggles of the 1990s and early 2000s. This means they view our struggles as simply for limited democratic rights and as a struggle against “homophobia” (and, for some, “transphobia” as well) and as having no major relation to racialized class struggles. Much of this broader and even more radical left has not listened to or learned from those of us critical of the same-sex marriage struggle and other limited struggles for democratic rights, as covered in Chapters 11 and 12. They instead focus on the struggle *within* capitalist relations and not on *against* and *beyond*. But we need to move far beyond limited democratic rights to achieve queer and trans liberation, which is also bound up with anti-racist, anti-patriarchal, and anti-capitalist struggles.

Then there are the sometimes-overlapping sections of the broad and radical left who read our struggles only through the lens of “identity” politics. Sometimes this is combined with a liberal approach to queer and trans rights. I am critical of forms of identity politics²¹⁸ that can freeze and fix us and, as Rinaldo Walcott puts it, to “cage us” as essential identities,²¹⁹ obscuring how our oppressions are bound up with racial class relations and struggles, and with historical transformations. But, at the same time, the desire to be able to name our experiences of oppression and to claim our histories of resistance can be crucial in our struggles. And those on the left who adopt a narrow “class first” politics and who claim to reject the politics of identity not only refuse to see how class is always made in and through race, gender, sexuality and other relations,²²⁰ they also never seem to notice the problem with ruling forms of identity politics, since they tend to construct their mythology of the working class as white, male and heterosexual, violently abstracted away from race, gender, sexual, ability, and other relations and struggles. Instead, they need to start with challenging ruling forms of identity politics like whiteness, Canadianness, masculinity, heterosexuality, and cisgenderness.²²¹ They need to contest the forms of identity in hegemony before critiquing the identity claims of oppressed people. Otherwise, they only focus on contesting the naming and experiences of oppressed peoples themselves.²²²

In 2023, I no longer use “socialist” to describe my politics. I did adopt this in the first two editions, given my political experiences and perspectives at the time. I have learned a great deal from people who define themselves as socialists and the long histories of struggle for socialism, but “socialism” now, for me, is too state-identified, and the radical social transformation that I hope for is not defined by the top-down, hierarchical, and bureaucratic relations that define the state social form. I have now learned from the anti-statist critiques of C.L.R. James, John Holloway, and others, of the need for social transformation that does not flow through seizing or expanding state power, and flows instead through abolishing police, prisons, and carceral relations more generally. Instead, we need to move towards community-based mutual aid and popular assemblies and forms of direct democracy, like the forms of political organizing developed by the Zapatistas or the popular councils that have sprung up in many revolutionary situations. I now define myself as an anti-capitalist activist organizing from below.²²³

Marx learned from the Paris Commune,²²⁴ the first time working-class people took over running a city, and other struggles, that his statist position in *The Communist*

Manifesto was wrong and “that the working class cannot simply lay hold on the ready-made state machinery and wield it for their own purpose. The political instrument of their enslavement cannot serve as the political instrument of their emancipation.”²²⁵ This resonates well with Audre Lorde’s “for the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house,”²²⁶ and also with Simpson’s Indigenous critique of the Western nation-state and exposition of Indigenous nationhoods as not being based on “enclosure, borders, authoritarian power, violence,” and as not being a

...replication of the nation-state and the violence required to maintain statehood; in the context of colonialism, they are a generative refusal of the Westphalian [western/European] nation state system...they are a different way of organizing life, structuring the ways we live and relate to the worlds around us...based on deep relationality, [and] grounded solidarities...²²⁷

Marx also went on to say that we need

...a Revolution not against this or that, legitimate, constitutional, republican or Imperialist form of state power. It [is] a Revolution against the State itself...a resumption by the people for the people of its own social life. It [is] not Revolution to transfer it from one faction of the ruling class to another, but a Revolution to break down this horrid machinery of class domination itself.²²⁸

In short, we need a revolution against the state form. In the context of the uprising against anti-Black racism and the police, we need to challenge strategies of liberal and social democratic containment of our struggles to reforming the police, which is a central state institution, by instead organizing *against* the very social form of policing, which is capitalist, racist, colonialist, and patriarchal. In organizing for No Pride in Genocide, we move far beyond reforms within Canadian state formation, putting this state and social form in question as we organize against Canada and for alternatives based on Indigenous sovereignty, #LandBack, and social and racial justice.

Hopefully, these remarks create a different context for reading the text from the second edition which comes next. Please remember it was written for 1996, although the references have been updated to bring in later resources when required.

The open-access version of this publication (coming in 2024) includes a list of bibliographic references and recommended resources. See: <https://press.library.concordia.ca/projects/the-regulation-of-desire>.

Introduction to the Second Edition

Inspirations

TAKE ONE. Anger, excitement, and surging sense of power fueled our steps as we moved south on Yonge Street, sweeping aside queerbashers and police alike.

It was February 6, 1981. I was among three thousand gay men, and lesbians, and our supporters taking over Toronto's main street. We were expressing our outrage at the arrests the previous night of close to three hundred men on "bawdy house" charges following raids on four gay baths. The police had invaded institutions that were central to the gay male community and the social and sexual spaces that we had established for ourselves. The demonstration was an unprecedented show of strength—a real high for me. The cops were disoriented, and the city was turned on its ear.¹

In the weeks that followed the police attack, a widespread sense of resistance, rebellion, pride, and community developed among Toronto's gay men and many of its lesbians. Thousands of gay men now realized that the police were not our friends—if we had any such illusions before—and that the cops, and the social institutions they defended, found something profoundly disturbing and threatening about gay men, gay sex, and a visible gay community. We not only felt the power of the police and the state, but also the power of gay resistance. It was in this energy and excitement that I found the inspiration for the first edition of this book, published in 1987.

TAKE TWO. Fifteen years after the rebellious resistance to the bath raids, the situation has changed dramatically. I can look back rather nostalgically to the rebellious days of 1981, but I also remember the new struggles that gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, people living with AIDS/HIV, trans people, and our supporters have engaged in. I have lived through the rebirth of "queer" activism in the late 1980s and the early 1990s as we have fought for our very survival against anti-queer violence and AIDS, and as we have continued to push for our liberation. I use "queer" here to identify with this new activism, and to reclaim a term of abuse so that it can no longer be used against us.²

Activism subsided in Toronto following the bath raids by the mid-1980s as the tide of gay resistance receded, but it picked up again in the context of the ravages of the AIDS crisis in our communities. Initially the AIDS crisis decreased the militancy of gay

communities as we tended to our sick and dying and were put on the defensive. While police arrests of gay men for having sex continued, the large-scale bath raids in Toronto ended after 1983. Police raids were no longer seen as necessary to keep us in line as we were once more labelled “sick” and “diseased” by dominant social agencies and the mass media.

By 1988, it had become clear to many people living with AIDS/HIV (PLWA/HIVs) that they were being denied access to promising treatments that could extend their lives. Standing up to his denial by state regulations and pharmaceutical corporations gave birth to a treatment-based activism that came initially from gay activists but extended far beyond them to raise crucial questions about both healthcare and the social regulation of sexuality.³ I became involved in this AIDS activism through Toronto’s AIDS ACTION NOW! as we recaptured some of the spirits of the resistance to the bath raids in our organizing.

During a demonstration in 1988, we burned an effigy of then Minister of Health Jake Epp in the streets of Toronto to protest against AIDS inaction. Along with AIDS activists from Montréal and New York City, we took over the opening session at the International AIDS Conference in Montréal in 1989 to protest the exclusion of the concerns and needs of PLWA/HIVs. We sat in the offices of the multinational drug corporation Bristol Myers in 1989 to protest their withholding of an anti-HIV drug that PLWA/HIVs needed to access.⁴ We won some victories in gaining more access to badly needed treatments, but governments, the professions, social agencies, and the media continued to organize problems in the lives of PLWA/HIVs. Over the next few years, I continued to be involved in AIDS activism in the rather different settings of St. John’s, Newfoundland, and the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia, lobbying with government officials and doing educational and media work.

Meanwhile, partly inspired by this AIDS activism, a new generation of queer activists formed “Queer Nation” type groups in Toronto, Ottawa, Montréal, and Vancouver to bash back against anti-queer violence and to promote lesbian and gay visibility in militant street actions and “in your face” protests.⁵ In the 1990s, some lesbians—inspired by the direct-action dimensions of AIDS activism and Queer Nation—would set up chapters of Lesbian Avengers across the U.S. and in a number of centres in Canada.⁶ It was out of these new queer and AIDS activisms that I found the initial inspiration to begin work on the revised edition of this book.

TAKE THREE. On June 9, 1994, the Ontario Legislature defeated Bill 167, which would have granted same-sex benefits and family-relationship-recognition rights to lesbians and gays in the province in what would have been the most advanced legislation on these questions in North America. The right-wing moral-conservative opposition, as well as the opposition of the majority of the Liberal Party, and a number of New Democrats focused on the inclusion of adoption rights in Bill 167. While this was largely directed at securing the legal right for the non-biological lesbian/gay co-parents to adopt their partners’ children, this was focused on by these forces and by much of the media as a

threat to young people and to the heterosexual family itself. The vote was fifty-nine for the bill and sixty-eight against. That night, close to eight thousand angry lesbians, gays, and our supporters gathered at the legislative buildings at Queen's Park to express our outrage. Some chanted "Burn Down the House."

The organizing for Bill 167 by the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario, and later the Campaign for Equal Families and the protests against its defeat, were unprecedented with lesbians and gays coming together for the first time in activism in many smaller centres across the province.⁷ And at Lesbian and Gay Pride Day that year in Toronto, tens of thousands of lesbians and gay men affirmed that "We are Family!" This struggle was far more extensive than the resistance to the bath raids.

A year later, in 1995, the election of a new Conservative government seems to have closed off possibilities for further provincial legislative action on this front for the foreseeable future. Important discussions have opened up on evaluating the struggle for Bill 167, the relation of lesbians and gays to the legal and social constructs of "family" and "spouse" and on ways forward for lesbian and gay organizing on these questions. I hope this book can contribute to clarifying the terrain of these debates.

Meanwhile, after the passage by the House of Commons of the hate crimes legislation that included sexual orientation as one ground for hate crimes sentencing in June 1995,⁸ the federal government seems reluctant to proceed on basic sexual orientation protection at the federal level. This is despite a recent Supreme Court decision affirming that the equality rights section of the Charter should be read as including sexual orientation. Liberal backbenchers Roseanne Skoke, Tom Wappel, and others have been allowed to speak out against lesbians and gay men, suggesting that our rights are no priority for the current federal government. Fortunately, Skoke's visibility in opposition to our rights has produced some very significant organizing by lesbians, gays, and others against her in Nova Scotia. In 1994, a protest of more than one hundred people outside her constituency office in New Glasgow was organized. Given my years of activism in St. John's, the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia, and now in Sudbury, I am much more conscious than when I wrote the first edition of this book about the importance of queer organizing in smaller centres and rural areas.

Sexual Policing and Human Rights

In 1996, the sex police are still very much with us, if not on the same scale as in 1981. The police continue to lay "indecent act" and "bawdy house" charges against men for engaging in consensual sex. In 1993, men engaging in consensual sex in washrooms were arrested by the police in St. John's, where video surveillance by the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary led to "indecent act" charges being laid against twenty-six men who also got their names published in the local newspaper.⁹ Men continue to be arrested in parks and washrooms in the Metro Toronto area.¹⁰ The police continue to not provide protection against anti-gay and anti-lesbian violence, often themselves joining in the harassment and violence—as we saw in the police attacks on Sex Garage, a gay/

lesbian late-night warehouse party in Montréal in 1990, and their lack of response until late 1993 to the murders of gay men in Montréal. On February 17, 1994, Montréal police arrested 175 men as “found ins” in a “common bawdy house” at the *Katakombes* bar. This was the largest mass arrest of men having sex with men since the early 1980s bath raids in Toronto.

At the same time there has been escalating sexual censorship by the police and especially by Canada Customs against lesbian and gay magazines, books, and videos coming into the country and against lesbian and gay bookstores, such as *Glad Day* in Toronto and *Little Sister's* in Vancouver, and a growing number of women's bookstores. *Little Sister's* took Canada Customs to court in 1994 to try to put a stop to this discrimination, and in January 1996, they won only a partial legal victory. The 1992 Butler decision of the Supreme Court, which altered the test for “obscurity,” has been interpreted by the police and Canada Customs to extend their seizures of gay and lesbian materials. One of the first seizures using this new interpretation was of the lesbian publication *Bad Attitude* from *Glad Day* in Toronto in 1992.¹¹ There has also been the use of new legislation passed in 1993, allegedly designed to deal with “youth pornography,” against male hustlers, and to collect evidence to re-criminalize consensual male/male sex in Southern Ontario, especially in London (see Chapter 11).

Sexual policing has been selectively intensified. This has been combined with violence against lesbians and gays; and moral-conservative mobilization around AIDS, against lesbian and gay rights, feminism, and progressive sex education in the schools.¹² The mass media and the right have continued to use the AIDS crisis to associate gay sex with sickness and disease. The social response to the AIDS crisis has become a condensation of many social relations, including a heterosexist response to gay men and lesbians.¹³ Through the 1989–1990 Hughes Commission hearings into the cover-up of “abuse” at Mount Cashel in St. John's in the mid-1970s and associated media coverage, once again homosexuals have been associated with “child sexual abuse.” This framing of gay men has been picked up by the media across the country to cover similar events and has also been recycled by the anti-gay right wing.¹⁴

We are still denied our basic human rights in many jurisdictions even though we have made remarkable progress on this front on many provincial levels. As of January 1996, Québec, Ontario, Yukon, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan have added “sexual orientation” protection to their human rights codes, a number of municipalities have instituted forms of protection, and many unions have won such protection in their contracts. At the same time, governments, social agencies, businesses, and landlords often continue to deny us our basic civil and human rights.

Some of these positive developments have occurred in the context of the equality rights section (Section 15) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is a partial modification of the strategy of state legal formation, and it opened some spaces and possibilities for the establishment of formal lesbian and gay legal equality that could be taken advantage of through court challenges. Lesbians, gays, feminists, and human

rights supporters—and the federal government’s equality rights committee and human rights commission—have been arguing that sexual orientation protection must be included in all human rights legislation. In 1986, the federal Conservative government, in response to the equality rights committee, stated that it believed the courts would interpret Section 15 as including sexual orientation protection. Almost ten years later in 1995 in the Egan/Nesbitt case, the Supreme Court of Canada decided that Section 15 must be read as including sexual orientation protection.

The Conservatives in office were extremely slow to move on the issue and there was lots of opposition among Tory backbenchers. Many Tories and the military elite—who in October 1992 in the Michelle Douglas case were finally forced to give up their official policies that discriminated against lesbians and gay men in employment—had been strongly opposed to even these limited steps. On December 10, 1992—International Human Rights Day—Kim Campbell, federal Minister of Justice, attempted to add sexual orientation to Canada’s Human Rights Act but with an important restriction prohibiting same-gender marital relations, which would have had important repercussions on our struggles for spousal benefits and immigration rights for our partners. In response, on a few hours’ notice more than 25 lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals gathered in the Minister of Justice’s office in Halifax in protest against this restriction.¹⁵

On December 13, 1994, Liberal Allan Rock became the latest Minister of Justice to delay enactment of sexual orientation protection in federal human rights legislation. At the time of writing—even though there have been positive court decisions and the new Liberal federal government has promised to move on basic human rights protection for lesbians and gay men—it has yet to do so. Prime Minister Jean Chrétien has apparently urged delay and faces opposition from within the Liberal caucus from Skoke, Wappel, and others.

The result of the May 25, 1995 Supreme Court decision in the Jim Egan/Jack Nesbitt same-sex spousal benefit case was mixed. They lost the case with four of the judges arguing that there was no discrimination in the denial of the pension benefit to Jack Nesbitt, and one arguing that there was, but that it was a “justified” form of discrimination (four judges argued that there was discrimination, and it was not justified). At the same time the Supreme Court judges clearly decided that the equality rights section of the Charter should be read as including sexual orientation protection.¹⁶ This decision embodies the ambiguous and contradictory character of the current legal situation facing lesbians and gays in Canada. On the one hand, on an abstract basis our rights are recognized, but not in the context of our actual and substantive relationships and sexualities. The 1995 legal decision in Ontario regarding the adoption rights of non-biological mothers is important but of limited jurisdiction. In the face of a hostile provincial government, its implications are very important but unlikely to be far reaching.¹⁷

Lesbians and gays have won some important legal and social victories through our own struggles, and the allies we have won, and coalitions we have forged. There is now a more widespread tolerance and acceptance for us than ever before in Canadian history. At the same time there is also a more vociferous minority opposition than ever before,

which often has important support within state relations, especially within police forces and among right-wing and—as we have seen—among Liberal and even Social Democratic politicians. NDPer George Mammoliti made some incredibly vile remarks against gay men and lesbians in the Ontario legislature during the Bill 167 debate.¹⁸ We are closer than ever to winning our abstract formal rights but at the same time are also still criminalized and face denial of our sexualities and our relationships.

Elites and Differences

Most disturbing for me as an activist, a new gay elite (the lesbian elite is much smaller) of professionals (doctors, lawyers, managers, social workers) has ironically been the main beneficiary of the early 1980s rebellions in Toronto and other large centres, rather than the radicals and grassroots bar people who led the surges into the streets in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and who formed Queer Nation groups later on. These professionals are now able to speak for the “community” as its legitimate representatives since they speak the same language as those who govern society and are already associated with relations of ruling. This is also often the case in “community-based” AIDS groups that are often dominated by a professional and managerial stratum.¹⁹ These professional groups do have valuable skills that need to be put at the disposal of our movements and communities, but without accountability to grassroots communities they develop their own interests as “respectable” and “responsible” gays and lesbians.

In smaller centres and rural areas where there is usually less visible activism, there are different dynamics and histories. In these areas the layer of “out” people is often quite limited and there are few professionals who are “out.” This can limit organizing possibilities, but the experiences of the Saskatchewan Gay Coalition organizing across that province in the late 1970s, the recent organizing against Roseanne Skoke in Pictou County, Nova Scotia, and the success of the first ever Northern Ontario regional lesbian, gay, and bisexual conference held in Sudbury in April 1995, which attracted more than one hundred people, all suggest possibilities for organizing in these areas.

Social differences among and between lesbians and gay men have also continued. There are other differences within the lesbian and gay communities as well—differences of class, race, gender, HIV status, age, ability, language, whether living in large urban centres or more rural areas, and sexual practice. Some of these differences have been highlighted by the self-organization of lesbians and gays of colour, and the organization of Indigenous Two-Spirit peoples, as racism within gay and lesbian communities and the construction of lesbian and gay as “white” has been challenged. It is important to not only recognize and celebrate differences, but also to deal with transforming the underlying social power relations of discrimination and inequality. There have also been challenges from bisexuals against their exclusion from lesbian and gay establishments, and events that have led to the incorporation of bisexual into the names of many gay and lesbian groups; as well as challenges from transgender people to their exclusion from lesbian/gay community formation.

Tensions, Heterosexual Hegemony, and the Left

This book attempts to account for these various experiences, and in a broader sense, to account for both lesbian and gay oppression and resistance in a historical sociological perspective.

My experience as a gay man—one that I know is shared by many lesbians and gay men, although it is lived differently on the basis of class, race and gender—is that there exists a constant tension between, on the one hand, how we live our daily lives and give and receive erotic pleasure, and on the other, the sexual categories imposed by the social relations of a presumed universal heterosexuality. The mass media, the psychiatric, sexological and medical professions, government policies, the denial of spousal and family-recognition rights to lesbian and gay couples, and police actions such as the bath raids and washroom arrests, defend and construct heterosexual hegemony. Heterosexuality is socially organized as “natural” and “normal”; we gays and lesbians are outsiders—we cannot see ourselves through mainstream social categories, institutions, and images. The “normality” of heterosexuality is organized in relation to the “deviance” and “abnormality” of homosexuality. The “normality” of heterosexuality rests on lesbian and gay sexualities being constructed as “abnormal” and “deviant.”

This disparity between our reality and the categories used to interpret us is fostered not only by the right-wing, state agencies, and the social mainstream, it is also the “tradition” within the progressive movement. Some lesbians and gay men, like myself, have looked to the socialist and Marxist traditions because of their promise of liberation for all the oppressed and exploited. There were a number of tenuous connections between early homosexual rights reformers and the left from the late nineteenth century to the early 1930s.²⁰ These ties were severed, however, with the establishment of the hegemony of the Stalinist position that homosexuality was a symptom of capitalist and “fascist degeneration,” and with the male-dominated working-class movement’s defence of the heterosexual “proletarian” family. The socialist movement thus reinforced the practices of heterosexual hegemony, integrating them into its own organizations. The recent collapse of “communism” (what I would refer to as bureaucratic class societies of a new type that were neither socialist nor communist in a Marxist sense) in the Eastern Bloc has created some new legal opportunities for lesbians and gay men in these formerly Stalinist states, but has also generated attempts to reassert patriarchal relations, including the oppression of women, and lesbians and gay men. The gains of women in employment and social services in many of these countries are being rapidly eroded.²¹

Leftists have continued to initiate lesbian and gay resistance, but this struggle has often been marginalized by the left-wing mainstream, although there have been some important gains since the first edition of this book was written.²² Heterosexism—the ideology that proclaims lesbians and gays to be “deviant” and “sick” and heterosexuals to be “normal”—has therefore been integrated into the analysis and traditions of the socialist movement. My experiences in several socialist organizations—as a gay activist influenced by socialism and feminism—is that this norm of heterosexuality is

reproduced. In these groups, “class struggle” is often still counterposed to the “peripheral” or “secondary” issue of gay liberation. Much of the organized left has participated in this social marginalization of lesbians and gay men.²³

Within the current debates on the reasons for the crisis of the federal and some provincial New Democratic parties, some try to suggest that the problems have been caused by too much support for the gay, feminist, or anti-racist movements and not enough for real “working-class concerns” (read the concerns of white working-class heterosexual men). This is one interpretation that has been produced over the defeat of Bill 167 and its implications for the Ontario NDP and the NDP across the country.

A theme that will run through this book is the relationship between our struggles and socialist organizing, and the new liberationist possibilities that are opening up for this in remaking a democratic socialist movement informed by various progressive social movements, including lesbian and gay liberation. While there have been downturns in other struggles, there have been continuing mobilization around lesbian and gay concerns. There are active movement organizations, and layers of activists who are not only involved in lesbian and gay struggles but also in other social justice struggles. These are important resources to be built on. This means that lesbian/gay/queer activism is not peripheral to but has a central “role” to play in reconstituting a vibrant socialist movement. This new socialist movement would be informed by the perspectives that queers can bring to it.

The gay liberation movement that followed the Stonewall riots in New York City²⁴ in 1969 ignited by Puerto Rican drag queens, trans women of colour, bar dykes, and street people against routine police repression of a gay bar, challenged the hegemony of heterosexuality by calling on us to come out of the closet and affirm that lesbian and gay is just as good as straight. The movement focused on “coming out” as a means of proclaiming gay “identity” and community, suggesting in the process that such acts of will could, in and of themselves, cause the walls of heterosexual hegemony to come tumbling down.²⁵ The many years of struggle since Stonewall have demonstrated that heterosexual hegemony is a far more complex terrain and is far more entrenched than was ever imagined in 1969. Heterosexual hegemony is still very much with us, even though feminists, lesbians, and gay men have certainly helped alter the relations of sexual regulation through our struggles.

Remaking History

These questions create the need for a more historically grounded perspective for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and trans liberation: a view that understands the social forces that have both organized our oppression and made it possible for us to resist. This perspective helps account for the relationship between gay oppression and the regulation of sexuality generally, including the construction of heterosexual hegemony and the relationships between our oppression and the organization of gender, class, race, and state relations. This historical inquiry needs to be combined with more concrete investigations of how our oppression is presently socially organized. This perspective could

also help erase the dichotomy between “class struggle,” defined in a narrow economic way, and gay liberation struggle seen as solely a middle-class or “cultural” issue. Sexual rule and heterosexual hegemony have historically played an important part in class struggle and state formation.²⁶

Recent historical explorations of the institutions of sexual rule, the emergence of homosexual and lesbian “identities” and cultures, and our resistance to oppression can account for this dialectical emergence and confrontation of gay resistance and heterosexual hegemony.²⁷ This work, which can be called the social-constructionist “emergence” thesis, suggests that while same-gender erotic pleasures have always existed, they have been socially organized very differently, and that homosexuality and lesbianism in the contemporary sense is also a recent creation, developing in response to the emergence of same-gender erotic cultures.²⁸ This emergence perspective is based on a critique of sexual “naturalism”—the notion that there is an intrinsic, natural, gay, lesbian, heterosexual, bisexual, or other form of sexuality.²⁹ Sexuality is not some natural essence that has been repressed; it is socially made and regulated.³⁰ It is perhaps more accurate to use words like “sexualities” and “cultures” to express that there is no unitary sexuality nor culture. Rather than any singular unitary history of sexuality, there are diverse and multiple histories of sexualities, genders, and cultures. Pluralizing these words expresses the diversity of these experiences that can often be denied under monolithic categories like a singular “sexuality.”

This book is an attempt to develop such a historical perspective for Canada, to develop a gay or sexually “deviant” view of this country’s history—one could even say to develop a first glimpse of a “queer history” of what we now call Canada. This history is not just about adding the experiences of queers to the existing canons of settler colonial Canadian history, it is about rewriting the history of Canada. As Roxana Ng, writing about sexism and racism in Canadian history, argues: “It is not enough for feminist and ethnic historians to rewrite women’s history and ethnic history. In order to understand how Canada came to be a nation with its present configuration, we have to rewrite the history of Canada.”³¹ And as feminist historian Karen Dubinsky suggests: “Historians have started to rewrite the history of Canada as though women and workers mattered. We must now also begin to rethink Canadian history as though sexuality mattered.”³² This history is not only relevant to queers but it also makes visible major aspects of the social making of heterosexuality as well.

Not for Queers Only

To make this more relevant for the heterosexual reader requires the recognition that heterosexuals in this society have what can be referred to as “heterosexual privilege,” and again this is lived differently on the basis of class, race and gender. This privilege is not a possession or an essence—it is a social practice through which heterosexuals empower themselves through daily participation in the relations of heterosexual hegemony. I ask my heterosexual students to think through the following exercise to help make this visible to them. This is like an ethnomethodological breaching experiment within

sociology—which requires suspending the “natural” or “common-sense” attitude and the violation of social convention to learn from the social reactions we provoke.³³

Lesbian feminist Charlotte Bunch once explained to heterosexual women that the best way to find out what “heterosexual privilege” is all about is to go about for a few days as an open lesbian. If you are a heterosexual man, think about going about your life as an openly gay man.

What makes heterosexuality work is heterosexual privilege—and if you don’t have a sense of what privilege is, I suggest that you go home and announce to everybody that you know—a roommate, your family, the people you work with—and everywhere that you go—that you’re a queer. Try being a queer for a week.³⁴

A heterosexual woman or man can easily imagine the discomfort, ridicule, and fear, and even violence that she or he might experience, how his or her “coming out” would disrupt “normal” relations at work and with his or her family. Such experiences are the substance of gay and lesbian oppression in this society and are also the substance of heterosexual privilege and hegemony. Looking at the social world from this place allows one to see aspects of social power and oppression that cannot be seen from other locations. As heterosexual feminist Lynne Segal puts it in her book *Straight Sex*, in which she learned much about the social organization of heterosexual relations from the critiques produced by lesbians and gay men: “Lesbians and gay people increasingly set the agenda for a reversal in which ‘the interrogators are interrogated,’ and compulsory heterosexuality, heterosexism, and the roping of sexuality to gender themselves become the problem.”³⁵ In this sense, doing queer historical and sociological work is not for queers alone,³⁶ but has many insights for heterosexuals if they are willing to challenge heterosexism in their own lives and practices.

In this book I sketch in how contradictions between gay and lesbian experiences and practices and heterosexual hegemony have come about in Canadian society, and how our experiences have been organized by a social and historical process that extends outside and beyond our own individual fields of vision. Only when we begin to understand this process can we distinguish between our enemies and our allies. Then we can chart a course toward liberation.

Gay and lesbian liberation politics has not yet been able to adequately account for the historical organization of our oppression, instead often implicitly or explicitly assuming the existence of some sort of natural homogenous lesbian or gay minority outside of history and imprisoning our political perspectives in a naturalist, ahistorical mould. This has shaped even the queer activism that has tried to break away from some of the problems of narrow gay and lesbian “identity” politics.³⁷ In the 1980s and 1990s, we have begun to realize that while coming out and defending the gay ghetto and lesbian spaces are crucial, this alone will not determine a strategy for liberation. We must move beyond this to a more general understanding of sexual rule and resistance. Historical work helps us evaluate the shifting of policies of sexual rule with the Canadian state.

It helps us examine the significance of the 1969 Criminal Code reform, for example, which some felt had “legalized” homosexuality, and to look at equality rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms—a charter that is shaping legal decisions even as the sexual policing of lesbians and gay men selectively intensifies—and also to look at spousal and family recognition rights, and how significant a challenge to heterosexual social and family policies they are. This helps us to account for the gains we have won, but also the continuing violence toward us, the continuing hatred, and the continuing deafening silence about our actual lives in the dominant culture. This history of sexual regulation and resistance is not of theoretical interest only. It has a great deal of relevance both for our present struggles and for future possibilities.

Before outlining the chapters that follow, I must discuss the book’s scope and limitations. The terms “gay,” “lesbian,” “heterosexual,” and “bisexual” are used in a historically specific sense. This may make for difficult language at times because it goes against the grain of “common sense” assumptions about the naturalness of sexuality, but I feel it is necessary to be specific. Contemporary social categories and experiences emerge only in specific social and historical settings. There is no lesbian, gay, heterosexual, or bisexual standing outside history, even though “common sense” perspectives project the present hetero/homo polarity back in time. For instance, the essentialist view that posits essences that are outside history finds the “homosexual” of Ancient Greece to be comparable to the “homosexual” in modern times.³⁸ However, sexual life throughout history has been regulated and made meaningful in very different ways:

Modern homosexuality and ancient pederasty, for example, share at least one feature: that the participants were of the same sex and that sexual intercourse is often involved—but the significant features are those that are not shared, including the entire range of symbolic, social, economic, and political meanings and functions each group of roles possesses.³⁹

And as Jonathan Katz also argues:

It is only the most one-dimensional, mechanical “behaviourism” that suggests that the act of male with male called “sodomy” in the early [American] colonies was identical to that behaviour called “homosexual” in the 1980s. It is only the most vulgar technological determinism of sexual organs that suggest their “contact” sums up that complex of intimate acts, behaviours, feelings and relationships now called “lesbian” and “gay.”⁴⁰

Similarly, earlier practices of reproductive and different-gender forms of sexual practice are not the same as contemporary heterosexuality that only emerges in the first parts of the twentieth century.⁴¹ I will use the term “heterosexual” to describe the practices and identities of men and women who no longer simply were engaging in reproductive forms of sex or participating in a familial division of labour, but were guided by a “necessary” and “essential” erotic orientation to the “opposite” gender.

Similarly, I will use the word “homosexual” to describe the activities, the identities, and experiences of homosexual or gay men over the last two centuries. Clearly, a number of different terms to be mentioned throughout this book were used, and where appropriate I will use fairy, queer, and other terms. I generally prefer the word “gay” to describe homosexual men since the post-World War II growth of homosexual cultures and ghettos. It is less clinical than “homosexual” and was coined by homosexual men ourselves.

“Lesbian” is used here to describe a

woman who has sexual and erotic-emotional ties primarily with women or who sees herself as centrally involved with a community of self-identified lesbians whose sexual and erotic-emotional ties are primarily with women and who is herself a self-identified lesbian.⁴²

These possibilities only emerged over the last two hundred years, as I will outline later.

Bisexuality arose even later as a term men and women who are erotically interested in both genders began to take up to describe themselves. Even though Freud and others used it in their writings on sexuality much earlier, bisexual networks and “identities” really only emerged after the recent wave of gay liberation and lesbian feminism had already emerged.⁴³ In this sense I would disagree with those who argue it is the most “natural” form of sexuality since bisexuality can only emerge in the context of the hetero/homo polarity which was fully put in place only over the last two centuries. Prior to this it would have had no real basis for social existence.

For previous historical periods I will try to use the words in common usage at the time. For erotic activity among men, for example, “sodomite,” “catamite,” “Molly,” “invert,” “faggot,” “queer,” “cocksucker,” “pogue,” “fairy,” “moffie” (in South Africa), or “queen” might have been used in different periods; for activity among women, “tribadist,” “sapphist,” “man royal,”⁴⁴ “bull dagger,” or “dyke” have been used. These do not necessarily have equivalent social meanings with “homosexual” or “lesbian” today.

This work cannot address the diversity of same-gender erotic practices in the “Third World” since in these contexts sexuality takes on other features and is rooted in a rather different social and historical process.⁴⁵ I will, however, at a number of points disrupt or problematize the construction of a distinct “white” European derived character of the hegemonic construction of lesbian and gay “identities” and cultures in settler colonial Canada.⁴⁶ This is not necessarily the path to liberation for “Third World” lesbians and gays. There are other possible ways put forward, building on other traditions and cultural resources. It is important not to impose the “American” model on the rest of the world.⁴⁷ In making this racial/ethnic construction visible my point is not to label previous white lesbians and gays as always “racist,” thereby dismissing their experiences. My point rather is that we have much to learn from their experiences of resistance to oppression, including how the construction of lesbian and gay as “white” and European-derived has also excluded other groups of people from being able to redefine what being lesbian and gay is all about through drawing on other traditions and cultural practices.

This is one point I was not very conscious of in the first edition and I hope this edition is a much better effort at challenging some of the historical roots of racism and colonialism in Canadian society in general but also within sexual regulation and lesbian and gay communities/cultures more specifically.⁴⁸

I look at the lives of lesbians, gay men, and of heterosexuals as well from time to time. Given that I am a gay man, however, I focus more on erotic activity among men and what this tells us about sexual rule in general. I recognize that lesbianism cannot be lumped uncritically together with male homosexuality for purposes of analysis. Given differences in the social organization of gender as it affects our sexual lives, any use of a unitary homosexual category for both male and female experiences necessarily distorts lesbian experience to fit the male category. Lesbians are thereby transformed into female homosexual “men.” This is the case even in much current “queer” theorizing where queer is coded most often as male.⁴⁹ Differences in the social organization of gender—of forms of masculinity, femininity, and sexuality—tend to become obscured and the effect of patriarchal social organization is overlooked.⁵⁰ Gay men may be “queer,” but we are still men, and we can even be “masculine” men in this society.⁵¹

Lesbian feminist theory developed from the diverse experiences of lesbians can at the same time be useful in examining gay male experiences, bringing with it a critique of institutionalized heterosexuality.⁵² Lesbian-feminism, in general, has developed a broader social vision than has most gay men’s liberation since lesbians are oppressed as “women” and as “lesbians,” and this has led to a broader and more diffuse social radicalization among lesbians. Fewer laws have been used to specifically regulate lesbian sexual activities. Gay men have been more directly affected by state regulation of sex and tended to organize around specific laws and police actions,⁵³ prior to AIDS activism when a series of new questions have been faced. The experiences of lesbians and gay men, along with bisexuals and trans people, must be examined in their specificity and their synthesis to give us a fuller picture of the ways in which heterosexual hegemony is organized.⁵⁴

Since the mid-1980s a lot has changed, and new questions need to be addressed. At the same time as new queer activism were emerging, a new theory—“queer theory”—emerged in the US and began spilling across the border into Canada. This literary and culturally derived theory began to again put in question the polarity between homo and hetero sexualities.⁵⁵ “Queer theory” was refreshing in once again placing on the agenda the contestation of what I call heterosexual hegemony. As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, one of the key American architects of “queer theory,” put it: “An understanding of virtually any aspect of Western culture must be, not merely incomplete, but damaged in its central substance to the degree that it does not incorporate a critical analysis of modern homo/heterosexual definitions.”⁵⁶

This important challenge is unfortunately limited by the character of “queer theory,” which largely only contests heterosexual hegemony on “cultural” and “literary” terrains. The notion of language used in “queer theory”—drawn from post-structuralism and post-modernism⁵⁷—tends to have a rather non-social character to it, not clearly seeing how language and discourse are social practices that people accomplish in our

daily lives.⁵⁸ This can lead “queer theory” to veer off in the direction of a discourse reductionism that reduces the complexities of social processes to the discursive domain alone, and obscures that it is people located in various social places and positions who produce discourse. These critiques will be developed further throughout this book. One of my objectives in this edition is to try to give the insights of “queer theory” a more social and materialist grounding to make them more relevant to critical historical, social, and political investigations and to social movement activism.

I begin with a section that surveys the perspectives and methods used in this book. This can be skipped over for those less interested in questions of “theory” and “method” or come back to later after investigating the rest of the book. Chapter 1 covers the crucial notion of shifting standpoints in studies of erotic desires and sexual regulation, and sketches in the key perspectives I have used in looking at sexualities in Canadian social history. This is followed by a chapter on the historical and social conditions necessary for the emergence of lesbian, gay, and heterosexual identities and cultures; it draws primarily on English, European, and American experiences. This then allows us to move on to see how this process took place in Canada.

There follows the main body of the book, which deals with sexual regulation in Canadian history. This sets the stage for the stories of sexual rule and sexual resistance in Canada, focusing on regulation of same-gender desires and how the social organization of homosexuality and lesbianism has affected the emergence of same-gender and different-gender erotic cultures. These categories have shaped the very terrain upon which our resistance has taken place. This exploration will also bring into focus more general features of social, moral and gender regulations and the organization of class and state rule. This section covers the period from European colonization, genocide, and marginalization of the Indigenous peoples to the contemporary moral-conservative mobilizations against gay liberation and feminism and the social construction of the AIDS crisis.

I present merely an outline of these histories, focusing on periods of transition. This is intended as a starting point for discussion, debate, and further research. It focuses much more on the historical experience in “English Canada,” than that of the distinct national experience in Québec. It is more developed for the 1950s and 1960s in Canada, since that is where I have done the most research and more information is available. In this second edition, Chapters 7 and 8—largely addressing the 1950s and 1960s—have been enriched by the addition of some of the analysis I undertook for my PhD thesis on “Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation,” completed in late 1988.⁵⁹

The latter sections of the book are not intended to be a history of the lesbian and gay liberation movements in the 1970s and 1980s.⁶⁰ This I leave to others, although there are suggestions here. The book is still far more Toronto- and Ontario-centric, especially for the 1970s to 1990s, than I would wish. I hope others will take the suggestions here and take them further for other regions of Canada. I have also updated this edition to take account of the explosion of research since the first edition,⁶¹ but it still needs to be developed and taken much further. As it stands, this is still a limited and partial history of the regulation of erotic desires in the Canadian state.

The last concluding chapter (Chapter 12), re-written and updated for this third edition, ties the book together, drawing a number of conclusions for gay and lesbian liberation and social, transformative, and feminist change more generally, zeroing in on a number of contemporary sexual, gender, and racialized struggles. I argue that current queer and trans struggles put in question some of the fundamental features of the capitalist, patriarchal and racist society we live in. This holds out the possibility that lesbian and gay liberation could be at the centre of reconstituting a dynamic movement for anti-racist and anti-capitalist social transformation.

THE REGULATION OF DESIRE

The Creation of “Homosexuality” as a “Social Problem”

Why Historical Materialism?

My method of exploration is a historical materialist one: that is, a perspective that views historical transformation as central to understanding our lives and that sees social relations and practices, rather than ideas or discourse separate from these,¹ as the primary elements in social change. Discourse both organizes and is organized through social relations. I am using “materialism” here in a broad sense, including eroticism and sexualities, as sensuous human practices. I do not view class as separate from other social relations and struggles, or as simply “economic” in character. Rather than displacing class relations and struggles, we need new ways of viewing class—not as a reified concept—but as lived historical, social experience and practice.² Sexual relations have been an important part of the formation of class relations and struggles; and class relations have shaped sexual relations and struggles.³

We can learn a great deal from the method of historical materialism. But to do this, we cannot read historical materialism—as a critical method of analysis—as a form of economic determinism in which “the economy” determines everything. This is unfortunately the main reading in current postmodernism and queer theory.⁴ This is also a major problem with the “political economy” tradition that has been the hegemonic intellectual interpretation of Marxism in Canada until recently and that has not engaged seriously with critical work on gender, and especially with sexual regulation.⁵ Unfortunately, it is this very reading of Marxism that has provided part of the basis for the growth of a “queer theory” divorced from and often antagonistic to the insights of historical materialism.

While Marx’s and Engels’s public and private writings on sex, and same-gender sex, in particular, are an instance of “unthinking sex,” as Andrew Parker suggests,⁶ this was in part because in the context of the times in which they lived and of their own gender and sexual practices they were unable to apply their revolutionary method to this arena. Their critical social method that contested naturalism in other spheres of social life accepted a form of sexual naturalism. The “founding fathers” of Marxism relegated sex and eroticism to a historically insignificant terrain. Marx remained a prisoner of hegemonic social ideologies and practices, taking for granted the hegemonic forms of sexuality (and to some extent gender and race) he lived and found around himself as “natural.” At the same time his critical method can be extended to these areas if it is

taken up and transformed from the standpoints of women, gays, Black, Indigenous and racialized people, and others who face oppression and marginalization.

Marx's critique of capitalist political economy shattered the "natural" and ahistorical character of capitalist social relations and provided a way of moving beyond the appearance of "fair" exchange between capitalist and worker to disclose the underlying relations of exploitation upon which this rested. He was able to go beyond the equal and ahistorical appearance of the exchange between capitalist and worker to reveal the underlying appropriation of surplus value by the capitalist, which defined the exploitation of the worker during the process of production; yet he proved unable to move beyond the "natural" appearance of the existing and developing heterosexual and two gender binary social forms of sexual and gendered life to reveal how these, too, were historical and social creations. In the sphere of commodity production, exchange, and circulation, Marx and Engels were able to analyze commodity fetishism as the mystified surface appearance of capitalist social relations in which social relationships appear to be relations between products.⁷ They could therefore reveal in the realm of commodities the relation between this phenomenal form, or the ways in which the everyday accepted phenomena of the world present themselves, and the underlying social relations organizing this experience.⁸ Marx and Engels could not, however, go beyond the surface appearance of sexual and gender relation to reveal the process of fetishism that obscures the social relations in which our sexualities and genders are made. Insofar as they considered the matter, they were prisoners of a naturalist and essentialist view.

Marx focused on the social character of the processes of production and capitalist relations and did not produce a narrow "economic" theory. He was able to disclose the ideological practices through which bourgeois political economy separated its concepts from the social practices and relations through which they were produced.⁹

In stressing the insights of historical materialism, I am focusing on the revolutionary aspects of Marx's method: the historical character of social processes, the importance of social practices and relations, and his vital critique of ideological practices. People's social worlds are made through the practices and activities of people themselves. I emphasize the need for a central critique of "naturalism," of "surface appearances," and of the phenomenal forms through which social processes often get presented to us. This centrally includes a critique of the ideological practices that produce forms of knowledge separated from the social practices that produce them, resulting in forms of knowledge that are removed from experience and that attend to ruling and managing people's lives.¹⁰ I am also pointing to Marx's crucial critique of reification—his opposition to converting social relations between people into relations between things.¹¹ Above all, this liberatory approach emphasizes that what is socially made can be socially transformed.

Rather than dismissing the insights of a non-reductionist historical materialism, we need to reclaim and transform them *for* queers in our struggles for liberation. It will be through various subordinated, marginalized, and exploited groups taking up critical historical materialist work from their own standpoints that the resources for new transformative anti-capitalist theoretical and activist movements will be made.

Historical materialism *for queers*, as I develop it here, shatters the natural and ahistorical character of heterosexual hegemony, discloses the oppressions lying beneath the “natural” appearance of this hegemony, points to the socially and historically made character of sexualities and genders, and puts heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary in question. It directs our attention to the ideological practices through which heterosexual hegemonic relations are constructed. This points toward the possibilities of overturning heterosexual hegemony and transforming erotic relations, and would link this to the transformation of state, class, gender, and race relations. Marx’s work and method still have a lot to tell us about the dynamics of capitalist social relations and how these shape the lives of lesbians and gay men as well as others. This approach also sharpens our focus of attention on class relations and struggles within gay, lesbian, and other communities.

History, in this sense, belongs not only to the past. It participates in forming what Jeffrey Weeks calls the “historical present.”¹² Examining historical experiences and practices can help us understand from where lesbian and gay oppression and, more generally, oppressive sexual regulation has come, where it may be going, and the possibilities for transformation. The concepts necessary for an understanding of sexual rule and resistance exist only in initial form at present. One way of proceeding is by studying our past to develop the historically rooted categories necessary for this exploration. This approach explores how people’s experiences are socially organized and how they change over time.¹³ When examining official government documents or police records, we must immediately place them in the context of people’s lives. The emergence of “lesbianism” and “homosexuality,” and that of lesbian, homosexual, bisexual, and heterosexual categories in official discourse, were part of broader shifts in class, gender, and racial relations and social organization. Same-gender sex was relegated to a subordinate position through relations of sex and gender regulation that established a particular form of heterosexuality as the social norm.

If analysis can be rooted in the social relations that have organized these experiences, then a much better understanding of how sexuality and gender has been defined, organized, and regulated in capitalist, racist and patriarchal societies will be possible. Capitalism is a dynamic social system that is constantly “transforming the ‘ground’ on which we stand so that we are always...experiencing changing historical process.”¹⁴ History does not stand still, and it is this very undermining of previous forms of sex and gender regulations that has created the basis for gay liberation and feminist movements.

These needed historical investigations do not replace the need for critical social analysis of the contemporary forms of social organization of our oppression, including studies of policing, AIDS, family and social policies, violence against lesbians and gay men, problems facing lesbian and gay youth, and others.¹⁵ At the same time, this critical historical work can help to develop the concepts needed for critical analysis of the present and future possibilities.

In undertaking these historical materialist journeys, I have drawn on several sources. These are the historical and social organization of sexuality and gender perspectives; the perspective of taking up the standpoints of the oppressed, and the social

organization of knowledge approach of Marxist-feminist Dorothy E. Smith; and various Marxist-inspired approaches to state formation, moral and cultural regulation, historical sociology, and the social organization of hegemony.¹⁶

Sexuality, History, and Social Organization

Contrary to “common sense,” sexuality is not natural nor innate. Cross-cultural and historical studies have unearthed the diverse ways in which eroticism has been organized in various social settings. Sexuality is not simply biologically defined; it is socially created, building on physiological potentialities. Robert A. Padgug writes: “Biological sexuality is the necessary precondition for human sexuality. But biological sexuality is only a set of potentialities, which is never unmediated by human reality, and which becomes transformed in qualitatively new ways in human society.”¹⁷ The various possible erotic zones of the human body provide the preconditions for the social and cultural forms of activity and meaning that come to compose human sexual practices. It is in this transition from “biological”¹⁸ to historical and social that the definitions and regulations of sexuality have emerged. Physiological capacities are transformed to create sexuality as a social need, and, in turn, to produce new erotic and social needs.

Our various forms of sexuality and the social identities built around them are organized through the sex and gender relations that have existed in different societies.¹⁹ Sex is fundamentally a social activity. A history of sexuality is a history of social relations. Human sexual practice is composed of thoughts (eroticized images, socially learned courses of action, or “sexual scripts”²⁰) and the physical/sensual activities themselves. The way in which our erotic capacities come together with mental constructs, gender, language, and symbolic systems and images is a social process. For instance, in our everyday lives we can differentiate between the touch of a doctor on our genitals as part of a medical examination and the caress of a lover in a more intimate setting. Even though the touch of the doctor could have been the same physical touch as of a lover, our lover’s touch will be responded to erotically through the enactment of a “sexual script.” Together, thought and activity form human praxis that provides the basis for a historical materialist view of sexual relations.²¹

In making sense of sexuality as a social practice, a historical materialist method is very useful. At the most general level, erotic activity, in all its diversity and meanings, can be seen as a human universal similar to the way in which Marx saw human production. Sexual activity, like production in general, has existed in all human societies.²² However, what can be said about sexual practice in this general sense is extremely limited. It provides us with no basis from which to explore sexuality in the historical sense. What organizes and comprises sexual relations in each period is therefore a historical and empirical question—a topic for exploration.²³ We need historically rooted concepts, and we must reject transhistorical categorizations—for instance, the notion that the homosexual, the lesbian, or the heterosexual have been around for all time (or, for some, since Sodom and Gomorrah). Both same-sex and different-sex sexual practices

have existed throughout human history, but they have differed radically in their social organization.

But it is even more complex than this when we enter the social construction of gender into the picture since there have also been same-gender and different-gender erotic practices. For instance, in some Indigenous cultures in North America (Turtle Island), there were same-sex erotic relations between what might be described in very inexact language as “regular” men, and “biological” males who were members of a “third” gender that combined masculine/feminine characteristics in the gendered division of labour in these societies. This would have been seen culturally as different-gender eroticism since there were more than two genders in these societies (see Chapter 4).

Contemporary “heterosexuality” and “homosexuality” are historically and socially specific organizations of different-gender and same-gender desires and pleasures. For instance, same-gender erotic activities between men and boys have ranged from structured “educational” relationships between men and boys in particular class, family, and state relations, to acts surrounding puberty or masculinity rituals, to cross-dressing and gender activity “reversals,” to contemporary transgender experiences.²⁴ These had different social meanings in different social/ cultural contexts and were different social practices. Among the Sambia of Papua, for instance, same-gender sex for men and boys between seven and nineteen was mandatory. Boys fellated men on a daily basis, so that they would grow into masculine adults. According to this cultural practice, men cannot produce sperm on their own; they can only recycle it from one generation to another. Questions can be asked of whether this was an erotic practice or more like eating in this social and historical context. In their adult lives, these men and boys engaged in sex with women.²⁵ Our contemporary notions of the heterosexual/ homosexual dichotomy make no sense in a culture like this. It is impossible to hold onto any transhistorical notion of homosexuality or homosexual behaviour—or transhistorical heterosexuality, for that matter—in the face of these diverse practices and social meanings.

Much critical understanding of the social organization of sexuality comes from how we see the social organization of gender. Sexuality, like gender, is a product of social interaction—a continuous social accomplishment.²⁶ Gender is assigned in our society at birth (and now often earlier via ultrasound) by doctors and nurses based on apparent genital features. It then takes on many social features that have nothing to do with physiology, even though biological determinist approaches claim that biology determines gender, whether it be through genes or hormones.²⁷ Tied in with this social organization of gender is an associated sexuality and sexual “identity.” Through this social process a “natural” attitude toward sexuality and gender is created.²⁸

In patriarchal capitalist societies, sexuality and sexual identities connect a number of needs—emotional contact, friendship, sensual closeness, touching, bodily pleasure, and genital sex—with notions of biology, gender, and reproductive capacity. This formation of sexuality implants naturalized constructs of masculinity and femininity within our very social and sexual beings, making it very difficult to disentangle our various needs grouped together as sexuality from biology, reproduction, and gender.

Sexuality can be seen as a collecting category that groups together diverse needs, capacities, and desires.²⁹ Our sexuality has come to be defined by naturalist notions to such a degree that the process of social organization is rendered invisible (or unconscious).³⁰ We tend to “reify sex as a thing-in-itself.”³¹ We see our sexualities as a personal essence defining who we are rather than as constituted through the social practices that we ourselves have been active in through which our sexualities have been made. To critically investigate sexuality, we must put in question this “natural attitude” to recover the social practices and relations through which sexualities are made.

The human and social praxis involved in the formation of sexualities is obscured by the relations in which this process takes place. In a similar but different fashion to Marx’s analysis of commodity fetishism, sexuality has come to be fetishized as something individual, “natural,” and essential in which social relations and practices disappear. It should be clear, however, that the social relations organizing commodity fetishism and sexual fetishism are not the same and need their own historical investigation.³² Ideologies of naturalism and an essential sexual nature are tied to the appearance of sexual fetishism. It must be stressed that powerful state and social policies lie behind the “naturalness” of heterosexuality in this society.

Sexual practice and “identity” is formed through a process of social interaction and encounters with social discourse, significant others, and bodily-based pleasures. There is no “natural” or “unitary” sexuality. No situation is inherently sexual, but many situations are capable of being eroticized. Sexuality is subject to “socio-cultural moulding to a degree surpassed by few other forms of human behaviour.”³³ Sexuality is not simply individual or “private,” and the individual is only an individual in a social context. Social individuals come to take part in and take up particular sexual practices and identities. “Proper” gender is associated with “normal” sexuality, since gender shapes sexual conduct. Part of this process of normalization “derives from organs being placed in legitimate orifices.”³⁴ “Identities” such as heterosexual, homosexual, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender are socially created.

While heterosexuality in contemporary societies is established as “natural,” some of us do come to realize that we are erotically “different.” Masculinities, femininities, heterosexualities, and family life itself, are contradictory. Subversive readings of dominant erotic images, along with the experiences of bodily pleasures and erotic play, are the initial bases for our queer desires. We may see ourselves as “outsiders,” or as “different,” as we grow up or later in our life experience. This is a dialectic of broader social and self-definition. We may eventually encounter homosexual, lesbian, bisexual, or queer labelling and discover other lesbian and gay individuals and cultures that have managed to seize social spaces from the dominant order.³⁵

Mary Douglas, in her anthropological work, explores one bridge between the individual and broader social worlds: how social and moral notions of purity, pollution, and taboo have been built on the social relations of biological reproduction and sexuality. These symbols play an important role in organizing social boundaries and in providing a sense of social and moral order in a chaotic world:

Ideas about separating, purifying, demarcating and punishing transgressions have as their main function to impose system on an inherently untidy experience. It is only by exaggerating the difference between within and without, above and below, male and female, that a semblance of order is created.³⁶

As Douglas writes, “nothing is more essentially transmitted by a social process of learning than sexual behaviour and this of course is closely related to morality.”³⁷ Reproductive and sexual norms and taboos produce a “natural” order around which life comes to be organized. This natural order depends on boundaries separating the normal from the ambiguous. Any challenge to these boundaries by anomalous behaviour leads to the mobilization of fear and anxiety. This moral order therefore depends on the marginalization of anomalies and firm social boundaries demarcated by “natural” markers that are rigorously policed: heterosexuality, in contemporary Western society, is associated with the natural, the normal, the clean, the healthy, and the pure; homosexuality, with the dangerous, the impure, the unnatural, the sick, and the abnormal.³⁸

Frank Pearce used Douglas’s perspective in an analysis of the presentation of gay men in the media. Homosexuals are viewed as anomalies since they violate and defy the natural boundaries of sex and gender behaviour. Homosexuals, according to Pearce:

Fracture the coherence of the core gender identities thought to be necessarily associated with male and female biological equipment. These men finding other men attractive are anomalies, and “anomalies,” as Mary Douglas points out, endanger the natural moral order of this society.³⁹

We therefore mobilize anxiety, fear, and hatred. Pearce describes four main strategies whereby the threat to heterosexuality is deflected: ignoring or condemning homosexuality, providing easy definitions such as gender “inversion” to explain it away and reduce ambiguity, using homosexuals as a negative reference point, and labelling us as dangerous, even inciting violence against us.⁴⁰

The Social Organization of Sexual Knowledge

This book proposes a shift of focus in the study of same-gender and different-gender desire and pleasure and sexual regulation: a shift away from homosexuality and lesbianism as a “problem,” and toward a historical and social account of the emergence of sexual life, including heterosexuality. The “traditions” of religion, psychology, medicine, criminology, sexology, history, sociology, social work, and anthropology have created the “problem”: defining us as sick, deviant, abnormal—even criminal—and defining heterosexuality as “normal.” These socially organized forms of knowledge have been crucial to the construction of heterosexual hegemony. In these forms of knowledge production that have also been forms of social power—what Foucault describes as “power/ knowledge”⁴¹—lesbians and gay men have been treated as objects of study

to be researched. It has always been homosexuality and lesbianism, and not heterosexuality, that stands in need of explanation. The “problematization” of homosexuality has been a crucial part of the normalization⁴² of heterosexuality. Four examples help clarify this social process.

Anthropology in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was engaged in setting sexual and social norms. Classification of the races was a main preoccupation,⁴³ integral to which was the classification of sexual behaviour. “Savages” came to be defined as more “primitive” regarding sexual behaviour than “civilized” peoples, although sometimes the savages were romanticized as acting more “naturally.” Anthropologists carried their own cultural values with them, displaying an acute ethnocentric, racist, and Eurocentric⁴⁴ bias but, at the same time supplying much of the data upon which the work of the sex psychologists and sexologists in the metropolitan countries relied.⁴⁵ Anthropology as a profession was very much involved in the organization of colonial, class, racial, gender, and sexual relations.

Perhaps this can best be seen through an examination of Bronislaw Malinowski’s classic study of the Trobriand Islanders. The villagers described their villages from ground view as a number of bumps. Malinowski saw them as a series of concentric circles, describing them from above using a mapping representation. This disparity in descriptions was socially rooted. Malinowski came from a vigorously class-divided society, and he was a member of the academic discipline of anthropology. His account was addressed to a specialized intelligentsia in the colonizing countries. There was no position within Trobriand culture from which their villages could be seen thus, but Malinowski, located as he was outside and “above” their society, could so describe them. Malinowski’s anthropological work embodied the developing social relations of imperialism.⁴⁶

Malinowski’s work also embodied a developing heterosexual hegemony. Among the Trobriand Islanders, they did not see different-gender sexual intercourse and reproduction as linked. In one book, Malinowski included homosexuality, masturbation, and fellatio in a section entitled, “The Censure of Sexual Aberrations.”⁴⁷ Despite accounts of widespread same-gender sex in Melanesian societies, he argued that homosexuality was not prevalent and that it was treated with contempt and derision.⁴⁸ His work embodied the imposition of sexual norms on Indigenous populations. Malinowski saw things from the standpoint of the missionaries, the administrators, and a developing heterosexual hegemony. In the next chapter, I again touch on the links between imperialism and heterosexual hegemony.

The work of nineteenth-century forensic psychiatrists and sex psychologists—who classified and categorized sexualities and sexual practices—also reveals the social relations that their work embodied and helped organize. Dr. Richard Von Krafft-Ebing, the foremost forensic psychiatrist of the nineteenth century who addressed sexual pathologies (and the “grand-daddy” of sexology), felt that sexual relations outside heterosexual marriage represented not only a degeneration to an earlier, lower stage of evolution, but that they threatened Western civilization itself. For example:

Every expression of the sex-drive which does not comply with the goals of nature, i.e., procreation, must be declared perverse.... Episodes of moral decline in the life of peoples fall regularly together with times of effeminacy, voluptuousness, and luxury.... Rapidly growing nervousness results in an increase in sensuality and by leading to the dissipation among the masses of people, undermines the pillars of society: morality and purity of family life. If this is undermined through dissipation, adultery, and luxury, then the fall of the state is inevitable.⁴⁹

Krafft-Ebing's work expresses not only the standpoint of state agencies, but also middle-class assumptions about the class character of sexual morality.

Mainstream psychiatry and psychology in the twentieth century generally viewed homosexuality as a symptom of "infantile regression" or some other pathological disorder, and have developed various strategies to cure, regulate, or adjust patients to the heterosexual and two gender binary norms.⁵⁰ This has included various forms of aversion and conversion therapy, as well as partial lobotomies. Psychiatrists and psychologists rarely treated lesbians and gay men as individuals with our own unique biographies and experiences. Instead, we are slotted into clinical and abstract categories of "homosexuality," and produced as "cases." We were already cut out of "normal" social interaction by this diagnosis.⁵¹ Before we even enter a psychiatrist's or a psychologist's office, a homosexual, lesbian, or "deviant" "typology" has often already defined us as "deviant," laying out a particular course of "treatment."

Homosexual "deviance" is investigated with the aim of our elimination, containment, or regulation. Knowledge has been produced so that ruling institutions can formulate legal codes, policing policies, and social policies. According to Magnus Hirschfeld, an early sex psychologist and homosexual-rights reformer, most of the thousand or so works on homosexuality that appeared between 1898 and 1908 were addressed to the legal profession.⁵² Many early works by medical and legal experts "were chiefly concerned with whether the disgusting breed of perverts could be physically identified for the courts, and whether they should be held legally responsible for their acts."⁵³ The men and women engaged in same-gender sex have thus been labelled "deviants," "perverts," "gender inverts," "gender non-conformists," "sexual psychopaths," "dangerous sex offenders," "promiscuous," guilty of committing "gross indecency," engaging in "anonymous" sex, and have been the subjects of the distinction between "public" and "private" sex.

Official knowledge about homosexuals and lesbians came chiefly from studies of imprisoned or "psychologically disturbed" homosexuals.⁵⁴ Much of this work relies on data such as the legal codification of offences, court and police records, and sexual, medical, and psychological discourse,⁵⁵ and often incorporates features of the power relations of the legal and prison systems and the psychiatric and medical professions. A great deal of official knowledge about homosexuality and lesbianism has been produced so that social agencies can "understand," classify, police, and regulate our sexual lives.

This knowledge has in turn shaped popular cultures and “common-sense” notions of how society is organized, through the mass media, the schools, government policies, the Criminal Code, police action, and the social organization of intended “moral panics”⁵⁶ on sexual questions.

During the last part of the nineteenth century, homosexuality was often seen by the scientific disciplines as a form of congenital inversion rooted in biological degeneration or anomaly. These approaches reduced homosexuality to a biological cause. More recently, given the challenge presented by lesbian and gay liberation to psychological theories of homosexuality and lesbianism as a mental illness, there has been a return to these types of approaches by some researchers. Initial results of some of this research has been magnified and intensified by mass-media coverage. The research usually starts off by assuming the “normality” of heterosexuality and that it is usually homosexuality among men that stands in need of explanation. It assumes that there are only two rigidly dichotomous sexualities (heterosexuality and homosexuality), and these are based in biological difference. Men and women who are interested in both men and women undermine the basis of this research as do non-binary people.

Ignoring the rich work done on the historical and social construction of sexuality, this research is directed at finding the biological cause or causes of homosexuality. This reduces the complex social and cultural process through which sexuality is formed to biological causes, whether they be located in a different structure in the hypothalamus, or genetic or hormonal elements—there is even one theory suggesting that stress for the mother during pregnancy produces homosexuality in the male fetus.⁵⁷ Liberal proponents of this more recent research argue that the establishment of homosexual difference as biological in character will lead to greater social acceptance, as homosexuality will now be “natural” for a minority of the population. This does not address how the acceptance of “race” as biological in character has done nothing to eliminate racism against Black people and people of colour. Appeals to “nature” do not get rid of discrimination and oppression. And the response of some to reports that there may be a “gay gene” is to try to eliminate this gene in order to eliminate homosexuality. Again, the problem to be explained is “homosexuality,” while the “naturalness” of heterosexual hegemony and the two-gender binary is just accepted.⁵⁸

The resurgence of biological determinist explanations of homosexuality is occurring in the context of a new popularity for biological explanations of human behaviours and differences. This is also related to a resurgence of biological explanations of gender and gender inequality and of race and racial inequality.⁵⁹ For instance, some researchers now suggest that women’s math and spatial skills really are biologically inferior to men’s. Therefore, the social equality that feminism has demanded is seen to go against “nature.”⁶⁰ This is part of a broader social organization of a “backlash” to feminism, and it is not the first time biological explanations have been used to buttress social inequality. “Biology” has long been invoked to justify the social subordination of Blacks, women and lesbians, and gay men.

Heterosexist ideas about the naturalness of heterosexuality and the sickness of homosexuality are not simply backward individual ideas; they are organized through

the social relations and practices of heterosexual hegemony. This points to one of the problems with the use by gay, lesbian, queer, and other activists of the concept of “homophobia”—the “dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals.”⁶¹ This term quite accurately describes the panic some heterosexuals feel when confronted by visible lesbians and gays. It has also been used to explain homosexual oppression in general, however, and as such tends to simply reverse existing psychological definitions of homosexuality as mental illness, turning them back onto heterosexuals who have difficulty dealing with “queers.” “Homophobia” does not seriously dispute these psychological definitions; it individualizes and privatizes gay, lesbian, and bisexual oppression and obscures the social relations that organize it. It reduces homophobia to a mental illness, detaching it from its social contexts and reproducing all the problems of psychological definitions.⁶² Unfortunately, “homophobia” has also been the main way in which other movements and groups of people beyond the feminist movement have taken up our oppression, and this leads them to misunderstand the roots of our oppression.⁶³

“Homophobia” also continues to be used as a major way of accounting for our oppression, even in the new forms of queer activism that emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s. “Queer Nation” groups with their “in your face” politics took “anti-homophobic” politics to their most militant expression. At times it seemed as if militant confrontations with individual homophobes would lead to the ending of our oppression, which has not allowed this queer activism to get at the social roots of queer oppression. “Homophobia” is continued as a central concept even in much of the new “queer theory” that emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s in the US. In Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s influential book, *The Epistemology of the Closet*, for instance, her taking up of an antihomophobic position has allowed her to separate sexual oppression from gender oppression and has allowed her to focus on literary and cultural re-readings of texts to discern homophobic assumptions.⁶⁴ Such a focus on homophobia often operates to obscure the social relations and practices that shape lesbian and gay oppression.

I therefore prefer to use the term “heterosexism,” relating the practices of heterosexual hegemony to institutional and social settings and to sex and gender relations without reducing gay and lesbian oppression to an “effect” of gender. In this context, homophobia can be seen as a particularly virulent personal response organized by heterosexist discourse and practice.

Until recently, heterosexuals rarely encountered visible gays, lesbians, bisexuals, or trans people. Most images were those projected by the mass media and those circulating in popular cultures, which generally came from psychology, sexology, the churches, and the courts and police. Dorothy E. Smith describes the “ideological circle” through which the world is interpreted by the media and other agencies;⁶⁵ this is one of the ways heterosexual hegemony operates. The world is interpreted through the schemas of “expert sources” (police, policy analysts, government bureaucrats, psychiatrists, social workers) and hegemonic cultural narratives to confirm the dominant interpretation of same-gender sexuality. “Scientific” theories of homosexual deviance, criminality, or sickness thereby enter public discussion.

Shifting Standpoints

In suggesting that the basis of sexual inquiry be reoriented, I draw upon what can be called a standpoint approach, which, as formulated by Dorothy E. Smith, calls for a change in vantage point from that of hegemonic ruling relations, to that of women and other oppressed groups.⁶⁶ Ruling relations and regimes are the agencies involved in the management of contemporary capitalist patriarchal racist societies. Ruling relations are broader than those of state agencies, and include the mass media, various professional groups, and the forms of bureaucracy that have emerged over the last two centuries.⁶⁷

In “A Sociology for Women,” Smith analyzes how ruling relations produce knowledge from the standpoint of a male-dominated ruling class.⁶⁸ A sociology *for* women entails a reorientation of inquiry starting from the social experiences of individual women or groups of women. Smith’s analysis provides insights into how ruling knowledge is produced and how it rules—bringing into view the social relations through which women are subordinated:

As we explored the world from this place in it, we became aware that this rupture in experience, and between experience and the social forms of its expression, was located in a relation of power between women and men, in which men dominated over women.⁶⁹

Inquiry, then, begins with questions about everyday experiences and the social practices we engage in on a day-to-day basis. It proceeds to render the everyday world “problematic” by investigating the social relations in which women’s experiences (or the experiences of other groups) are located.⁷⁰ For this perspective, the notion of social relation is key, being the process by which our own activities participate in but are also shaped, constrained, and regulated by broader social forces. The notion of a social relation links together social practices in different local sites in a combined and inter-linked social process. While we participate in producing these social relations, we also, as individuals and as groups, tend to lose control over them, and they come to stand over and against our everyday lives. While social relations develop historically, in contemporary societies, they render the world in which we live natural and ahistorical. This provides a social basis for the ideologies and discourses of naturalism that we find around us.

The social world is, however, composed of people’s own activities articulated through these social relations. We daily engage in practices that produce relations of class, gender, race, and sexuality. Social “structures” cannot be seen as separate from human activity; they are organized by, and, at the same time, organize social interaction. Social relations are actual practices, not merely concepts or structures. They are produced by people, but they are not constituted by individual actors alone, as they are sequences of actions and relationships that no single individual can complete.

The social relations that organize women’s experiences in this society are capitalist, patriarchal, racist, and heterosexist. An example from the work of Marx may help clarify this: a commodity (a product made to be exchanged) as a social object is realized—made socially real as a commodity—only through exchange in a market. If the

commodity is not exchanged, its value cannot be realized. If it does not enter into a series of social relationships between different individuals composing a social relation, it cannot be realized as a commodity. As Marx also argued, through this process of exchange the commodity comes to appear as though it has intrinsic value as a thing. Exchange therefore comes to be seen as a relation between different commodities (between things) rather than a social relationship between producers, buyers, and sellers. This is what Marx called the fetishism of commodities,⁷¹ and can also be seen as a form of reification (or “thingification”).

Similarly, although differently, women’s experiences are organized through a series of social practices that define and regulate sex and gender and in which women are themselves active. This web of relations shapes gender identifications, gender dichotomies, sexualities, and patriarchal social organization.⁷²

Making the everyday world problematic moves analysis from “experience” itself to the specific social relations that organize it. This helps to make people’s social practices visible. There is no pure unmediated “telling of experience,” as this is always affected by social discourse, but starting with the experiences of the oppressed and marginalized and then making it problematic locates our investigation in a very different place, at least partially outside of or in rupture with ruling regimes and discourse. This allows us to see the workings of ruling relations from the standpoints of the oppressed. As Smith notes:

It is not individual social behaviour which is our interest but the social determinations of our everyday experience. The object of inquiry is the historical processes and development of social relations which organize, shape and determine our directly experienced worlds.⁷³

In this book, I apply this method of inquiry to the historical and social situations of lesbians and gay men. A history and sociology for lesbians and gay men involves both a critique of official knowledge (which I begin in this chapter) and a reorientation of inquiry to begin from the experiences of those who have engaged in same-gender sex and others who have been oppressed by ruling sexual and gender regulation (which I begin in the historical sections). The purpose is not to interrogate the experiences of lesbians and gay men but instead to learn from their experiences about the social organization of heterosexual hegemony and oppressive sexual and gender regulation so that these ruling practices can be interrogated and transformed.⁷⁴

The contemporary lesbian and gay experience of a rupture between our lives as “deviants” or outsiders and the heterosexual norm serves as the beginning of inquiry. This rupture is lived differently by people on the basis of class, race, gender, age, ability, and health. How this tension has come about is one of the key questions to be explored. By making our everyday experiences problematic and locating them in emerging social relations, we can reveal aspects of our oppression and of heterosexual hegemony that are not visible from the vantage point of ruling relations. This process exposes not only the work of the agencies who have labelled us “perverts” and “criminals,” but also the

activities of those engaged in same-gender sex ourselves. We have been able to construct a certain “naturalness” and “normalness” for ourselves in opposition to heterosexual hegemony. If we start from here—the experiences of lesbians, gays, and others who engage in queer sex of the ruptures we feel between hegemonic heterosexuality and the actualities of our lives—then the problem is no longer homosexuality, but rather heterosexual hegemony and sexual rule more generally.

From this socially and historically grounded standpoint, the absolute distinction between homosexuality and heterosexuality is rooted in the work of the ruling regime and relations. This distinction is not as clearly expressed in our individual erotic lives, however. The actual relationship between social categories, identity construction and formation, and sexual activity is not as clear-cut as official discourse contends.

Sexual preferences and “identities” are not fixed in stone. They develop unevenly, are often contradictory, and are potentially fluid. Kinsey’s statistics suggested that a majority of men involved in reported homosexual acts did not see their experiences as defining them as homosexual.⁷⁵ Many are able to engage in occasional erotic delights with other men while maintaining a heterosexual and masculine gender “identity.” Prison inmates and hustlers often managed their identities so that they were not tainted by the stigma of homosexuality. For instance, in prison, the “masculine” man who plays the “active” role in anal intercourse but never plays the “passive” position in anal intercourse and who gets his penis fellated but never sucks another penis, may be able to escape the label of “queer” and preserve his “heterosexual” identity. Some hustlers manage their identities by claiming they have sex only for the money, or that they engage only in acts that don’t define them as homosexual. John Rechy in *City of Night* quotes Pete, a hustler:

Whatever a guy does with other guys, if he does it for money that don’t make him queer. You’re still straight. It’s when you start doing it for free, with other young guys, that you start growing wings.⁷⁶

George Chauncey, in an illuminating historical analysis, shows us that, in the early twentieth century in the US among working-class and other cultures, there was often a distinction made between “queer” men who were associated with effeminacy and full-time participation in same-gender sexual activities, and those men who occasionally would allow these “queers” to have sex with them. This latter group of men would not be tainted with “queerness.”⁷⁷ And in the Canadian Navy in the 1950s, some doctors felt that only “effeminate” men were real homosexuals, while men who were more “masculine” and only occasionally engaged in sex with other men when women were not available were basically “normal” (see Chapter 7). Men who are married and have children may feel that their sexual adventures in tea rooms (washrooms), steam baths, or parks do not define them as homosexual.⁷⁸

Ruling discourse rigorously associates sexual acts with gender and sexual identity (or else views homosexual activity as merely a brief “phase” one is passing through). In real life, however, it is not that clear. A sexual act may not be immediately associated with

a particular sexuality or sexual identity. There is also the experience of bisexuality that undermines the dominant sexual dichotomy and that allows some people to combine same and different gender erotic desires. While bisexuality is not the only “natural” sexuality, as some bisexual liberationists argue, given it is as socially constructed as other sexualities, it does destabilize the heterosexual/ homosexual polarity in a powerful way.⁷⁹

At the same time, the historical and social accounts presented in this book demonstrate that contemporary lesbian and gay experiences are very real social and experiential realities that cannot be dismissed as simply the imposition of ruling sexual classifications. Lesbians and gay men have participated in the creation of our own cultures and networks.

Ruling concepts cannot simply be stretched to cover our experiences. We must step outside ruling discourses—as we must as women, people of colour, and other oppressed groups—if we are to create knowledge to help us in our struggles.⁸⁰

This perspective starts from our own experiences and practices.⁸¹ We must become the subjects of our work rather than its objects. We must move beyond this starting point, however, to view everyday life as problematic; to see the struggles between ruling institutions and lesbians, gays and queers over the meanings, images, and definitions of sexual regulation. We must move beyond our immediate experiences and the assumed “naturalness” of our existence by uncovering the social relations in which homosexualities and heterosexualities have emerged historically.

Hegemony, State Formation, and Cultural Revolution

My analysis also draws upon a number of recent developments within Marxism and historical materialist approaches.⁸² Recent historical and sociological explorations of capitalist or bourgeois state formation have illuminated how crucial to the formation of the contemporary state has been what can be called a “bourgeois cultural revolution.”⁸³

Building on earlier state forms, the capitalist class made itself the ruling class and forged contemporary state relations by attempting to remake society in its own image. Crucial to this process was the creation of approved or respectable social identities, which necessarily meant the denial of alternatives. State formation is therefore always an active process, always contested and resisted, and riddled with contradictions. Heterosexual hegemony, as a part of this process, was constructed at the expense of other social and sexual possibilities, such as emerging homosexual and lesbian cultures. Heterosexuality was established as “normal.” Homosexuality and lesbianism were disadvantaged as perverted, sick, and criminal.⁸⁴

This approach stresses the importance to racist, capitalist, and patriarchal rule of the cultural and moral regulation of social identities and practices. The oppressive regulation of social life establishes some forms of activity as acceptable, respectable, responsible, normal, and natural; some ways of life are empowered, others are devalued. This approach refuses to reduce capitalism to its economic dimensions alone. State formation is seen as central to capitalist development. Class relations include struggles over

cultural norms, social identities, and sexualities. Non-economic relations are thereby crucial to class relations.⁸⁵ Within historical materialism using these insights, the relationship of class, state formation, and sexual rule can be explored. This perspective on state formation will be particularly useful when we examine the making of the Canadian state and its relation to English and US state formation.

A crucial aspect of this state formation and cultural revolution has been the establishment of social, cultural, and political forms of hegemony. "Hegemony," as I use the term, derives from the work of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci in the 1920s and 1930s.⁸⁶ Hegemony unites the process of coercion and consent, viewing the two as often taking place through the same social practices. Hegemony occurs through the normalization or naturalization of existing relations and is achieved when one class can exert social authority and leadership over others. This includes the power to "frame alternatives and contain communities, to win and shape consent so that the granting of legitimacy to the dominant classes appears not only 'spontaneous' but natural and 'normal.'"⁸⁷

Hegemony is, however, not simply imposed by state agencies and the ruling class. It must be continually re-established. It is therefore never total or exclusive. "[Hegemony] is not self-securing, it is constructed, sustained, reconstructed, by particular agents and agencies, in part by violence."⁸⁸ When successfully established, hegemony shapes, re-defines, and incorporates the needs and concerns of the subordinated groups so that they conform to the interests of ruling groups.⁸⁹

The development, transformation, and struggle over cultural and social definitions, boundaries, acceptable knowledge, identities, and norms is a key terrain for the continuous organization and reorganization of hegemonic relations:

The dominant culture represents itself as the culture. It tries to define and contain all other cultures within its most inclusive range. Its views of the world, unless challenged, will stand as the most natural, all-embracing culture.⁹⁰

Hegemonic approaches therefore allow for a combination in historical explorations of people as active participants in the making of their worlds with the social constraints that limit their activities. Unfortunately, until recently, most attempts to use hegemony to explore the process of ruling have confined it to a rather narrow economic realm, or to narrow, economically defined notions of class relations, and have remained "male," white, and heterosexually defined.⁹¹

I use a hegemonic approach to examine Canadian struggles over sexual definitions and regulations. Hegemony must therefore be freed from its narrower meanings and made relevant to sexual and other political movements so that the organization of racial, patriarchal, and heterosexual hegemonies can be explored and challenged. While these forms of hegemony have their own features, they are part of a larger social and historical organization of class and state rule.

Hegemonic approaches can be used to explore lesbian and gay oppression and resistance. Heterosexual hegemony came about with the emergence of distinct heterosexual and homosexual/lesbian identities and cultures over the last two centuries. Its

bases are the relations of ruling class morality, sex and gender, the gender division of labour, family and kinship relations, state policies, and sexual policing, and it relies not only on consent, legitimation, and “common sense,” but also on moments of denial, silencing, and coercion. Heterosexuality is “freely compelled” for many in this society. Coercive laws, police practices, “queer-bashing,” and limited social options all attempt to make heterosexuality compulsory (or compulsive).⁹² At the same time, there is an active social construction of “consent” to heterosexual desire through strategies of the naturalization and normalization of heterosexuality and the construction of heterosexual cultures.

Heterosexual hegemony is produced on many fronts—from family relations that often marginalize and sometimes exclude gays and lesbians,⁹³ to the violence we face on city streets, to state policies, the police, to the medical profession, to sociology, sexology, and psychiatry, to the church, the school system, and the media. These forms of sexual regulation (which do not develop in a linear fashion)⁹⁴ interact with the social relations we live to produce heterosexist “common sense.” There exist also conflicts between and within various agencies over definitions of homosexuality and jurisdictional disputes over who can best deal with the sexual deviant.

The entry of heterosexual hegemony into public “common-sense” involves many variants of heterosexist discourse, each of which merits its own analysis (which I explore in later chapters). These include homosexuality as a sin (in religious discourse); as unnatural (in both religious and secular discourse); as an illness (in medicine and psychiatry and, in a new sense, with the current AIDS crisis); as a congenital disorder or inversion (in sex psychology and sexology); as deviance (in some sociological theory); homosexuals as child molesters, seducers, and corruptors (in certain sexological studies, the law, and the media); as a symptom of social or national degeneration (in Social Darwinist and eugenic discourse); homosexuals as communists, “pinkos,” and a national security risk because of the potential for blackmail (rooted in McCarthyism, military organization, the Cold War and 1950s/1960s security regime practices); as tolerated only when practised between consenting adults in “private” (the Wolfenden strategy of privatization); and as a criminal offence or a social menace (in police campaigns, “moral panics,” and the media).

How these various forms of heterosexism interact, and how they are based in social practices and relations, is a question for social and historical investigation. It is sufficient to note here that all these ideas can be found in contemporary discourse. There is a continuing resiliency for anti-gay/anti-lesbian discourses formed in previous historical periods that can still be remobilized against us. In certain periods, some regulatory strategies and discourses achieve a degree of cogency for maintaining and reconstructing heterosexual hegemony.⁹⁵ Given the various social processes at play, heterosexual common sense clearly suffers from many internal contradictions.

My historical investigation involves an analysis of the social relations that have organized heterosexual hegemony. Heterosexual hegemony and contemporary lesbian and gay cultures are two sides of the same relational social process. Heterosexual hegemony necessarily involves lesbian and gay subordination. As Rachel Harrison and

Frank Mort note: “The ‘deviant’ subject is not absent from the discourse but she/he is only permitted to speak from a subordinate position: as ‘patient,’ as ‘pervert,’ etc.”⁹⁶

Heterosexual hegemony, and oppressive sexual regulation more generally, are an integral aspect of the organization of class, state, gender, and race relations. Let us now turn to look at how this has historically come about, first in England and the United States, and then in Canada.

The Historical Emergence of Homosexualities and Heterosexualities

Social Relations, Sexual Rule, and Sexual Resistance

I now look at the English, and, to a lesser extent, the American and German social emergence of homosexuality, lesbianism, and heterosexuality. This examination includes an outline of how the present regime of sexual rule was formed. Each country's history is unique; however, any understanding of Canadian settler-colonial state and sexual formation must take into account the experiences of other countries. For Canada, this especially includes those of England and the United States, given the generally referenced (although at times autonomous) character of Canadian state formation to these two powers during different periods of Canadian history.

Sex, Class, and Capitalism

The formation of hetero- and homosexual experiences and categories is based in the transformation of the social relations of production, reproduction, race, gender, and sexuality that has occurred over the last few centuries. It would be a major mistake, however, to see this transformation as simply reflecting the development of the capitalist mode of production, particularly if this definition of capitalism is reduced to the economic domain.¹

I try to avoid the dangers of economism—the view that there is a direct cause-and-effect relationship between capitalist economic relations and non-economic relations. Capitalist relations are based on the private ownership of the means of production (offices, factories) and the exploitation of the working class, in both paid and unpaid labour. These relations are not simply “economic” in character, they are profoundly social, cultural, political, and always racialized. Sexuality as a social practice cannot be reduced to an “effect” of the economy or to narrow notions of class. I attempt to develop a more historically specific approach and a wider notion of class—as embodying all social life, including sexual relations. As I argue in this broader historical materialist sense, struggles over sexual relations have been important parts of class struggles.

The transformation of sexual experience and regulation is part of a process that has integrated previous forms of sexual organization and struggle over sexual and gender definitions into new capitalist settings. These new relations “are actively constructed through the transformation of pre-existing social forms.”² Capitalism was built on already existing social forms, while these have at the same time been redefined to conform to the dynamics of capitalist development, class hegemony, and state organization, and to the resistance of the exploited and oppressed in these contexts. This dialectic of state and social construction, constrained by existing social forms,³ recognizes both continuity in sexual regulation from pre-capitalist to capitalist societies, and the ruptures brought about by new sexual definitions, categories, and experiences.

Until the mid-sixteenth century in England, men who engaged in anal intercourse or fellatio with other men were dealt with by the Church courts. After the Reformation and abolition of the Church courts, Parliament passed a statute in 1533 making “sodomy” between men a felony that the criminal courts could punish by death.⁴ Sodomy was generally seen as a sinful act that grouped together all non-reproductive sex—whether different- or same-gender—it was not a distinctly “homosexual” offense. These attitudes to non-procreative sex were retained and transformed in emerging capitalist societies.

The contemporary oppression of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals in Western societies comes from a centuries-long “tradition” in Western Christian cultures of prohibiting non-reproductive sexual activity. Once this tradition had been embedded in social, moral, class, and state relations, it came to be viewed by ruling groups as necessary to the maintenance of class, gender, racialized, and state power. This suggests that notions of a “proper” or “respectable” sexuality and the gender binary came to play an important part in class and state organization. Harrison and Mort note some of the different tendencies at work in their study of state formation in the nineteenth century:

Nineteenth-century state legislation addressing homosexuality is as much determined by pre-existing legal structures governing forms of sexual “deviancy” as it is by particular social and cultural developments during the period. We have come to define the significance of the legislation in this area by locating the beginnings of a shift in the modality of state control of particular sexualities, which is more generally related to the way in which sexual meanings are constructed within specific practices and institutions.⁵

The “homosexual,” however, is not simply a “sodomite” who has accidentally stumbled into new capitalist conditions. His very being comes to be defined by “deviant” sex and gender characteristics. There is an important difference between the “sodomite” and what we now call a homosexual.

Three major processes were involved in the emergence of the “homosexual” and the “lesbian,” which in turn set the stage for the “heterosexual.” But on this, see the important expansion of this analysis in the Introduction to this edition. This emergence can only occur following the generation of “modern” sexuality and gender in response to the “threats” from third and fourth-gender groupings among the Indigenous peoples

that European-based colonialisms encountered around the world. This led to the solidification of the two-gender binary with its implications in the emergence of sexualities.

These social processes developed unevenly over several centuries. They can be summarized as: first, the emergence and development of capitalist social relations that opened up some social spaces for same-gender erotic networks and cultures⁶—these capitalist relations were in many ways established by legal and state relations. Second, the resistance, and the accommodation, of those engaged in same-gender sex as an integral feature of the formation of lesbian and gay cultures since lesbians and gays participated in making themselves and seizing these social spaces. And third, the regime of sexual regulation itself, which policed these social spaces defining “normal” and “deviant” sexualities and genders.⁷ None of these social processes alone would have led to the emergence of lesbian, gay, trans, or heterosexual experiences; what is important here is their intersection or mediation. These developments were internally related and not separate; I am distinguishing them here for analytical purposes.

The protracted transition from feudalism to capitalism removed the labouring population from ownership and control over the means of production, increasingly separating “productive” labour from the household “economy” and reproductive realms. This occurred much more quickly and more smoothly for some people than for others. The working class made itself, and was a creation of, these new social relations: including commercialization, industrialization, and urbanization. This social transformation integrated and shifted previous gender and labour divisions and forms of sexual regulation.⁸ As Dorothy E. Smith has explained:

It is only in capitalism that we find an economic process constituted independently of the daily and generational production of the lives of particular individuals and in which therefore we can think economy apart from gender.⁹

Social Relations, Social Space and Family/Household Relations

Part of this process was a transformation of family/household and sex/gender relations. Market processes developed unevenly but began to provide for meeting some daily needs outside the household “economy.” Previously these needs for most people would only have been able to be met within familial relations. The separation of “work” from the household economy and the process of proletarianization meant that men in cities could now live outside or on the margins of the family/household, earning wages and living in boarding-houses.

They would later eat in taverns and restaurants and rent rooms in inns, hostels, and hotels.¹⁰ Only the wealthy could afford rooms at first, but these later became available to working-class men with pay in their pockets. Much later, women could also rent rooms. Some people were beginning to be able to live in non-conformity with social and family norms.

Several kinds of social spaces now opened up outside the family/household network. These included a distinct “waged work” space as wage-labour became separated from

household labour; a “recreational” space of bars or clubs where men with a discretionary income could go after work (recreational spaces for women would come later); and what may be too modern a category, “private” space—usually rooms where men (and later women) could have intimate liaisons. This private space for same-gender sex existed more precariously than did other social spaces.¹¹ Men who were married and lived at home, younger men who did not have their own rooms, and other men whose situations did not permit them to bring home the men they met had to develop creative ways to meet and have sex. Women searching for same-gender liaisons may have had similar difficulties, although, ironically, the domestic middle-class realm may have allowed white women’s erotic friendships to flourish in these social locations in the nineteenth century.¹²

Erotic same-gender networks among men emerged within the limits of these social spaces. Some men, given the constraints placed on “private” space, found ways to meet and have sex in socially defined “public” spaces like parks, and later washrooms, movie-houses, bath houses and other cruising spots. These men handled the problem of their lack of “private” space in an innovative fashion that would help form homosexual erotic cultures. These early sexual/cultural networks can be seen as struggling to redefine social space and claim areas for themselves.

Sexual activities had previously been organized through the household, where marriage, family, and procreation were major productive institutions. This family/household, through an uneven and protracted historical process, was now separated from ownership of the means of production (particularly land ownership), leading to a profound transformation of generational, gender, and sexual relations.

The domestic and “productive” aspects of the household economy were being ripped apart. The prerogative of patrilineal land inheritance (from father to son) began to break down as the system of production/inheritance played less of a role in marriage. This led to a loosening of inter-generational social regulations. Youths began to leave the family in order to find waged work, which in the long run increased the potential for autonomy among young people, particularly young men. These processes decreased the chances of a smooth transition from family of origin to family of procreation.¹³ The undermining of several institutions contributed to this weakening of social regulation: domestic service, arranged marriage, dowries, closely supervised courtship, and apprenticeship. Young people (especially boys and young men) could now more easily break free of family relations. This facilitated some men’s entry into erotic male networks.¹⁴

These social changes affected men and women differently, generally increasing white men’s autonomy and white women’s dependence. Women’s subordination in the increasingly privatized “domestic” sphere, which was now separated from “production,” was intensified. Middle-class white women came to be imprisoned in the private sphere, playing a crucial role in moulding the social life and morality of their class. The first stages of entrepreneurial capitalism depended on a particular form of bourgeois family and property organization in which the wife as a civil person was subsumed under the person of her husband, allowing him to appropriate her earnings, children,

and property.¹⁵ Working-class women, in contrast, continued to be responsible for domestic and reproductive labour, and also took on paid work, including casual and occasional forms of prostitution, to ensure the survival of their families.

Only much later—at the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth century with the rise of feminism and increased opportunities for their economic independence—would it be possible for more women to create their own erotic networks apart from men. This points once again to the need for separate, although overlapping, social histories of homosexuality and lesbianism in order to see how differences in the social organization of gender (as well as class and race) help shape differences in erotic practices.

Previously, it would have been impossible for men to live as homosexuals in the modern sense. In monasteries, within the aristocracy, among theatre performers, and in the army and navy, same-gender sex certainly went on, but it was not a basis for the generation of a distinct erotic culture and social identity.

With these transformations of social, sex/gender, and familial relations, however, there were increased possibilities for men to live at least partly outside family networks. The existence of these new social spaces did not spontaneously create the homosexual, however. This would require, as well, a relational process of struggle between the developing agencies of sexual rule and those who would later be called homosexuals and lesbians. This process would include the seizing of these social spaces by “deviant” cultural networks. A historical relation exists between the emergence of the outcast status of the homosexual and lesbian and that of the “normality” of heterosexuality.

Mollies and Sodomites

By the late seventeenth century, the white men engaged in same-gender sex were beginning to congregate in both London and Paris and were developing their own vocabulary. These emerging networks provided a place in which men could meet others for sex, but also in which they could develop a self-consciousness that social institutions denied them. In England, they gathered in “Molly houses,” and were called “Mollies.”¹⁶ Many of these cultural networks were associated with cross-dressing. If we are to judge from the court records, most of the Mollies, or “sodomites,” were working-class and lower middle class. Many of them used as their defence in court that they were married and had children, and for many this was true. Alan Bray argues that these men claimed to be married with children simply as a good defence in court; however, many of them were probably married or lived with women, often with children, and only occasionally participated in the Molly networks.¹⁷ Bray reports that these court records suggest that there were few aristocrats in the Molly networks. This contrasts with the social image of “sodomites” as effete and decadent aristocrats.

The arrest of sodomites was correlated with campaigns by the Society for the Reformation of Manners, in London and in the provinces, against sodomy and debauchery. The Society’s arguments against sodomy were based on its “sinfulness” and

“unnaturalness,” and they played a key role in prosecuting the perpetrators of various “immoral” acts. Records show that in 1709 the Society closed a number of Molly clubs, and in 1726 it broke up more than twenty of these. It helped prosecute not only sodomites, but also violators of the Sabbath, profane swearers, sex workers, keepers of bawdy houses, and actors in “indecent” plays.

The Society’s activities came in the period after the old ecclesiastical jurisdiction had broken down, and before state authorities could fill the breach. It received the encouragement of state officials in the royal court for its efforts in moral regulation, which was particularly valued given the weak policing forces of the day. The Society for the Reformation of Manners was part of a religious revival that also included the rise of Methodism. The common people, however, seem to have been more tolerant of the Molly houses in their midst.

The classification of sodomy was no longer a sinful potential that existed in everyone, but a characteristic of the particular type of man who inhabited the Molly houses. Certain sexual and cultural attributes separated the sodomite from other men. By the nineteenth century, sodomite had become the typical epithet for the sexually deviant, usually men.¹⁸ The Molly was a historically transitional “type” between the isolated sodomite and the homosexual. He provided one of the cultural sources for later homosexual networks. Molly culture was created not only through the suppression of the Molly houses, but also by the solidarity that grew among the Mollies. Alan Bray reports that when “a molly house in Covent Garden was broken up in 1725, the crowded household, many of them in drag, met the raid with determined and violent resistance.”¹⁹ In 1726, William Brown, who had been entrapped by constables, defended himself in the following way: “I did it because I thought I knew him...and I think that there is no crime in making what use I please of my own body...”²⁰

A supportive cultural network and a certain group social consciousness made possible such a statement of defiance.

Buggery and the Royal Navy

In the military, particularly in the navy, where men were segregated on ships, there existed both possibilities for erotic friendships between men, but also severe prohibitions against “buggery” (generally, but not always, referring to anal intercourse). From the seventeenth century onwards, “the unnatural and detestable sin of buggery...with man or beast” was mentioned in the British Articles of War as punishable “with death by sentence of a Court Martial.”²¹ The navy was concerned not so much with religious or political heresy, or social and sexual identities, but with maintaining proper military discipline. While there was some dispute as to exactly what constituted buggery, and whether proof of emission was necessary for conviction, it was nonetheless a capital crime on a par with desertion, mutiny, and murder. Records show that sailors were more likely to be hanged for buggery than for desertion or mutiny. The number of buggery trials increased in wartime when men were thrown together in crowded conditions.

More than eighty were executed for sodomy under English criminal and naval law between 1800 and 1835.²²

The military regime operated through an extremely rigorous code of conduct. Buggery, or sodomy, was seen as challenging the navy's hierarchical order and its clear boundaries between proper and improper behaviour. Men engaging in sex with other men created ambiguity and challenged military ideals of masculinity.²³ The military "believed themselves to have special problems of order and discipline: sexual contact between men, and especially across ranks, threatened to tear asunder the carefully maintained hierarchy."²⁴ The extension and development of hierarchical and bureaucratic institutional relations within the military and other state and professional agencies led to a clamping down on passionate relationships between men. Sex between men within hierarchical and bureaucratic forms of organization complicates relationships between subordinates and superiors and denies the "impartiality" and "objectivity" of the bureaucratic order.²⁵ This is also part of the construction of a hegemonic form of masculinity that was defined in opposition to those who engaged in buggery and sodomy.

Individuality and Sexual Identifications

With the development of capitalist social relations and state formation there emerged the discourse of individualism: Karl Marx writes:

In this society of free competition, the individual appears detached from the natural bonds, etc., which in earlier historical periods make him the accessory of a definite and limited human conglomerate.²⁶

Marx viewed individualism as a social construction in the context of capitalist social relations. The individual (usually seen as a white man) emerged as a social actor entering into social and economic relations with other individuals. Early on this included some white men owning slaves as their property. The historical practices producing this individual identity included the competitive character of the capitalist marketplace, the conversion of labour into an individually owned commodity to be bought and sold in the marketplace, the transformation of the existing divisions of labour, the creation of the individual as a unit of administration and governance for the state (in the census, as voter or citizen, as a social statistic) that depended on the development of particular forms of documentation, administration and organization,²⁷ and the emergence of legal conceptions of the individual and the assertion of the body as one's personal property over which one had the fundamental right of control. This latter process has yet to be fully extended to women and had a clear racialized character, and certainly did not apply to slaves.²⁸ These experiences made it possible to conceive of an individual social and sexual identity. Individuality in the bourgeois epoch is based not only on property ownership (the isolated white male property owner of liberal theory) but also

on experiences of gender and sexuality as decisive components of the “respectable” and “civilized” individual.

Lust Acquires a Gender

In previous epochs, a form of social identification as man or woman had been organized on the basis of the division of labour in the household and in relation to the social relations of biological reproduction. However, this “identity” was not defined in an explicitly erotic or sexual sense. As Jonathan Ned Katz states, when referring to the early American colonies, “the early colonists did not distinguish between lust in terms of its “same-sex” or “different-sex” objects.”²⁹

In the capitalist epoch, with the partial separation of gender divisions from the division of labour in the household economy, and the emergence of the regime of sexuality, gender categorizations became more intensely polarized as they were combined with notions of a distinct sexuality. This occurred in a highly classed and racialized social and historical context. Sexuality emerged as an autonomous personal terrain of identity formation by the late nineteenth century. There now existed a diversity of sexual practices and their simultaneous categorization by the emerging sexual sciences. Erotic practices under this regime of sexual categorization became the basis for the articulation of specific sexual identities. The sodomite as a sinful, perverse, and deviant sexual being provided the basis for the initial articulation of a “deviant” sexual identity and culture in many Western societies.

Men could now begin to live outside the household system—which had previously united production, reproduction, and sex.³⁰ The existence of same-gender erotic networks and cultures (even in their tentative beginnings) presented a challenge to the developing norms and practices of respectable sexuality. In previous periods, a necessary participation in the interdependent household economy and the necessity of procreative sexual relations, along with religious and legal prohibitions against sodomy and buggery, had been enough to enforce reproductive sexual norms. Heterosexuality as a distinct and defined sexuality did not exist.³¹

With sexuality now being experienced as a distinct and important realm of experience, sexual cultures and identities needed their own justification. Reproductive sexuality, and eventually heterosexuality (although not specifically named as such), came to be defended by the bourgeoisie and its agencies through a historical and social process integrating and transforming previous forms of sexual organization and regulation. The new white capitalist and middle-class elite associated “heterosexuality” and respectable family life with social and moral order itself—with the maintenance of its own racial class unity and hegemony. The blood and kinship ties of feudalism were transformed into the norms of “heterosexual” love and attraction, shifting the emphasis in the regulation of sexuality from marriage and kinship networks to sexuality and sexual identity themselves. The blood ties of the aristocracy that marked the antiquity of its ancestry and marriage alliances were replaced by the sexuality, gender, and racial

practices of the new ruling class. This was specified through biological, medical, and eugenic concepts that sought to avoid the menaces of heredity and to produce “healthy” children who would improve the white ruling class.³² The class body of the bourgeoisie was differentiated from the body of the “lower” orders, and central to this sense of class embodiment were sexuality, and sexual practices, as well as race. The categories of sexuality were first applied to the body of the bourgeoisie, which served to draw a boundary between it and other social classes. As Foucault pointed out people’s “truth” came to be found in their sexuality. The bourgeoisie as a white class thus came to regard “heterosexuality” as necessary to its own class reproduction, hegemony, and social ways of life.

These notions of personal sexual identity were articulated first in the white bourgeoisie and the middle classes because of the earlier emergence of a distinct “personal” life within these classes, and that this was the initial site of the deployment of sexual classifications and “norms.” Notions of sexual culture and identity came about through an uneven social process, making it necessary to discuss the formation of classed, raced, and gendered sexualities rather than any sexuality in general.

The respectable sexual identity of the ruling class served, in the first instance, to erect a boundary between the ruling class and the working class. In the face of potential challengers like the Mollies and sodomites, tribadists, and later fairies, queers,³³ bull daggers, and dykes, reproductive different-gender sexuality needed to be defended as the only approved way of life. Any challenge to the “natural” moral order of reproductive sexuality mobilized a response from right-wing religious groups, the police, and various state agencies. Heterosexuality emerged as the “universal” order, requiring new forms of social, cultural, and political defence. This new hegemony was established through secular, legal, sexological, and medical practices forged through state formation and social struggles. “Sexual respectability” has been used to defend this institutionalized form of heterosexuality from queer sexualities and people moving beyond the two-gender binary that can potentially claim equal status for themselves.

It is in this social process that the emergence of polarized gender and sexual classifications can be located. Too often, studies of homosexual/lesbian or queer cultures and practices have been limited or distorted by their failure to look at the other side of this process—the emergence of the heterosexual man and woman. The contemporary male heterosexual, for instance, is no longer simply engaged in sexual activity that leads to reproduction. He has become a particular “type” of being with a particular erotic orientation tied to a heightened sense of masculine gender identification. Lust now had a gender.³⁴ If your lust and your gender did not match up properly, you were an “invert,” a “pervert,” a “queer,” or, later, a “homosexual” and even later a transexual or transgendered person. You were excluded from emerging social norms.

This emerging heterosexuality is tied to the shifting social organization of gender and patriarchal relations. Male heterosexual practice is bound up with the institutionalization of particular forms of masculinities and is associated with the daily practices of men in the gender division of labour: a class and racialized organization of masculinity that contains common features across class boundaries, shifting forms of family

organization, the struggle for a family wage paid to the male breadwinner, male responsibility for “his” wife and children, and male control over women’s bodies and sexuality.³⁵ Add to this the redefinition of “public” and “private” that associated white masculinity with the public spheres of the economy and politics, and trapped white middle-class women in an increasingly privatized domestic sphere shorn of its previously “productive” dimensions. Patriarchal hegemony organizes an apparent unity of interests between men in different classes and races, as “real men” in opposition to the women of their classes whose subordination it actively organizes, and also in opposition to “queers” and “fags.” Heterosexual hegemony thus organizes and is organized through capitalist racist patriarchal relations.

Class and Race Sexualities

We can now see the historical intersection of sexual experience with the relations of class, gender, age, and race. In the symbolic world views articulated by and for the Victorian male ruling class, middle-class white men came to be seen as the “head” of the household and the social system, middle-class white women as the guardians of emotions and respectability—the “heart” of society, yet lacking in sexual/erotic drives. White middle-class women themselves helped construct this image of passionlessness in an attempt to defend themselves from unwanted male sexual advances and sexual violence, in a context where women were denied access to birth control, abortion, and information about their own bodies.³⁶

The “lower orders” were defined as the “hands” of society, the unthinking but physical “doers” associated with menial work and “nature.” Working-class and Black women were seen as more “sexual” than middle-class white women, and there emerged double standards separating male from female, and middle-class “ladies” from working-class and Black women. This symbolic system affected the social organization of sex work, and eroticism more generally.

This white, middle-class, male-defined view of sexuality also affected the organization of same-gender desires among some white middle-class and elite homosexual men in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Many of these men perceived young working-class men as not only erotically more interesting but as not hostile to engaging in sex with men. The working class was viewed as less infected with social hostility toward same-gender erotic pleasures. This pattern has been described as a form of “sexual colonialism” that coincided with an idealization of the reconciling effects of cross-class liaisons.³⁷ The “lower orders” came to be sexualized from this middle-class vantage point, suggesting that social power relations and the deployment of sexuality were linked through the eroticization of social differences of class, race, age, and gender. At the same time, working-class and Black men and women did not necessarily experience their sexualities in this way at all.

The “lower orders” were also seen by the respectable white middle class as a threat, as having the potential to pollute the rising ruling class. Chauncey describes part of this process as it occurred in the United States:

The medical profession grew out of the white middle class and reflected its values and concerns in an extremely class conscious manner. It perceived not only non-Europeans but also America's own lower classes as immoral. Doctors assumed that sexual license and sensuality characterized the poor and working classes, and that only the middle and upper classes had "achieved" a sense of sexual propriety.³⁸

Doctors accused servants of introducing perversion into the middle-class household, of showing children how to masturbate—thus causing some of them to engage in same-gender sexual activities.³⁹ This formation of class morality and sexuality was the setting for Victorian debates over sex work and social purity. These debates had an important influence on the regulation of same-gender sexual activities and sex more generally—in Canada as well.⁴⁰

The Sexual Sciences and Sexual Rule

It was in these social conditions that sexuality became an object of study and an arena for the production of "scientific" knowledge. Sexuality became a terrain for medicalization by professional groups: the new medical, psychiatric, and scientific professions became the legitimizers and definers of sexual identities and norms. A specific sexual instinct was demarcated by Heinrich Kaan in 1846 and became an object to be classified, categorized, and managed.⁴¹ Various "irregular" forms of sexual behaviour were studied and classified. The forms of behaviour and identity that were produced and classified in medical and psychiatric discourse included the "hysterical" woman, the simultaneously "innocent" and masturbating child, and the perverse adult. There emerged the sexual sciences, a regime of sexual categories and definitions including parts of forensic psychiatry, sex psychology, and later sexology.⁴²

It was the work of medical, psychological, educational, and eugenic practices—articulated in a new sub-discipline of sexology—which defined the unity of these strategies around a new concept of sex as expressive of basic instincts.⁴³

This regime of sexual sciences and disciplines was two-sided in its implications for sexual experience. On the one side, a number of the early sex psychologists were also sex reformers of one persuasion or another. In naming the various sexual categories, they also created the possibilities for these categories, like homosexual or lesbian, to be taken up as a basis for opposition to sexual rule. On the other side, these disciplines participated in the construction of oppressive sexual regulations that were used to police sexual life. The development of these sexual sciences was uneven, contradictory, and never monolithic.⁴⁴ As Weeks describes:

The paradox was that the early sexologists, who by and large were also conscious sex reformers, were simultaneously powerful agents in the organization, and...control, of the sexual behaviours they sought to describe.⁴⁵

The work of sexual scientists was and is a key part of the contemporary relations of sexual rule.⁴⁶ Regardless of the individual intentions of these early sex researchers, their work was entered into the social relations and practices of sexual policing. Sex-scientific knowledge was used to mandate police action, to assist Parliaments, judges, and courts in the formation of criminal-code offences, and to help organize psychiatric, medical, media, and social policies for dealing with sexual and social “problems.” The categorization of different sexual “types,” “deviations,” “perversions,” and “norms” were entered into an administrative and policing apparatus of sexual regulation, mandating action for the containment of sex deviants and perverts.

The sex sciences first labelled the perversions—the “deviant” masturbating child or the homosexual—and separated them from acceptable behaviour, before returning to outline in more detail the norm of heterosexuality itself. The term “heterosexual” does not seem to have been used in its present sense until the 1890s in medical discourse in the United States and later in Canada.⁴⁷

These sexual practices were both forced on and taken up by the working class and the poor in what Foucault described as the “moralization of the poorer classes.”⁴⁸ This was a major part of the bourgeois cultural revolution. Class struggles were fought not only at the point of production; they also included struggles over gender, sexual, racial, and moral relations. Sexuality came to play an important role in state policies and as a locus for social surveillance and intervention, providing access to the life of the species and the life of the individual: it became a crucial arena for the surveillance of the body politic. The emergence of the “problem” of sexuality was grounded in that of the politics of population, which was centrally concerned with sexual and reproductive life.⁴⁹ This export of sexual norms was resisted, negotiated, shifted, and accepted by the male-dominated organizations of the working class. Within the working class itself, a struggle also took place—women and the least “skilled” workers including Black, Asian and other non-whites being the losers.⁵⁰ The white “skilled” working class dominated by men tended to defend its own interests in the conditions of exploitation it faced, and built on existing traditions and divisions of labour to fight for the formation and defence of a white male-dominated working-class family form. Working-class people often had their own reasons to fight for their versions of “respectable” and “proper” sexuality.

These social transitions had a dramatic effect on same-gender intimacy and friendship, whether this took openly erotic forms or not. While this process has been explored regarding women at the end of the nineteenth century, particularly concerning the destruction of white female support networks and passionate friendships,⁵¹ a similar, but perhaps earlier, process occurred among men. Foucault has suggested that in Europe, same-gender passionate friendships among men were first prohibited in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Institutions like the army, schools, and bureaucratic administration could not handle intense friendships among men because of the need for hierarchical relations and “proper” discipline. Passionate friendships between men were seen to violate the new norms of bureaucratic rationality. When passionate friendships were prohibited between men, all close relationships became suspect. Foucault speculated that the “disappearance of friendship as a social relation, and the declaration of homosexuality as a social/political/medical problem, are the same social process.”⁵²

Respectability and Masculinities

It was during the late nineteenth century that notions of respectability and distinctions between proper and deviant forms of life became generalized among the skilled white working class. The skilled sections of the white working class adopted their version of middle-class family and sexual norms. This can perhaps best be seen in the social-purity campaigns of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries:

Sexual respectability became a hallmark of the labour aristocrat, anxious to distance himself from the “bestiality” of the casual labouring poor, as increased pressure was placed on the respectable working class to break their ties with “outcast” groups.... Changing employment patterns seem to have reinforced patriarchal tendencies among skilled sectors of the working class by the end of the century, as the proportion of married women working outside the home declined and the family wage for male workers became a demand of trade unions. Seen in this context, social purity, which called on men to protect and control their women, served as the ideological corollary of the family wage, morally legitimating the prerogatives of patriarchy inside and outside the family. Thus social purity served to undermine working-class solidarity, while tightening definitions of gender among respectable working men and working women.⁵³

Social-purity agitation, which I examine in more detail in the Canadian context, was directed against schoolboy masturbation, sexual perversion, and sex work.⁵⁴ Notions of social purity and respectability played an important role in organizing working-class heterosexism, and also united the white middle class and the respectable working class against aristocratic decadence, lust, and selfishness, and at the same time against the pariah sexual practices of the outcast poor.⁵⁵ Similarly, working-class social-purity campaigns often had a different character than those initiated by the middle class. They were more often directed against the elite. In these ways some working-class forces tried to shift social-purity discourse and practice away from bourgeois hegemony.⁵⁶ These efforts were not usually very successful since bourgeois forces usually came to hegemonize these campaigns. Social-purity campaigns often had a clear white racial character and were often directed against “sexually depraved” images of Blacks and other people of colour.⁵⁷

“Respectability,” then, was used to articulate and establish a broad social bloc of different class, gender, and racial groups under the hegemony of white moral-conservative political and religious forces. This historic social bloc played an important role in shaping state policy and the present relations of sexual rule.

The struggles for a “family wage” and for “protective” legislation to keep children and women out of competition with the male wage worker—thus establishing the male “role” as breadwinner—along with the call for sexual protection and control over women, organized a particular form of family life in the white working class. The formation of gender within the working class included the affirmation of forms of masculinity and patriarchal relations. Men workers have resisted the devaluing of manual labour by associating real masculinity with “hard” manual work, and effeminacy and physical

weakness with mental labour. The working class has therefore tended to generate its own forms of heterosexism through its debasement of “effeminacy” among men and the assignment of women to primary responsibility in domestic life. Working-class masculinity contains both patriarchal and heterosexist practices, formed in interaction with, and in resistance to, capitalist exploitation. Forms of cultural production, or the resistance of subordinate groups, can, ironically, act to reinforce the social hegemony of the ruling class, gender, race, and sexuality.⁵⁸ Patriarchal hegemony within the working class is the other side of the construction of heterosexual hegemony. Through the organization of these forms of hegemony, not only were women and homosexuals oppressed, but working-class organizations positioned themselves on the same side as the ruling regime on these questions.

Enter the Homosexual

The specification of “homosexuality” in forensic psychiatry, sex psychology, and later in sexological discourse was used to explain the “deviants” encountered by the police, courts, doctors, and moral reformers in the larger urban centres. The emergence of the “homosexual” is a complex historical interaction between social conditions, social discourse, cultural developments, and the resistance of people engaged in same-gender sex ourselves.

Some distinction was being made between homosexuality and other sexual “perversions” by the late nineteenth century⁵⁹—in official sexual and medical discourse in the 1890s, but largely not until after the turn of the century in Canada. This category developed in an uneven process, with same-gender sex being classified in various ways before “homosexual” became firmly established. In early sexual psychiatric discourse it was seen as a form of gender inversion: male homosexuality was associated with effeminacy and female “masculinity” with lesbianism. Within the gender categories of the day, masculinity began to be defined as inherently heterosexual.

Some men were able, however, to continue to engage in same-gender sex without fear of being labelled a fairy or queer by asserting a “masculine” position in the sexual activities they engaged in with other men. This was before the social generalization of the concepts of a sharply dichotomized heterosexuality and homosexuality that took place unevenly over the first half of the twentieth century.⁶⁰ Homosexuality began to mean not only that there was something crucially significant about one’s sexuality, but also about one’s gender.⁶¹ It would only be after 1900 that the distinctly sexual aspects of homosexuality would be classified in the works of Havelock Ellis and Freud.⁶²

The origin of the term “homosexual” itself illustrates the struggle between those who experienced same-gender desires and heterosexual hegemony. It first appeared in 1869 in the writings of the Hungarian Karoly Maria Benkert, although it did not enter into the English language until the 1890s in the work of Havelock Ellis and in US medical literature.⁶³ Benkert, who himself engaged in sexual affairs with men, appealed to the government to keep out of people’s sexual lives in response to German legislation against same-gender sex among men.⁶⁴ The word “homosexual” was elaborated by white professional men who engaged in same-gender sex in order both to name what

they experienced as their “inborn” difference and to protect themselves from the law. This category, then, arose in the context of a lived reality of same-gender sexual networks and in the context of a social explosion of sexual classifications.⁶⁵

Homosexuality was defined in relation to a discourse then emerging in the medical, psychiatric, and legal professions initially as a form of “reverse discourse”⁶⁶ in an attempt to oppose sexual rule—by asserting that homosexuals were “congenital inverts” and not a social threat. However, this formulation was trapped within the confines of the ruling regime of sexual definition and regulation. This category was, then, removed from the context of experiences of people like Benkert and became part of the official discourse of the legal system, the police, the medical profession, the media, and, later, social work.

The “homosexual” thus became a component in the campaign against the moral standards of the poor, represented by the sex workers for men involved in the scandals of the period, and the image of the decadent white upper-class man preying on working-class youth developed in the Oscar Wilde scandal.⁶⁷ Childhood and adolescence were defined as years of sexual innocence, and masturbation, or “self-abuse,” among young boys, particularly in the white middle class, became a focus of fear. “Self-abuse” was said to cause sexual inversion.⁶⁸

The social-purity campaigns focused on the image of upper-class men corrupting working-class and poor youth. When these concerns were taken up by the ruling regime, however, hardest hit were the poor sex workers and working-class men engaged in same-gender sex. It was the same in relation to women sex workers. Poor and working-class women, and Black and other women of colour, always got hit the hardest.

Imperialism and Sexuality

The rise of imperialism, with its military efficiency and industrial competition, and the shifting character of capitalism, had an important effect on sex and gender relations:

The old system of capitalist production (which itself had nourished imperial expansion) with its mobile super-abundant workforce of people who were underpaid, underfed, untrained, and infinitely replaceable, was passing. In its place, with the introduction of capital-intensive methods, was needed a stable workforce of people trained to stay in them, neither moving on, nor losing too much time through ill health.⁶⁹

This led to the

...recognition that under the need for growing productivity and efficiency labour was not simply a commodity that could be used up and discarded: that capitalism had both an immediate interest in its healthy maintenance and reproduction.⁷⁰

The growth of a “managed” capitalism led to changes in family and gender relations. The new labour force had to be physically healthy, familiar with factory discipline, and generally more highly “skilled.” This led to the reinforcement of reproductive sex along

with institutionalized training for motherhood among working-class women and girls and the expansion of universal, compulsory schooling.

Imperialist wars such as the Boer War, in the meantime, led to concerns over the malnutrition and ill health of the working-class “cannon fodder” of the imperial armies, and a “surge of concern about the bearing and rearing of children—the next generation of soldiers and workers, the Imperial race.”⁷¹ The liberation of white women for work in the home became an objective of the ruling class: to rear healthy babies and thus replenish the wage labour force and the armies with men. Women were denied access to contraception and abortion information. Although they met with resistance, “male” professionals increasingly gained control over women’s bodies.⁷² For white women, sex was officially defined as a racial instinct for the perpetuation of the species. The spread of venereal disease and illegitimacy was blamed on the “unnatural promiscuity” of deviant women.⁷³ All this occurred in a climate of white middle-class fear of not only moral and national decay, but also race and class suicide due to the low white middle-class birth rate. This reinforced stringent standards of proper femininity, masculinity, and reproductive sexuality. Said President Theodore Roosevelt: “The woman who flinches from childbirth stands on a par with the soldier who drops his rifle and runs in battle.”⁷⁴

Para-military youth organizations drilled young boys in the spirit of nationalism and imperialism. An association was established between imperialism, nationalism, militarism, masculinity, and sexual respectability.⁷⁵ Sexual perversion became a symptom of national and moral decline.

State agencies built on previous public/private distinctions to allow “private” economic enterprise to flourish, while also creating a “private” form of regulation of women’s domestic lives and sexuality. The public sphere was therefore built-in distinction from at least two “private” spheres, the private economic sphere of “free enterprise,” and the private domestic realm.⁷⁶

The regulation of sexual pleasure moved from the local community and the Church to a bureaucratic state, with its criminal code, police, professional groups, official knowledge, and social policies. This increasingly extra-local organization of sexual rule was part of a broader shift in social power and decision making away from local settings.⁷⁷ Religious discourse against same-gender sexuality did not disappear, of course. Churches have continued to influence moral campaigns against homosexuality. Earlier notions of immorality and sinfulness helped shape “scientific” theories, which, in turn, moulded the moral climate in which psychiatric, medical, and sexological work on “queers” took place. Sexuality became a matter to be regulated, managed, administered, and policed.

Degeneracy and Legal Codifications

New psychiatric and medical theories of degeneracy associated with homosexuality were accepted by the institutions of sexual rule. The creation of the homosexual as outcast was part of the same process that cast sex workers outside “respectable” sexuality. As Isabel Hull argues, “For the state to punish sexual acts, it had to define them first.”⁷⁸

Cesare Lombroso's criminal anthropology operated in this general field to specify anatomical differences between criminal "types," that he related to evolutionary theory. For Lombroso, degeneracy was a sign of inherent criminality, and he saw "homosexuals, like criminals, as throwbacks to earlier stages of civilization."⁷⁹ Lombroso's criminal anthropology "provided a powerful argument for racism and imperialism at the height of European colonial expansion."⁸⁰

The work of early forensic and sex psychologists like Krafft-Ebing and Havelock Ellis was influenced by degeneration theory.⁸¹ Marx and Engels, in their few written references to male same-gender passion, were influenced by these fears of "degeneracy."⁸² Eugenic theory grew out of this intersection of degeneration theory and fear of ruling-class suicide, resulting in proposals for the castration or sterilization of sex "perverts," including sodomites.⁸³

These categories of homosexuality in official discourse mandated police campaigns against the emerging cultures and networks of men who had sex with men just as those of "decadence" and "degeneration" organized media interpretation of the Oscar Wilde trial. "Inverts" and homosexuals emerged as particular categories of criminal suspects as the police played an important role in holding dominant gender, class, race, and sexual relations in place.⁸⁴

Legal offences such as "gross indecency" marked a transition from the broad term "sodomy" to more specific charges. "Gross indecency" brought various male same-sex acts under a common legal category, beginning to create the legal personality of the "homosexual" (although the word homosexual was never used in the text of the law).⁸⁵ These legal changes were part of a broad social process in which the various components of homosexual practice and culture were brought together to define not only particular offences but a particular sexual being.

Homosexual Cultures and Resistance

Not only did the law and sexual science play a crucial part in the organization and transformation of sex/gender relations,⁸⁶ those participating in same-gender sex also played a very active part in the articulation of homosexual experiences. As with the making of the working class, homosexuals were present at and very involved in our own making. To paraphrase Marx, we make our own history, but we do not make it just as we please; we make it under circumstances given us by the past and the constraints these present for our own activities.⁸⁷

In the context of sexual categorization, certain homosexuals (like K.M. Benkert, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Magnus Hirschfeld, and Edward Carpenter) participated in naming and defining their experiences through the categories available to them.⁸⁸ These men were the white middle-class or professional expression of broader cultural networks. Wrote G. Frank Lydston of the United States in 1889: "...in every community of any size [there exists] a colony of male sex perverts; they are usually known to each other and are likely to congregate together."⁸⁹

The lives of homosexuals were never completely defined by state agencies and medical professionals; there was always resistance and subversion. This resistance seems to

have taken on visible collective and political forms only in Germany during this period, however.⁹⁰ Some homosexuals used the category of “homosexual” to articulate a separate identity and culture, shifting it in a more progressive direction. Their cultural resources included earlier cultural forms such as the Mollies and ongoing same-gender erotic networks; Walt Whitman’s important notion of the “adhesiveness of comrades” (which played an important transitional role in the making of a homosexual consciousness among both men and women); Edward Carpenter’s writings on the “intermediate sex”; and the more “liberal” sex psychological and sexological literature of the day like that of Ellis and Hirschfeld. The appropriation of the literature and art of classical Greece with an emphasis on “homosexuality” as a valid way of life played a role in the formation of homosexual cultures among white middle-class and upper-class intellectual men.⁹¹

In the years prior to the creation of “the lesbian” as a specific category, some lesbians shared these cultural sources as well. I will come back to this when we look at Elsa Gidlow’s experiences in the early twentieth century in Montréal in Chapter 6. This construction of homosexual cultures had a generally white and European-derived character, especially through the use of the example of ancient Greece to justify contemporary homosexuality and the references to European sexological work. This associated homosexual identities with a racist Eurocentric perspective on the world, making it more difficult for those coming from different cultural and sexual traditions to identify with this process of identity formation.

Homosexual and lesbian cultures formed differently in relation to class and race.⁹² I have already suggested that hegemonic patterns of class eroticization affected the formation of white middle-class and elite homosexual practices. For a number of historical and social reasons, individual homosexual identifications appear to have emerged first among some men in the bourgeoisie and middle class. This was also the case with heterosexual identifications that developed somewhat later. This is by no means to suggest that the middle class was more sexually “advanced” or that the working class suffered from a process of “cultural lag.” It must be stressed that working-class men played a crucial and very active part in seizing and creating social spaces for same-gender sex and in resisting sexual policing during these years. We must also be very wary of drawing conclusions from personal texts since working-class men who engaged in sex with other men were less likely to have left behind written diaries or records of their erotic experiences.

In the working class, practices of same-gender sex that were not understood as possessing a distinct homosexual identity, or as homosexuality, already existed. In the early twentieth century in some working-class communities, a distinction may have been made between “fairies” or “queer” men who organized their lives around sex with other men and may have been associated with “effeminacy,” and those men who allowed these fairies and queers to have sex with them. These men would not have been seen as queer and would have been able to construct themselves as masculine in character.⁹³ It took a few more decades, it appears, for networks of working-class men (as compared to networks of middle-class men) to begin to take up homosexual classifications as the “truth”

of their beings.⁹⁴ Homosexuality emerged in a different way among working-class men than for middle-class men. This process of identity formation was organized partly through psychiatry and medicine: doctors would describe homosexuality as an inversion or a disease “afflicting” middle-class patients, but as an immoral form of behaviour willfully chosen by the poor and working class.⁹⁵ This attitude blended in with white middle-class notions of sexual excess in the “lower” classes.

Part of this process was also the uneven and protracted “colonization” of working-class practices of same-gender sex by middle-class, sex-psychological, and sexual-policing classifications of “homosexuality” that were understood by working-class men in rather different terms. This process of “colonization,” resistance, and accommodation needs to be explored much more fully. George Chauncey begins to raise some of these questions:

We need to be paying more attention to *other* social forms of homosexuality—other ways in which homosexual relations have been organized and understood, differentiated, named and left deliberately unnamed. We need to specify the *particularity* of various modes of homosexual behaviour and the relationships between these modes and particular configurations of sexual identity.⁹⁶

A bit later in the same article, he adds that there are problems in using contemporary sexual classifications in grasping how people, even in the early parts of the twentieth century, would have made sense of their own erotic experiences and lives.

To classify their behaviour and character using the simple polarities of “homosexual” and “heterosexual” would be to misunderstand the complexity of their sexual system. Indeed the very terms “homosexual behaviour” and “identity,” because of their tendency to conflate phenomena that other cultures may have regarded as quite distinct, appear to be insufficiently precise to denote the variety of social forms of sexuality we wish to analyze.⁹⁷

This social process was also tied into the emergence of “heterosexuality” within the working class coming to eclipse other forms of different-gender sexuality and social-support relations. A similar but also different process of sexual “colonization” has gone on in relation to Indigenous practices of same-gender and different-gender sexualities in many “Third World” countries where Indigenous practices through an uneven process have been hegemonized by Western notions of heterosexuality and homosexuality.⁹⁸

In North America and Europe, it was in response to same-gender erotic practices that the stigmatized classification of the “homosexual” was put in place as were the social relations of “the closet.” This reverses the “common-sense” historical narrative that has been accepted by many lesbians and gays. It has been assumed that the relations of the closet have been in place for a long time and that we are only now slowly freeing ourselves from them as we come out. Instead, historical work by Chauncey⁹⁹ and others points out that the relations of the closet are recent in their formation and

were constructed as a way of decreasing the visibility and acceptance of same-gender sexualities. In this sense, the closet was actively constructed through the relations of heterosexual hegemony in response to challenges from fairies, queers, and dykes and those challenging the gender binary. We were forced into the relations of the closet. This in turn had a profound impact on how heterosexuality was lived and defined.

White, middle-class, homosexual-identified men in the late nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth century may have had a sense of a private, personal life that most working-class men did not share. They may have therefore adopted a homosexual identification earlier; they had more mobility, they could live outside or on the fringes of family networks that were still necessary for the survival of most working-class men, and they were more likely to encounter the medical and sex-scientific literature categorizing homosexuality as different. Given the middle-class identification of respectability with “proper” family life, these white middle- and upper-class men may have found themselves excluded from their class mores at an earlier date.¹⁰⁰ Working-class cultures, particularly their more “outcast” or “rough” sections, were much more resistant to linking occasional same-gender sexual acts with an exclusive homosexual identity, and had their own practices of same-gender sex that did not revolve around homosexual identities. Many working-class men did engage in same-gender sex and were involved in the emerging homosexual cultures and networks,¹⁰¹ but they often participated in them differently than middle-class men and did not seem to feel as compelled to adopt a particular overall homosexual “identity.”

George Merrill lived for a number of years with the early homosexual socialist writer Edward Carpenter. Merrill had grown up in the slums of Sheffield, England. Early on, he became involved in the late Victorian men/men sexual “underground” and developed a particular erotic interest in middle- and upper-class men. He certainly loved Carpenter very much and had no reservations about openly living with him. Experiences such as Merrill’s must be examined more closely in order to give us more insights into working-class homosexual life in this period.¹⁰² Nonetheless, it seems to have taken several decades for working-class homosexual cultures to emerge. The reasons for this include not only the later development of a “respectable” heterosexual culture in the working class, but also that a popular culture and mass communications industry carrying the values of heterosexual hegemony into the heart of the working class did not come about until the early to mid-twentieth century.

Some of these late nineteenth-century emerging homosexual networks were organized around sex work for men. Some working-class boys and men took advantage of middle-class and elite men’s erotic interests in them for their own financial advantage as well as for erotic pleasures. Many of the slang words still common in gay cultures, such as “trick” and “trade,” can be traced back to this period and also to interactions with women sex workers. Sex workers for other men or hustlers, often did not identify themselves in terms of their sexuality, but rather by the acts in which they engaged for money. Identities were produced through complex sexual, gender, racializing and class interactions. According to Weeks, there were few professional “Mary Annes” (male sex workers for men) in nineteenth-century England; however, those sex workers who

stayed involved in the emerging homosexual cultures, participating in its interactions, were more likely to take up homosexual identifications.¹⁰³

The homosexual was someone whose very existence was defined by his sexuality according to the definitions of sexual science. The articulation of this “identity” was both imprisoned within the “scientific” categorization of sex as truth, and also potentially capable of subverting and challenging this regime of classification. There has been debate and struggle for more than the last century and a half over the meanings and definitions of homosexuality and lesbianism engaged in by sexologists, psychiatrists, the police, the legal system, politicians, and gays and lesbians. The development of new sexual definitions was an attempt to establish heterosexuality as the norm and exclude the deviations. Unwittingly, however, these categorizations also provided a basis for the dialectical emergence of homosexual and lesbian experiences, pleasures and desires for a consciousness developed in resistance and affirmation. A historic bloc of social forces was constructed of the medical profession, sex scientists, the legal apparatus, the police, middle-class moral reformers, and the “respectable” working class. This informal alliance helped shape the main contours of the regime of sexual regulation that is in many ways still with us today.

The implicit alliance between state agencies and the dominant union organizations created the conditions for the subordination of women, for the suppression of female sexuality other than male-dominated heterosexuality, and for the subordination of homosexuality and lesbianism as well as the relations of white supremacy. It also narrowed the terrain of working-class struggle to a trade-unionist economic and workplace realm, and associated unions and working-class struggles with a particular construction of heterosexual masculinity and manhood.¹⁰⁴ Homosexuals and women were subordinated—in different ways—in the organization of heterosexual hegemony and racist capitalist patriarchal “civilization.”

The emergence of corporate or managed capitalism has had an important impact on sexual and moral regulation. As Dorothy E. Smith points out, “Economic organization became increasingly separated from the local organization of the household”¹⁰⁵ as social power shifted from the local community and the household to state bodies and national and eventually international corporate bodies, and as administrative and managerial positions in the new corporations have shifted gender and household organization. In the working class, women’s labour has been increasingly appropriated in the waged workforce, and, in the middle class, into the professional, bureaucratic, and managerial levels. These areas have continued to be dominated by men. Corporate ownership has been accompanied by increased bureaucratic management that increasingly relies on abstract and universal forms of categorization and textual/documentary communication.¹⁰⁶

The Heterosexual Counter-Revolution

It is in this context that practices of masculinity, femininity, and sexuality were reorganized with uneven classed and racializing impacts. During the 1920s, media, advertising,

and the beginnings of a mass consumer culture created a setting in which heterosexual images were amplified and commercialized in the Western countries—selling both products and social norms at the same time. Says Jonathan Ned Katz:

The word and concept “heterosexual” was produced and distributed in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America to express and to idealize qualitatively new relationships between men and women in which eroticism was defined as central and legitimate.¹⁰⁷

In this context, “personal” life emerged as a distinct realm, for managerial and professional employees (and later for growing sectors of the working class), for the accumulation of goods, personal and family investment, life insurance, and leisure “capital.” Heterosexuality as an erotic relation was “naturalized” through advertising, the mass media, and the developing entertainment industries.¹⁰⁸ Household and family relations shifted, and the nuclear family began to be isolated from relatives and support networks in the expanding urban centres.

In the first decades of the twentieth century, women were re-sexualized in mainstream sexual ideology. Sexual-advice literature placed an important new emphasis on “companionate” marriage, defined by heterosexual friendship and erotic attraction and satisfaction. This literature was written largely by male “educators, social workers, psychologists, physicians, and others in a rising class of trained professional people.”¹⁰⁹ Professionals (mostly men) began to play an important role in the restructuring and taming of the erotic desires of women. Taking account of, and at the same time organizing aspects of, heterosexuality among women in the organization of companionate marriage “meant the extension of assembly-line techniques into the bedroom.”¹¹⁰ Experts were called upon to intervene in the realm of the body, pleasure, and desire through prescribed sexual techniques.

This construction of heterosexuality did not only come from above, however. It also arose in part out of various forms of resistance to previous forms of the regulation of reproductive and “male” dominated men/women sexual and family relations. Paradoxically, forms of resistance to earlier forms of different-gender familial and sexual regulation played a part in the construction of heterosexual hegemony. This led to the articulation of the “ideal” of companionate marriage and notions of an “active” female heterosexual desire that was based on a necessary or essential erotic attraction between men and women. While some women were able to expand their possibilities for pleasure in relations with men, the longer-term implications of this shift would not be so positive for women, and certainly not for women who loved and had sex with other women. This process developed unevenly over several decades.

This period has been described as one of veritable “heterosexual counter-revolution” against feminism, whereby forms of same-gender friendship, intimacy, and support networks between women were transformed into the perversions of “lesbianism.”¹¹¹ Early studies of sapphism, or lesbianism, had investigated the “masculine” partner in

same-gender relationships between women for her supposed physiological peculiarities in menstruation and for her allegedly large clitoris. Attention was now extended to all women—even those deemed “feminine”—involved in same-gender sex and those in rupture with the two-gender binary.¹¹²

Distinct lesbian experiences and cultures came about through a different social process than did homosexuality among men, and it did not reach fruition until a few decades later. This process involved a degree of economic independence and social spaces apart from men, the seizure of these spaces and the cultural resistance of women involved in same-gender sex, and the articulation of “lesbian” in scientific and medical discourse—which was used to police women’s sexuality in general. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it became possible for more women to live alone or to share boarding-house rooms with other women.¹¹³ The rise of feminism facilitated the emergence of female autonomy and support networks for some women. Companionate marriage and heterosexual culture were partly a response to feminism and same-gender eroticism among women.

Lesbian experiences in the United States had roots in the tradition of working-class women who “passed” as men¹¹⁴—sometimes living with other women—and the tradition of passionate romantic friendships between white middle-class women. Among Black and working-class women, this cultural formation took place in the 1920s American jazz scene, in early networks of apartment parties, and in the few bars and clubs in which women could gather.¹¹⁵

Among the middle class and intellectuals, there emerged a number of lesbian literary circles. In the 1920s, a community of middle-class lesbians, most of them financially independent, was formed in Paris. The case of Radclyffe Hall’s *The Well of Loneliness* in 1928 was the lesbian equivalent of the Oscar Wilde trial. The book was banned because Hall “had not stigmatized [lesbianism] as in any way blameworthy.”¹¹⁶ The resulting suppression of lesbian literature generated enormous publicity for lesbianism. Thousands of women wrote to Hall, and this helped give lesbianism a name and an image.¹¹⁷

The development of the welfare state meant the entrenchment of women’s subordination and sexual regulation into the centre of state social policy.¹¹⁸ State policy now embodies defence of the “traditional” family, institutionalized motherhood, and women’s dependence on men—or, in their absence, on sub-poverty funding, and policing by welfare agencies. State intervention established as normative the two-parent heterosexual family and as deviant all other forms of family and social life. These same social policies helped organize institutionalized heterosexuality.¹¹⁹ This had particular impacts on Black and Indigenous family formation.

Lesbian and homosexual cultures have taken on different features according to gender and patriarchal social organization and according to class and race. Heterosexual hegemony emerged in response to these “deviant” forms of sexuality. Homosexual and lesbian cultures and heterosexual hegemony, then, are two sides of the same relational process that is part of a series of gender, class, and racialized struggles in the formation

of a capitalist, racist and patriarchal society. In the next chapters, I will explore how this historical process took place in what is currently called Canada. Many of the same influences I have explored in this chapter are also present in Canadian history, but they are combined in a specific fashion.

Sexualities in Canadian History

Problems of Sources and Interpretation

“Canadian historians have been particularly reticent to discuss the historical phenomena of homosexuality,” wrote Geoffrey Egan in 1980.¹ The other side of this reticence has been an assumption that everyone has been heterosexual throughout the history of the Canadian state. This, of course, has not led to any critical problematization of the construction of heterosexuality. History, like other “disciplines,” has been dominated by heterosexism. My approach is rooted in a critique of the dominant Canadian historical “traditions”—that of the orthodox history of the “great white men who founded the country” and of the “fathers” of Confederation, but also of most left-wing and political economy-oriented approaches.

There has been little historical investigation until recently of same-gender sexual experiences and the two-gender binary, the emergence of heterosexuality, and the development of heterosexual hegemony in Canada. This excursion toward a queer history of Canada draws on some important early efforts. Even though I celebrate and have learned much from the important contributions from feminist, anti-racist, and gay and lesbian historians in developing critical histories and analyses of sexual regulation in Canada since the first edition, this is still an initial work.² My purpose, given that the scope of this book is so broad, is to present these various historical narratives often in a rather fragmented and partial form; the work of more adequately interpreting them and constructing a more comprehensive history still needs to follow. It is work I hope to inspire others to do. My historical research has been more detailed for the period from the 1950s on and includes interviews with those involved in queer activities during these years. My analysis is therefore more developed and grounded for these years.

The first question in this exploration of sexuality in what is now called Canada is one of scope, sources, and interpretation. I cannot analyze the specific national developments in Québec in the same way, given its distinct national, cultural, linguistic, and religious history. However, much of what I outline will be applicable to Québec society given the common state and criminal-law framework since the English conquest.³ None of this can be addressed without rooting this analysis of the settler colonial character of Canadian state formation, which I address in the Introduction to this third edition and in the next chapter.

There has been no constant gay, lesbian, or trans minority, or heterosexual majority in Canadian history. When looking for evidence of same-gender sexual activity, we must not read back into the past our own modern-day categories. What we are looking for, then, is not a continuous history of homosexuality, lesbianism, or heterosexuality, or of “men” and “women,” but instead histories of the shifting social organization of gender and sex and erotic pleasures.

Various social meanings have been attached to sex and gender activity in the languages and literatures of the past. The actual names for same-gender sex (and same-sex sex when these do not coincide) have ranged from many different terms in the languages and cultures of the Indigenous peoples, to the legal terms of “sodomy,” “buggery,” and “crime against nature” in the French and English periods, to terms like an “Oscar Wilde type,” a member of the “third sex,” to “queer,” and “dyke,” and to more contemporary terms like “homosexuality” and “lesbianism” after the formation of the Canadian state and the rise of the medical and sexual sciences at the beginning of the twentieth century. Furthermore, the use and meaning of the words themselves have varied markedly according to period and social context.

In the period between the establishment of British North America and the formation of an urban capitalist society and a somewhat autonomous Canadian state, sexual and gender regulation and understanding were radically transformed. In the nineteenth century, terms used to describe same-gender sex in various official discourses ranged from “crime against nature,” to “sodomy” and “buggery,” to the “secret sin,” “sex perversion,” “sexual immorality,” and the “social evil.” As we will see, others toward the end of the century began to use expressions like a man of the “Oscar Wilde type” and a member of the “third sex.” In Western Canada from 1880 to 1920, says Terry Chapman, “sodomy” generally referred to anal intercourse with a human (either male or female), while “bestiality” referred to anal intercourse with an animal. The term “buggery,” however, officially included both sodomy and bestiality.⁴

Vern Bullough and Martha Voght have pointed to what they call the confusion of same-gender sex and masturbation, which were both called the “secret sin” in nineteenth-century US medical and popular discussions.⁵ In the context of nineteenth-century North American social life, however, the two were not yet necessarily distinguished as socially different types of activity. Bullough and Voght are therefore projecting back a distinction that did not yet exist.⁶

All non-reproductive sex was thought to lead to degeneration, in the theory of the “spermatic economy,” since “precious bodily fluids” were considered wasted.⁷ Such notions established the context for much official and indeed popular discussion of sexuality in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In *Our Sons* (1914), for instance, William Lund Clark refers to the “secret vice” and “self-abuse” that cause the body’s secretions to be wasted, and he laments a boy’s not becoming “the splendid young man he might have been.” He refers to boys who were “taught that act by an older companion,” “even in the presence of their friends,” and quotes one boy: “I was taught that habit three years ago...by a man in my home town. He took six of us to his house and taught us that evil.”⁸ In this text, there is no notion whatsoever of the homosexual or the

contemporary homo/hetero polarity, and there is no distinction between the “secret vice” of solitary masturbation and joint sessions, or indeed being introduced to the practice along with five other boys by an older man. The “homosexual” in this Protestant and social-purity-oriented discourse had not yet emerged as a distinct sexual type. It is important to remember the unevenness of the development of sexual discourses and identifications. In some more medicalized discourses, the homosexual would already have emerged while in other more religiously based discourses the homosexual did not yet exist. Sexual discourse is never monolithic and different discursive frameworks are in use in different sites at the same time.

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Canada, a number of words may have been used to describe same-gender desire by those in positions of power and influence. Most, building on earlier social definitions, grouped same-gender pleasures with other prohibited sexual or social activities. For instance, the Canadian social-purity movement grouped sex work, masturbation, and same-gender sex under “social evil,” “sexual perversion,” and “sexual immorality.” Only in the 1890s would emerge “homosexual” and “lesbian,” and later “heterosexual.” The important work of tracing the specific emergence of “the heterosexual” in Canada, as Jonathan Katz has done for the US, remains to be carried out.⁹

Because of the socially organized “private” or “personal” character of intimate sexual relations, there has been little public record of same-gender sex aside from the “deviant” or “criminal” behaviour found in police records, government reports, newspaper articles, medical and psychiatric discourse, and sex-advice literature. Since same-gender eroticism was stigmatized, historically valuable diaries and letters have not been preserved. Gay, lesbian, and trans oppression has led to the destruction of many first-hand accounts, or to their never having been recorded or written down because they would provide evidence of “homosexuality” or “gender deviance” with possible damaging consequences for those individuals. Or these records have been destroyed by those who came later to preserve (or more accurately to produce) the heterosexual and gendered “purity” of the individual’s public record. The voices of those people engaged in same-gender sex and gender diversity have thereby been silenced. This has been a feature of the social organization of heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary.

While we must use police records, legal and court reports, social-purity tracts, social-service reports, and newspaper stories, we must be wary of relying uncritically on them. All of these sources stand in an administrative relation to the actual experiences of the men, women and gender diverse people engaged in same-gender sex and gender diversity and are part of constructing them as social problems. We can critically examine accounts from these ruling agencies, however. I try to analyze them to expose their process of social construction and the work of the ruling regime in sexual and gender categorization. These official accounts are therefore not treated as “objective” or “factual.” Instead, I attempt to interrogate them from the vantage points of those who engaged in same-gender eroticism and gender diversity. This becomes easier and clearer when we have first-hand accounts from these people themselves.¹⁰

The resources necessary for a historical account of the emergence of lesbian, gay, and trans life in Canada and of heterosexuality remain widely dispersed, waiting to be recovered from the mists of the past by innovative activists and historians. Lesbian and gay and now trans history has been one of the most exciting frontiers to emerge out of the queer and trans liberation movements. Queer and trans historians are not necessarily professionally trained historians, which has often given the lesbian and gay and trans history movements a more grass-roots character. Much of the early innovative work was done by community-based groups. Lesbian and gay history, along with feminist and anti-racist histories, have been the major inspirations behind the development of more general critical sexual and gender histories and has made it possible for some people to begin to investigate the history of heterosexuality and the gender binary.

Historical investigation is also hampered by a general lack of critical analysis of Canadian social and state formation, especially as it relates to moral, gender, sexual, colonizing and racial regulations. While the Canadian political-economy tradition has undertaken some useful historical examinations, there has been little critical work on social organization and social policies until recently. Political-economy approaches have tended to reduce class relations to a narrow economic realm that marginalizes sexual and gender and often racializing and colonizing relations.¹¹

A major pre-condition of the Canadian state was the colonization, genocide, and marginalization of the Indigenous peoples; a continuing problem is their containment, regulation, and management, as we saw in Kaneshatake in 1990.¹² The management of French speaking people and the Québécois and the Acadians has also been a key aspect of Canadian state formation. From the days of the fur trade and the colonization of the Indigenous peoples, Canadian state formation has been bound up with French, British, and then American social and political developments.

British interest in a territory in opposition to the United States led to alliances among the regional elites and a division between the central state and the provinces as laid out in the British North America Act in 1867. During the period 1850 to 1930, Canada was transformed from a series of rural trading colonies tied to England to a consolidated state apparatus divided between Ottawa and the provinces. Canada was at this point a tributary territory in a subordinate alliance with British imperialism.

In Canada the...development of class arising in relation to indigenous economic organization is given a distinctive character by the intersection of the leading section of the Canadian ruling class with that of Britain.¹³

The United States would later, in an uneven fashion, replace Britain as the chief influence. Within the context of referenced and semi-autonomous development in relation to Britain and then the US, there has been an active and somewhat autonomous state-making strategy within the Canadian territories.

This history has resulted in the adoption of British and American forms of sexual and gender organization. Sexual and gender discourses and practices from England and the United States have entered into Canada, subordinating or ruling out other possible

ways of social and sexual life. Any examination of Canadian sexual and gender history must therefore be prefaced by a brief overview of the colonization of the Indigenous peoples, and English and United States developments (undertaken in the last chapter).

Before Confederation, the statutes of the Imperial British Parliament applied to the colonies and, after Confederation, legal statutes and procedures were borrowed from Britain.¹⁴ The medical and sexological literature was either English or American, or was derived from such works, and many doctors received their training outside Canada.¹⁵ At a popular level, the sexual-advice literature circulating in English Canada was often American or “British.”¹⁶ Finally, the social-purity organizations had ties with similar groups in the US and England, and their speakers regularly crossed the Canadian-American border.¹⁷

Specifically, Canadian sources in a number of areas are therefore often difficult to come by for the early years. An examination of Canadian history reveals processes of sexual and gender formation and regulation similar to those of its colonizers, although perhaps in a more truncated form and within a more compressed time frame.

The specific features of this process have to do with the particular features of Canadian state and social formation more generally. In the following chapters, I outline what queering Canadian histories might begin to look like.

These narratives focus on major transformations in sexual and gender regulation, the emergence of lesbian and gay experiences, the emergence of heterosexuality, and their relation to other social changes and to the organization of settler colonialism and white supremacy. For the earlier years, the analysis is still quite skeletal, needing to be elaborated and fleshed out by others.

I start with the colonialism and genocidal practices directed at the Indigenous peoples, and their resistance to them.

Sexual/Gender Colonization, Genocidal Practices, and the Resistance of Indigenous Peoples

The colonization of what is currently called Canada led to major conflicts between European social, moral, and sexual life—and understanding of gender—and that of Indigenous peoples. A crucial part of the attempted subjugation of Indigenous peoples was the uneven marginalization and destruction of their diverse forms of erotic, gender, and social life and their uneven subordination to white, colonially imposed forms of social, gender, and sexual organization. There have always been important histories of Indigenous resistance and survival here.

I also remind readers of the important discussion, in the Introduction to this third edition, of how “modern” sexuality and gender emerged against the “threat” that gender and erotic diversity among Indigenous peoples in Turtle Island (and around the world) presented to the consolidation of the gender binary and reproductive sexuality (later heterosexuality) within European colonizing cultures. This was central to separating Indigenous peoples from their social relations to the land through residential schools and other genocidal practices, violence against Indigenous women, girls and Two-Spirit people, and through treaties and the Indian Act. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson has shown that settler colonialism strategically targets Indigenous women, children, and Two-Spirit people in order to break up Indigenous communities and their social relations to the land.¹ Going after gender/sexually diverse Indigenous peoples was a crucial strategy of colonization, and was not only about sex, sexuality, and gender but also very much about land and culture. Settler sexuality, what becomes white European-defined sexuality, is developed in response to the perceived threat that Indigenous ways of doing gender and eroticism bring to colonial power relations that are rooted in white patriarchal governance systems.² This relationality between Indigenous genders and sexualities and the emergence of settler gender and sexuality is crucial to grasp. Colonially imposed views of sexuality and gender are both an attempt to rip apart Indigenous social practices of gender and eroticism and an attempt to place settler gender and sexuality at the very heart of the construction of white settler society.

The standpoint taken up here is in firm defence of Indigenous peoples against colonization and genocidal practices and against this imposition of colonial gender and sexuality on their lives and communities. For this third edition, I recontextualize this revised second-edition chapter in the context of Idle No More activism, Indigenous struggles

against the tar sands and pipelines, including the struggle of the Wet'suwet'en against Coastal GasLink, the Secwepemc against the TMX pipeline, the struggle against the Muskrat Falls dam project, the Mi'kmaq struggle for lobster treaty rights, No Pride in Genocide organizing, and Six Nations Land Back.³ At the same time, I continue to struggle against still too many residues of white settler "anthropology" in this account, despite this commitment. The narrative here is still too defined by settler accounts rather than by the narrative and experiences of Two-Spirit people. I have worked towards addressing this by including excerpts from important contemporary work being done by Indigenous women and Two-Spirit people. This work draws upon contemporary Two-Spirit writers, whose work is integrated throughout the chapter. This chapter is in no way exhaustive but rather offers insights into some of the crucial contributions being made by the various activists, scholars, and writers included in this edition.

There were a number of different processes of colonization that occurred across Turtle Island. Already mentioned is the suppression of gender/sexual diversity which was often a major means of separating Indigenous peoples from their social relations to the land as well as a central vehicle for destroying Indigenous ways of life. One such combined strategy was experienced in the northwest of what is now called Canada, which I focused on in earlier editions. As Ron Bourgeault (Métis) pointed out in his early study of Indigenous peoples and the fur trade, "Class, racial, and sexist divisions came to be imposed upon the indigenous Indian population through colonial relations based upon a particular form of exploitation."⁴

While there existed a vast panorama of erotic and gender relations among Turtle Island's Indigenous peoples, with wide-ranging regional and nation-specific variations, Indigenous women enjoyed more social equality and more decision-making power than European women. Among many Indigenous communities, there was also social acceptance for fluid genders and sexualities. Often the term applied to these individuals by anthropologists and colonizers was "berdache" (derived from the French word *bardache* that refers to "the passive homosexual partner" and/or "male prostitute").⁵ In the last two editions, I unfortunately used this expression, which carries with it ongoing legacies of racism and colonialism. I no longer do this and have learned from Indigenous activists and scholars who have resisted its usage to describe gender and sexual diversity in Indigenous communities. In 1990, at the Third Annual Native American Gay and Lesbian Gathering, the term was problematized due to its pejorative colonial roots, which served as a major catalyst for future gatherings to be called the International Two-Spirit Gathering.⁶ Chelsea Vowel, a Métis scholar, writer, and educator from manitow-sakahikan (Lac Ste. Anne), Alberta, explains that the umbrella term Two-Spirit, while chosen to replace berdache as a less insulting alternative, is still a term rooted in colonial languages and must be carefully contextualized. She writes:

Learning the words is not enough, however. Digging deeper and trying to understand the way Indigenous peoples viewed Two-Spirit individuals is also important. Without that, all we have are equivalents—words we cannot help but think of in the context of their English counterparts. Like it or not, most of us have been educated within the Canadian

system, and European notions of homosexuality, gender, and sex have found their way into every nook and cranny of our minds. Decolonization involves becoming aware of this and consciously trying to reclaim what existed before. It also includes building new traditions if, within specific First Nations, Two-Spirit people were not accepted. This is no easy task.⁷

As Vowel points out, the Canadian education system has predominantly used colonial languages to define gender, sexuality, and eroticism. At the same time, as Jonathan Goldberg points out in a critique of European accounts of “sodomy” among Indigenous people: “Cross-dressing does not mean the same thing from one native situation to another, or even within the same tribe; to believe otherwise is to homogenize all natives into the figure of the Indian, and to once more give in to the ethnocentricity that has invented the category of people without history.”⁸ It is clear that language translation is a colonial tool that centres settler belief systems and colonization. Centring white European languages—such as English and French—at the expense of all others is one way Canadian state formation enacts ongoing genocidal practices against Indigenous peoples. Perpetuation of white settler standpoints must be resisted and rejected in learning from the various experiences of Indigenous peoples. It is vital that pan-Indigenous terms for gender, sex, and sexuality are carefully situated in specific cultural and linguistic contexts.

In some Indigenous groups, women had a degree of erotic freedom that seemed scandalous to white fur traders and missionaries. Pre-marital sex was common, and many Indigenous groups did not view the marriage tie as indissoluble.⁹ Early white explorers, missionaries, and military men brought back to Europe stories of “men” who dressed and worked as women and engaged in “sodomy.”¹⁰ Early anthropologists expressed shock and horror at this eroticism between men. According to one English-language text, Turtle Island Indigenous peoples were inclined to “practical homosexuality.”¹¹ An early Jesuit missionary writing in the years 1711–17 tells of “men who dress as women” and “special friendships among men.”¹² Others reported encounters with people who had fluid gender and sexualities.¹³ From the vantage point of an increasingly gender-binary-based colonial society, these settler perspectives reduced complex genders and sexualities into English and French terms and societal understandings. As mentioned previously in this chapter, English and French terms are rooted in colonial language systems and do not adequately describe pan-Indigenous concepts for sexual, gender, erotic and/or spiritual identities and expressions. Other white European observers interpreted people with fluid gender and sexualities as “hermaphrodites,” which was a medical term that was gaining currency in Europe to describe people with physiological features of both “biological” sexes; in English terms, this group of people are now called intersex people.¹⁴ In some Indigenous communities, these people were later to be known as Two-Spirit people.¹⁵

Unfortunately, until recently for non-Indigenous people (even the most well-intentioned) there were mostly only colonial accounts on which to rely, and these are imbued with white, Christian, racist, “civilizing,” missionary viewpoints. Stories based

on Indigenous peoples' accounts of their own experiences are quite different and, fortunately, many more of these accounts have recently emerged.¹⁶

As mentioned previously in this chapter, in 1990, at the Third Annual Native American Gay and Lesbian Gathering, the English term Two-Spirit was introduced and it was quickly adopted by many Indigenous communities across Turtle Island. It became an umbrella term that defined Indigenous gender and sexually diverse people within a cultural and historic context, distinct from white and Western notions of LGBT and queer. The name came through a vision by Myra Laramée, a member of Fisher River Cree Nation, who was one of the spiritual leaders in attendance at the 1990 gathering. While "two spirits" can be seen as referring to a "male" and "female spirit," this can also be a misinterpretation of what is known as a Spirit Name, a name received from the Spirit World.¹⁷ Alex Wilson, a Cree academic, educator, and community activist from Opaskwayak Cree Nation, explains that

Two-Spirit identity affirms the interrelatedness of all aspects of identity, including sexuality, gender, culture, community, and spirituality. That is, the sexuality of Two-Spirit people cannot be considered as separate from the rest of an individual's identity. Two-spirit connects us to our past by offering a link that had previously been severed by government policies and actions.¹⁸

Even though Wilson's remarks shift into the past, denying historical specificity, which I try to avoid as much as possible, I think it is best to use "Two-Spirit people" here to refer to gender and sexually diverse people in Indigenous communities, since there is now a fair amount of consensus among Indigenous Two-Spirit people on this usage as a pan-Indigenous, self-determined term. At the same time, it is necessary to recognize that there was a great amount of diversity in different Indigenous nations and cultures, and my use of Two-Spirit in this social and historical context must not be used to deny these differences.

The complexities inherent to diverse pan-Indigenous genders and sexualities cannot be interpreted through colonial language systems that render any deviation from heterosexuality a form of institutionalized homosexuality. Western societies reduced human sexuality to simplistic reproductive relations between women and men. They also divided gender into a colonial binary system that contained only two genders: one for men and one for women. From a settler vantage point, some Indigenous communities had "cross-working and cross-dressing" "men," and "women"¹⁹ belonging to the other gender, or to a third or fourth gender that either combined "male" and "female" features, or that was "not man, not woman."²⁰ Changing one's clothes, one's work, and one's social interests in the prevailing division of labour was enough, in some groups, to constitute one's gender.²¹ Gender attribution was based on gender practices in the social division of labour and not on physical attributes. In some of these cultures, these alternate-gender people were seen as combining the spirits of the other two genders. In many of these Indigenous communities, gender was seen as a cultural construction that had to do with the passage through social rituals and engagement in social activities. In

some cultures, these alternate-gender people were later known as “Two-Spirit” and, as previously mentioned, this term has now been claimed by many Indigenous lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, trans, and Two-Spirit activists.

This was a very different social organization of gender than in Europe at that time or in dominant white North American culture today. It is clear that gender was not primarily defined by physiology alone, but rather it also was defined through the types of work and other social activities done by the person, and there was not always a direct link between “biological” sex, gender, and sexual activity. Within and between these gender groupings there were forms of regulation of erotic relations. For a Two-Spirit person, sex could take place with a “cisgender” man, to use another contemporary term. In the context of some Indigenous cultures this would have been considered to be different-gender sex since Two-Spirit and “cisgender man” were socially different genders. Sex might also take place among cisgender men as well. There were also sexual relations between Two-Spirit people and cisgender women.²² Same-gender sexual activity did not threaten the boundaries of gender or sexual life. But we also see here how attempting to use European gender and sexuality terms gets in the way of grasping how this was a very different social form of organizing genders and sexualities. There are major problems here with having to use language from settler social worlds saturated with a naturalized and normalized gender binary.

Furthermore, “cross-dressing” and “cross-working” from the European-defined form of gender practice did not always signify same-sex/same-gender sexual activity—charges of “sodomy” could represent the interpretation of Indigenous activities through European religious and legal categories.²³ What was going on here was a clash between radically different forms of social, gender, and erotic life. Indigenous cultures did not always distinguish between sex with “cisgender” men, and sex with “cisgender” women, or with a Two-Spirit person, and understandings of “deviant” sexual or gender categories did not exist until they were colonially imposed.²⁴

Analysis of pan-Indigenous erotic practices before colonization must take into account multiple forms of social life and not simply read each of them through a white European settler vantage point. I can only begin to do this and still have much to learn from Two-Spirit people. I am not suggesting, in this book, a return to these earlier forms of gender and erotic life, although contemporary Two-Spirit people have found much affirmation and much to reclaim in these practices and traditions, as they remain distinct from “white” queer and trans identifications. Billy-Ray Belcourt discusses the relationship between Indigeneity, queerness, and the notion of tradition, tying them all to settler colonialism.²⁵ In his work, Belcourt critically questions the tendency to think about tradition as ahistorical or timeless, arguing that nostalgia for tradition is actually detrimental, because it forecloses the possibility of building future queer and trans Indigenous social worlds that are not reproducing colonially imposed genders and sexualities. Here, what is often identified as tradition within settler colonial society is taken from settler observations and interpretations of Indigeneity at the point of contact. To contrast this, Belcourt turns to writing poetry as a creative methodology that can show how language for Indigeneity and queerness must always change and shift through

various dynamic contexts, and therefore cannot be contained by colonial language systems. Rather, on seeing how different sex and gender relations have been in the past and continuing into the present, this perspective points out how different they could be in the future. Radical questions that are raised include: Why do there have to be only two genders when we know there are many cultures where there have been more than two, many of which still exist? And perhaps, and more radically, why does there have to be gender as a form of social classification at all?

Returning to the story of the colonization of the Indigenous people in the “Canadian” northwest, the communal and relatively egalitarian social divisions of labour in Indigenous societies were transformed so that Indigenous peoples would produce the desired commodities for the fur trade, disrupting their social relation to the land in the process. The North-West Company and then the Hudson’s Bay Company developed highly structured organizations tied into mercantile capitalism. Indigenous social equality was slowly undermined²⁶ and inequalities between Indigenous “men” and “women” intensified as their labour was appropriated. Trading was organized through Indigenous “men” only, creating a dependency of “women” on men and imposing on Indigenous people a patriarchal division of labour. Part of this transformation was a gradual process of confinement and sedenterization of people who previously moved and migrated over larger territories. This violent process of removal from the social relations to the land was key to colonization and genocidal practices. The organization of the fur trade, treaties, residential schools, reserves, and the attempt to marginalize Indigenous gender practices were all part of this violence.

As individual commodity production developed, the communal organization of Indigenous cultures was ripped apart. Merchant capitalism was compelled to destroy Indigenous women’s previous decision-making powers, making them into dependent support workers. Some Indigenous women began to realize it would be in their interests to take advantage of relationships with European men.²⁷ The male colonizers, meanwhile, saw that these women could be of use in penetrating communal societies and establishing trading relations. “Indian women became a valuable commodity,” says Bourgeault, “and were exploited both politically and sexually in the conquest of Indian society.”²⁸ White women were prohibited from the fur-trade territories so that traders were permitted to take “country wives” (*mariage à la façon du pays*). They could thus take advantage of not only Indigenous women’s skills and their bodies, but their all-important kinship networks as well. Through such marriages, the women were linked to both particular Indigenous kinship networks and specific trading posts. The children of mixed marriages were raised as “Indians,” creating the basis for a new labour market of “mixed-blood” people who would later be called Métis. Indigenous women’s dependency on men increased as they became support workers within the individual family and reproducers of labour. These social changes, along with church and state practices, transformed Indigenous sex, gender, and social life.²⁹ By the 1820s, however, white women were being admitted to the fur-trade territories and many of the traders repudiated their Indigenous wives for white wives.

There were many regional variations in this process of colonization, and there were various instances of Indigenous resistance, depending on differences in involvement within productive labour, gender relations, the official policies of French and English authorities, and the role of the Church and the missionaries. This resistance included protecting and hiding these third and fourth genders, or Two-Spirit people, from the white settler gaze.

In her account, which somewhat contrasts that of Bourgeault, Karen Anderson stresses the key role of state and church agencies in the subordination of Indigenous peoples. Her account of the effects of European colonization on two different Indigenous groups finds that women among the Montagnais-Naskapi were denied access to productive activity and made dependent on male relatives while, among the Huron-Wendat, kin-based social relations of production continued to guarantee women, as well as men, access to the necessities of life. As a result, it was not until later that gender relations were substantially transformed among the Huron-Wendat.³⁰ Anderson's analysis points to the need to examine the specific effects of the European incursion into the social, sexual, and gender life of different Indigenous groups and their relations to the land. There is a diverse range of Indigenous resistance and accommodation that must be examined in much more detail than can be done here.

Christianity played a fundamental role in "civilizing" Indigenous peoples and in creating one of the preconditions for Canadian state formation. Formation of this state was constructed in opposition to Indigenous ways of life and was based on their destruction and marginalization through genocidal practices. Says Bourgeault, "It was with Christianity that the ideological conquering of the Indian finally took place."³¹ Missionaries, fur traders, police, residential school teachers and administrators, and colonial agencies attempted to firmly link gender with masculinity and femininity and with reproductive forms of sex and Christian marriage, while also disrupting Indigenous relations with the land, establishing ties to specific locations and not broader territories. In the 1880s, for instance, as part of this mission, Canadian police forced a Two-Spirit person to wear men's clothes and to have their hair cut.³² As Katz explains for the American experience:

It seems reasonable to speculate that the elimination of native sodomy, cross-dressing and cross-working was early a common part of the Europeans' conversion mission, that genocidal enterprise by which white men in the employ of the church and state systematically forced their own "civilization" upon the original inhabitants in America, exterminating them in the name of Christian morality and rights of Empire.³³

With the centralization of British North American possessions into the Canadian state, the Anglo bourgeoisie shifted its interests to the West, the preserve of the fur-trading companies. This brought white settlers and state agencies, including their police forces, into conflict with the Indigenous and Métis populations, which existed at least partially outside their rule. With the crushing of the Riel rebellions in 1885, "the subjugation

of the Métis was completed with the formation of Canada as a Nation-State.”³⁴ But Indigenous resistance continued.

Also key to this subjugation was the official state strategy of assimilation and the residential school system “death camps,” through which young Indigenous people were taken away from their parents and communities and were denied the right to speak their own language or to engage in the cultural and linguistic practices of their communities, including gender practices. The treaties imposed on Indigenous peoples and the conditions that they laid down for life on reserves also played a major part in the subordination and transformation of Indigenous life. As Martin Cannon has pointed out, the Indian Act attempted to enforce patriarchal, two-gender, and what become heterosexist relations on Indigenous peoples.³⁵

Along with treaties, the Indian Act contributed to the ongoing removal of Indigenous peoples from their social relations to the land. Bonita Lawrence, of Mi’kmaw, Acadian, and English background, has done important work looking at gender discrimination in the Indian Act. In this work, she points out that the Gradual Enfranchisement Act, passed in 1869, institutionalized the concepts of “status Indian” and “nonstatus Indian” in this patriarchal state: textual constructions of different statuses for Indigenous peoples.³⁶ This was the first time that a Canadian statute created strict definitions for “Indian status,” which had specific implications for Indigenous women and feminine Two-Spirit people. Prior to this statute being passed, the definitions for who was Indigenous were loose and nonrestrictive. Lawrence explains this loose definition, however, “could not allow for the kind of control that could make a person born Native (and her offspring) legally white.” In order to do this, Lawrence continues, “‘Indianness’ had to be codified, to make it a category that could be granted or withheld, according to the needs of the settler society.”³⁷ This shows how the Indian Act functioned to introduce and uphold colonial patriarchal power relations in Indigenous communities, where Indigenous women and feminine Two-Spirit people were deemed subordinate to Indigenous men. Lawrence writes:

As a result, until 1985, the Indian Act removed the Indian status of all Native women who married individuals without Indian status (including nonstatus Canadian Indians and American Indians, as well as white men), and forced them to leave their communities. The same act gave Indian status to white women who married status Indians; this would remain part of the Indian Act until 1985. Loss of status was only one of many statutes that lowered the power of Native women in their societies relative to men. Because of the many ways in which Native women were rendered marginal in their communities, it was extremely difficult for them to challenge the tremendous disempowerment that loss of status represented.³⁸

Lawrence, taking up Ann Stoler’s work, explains that European settlements in Canada had deeply rooted colonial anxieties that manifested as the need for “maintaining colonial control” by “rigidly asserting differences between ‘Europeans’ and ‘Natives’ to develop and maintain white social solidarity and cohesion.” One of the focuses was on

meeting the needs of white settler society by imposing frameworks for a cohesive white identity, which relied on colonial patriarchal governance systems. Colonial governance systems impacted Indigenous women and Two-Spirit people in specific ways that led to the loss of important identity and kinship ties. In these frameworks, Indigenous women and feminine Two-Spirit people would lose legal status and important access to their families and communities by marrying white men. However, due to a “racist patriarchal framework governing white identities,” white “European women who married Native men were considered to have stepped outside the social boundaries of whiteness.”³⁹ It is clear that European white settler societies saw any form of difference as a threat to colonial systems of control.

Through gender discrimination in the Indian Act, marriage was used to regulate Indigenous legal status and enforce white patriarchal governance systems that controlled Indigenous women’s and Two-Spirit people’s access to their communities, kinship networks, legal status, and social relations to the land. The impacts of this are ongoing.⁴⁰ Settler colonialism imposed—and continues to impose—Eurocentric sexualities, gender discrimination, and familial relationships upon Indigenous peoples and communities. Heterosexuality and monogamy negate Indigenous kinship networks that include multiple persons and non-human relations. TallBear points out that the imposition of what becomes heterosexuality on Indigenous peoples is entwined with the colonization of Indigenous land, arguing that “Compulsory monogamy and the related institution of marriage have helped to structure land tenure” and the social, economic and political organization “of Western states,” adding that, “Settler colonialism has at its heart both hetero- and homonormative entanglements of coupledom, nuclear family, monogamy, and marriage.”⁴¹ Through marriage laws and gender discrimination in the Indian Act, the state excludes Indigenous kinship networks that extend beyond monogamy and include nonhuman relationships. The monogamous couple is at the very root of settler-colonial marriage laws, which are intertwined with property ownership and colonial relations to the land.

The imposition of settler sex and sexuality on Indigenous peoples was entwined with the colonization of Indigenous land. The imposition of marriage relations was therefore crucial to colonization. Chris Finley, member of Colville Confederated tribes, observes the importance of discussions of the colonial imposition of practices regarding gender and sexuality, stating “Heterosexism and the structure of the nuclear family needs to be thought of as a colonial system of violence.”⁴² At the same time, TallBear explains how colonial imposition of monogamous marriage and property laws were part of “a civilizing project” on her Dakota ancestors. She notes:

Government agents and missionaries saw these exchanges of goods for money or pelts as a form of evangelism, the evangelism of the 19th century civilizing project, which is very much still with us today. This included a forced conversion to private property, a market economy, monogamous marriage, nuclear family—all tied up with a rapacious individualism and farming. The whites did not know how to do kinship. This took the Dakota a long time to understand. The Dakota had already been living with French fur traders

for decades whom they had been able to inter-marry with, trade with, incorporate into their societies, although this was not always a bed of roses. Kinship never is. But these new settlers, English and German speaking, only knew how to evangelize, appropriate, and suppress. They had no interest in engaging in kinship relations. They had no interest in learning from Dakota people. They would make treaties in order to get what they wanted, and then renege on their obligations. The Indian must either adapt to their partitioning of the world—the partitioning of lands, communities, forms of love and kinship, resources, and knowledges—into categories that would either discipline the Indian into being a Christian citizen, or would result in their death. The settler state has been very poor kin indeed.⁴³

In this passage, TallBear explains that the recognition of Indigenous kinship must go beyond colonial relationships to land, as Indigenous relationships extend beyond humans to include nonhuman kin—such as lands, waters, and skies—forms of relationality challenged by settler colonialism. As TallBear shows, land ownership revolves around individualism, where property is attached to the individual. Indeed, private property and land ownership figured largely in colonial ideologies. Vowel outlines the Doctrine of Discovery and Doctrine of Occupation as indicative of ways of thinking that were used to justify colonization and slavery. The Doctrine of Discovery suggested that Christians had “the right to take ‘pagans’ (non-Christians) as perpetual slaves,” a notion that made possible the transatlantic slave trade.⁴⁴ The Doctrine of Discovery also assumed that if Indigenous peoples did not transform the lands and resources they inhabited, then Europeans had the right to assume ownership of the land and transform it into private property. Furthermore, the Doctrine of Occupation, or *terra nullius*, assumed that if land was not occupied at the time of contact, then it belonged to no one. Settler colonial ways of relating to land justified industrialization, extractive capitalism, private property, land ownership, and colonization. This is similar to the way in which settler colonialism centres the individual in ways of existing amongst others. Indigenous kinship networks are accompanied by the idea that land is held in common and relationally. Conversely, settler-colonial relationships, which centre the individual, are accompanied by the idea that land can only be possessed by the individual. Settler private-property ownership and compulsory monogamy cannot be considered outside of one another.

The extension of kinship networks beyond state-sanctioned monogamous couplings not only challenges the settler colonial state, but is also a way of coping with insecurity brought on by the global climate crisis. Métis feminist scholar Zoe Todd argues that “Indigenous people have been dreaming of an otherwise since the incursion of violent colonial ideologies, language, and laws into sovereign Indigenous territories in the Americas.” There are important lessons that everyone can learn from Indigenous peoples who, as Todd writes, “have already faced the upheaval wrought by the early forces” of climate change since 1492. These lessons include “principles of loving, accountability, and reciprocity” which “are deeply embedded in Indigenous legal orders and relationships.”⁴⁵ Todd goes on to explain that what she has

...learned from these teachings, from mentors like Tracey Lindberg and Cree legal scholar Val Napoleon, is that reciprocity, love, accountability, and care are tools we require to face uncertain futures and the end of worlds as we know them. Indeed, this ability to face the past, present, and future with care—tending to relationships between people, place, and stories—will be crucial as we face the challenges of the Anthropocene [climate crisis], collectively, in our nations/societies/peoples, and in communities around the globe.⁴⁶

The act of “tending to care” is an important form of anticolonial resistance, one that situates kinship networks outside of colonial governance systems. Here, anticolonial care networks practice relational interdependence as dynamic processes that connect stories, communities, places, and peoples.

TallBear similarly discusses kinship obligations to care for the Indigenous collective as a necessary way of surviving precarity, disrupting the linking of individualism with the word courage:

I end on this word “courage.” That word speaks to individual conviction and fearlessness, or overcoming of fear, in order to do “the right thing.” Having come to consciousness in the long wake of 1862, I have never understood the imperative to speak up as being about individual courage. Rather, I see indigenous peoples’ critiques and ongoing agreement-making as continued calls for non-indigenous people to engage in good relations, which involve exchange, not cruel evangelizing of settler lifeways. Rather than courage, I think in terms of acting out of obligation to the indigenous collective. And this not a moralistic sense of obligation, but it has been crafted through the steady work of kin-making in order to live. We need kin to survive. In turn, indigenous peoples speak out not necessarily from individual courage but rather their irrepressible voices cannot but call attention to injustices, and they continue to call the settler state to account for its failures at kin-making here, with both humans and nonhumans.⁴⁷

As TallBear explains in this passage, Indigenous survival amidst settler-colonial precarity depends upon solidarity and kinship, not individual will or courage. This is necessarily a collective project. It is essential that non-Indigenous people actively learn how to be relationally accountable and responsive to anticolonial kinship obligations.⁴⁸ TallBear extends this message to non-Indigenous settlers:

This isn’t about indigenous peoples being *incorporated into* your world. It’s about you learning how to live here in relation with this place and with peoples who were long co-constituted in relation to these lands and waters and skies. You clearly did not learn how to do that very well. I want to also emphasize one idea that the TRC [Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada Interim Report]⁴⁹ calls for action don’t sufficiently address: Kinship obligations to nonhuman kin were also violated by the settler state. The decimation of humans and nonhumans in these continents has gone hand in hand. When one speaks of genocide in the Americas it cannot be understood in relation

to the European holocaust, for example, that is seen as having a beginning and an end, and which is focused on humans alone. Our genocide in the Americas included and continues to include our other-than-human relatives.⁵⁰

Tending to care and kinship obligations are crucial relational practices that require being in ongoing solidarity with movements of resurgence led by Indigenous women, girls, and Two-Spirit people, as these movements are the sites where important inter-generational teaching and learning radical systems of care, anticolonial resistance, and re-connection across Turtle Island occur.

Indigenous erotic and gender relations came to be subordinated to those of the Europeans. This story of extreme cultural, social, physical, and genocidal violence lies at the root of Canadian state formation and continues in our historical present. Central to this was and is violence against Indigenous women, girls, and Two-Spirit people. It is largely to this white European-imposed history that I now turn, but it must be remembered that *resistance* to this colonization and genocide continues in the struggles for Indigenous liberation, as at Kanehsatake in 1990, and continues today with the struggles against the tar sands and pipelines, including the struggle of the Wet'suwet'en against Coastal GasLink, the struggle against the TMX pipeline, the struggle against the Muskrat Falls dam project, and Six Nations 1492 Land Back Lane.⁵¹ This is also seen in the self-organization of anticolonial resurgence movements led by Indigenous women, and Two-Spirit people.⁵² Central to No Pride in Genocide, Land Back, and opposition to resource extraction capitalism is the defence of land and water as vital social relations that must be defended as such. Possibilities for political transformation, surviving capitalism, and climate justice require learning inherently collective anticolonial social relations to the land and each other.

Buggery and Sodomy in New France, Upper Canada, and the West

The North American colonies imported forms of social and sexual regulation from Europe. In the largely French and British colonies, despite their differing social organization, the interdependent household economy became the main form of social life. In rural Upper and Lower Canada, women and men laboured together in an interdependent family division of labour working on the land. “Men without wives and families laboured under severe handicaps,”¹ and both men and women married out of economic and social necessity. While same-gender sex took place, there was no social place for lesbian and gay networks or for heterosexuality.

Buggery in New France

In New France a number of cases of same-gender “sodomy” among men have been uncovered. The first reported case, in which the governor sentenced to death a young drummer convicted of a “crime against nature,” dates from 1648 and is reported in the *Journal des Jesuites*:

About this time, there was Convictus criminal pessimo [convicted of the worst crime], whose death our fathers who were at Montréal opposed sed occulte; he was then sent hither and put in the prison. It was proposed to him, so that he might at least escape the galleys, to accept the office of executioner of Justice; he accepted it, but his trial was first disposed of, and then his sentence commuted.²

The Montréal Jesuits opposed the initial death sentence and managed to get the convicted man transferred to Québec City.³ This suggests a conflict between the Church and the colonial administration over the regulation of sexual activity—part of a more general conflict between Church and secular state authorities.

A second case is recorded in a judgement of the Supreme Council, the colony’s court of final appeal, in 1691. The court accused three soldiers of sodomy—one lieutenant in a company of marines, and two soldiers of the same detachment. The lieutenant was pronounced guilty of “corrupting the morals” of several men and was banished from the colony on pain of death. The other two were reprimanded before the court for having stooped to such “shameful affections and actions.”⁴ The central focus of the

legal proceedings seemed to be proof of insertion of penis into the anus. Robert-Lionel Séguin, in his book on libertine life in New France, reports that brutal punishments—including the death sentence—for crimes against nature were reserved for the ordinary farmer-soldier as opposed to members of the establishment.⁵ This story also suggests the emergence of networks in the military where, for men who had been separated from their families, comradeship could grow into same-gender sex.⁶

Same-gender sex took place throughout the history of the colonies, from the days of the *coureurs de bois*. Regulation of such activity was most severe, as it was in England, in the armed forces and in the new settlements. Military forms of organization brought together groups of men in same-gender contexts that created possibilities for friendships and eroticism. These networks of same-gender eroticism among military members produced some of the resources and experiences for the later expansion of same-gender erotic networks. At the same time, the existence of these erotic friendships between men also led to heightened forms of policing of same-gender sex in military contexts.⁷

Buggery in Upper Canada

There were also instances of prosecution for same-gender sex in Upper Canada in 1838, just months after the 1837 rebellion for democracy and independence had been crushed, George Herchmer Markland, the Inspector-General of Upper Canada, was forced to resign after charges that he took young men, often soldiers, into his office for sex. He was accused before the Executive Council of behaviour “derogatory to his character as a public officer.”⁸ Markland’s troubles started when a housekeeper alleged that she heard noises and movements coming from his office that led her to believe “there was a female in the room with whom some person was in connection.” When she learned that it was not women, but young men, she exclaimed, “Well, sir, these are queer things from the bottom to the top.” An inquiry was launched and Markland was forced to resign. During the course of the inquiry, a number of young men remarked on Markland’s “criminal intentions” and “uninvited advances.” The exact reason for his resignation is unclear. He may have been used to show that the Family Compact (the Upper Canadian ruling clique) could clean up its act following the rebellions. It may have been that his activities became public, or that he crossed class lines in his erotic tastes. It was fortunate for Markland that the full force of the law was not used against him. Under the Imperial statutes then in force, the penalty for sodomy and buggery was death. As Ed Jackson suggests, the inquiry gives us some idea of the terminology for male same-gender sexual acts in official circles in nineteenth-century Canada: “The references by witnesses are consistently in terms of the ‘crime’ or ‘criminal conduct’ or else distasteful circumlocution (‘an ugly look about it’). The concepts of sickness and perversion were to come later.”⁹

In 1840 and 1841, Toronto newspapers carried a story about Richard Yeo, a dancing master who was “arraigned on an abominable charge” for committing an “unnatural crime” against a private. The papers referred to him as “resembling less a man than a monkey.” Yeo was sentenced to one year in the new Kingston penitentiary.¹⁰

In 1842, Samuel Moore, Lance Corporal, and Patrick Kelly, Private, of the 89th Regiment of Foot were convicted of sodomy. Another private, in sworn testimony before Her Majesty's Justice of the Peace in Canada West, Eastern District, stated that he had found the two men together in bed.

Kelly was lying on his belly, the bed clothes were on the floor—both men were naked. I saw Moore on the top of Kelly working away as if it was a woman. Then the Alarm was given Moore rose up and I saw his private parts come out of Kelly's body.¹¹

They were found guilty and sentenced to hang, but this sentence was later commuted to life imprisonment. Both served about a decade in the Kingston penitentiary.¹²

These incidents suggest the beginnings of networks for sex among soldiers and guards and, in some cases, involving members of the elite and middle class. Some of these elite men may have been in positions to help working-class youth, in Markland's case by getting a young man out of the army and into another occupation. Working-class young men in the military may have been able to negotiate relations with elite men that not only led to erotic pleasure but also economic benefits for themselves as well. Sex work may also have been involved. These networks seem to have some similarities to those involving guards and regiments in England.¹³

Community Social Regulation and the Charivari

In the small towns and rural communities where there was no extensive form of state policing, social regulation was based on community pressure and exclusion combined with religious and church prohibition and, less prominently, the law. Beth Light and Alison Prentice describe the regulation of women's lives:

Community pressure and the forces of public opinion operate in myriad ways. Exclusion, a typical response to deviance in traditional societies, was one method of controlling women. Thus, bad women were chased out of town, white women denied access to fur trade country, and "respectable" women discouraged from walking the city streets at night.¹⁴

Based on traditions of European popular justice, community rituals like the charivari, or rough justice, sometimes regulated social behaviours.¹⁵ Charivari, which were common in early Canada, were used to punish wife-beaters, adulterers, and violators of racial, ethnic, or religious values.¹⁶ It was a way of enforcing gender and sexual norms before the centralized state and police forces had developed. The charivari often took the character of a community celebration, although violence and riots sometimes broke out. Some forms of the ritual involved cross-dressing since it granted a license to defy social conventions. While the charivari enforced traditional social practices, it also had a potentially subversive side: it was used, for instance, during the Patriote agitations in Lower Canada preceding the popular democratic rebellions of 1837–38.

Charivari, here was a world turned upside down, a carnival atmosphere of disguise producing the possibility of overturning the social relations of a paternalistic order.¹⁷

The magistrates and the police therefore vigorously opposed this form of popular justice—it was not the kind of social life required by a “civilized” capitalist state. In Newfoundland the cultural practice of mummering—when people would get dressed up in disguises (including cross-dressing)—was also used as part of popular protests and class struggles in the 1840s and 1850s against the power and exploitation of the merchant elite. The colonial government of Newfoundland in 1861 in “The Act to Make Further Provision for the Prevention of Nuisances” criminalized anyone “dressed as a Mummer, masked, or otherwise disguised.”¹⁸

Following Confederation in 1867, in most of the Canadian territories the administration of justice was gradually and unevenly taken out of the hands of the local community and moved into the mandates of state institutions. In the immediate post-Confederation years, the federal and provincial supreme courts were established.¹⁹

The Uneven and Combined Development of Sexual Regulation Across the Canadian State

The processes of community sexual regulation followed various patterns. Community and legal regulation did not develop uniformly, and often combined and interacted differently in different regions.²⁰ Terry Chapman says that in the West during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries sex among males was a “socially tolerated and accepted fact of life.”²¹ In logging and mining communities and threshing and railroad gangs,²² in Northern Ontario, in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century bush camps, men not only danced with each other, but some engaged in sex with other men. Gérard Fortin, a Québec Communist Party member and union organizer who spent his early years as a bushworker, gives us a glimpse into his experience:

We all lived together in the big cabins, mostly on stretchers with springs and a mattress, though there were still a few of the old bunks with straw mattresses, on which two men slept side by side under one blanket. I slept with a quiet, decent fellow who was going to get married in the spring. Unfortunately, I guess in anticipation of the event, he lost control of himself during one night. Imagine! I woke up with this fellow busy giving me the works. Not my ring (my ring is intact to this day, in spite of my many misadventures) but he was massaging both of us. We were in the top bunk. I couldn't move too much or everyone would know something was going on. I felt like a stupid ass trying to get rid of him without embarrassing him. He was so shy with me after that!²³

Beth Light and Joy Parr point out that “single men had long lived away from kin in Canadian bunkhouse communities. Domestic forms did not so govern males.”²⁴ In these communities, says Chapman, residents might have “deemed it unnecessary to

press charges [for participation in same-gender sex] as the act was not considered either deviant or criminal.”²⁵

[These groups] had their own form of law and methods of punishment...the culprit could have been subjected to the communities or an unofficial system of law, rather than the official, criminal law...the person could have been ostracized or banished from the area.²⁶

In the West, therefore, and possibly in parts of eastern Canada as well, community forms of justice may have continued to exist in concert with and in conflict with developing legal forms of regulation.

Legal records show that buggery (both sodomy and bestiality) was not an unknown “offence.” There are recorded cases for the years 1890–1920 in the West in places ranging from Vancouver, Victoria, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, and Moosimin, and Humbolt in Saskatchewan.²⁷ In Victoria in 1891, two men were sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment for sodomy; their sentences were commuted to seven years in 1895. The ultimate penalty for buggery (including sodomy) was life imprisonment.

Even though buggery was viewed by a large segment of society as an unnatural act, a crime against nature, more of a sin than a crime, the western judges and juries once again displayed a reluctance to convict and pass the full sentence.²⁸

The penalty in the West for buggery ranged from the option of a fine to one year in prison, to sentences of two to fifteen years. The punishment for “gross indecency,” which was entered into the Canadian Criminal Code in 1890, was usually a short prison term and flogging.²⁹ In the West, sentences for flogging or whipping were partially or totally remitted.³⁰ In 1894, two Vancouver men were convicted of “gross indecency” and sentenced to two years plus twenty-five lashes, but two years later twelve lashes each were remitted.

In Regina in 1895, three men were charged with the “most revolting offence” of “gross indecency of an unnatural character.”³¹ One of the men was Frank Hoskins, the “leading member of the largest dry goods, grocery and wholesale liquor firm in town.” Witnesses reported that through the windows of the dry goods store they saw the three men go into the cellar, where they observed two of the men with pants down around their knees in an apparent act of anal intercourse. One of the participants was apparently overheard saying that they needed some lard; they got some butter, but it was rejected because it was too salty. Later, all three men, with pants around their knees, were apparently observed in acts of mutual masturbation.³²

Before judgement was delivered in this case, a petition for leniency was admitted to court. The petition, which was signed by fifty-one people “personally acquainted” with Hoskins, argued for “as much leniency as possible, even to discharge him under suspended sentence,” and asked that Hoskins be “taken from the Territories.” Hoskins was convicted and fined \$200. He was also ordered to give security of \$500 to keep the peace

for one year—certainly a lenient sentence under the circumstances. The petitioners' request that Hoskins be removed from the territories had the desired result: he left the firm and apparently disappeared from the community, continuing a Prairie tradition of banishment in dealing with sex "offenders."³³

Petitions for leniency may also have been used even in central Canada when the man charged was a member of an ethnic minority group. Steven Maynard reports that, after a Jewish man was charged in 1917 in Toronto for rubbing the penis of another man, the judge was presented with a petition. In the context of widespread anti-Semitism that often associated Jews with sexual "immorality" and "perversion," it testified to the Jewish man's good character and was signed by dozens of Jewish women and men, including presidents of garment-manufacturing firms. The petition did not save this man from six months in the jail farm, but as Maynard suggests "it is evidence that for some men, a tightly knit immigrant community, capable of organizing a collective response, was an important source of support."³⁴

In the late 1900s, and particularly by the last few years of that century, Western Canada was being transformed from a "frontier" to a more settled, white-dominated society (although it was already populated by Indigenous peoples and Métis), based upon state-supported white immigration.³⁵ White settlement was one of the themes of Macdonald's National Policy of 1878.³⁶ The West was intended as an agricultural hinterland for central Canadian business, particularly in the transportation, financial, and manufacturing sectors.³⁷ By placing Indigenous nations on reserves and by suppressing Métis resistance in 1870 and 1885, the Dominion opened up millions of acres of land to white settlers. The land survey system, centring on the "free" homestead, was intended to place agricultural settlers on individual tracts of land best suited to family production. The creation of the family farm and interdependent farm economy was a conscious objective of state policy. Legislative and judicial institutions were established, and in 1873, the government set up the North-West Mounted Police as a quasi-military force, largely directed against Indigenous peoples but soon also against workers.

As these plans developed, "bachelors" were increasingly defined as a "social problem." Young, single men settlers were associated with drinking, card playing, and sexual license, thereby threatening Christianity and the image of the holy family.³⁸ As "respectable" white middle-class family life was imposed on the West, as part of this state-building strategy, campaigns of moralization and Canadianization were organized. Immigrants from southern Europe, and particularly those from Asia, were seen as "morally" inferior.³⁹

It seems that the race or ethnic background of a man charged with a sex-related offence influenced the punishment and sentence he would receive. Steven Maynard reports that in Halifax in 1777 a Black man named Prince was charged with committing "sodomy on the body of John Smith," a white soldier. Prince was found guilty and his sentence was to be "carried through the streets of the town and receive 39 lashes in different places and be imprisoned for 1 month." In contrast, Smith was found not guilty. Maynard points out that the court seemed not only concerned with the act of

sodomy itself but was also “concerned by the subversion of racial hierarchies that the sex seemed to represent.”⁴⁰

Racism against people of Asian descent also influenced the application of the Criminal Code, including the laying of sexual charges. The work of *Indiana Matters* suggests that the laws concerning homosexual acts were used particularly strenuously against South Asians in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Vancouver, including the use of police entrapment.⁴¹

As settlement and institution-building proceeded, regulations of sexual behaviour became more rigid. Says Chapman, “as the West became settled [by Europeans] and more [white] women arrived, the rise in conviction rates reflected a shift in social tolerance.”⁴²

Regarding developments in Ontario, Karen Dubinsky, in her study of rape and heterosexual conflict in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, describes how, in an uneven process, earlier community-based forms of social and sexual regulation were often combined with newer legal forms of regulation shaping how these legal processes were implemented. Eventually, these community forms of regulation were supplanted by legal hegemony.

I have documented the slow and uneven pace of development of legal hegemony. Sexual crimes provide a distinctive forum for studying the development of legal authority, for in this period, in these regions, legal structures were often rudimentary and communities continued to play an active role in moral regulation and punishment. The change in moral regulation from community scrutiny to community participation in the legal system to the final “triumph” of legal hegemony did not occur in a straightforward or linear manner, for all three were evident for this period.⁴³

I now turn to the formation of the Canadian state and the shift to an increasingly urban settler-colonial and racist capitalist society. These social transformations had an important impact on the emergence of homosexuality, lesbianism, and heterosexuality.

“These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species”

The Emergence of Homosexuality, Lesbianism, and Heterosexuality in Canada

Foundations of Canadian State Formation

From the mid-1800s to the early twentieth century, Canada was becoming increasingly industrialized and urbanized, with its own state and ruling relations, as Indigenous people were colonized and displaced. Some of these changes were prefigured in developments concerning the Upper Canadian school system. Bruce Curtis points out that educational reforms in the late 1830s and 1840s were made with a view to the construction of political subjects and to political socialization in the wake of the 1837–38 democratic rebellions. The school system played an ever more important role as it was extended to more and more young people in making “citizens” and a Canadian “public.”¹ Central to the concerns of the school promoters, says Alison Prentice, were questions of gender, sex, and the body: “How to deal with the growing gap between childhood and manhood was greatly complicated, if not entirely governed, by the whole question of sex.”²

A more specific concern with relations of sex and gender emerged in the context of this political “socialization” and construction of “character” through various practices of moral regulation and governance.³ In the first half of the nineteenth century in both Upper and Lower Canada, the conditions for industrial development were being laid with the formation of internal markets and the intentional creation of an urban working class. By the 1840s, access to the land was restricted, forcing many farm families onto smaller plots and new immigrants into wage-labour.⁴

A number of new concerns were generated through these social changes: the decline of the older Family Compact or Chateau Clique-type colonial elites; the emergence of a more clearly defined capitalist class and middle class; increasing urbanization (although Canada would only become more than fifty percent urban in 1926⁵); and the formation of an urban working class. Previous paternalist forms of social authority were gradually replaced by more centralized state and ruling relations. The old colonial elite gave way to a new capitalist class that developed an alliance with men who were white middle-class professionals in managing and regulating society. Canadian

state formation facilitated the formation of these professional groups. The Canadian Medical Association was founded in 1867, the same year that Confederation took place.⁶ This was all part of a shift from community regulation to “national” and increasingly centralized forms of bureaucratic and professional organization.

Confederation came about through the conjunction of British and developing Anglo-Canadian bourgeois interests to block integration with the US giant to the south. There emerged a particular Canadian system in which there was a division of jurisdiction and tasks between the central federal state and the provinces. Canadian state and settler-colonial nation-building strategies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries combined railway expansion in the West—and the development of a wheat commodity on which it could depend for freight—with land settlement through extensive white immigration.⁷ In Canada, perhaps more integrally than elsewhere, the development of capitalist relations and state formation went hand-in-hand.⁸ In the late nineteenth century, “frontiers” were being settled (after the Indigenous people had been pushed off their land), new agricultural communities were opening up along the railways, towns were emerging, white immigration was increasing, and an East-West transportation and communications system was dramatically altering the landscape, the social fabric, and the lives of Canadians.

New Forms of Social Regulation

The new elite and their ruling agencies, along with middle-class moral reformers, searched for ways to regulate and administer the social organism in the new urban setting.⁹ Older means of moral and social regulation were no longer working. “Traditional” social boundaries were rapidly eclipsed with the emergence of new social spaces and sites and the development of class relations. A fundamental feature of this process was the reorganization of sex and gender relations:

The market economy, the capitalization and mechanization of production, the partition of home and workplace, of producer and consumer, were transforming life in farm and city, separating and increasingly differentiating the material and social circumstances of men and women.¹⁰

The middle class increasingly became interested in the life of the “lower orders.” As early as 1816 (and probably earlier) in Upper Canada, concern had been generated over the living arrangements of mechanics in Kingston. Bryan Palmer reports that “it was suggested that the establishment of a church and individual homes for workmen” would solve this problem.¹¹ Craftsmen were encouraged to marry local women as a way of promoting social stability.¹²

By the late nineteenth century, urban poverty came to be defined by state agencies and middle-class moral reformers as a perplexing problem. The poor were now to be classified and administered as the professionals sought to comprehend and contain them. The “poor,” as a social category, were a creation of these early philanthropic and

welfare agencies.¹³ Middle-class white women played an important role in organizing class relations through their volunteer welfare work, in the process classifying the surplus labour pool in the cities and further defining the boundary between the middle class and the “lower orders.” In Toronto, “increasingly the ‘poor’ lived apart from and unconnected to ‘respectable’ society in a way unprecedented in the city’s history.”¹⁴ The poor were considered either reformable or beyond redemption—as worthy or unworthy—categories that would later become integral features of the policies of the welfare state.

By the 1890s, social order seemed to be in crisis as the “underside of industrial capitalism”—poverty, unregulated homeless children and young people, sex work, non-Anglo-Saxon and non-Christian immigration, and crime—was the subject of numerous studies and reports.¹⁵ The legal term “juvenile delinquent” was used to classify the “waifs and strays” appearing on city streets. The increasing visibility of ill-clad, undisciplined, and unschooled working-class youth symbolized for middle-class reformers a breakdown of the family contract and a threat to moral order itself.¹⁶ This street culture was seen as a breeding ground for immorality, vice, and crime. Control of the streets meant control of the city as “public” social space emerged. Emerging social agencies policed the “surplus” population, intervening directly in working-class social life. Young people who did not belong to a “proper” family were considered a social problem. Unsupervised youths were shepherded into schools or reformatories. The school system became a crucial agent of discipline and “socialization.”¹⁷

These agencies began to fear that the “foreign” culture of the working class and the poor would “pollute” and “corrupt” society as class cleavages deepened and as working-class struggles emerged. Some of these concerns were focused on the morality of working-class women.¹⁸ Women workers were seen as suffering from both poverty and lack of morals. This anxiety informed the work of the 1886 Royal Commission on the Relations of Labour and Capital:

The commissioners searched diligently for immorality, assuming it to be a necessary consequence of the mingling of the sexes in the factories. Their questions indicated an overwhelming concern about whether overhearing “immoral” language in the factories would cause them to become immoral.¹⁹

In different ways, both pro-capitalist members of the Commission and the worker representatives constructed women workers as raising troubling “moral” questions. While working-class representatives (largely men) defended the virtue of women working outside the home, they also constructed them as at risk for moral dangers. Men workers testified that women working in large mills would be exposed to “immoral words which could lead them to become immoral.” The Commissioners agreed: “morally corruptible women [have] to be protected from the ill effects of words.”²⁰ Women workers were considered both physically and morally weak. Dr. T.A. Morre, Secretary of the Temperance and Reform Department of the Methodist Church, carried out an investigation of women’s wages. He was far more interested, however, in maintaining

the “innocence” and “purity” of working women than in their low wages.²¹ Alice Klein and Wayne Roberts explain: “Their often compulsive concern for the working women’s purity was rooted in profound anxiety about the changing roles and endangered status of women.”²²

State agencies, religious leaders, and many men workers all played a role in creating the image of the immoral woman who worked outside the home. This provided justification for “protective” legislation—keeping women from competing with men in certain job categories, usually in the skilled and better-paid areas.

Protective legislation placed the parameters of reform well within their traditional notions of womanliness and femininity. Through factory inspection, the state acted as watchdog...over the morality and cleanliness of the environment of women workers.²³

Within the working class, patriarchal family relations were organized by class pressures and the pressures of industrial capitalism and state moralization. The Canadian Trades and Labour Congress had an avowed aim, early in the twentieth century, of eliminating women—particularly married women—from the wage-labour force.²⁴ Working-class social and political life came to be dominated by men. The emergence of the skilled trades was intrinsically tied to notions of social respectability, which, in turn, was equated with economic independence and the family wage paid to men. Working-class men could thereby avoid the stigma associated with charity. Further, this sense of social respectability linked skilled workers with the middle class, establishing a cross-class alliance around certain social and moral “norms.”²⁵ The division of the working class into “respectable” and “rough” was just one more distinction dividing workplace and society: skilled/non-skilled now joined masculine/feminine and adult/child.

Concerns were also generated about the morality of middle-class women. Women who rode bicycles clad in pant-like bloomers were likened to sex workers:

The essential costume for women cyclists, pant-like “bloomers,” scandalized education trustees who charged that women teachers thus attired resembled prostitutes. Unchaperoned riders were “exposed at the road houses to the most dangerous temptations,” warned evangelist Methodists. Fantasies of blazing saddles flashed before the editor of the *Dominion Medical Monthly*, who condemned [bicycle riding] as the latest outlet of carnal passion. “Bicycle riding produces in the female a distinct orgasm,” he wrote. Already, he continued, “Toronto’s scorching thoroughfares make the streets of Sodom and Gomorrah appear as pure as Salvation Army shelters.”²⁶

There was also official concern about “race suicide” as the birth rate among Anglo-Saxons in Ontario dramatically declined; it was feared that Anglo-Saxon stock was being submerged by “inferior” races through immigration and a higher birth rate among Irish-Canadian and French-Canadian Catholics. During much of this time, Catholics were almost seen as a separate race by many Protestants.²⁷ English Protestant social character was considered necessary to the ruling class. Yet, more middle-class Anglo-

Saxon women were staying single.²⁸ There was a particularly low marriage and birth rate among college-educated women. Furthermore, Canada had a high infant and maternal mortality rate, and this was seen as indicative of “race degeneration.”²⁹ Immigrants from China, Japan, and southern Europe were considered a particular threat to the “physical and mental superiority of the native white Anglo-Saxon-Canadian.”³⁰

In the West, alcohol and opium were associated with immigrants while “proper” religion, morality, and good character were associated with Anglos. Indigenous and mixed-blood women and their families found themselves outside the “newly forming respectability.”³¹ Opium use was prohibited except for medicinal purposes. The image of young white women being “seduced” by Chinese men helped to instigate riots against the Chinese.³² The Criminal Code sex legislation was used to discriminate against Asians. Black males were considered by official white society to be long on sex drive and short on mental ability.³³ All this demonstrates connections between sexuality, sexism, and racism, and Canada’s roots as a colonial, class, gender, and race-divided society.³⁴

Thus were fuelled the campaigns for the regulation of immigration and for the “Canadianization” of immigrants. People were denied entry if they were of “bad character” or if they were physical or moral “degenerates.” The churches and the Women’s Christian Temperance Union tried to teach immigrants to be good Christians, and to assimilate them to white middle-class Anglo-Protestant respectability. This was all part of broader attempts to establish social rule over a stable, efficient, disciplined work force made up increasingly of non-English immigrants. A key aspect of this project of moral regulation and reformation was to create a particular kind of Canadian “citizen.”³⁵ Campaigns against alcohol and opium consumption were linked to campaigns against the “secret vice,” the “social evil,” and promiscuity.³⁶

The emergence of eugenics, the study of improving the “quality” of the “race” through selective breeding, led to proposals for the segregation and sterilization of “inferior” immigrants so that “Canada would forever remain white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant.”³⁷ In 1928, the Alberta government enacted Canada’s first legislation for the sterilization of the “mental defective,” which lasted until 1972. Under the terms of this Act thousands were sterilized. Similar legislation in British Columbia was also not repealed until 1973.³⁸

Defending Marriage and Family

There were campaigns to defend and shore up patriarchal family and gender organization. Initiatives were launched against birth control and to get women out of the paid work force and into the home and institutionalized motherhood. The feminist and suffrage movements were blamed for the decreasing birth rate among middle-class white women, the growing divorce rate, the growing numbers of middle-class women who were not marrying, women’s economic independence, and for involving women—horrors of horrors—in the “public” world of production. These campaigns, in a number of ways, were a response to feminism—an attempt to shore up the institutions of marriage and motherhood. In 1908 Rev. C. Sharp told his Toronto congregation:

God abhors the spirit so prevalent nowadays which condemns motherhood. How it must grieve Him when He sees what we call race suicide; when He sees the problems of married life approached lightly and wantonly, based on nothing higher and nobler than mere luxury, and gratification of passion.³⁹

Concerns over motherhood had been developing throughout the late nineteenth century.⁴⁰ By the early twentieth century, the surveillance of motherhood had led to the generation of the concept of the “inadequate mother”—usually immigrant or working-class women without enough time to spend with their kids according to middle-class standards. The anxiety over race suicide and infant mortality was exacerbated by losses in World War I. The war heightened the emphasis on patriotism and maternity and the interdependence of cradle and sword. These national and “racial” concerns led to the introduction of domestic-science training for girls.⁴¹ By the “early twentieth century, motherhood, now a burden of state, a sacred office, and a scientific practice could be none other than a full-time occupation.”⁴² And as Beth Light and Joy Parr also point out: “The ideological sanctity of motherhood as the fount of and essence of female nature grew stronger as the need to bear many children decreased and the choice to raise large families became less common.”⁴³

These social trends led to concerns over sexual morality, particularly sex outside marriage. There had already been considerable white middle-class and “respectable” working-class concern over family instability in the years before World War I due to the social strains of industrialization and urbanization. Divorce had been difficult to obtain: in Ontario and Québec, there was no provincial divorce law, which meant divorce had to be granted through a private-member’s bill passed by federal Parliament—a process which took a year and cost at least \$1,000, and was thus not available to the working class.⁴⁴ The divorce rate, however, seemed to be doubling every decade. Desertion, meanwhile, “the poor man’s divorce,” was defined by moral reformers as a serious problem.

Marriage and the family were perceived to be weakening, undermined by general causes such as urbanization, but also by increasing immorality as demonstrated by such “sins of the flesh” as prostitution, adultery and cohabitation outside marriage and by a diminishing sense of responsibility on the part of individuals as shown by non-support, desertion and divorce.⁴⁵

Marriage, home, and the family were considered by ruling social agencies as the essence of a “healthy” community. In the words of Ontario Conservative Member of Parliament E.A. Lancaster, if divorces were granted freely, “the whole social fabric of the country would go to pieces.”⁴⁶ Moral reformers, the social-purity movement, and politicians pushed state agencies to play a stronger role in defending marriage and discouraging sex outside its confines. Sex work, the “social evil,” symbolized all forms of sexual immorality and perversion, and all women’s sexual activity outside marriage was thus identified.⁴⁷

Marriage breakdown operated as a similar, negative symbol. Marriage represented a code of moral and sexual behaviour which was felt to have long ordered society: marriage breakdown, on the other hand, symbolized a wide variety of conduct that was considered immoral, anti-social and unacceptable.⁴⁸

The link between marriage breakdown and sexual conduct was only reinforced by adultery being the main grounds for divorce. Marriage was the only state-sanctioned terrain for sex. Laws were passed to “protect” marriage, to inhibit the social process of marriage breakdown. With the formulation of the Criminal Code in 1892, it became clear that Parliament, and not the courts, would be the main agent of legal change.

The Society for the Protection of Women and Children, under the leadership of D.A. Watt, made use of social-purity literature from England and the United States. Young girls and women must be protected from seduction, they said, and the brothels and the “white slave trade” must be crushed. Use of the term “white slave trade” had clear racial and racist connotations informed by social purity’s symbolic emphasis on whiteness, cleanliness, and purity.⁴⁹ They attempted to make an analogy between the Black slave trade and white women sex workers. Social-purity agitation ignored the problems facing Indigenous women, Black women, and other women of colour and focused on an image of the virginal white girl being led astray by moral perverts.⁵⁰

Watt wrote lengthy tracts on “morals legislation” between 1889 and 1892.⁵¹ As a result, the 1892 Criminal Code included a comprehensive system of offences designed to “protect” young women and girls.⁵² The Criminal Code also included “gross indecency,” referring to sexual acts between men not already covered under “buggery.” These sex offences were codified as part of an attempt to establish the patriarchal family as an unshakeable institution.

Within the House of Commons social-purity activists like Watt often supported the campaigns of Norfolk County MP, John Charlton, for morals legislation to censor “obscene” literature, to criminalize sexual acts outside marriage and to oppose abortion and birth control. For Charlton there was a close relationship “between a strong morality and a strong state.”⁵³

Charlton became especially associated with new legislation against “seduction,” which he argued was necessary to protect women, especially young women, from moral danger. He first introduced such legislation in 1882, and by 1886 a version of it became law. This criminalized “seduction” as opposed to coercive or forcible sexual attack. In these cases, consent was not an issue since the law proclaimed that in certain situations consent to sexual relations could not exist. The law applied only to younger women who were “of previously chaste character” and were between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, or were under twenty-one when sex was tied to a promise of marriage, or were twenty-one and their employer or guardian had “seduced” them.⁵⁴ Throughout the 1880s and 1890s, Charlton attempted to raise the age limits for the protection of women from “seduction.” In her study of the use of these laws in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Ontario, Dubinsky found that criminal “seduction” laws were often used by parents to regulate consensual different-gender relationships.⁵⁵

Social-purity activists continued their campaigns in the succeeding decades in the belief that “the state had a clear right and duty to intrude into the bedrooms of the nation.”⁵⁶ Their work, however, was only one aspect of a broader effort to coerce working-class men into accepting their responsibilities as “proper” husbands and breadwinners, and to force women to be “proper” wives and mothers. The imposition of these white middle-class standards onto the working class was, in turn, only one part of the establishment of the family wage system and patriarchal family relations within the working class.⁵⁷ One way in which this was established was through an intensification of the regulation of non-matrimonial different-gender sex and same-gender sex.

Social-purity arguments influenced both “public” opinion and state policy. This public discussion, meanwhile, also produced a form of secular and popular consciousness of sexuality and sex “education.”

Social Purity

The Canadian social-purity movement was a main force behind the increasing regulation of sexuality, including same-gender sexualities. In social-purity discourse, the “social evil,” and sex itself, were a metaphor for concerns about sexual violence, gender, and racial and class morality.⁵⁸ The social evil became a symbol for national and social degeneration. In England, the social-purity movement emerged partly out of feminist protests against the sexual double standard and the “victimization” of women sex workers. However, given that feminists did not control the institutions and discourses which were coming to define and regulate erotic life, and given the prevailing notions of male sexual lust and female lack of sexual passion, the movement took a morally conservative direction, led by organizations which not only tried to control male lust and violence, but also tried to stigmatize and criminalize women sex workers. The movement which had initially rejected aspects of women’s subordination and attempted to challenge sexual violence from men; now moved in a repressive and anti-feminist direction, arguing for much of the sexual legislation that continued to shape the policing of sexuality until recently: higher age-of-consent-laws for engaging in sexual activities, the criminalization of sex work, and “gross indecency.”⁵⁹ Jeffrey Weeks describes the movement’s views on homosexuality:

In their minds, homosexuality was barely differentiated from prostitution. For the morality crusaders...both were part of the continuum of undifferentiated lust, products of man’s selfishness. Let one crack appear in the moral order and floods of lustfulness would sweep society away. In their minds the syndromes of schoolboy masturbation, public school “immorality” (meaning homosexuality) and prostitution were closely intertwined.⁶⁰

The weakness of radical or socialist feminism in the Canadian women’s and suffrage movements rendered them less resistant to the social-purity trend. Feminism based

on equal rights for women was often subordinated to a maternal feminism that advocated women's rights as a way of protecting and extending the institution of motherhood in the home and in society.⁶¹ Canadian women, unlike their US sisters, did not have the same radicalizing experiences of the mass anti-slavery movement, and only a "small minority suggested that women be freed from familial ties to allow them to pursue careers of their choice."⁶² Canadian feminists like Flora MacDonald Denison, Agnes Deans Cameron, and Carrie Derick were exceptions to this trend, although they were all shaped by white racism.⁶³ Indeed, several of the women's movement and suffrage leaders belonged to social-purity groups.⁶⁴ At that time, mainstream feminism in Canada had a white, largely Christian character, and was very concerned about non-white and non-Christian immigrants.

In order to understand the suffragists' social attitudes we have to understand the values of the group with which they identified. As Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, middle-class, such women shared the anxieties and expectations of this group. They saw women's problems through glasses tinted with values shaped by this allegiance.⁶⁵

At the same time, African-Canadian or Black women were beginning to organize, but these women were excluded and marginalized from the mainstream of Canadian feminism.⁶⁶ There were also feminist initiatives based among Indigenous women.

The social-purity movement was led for a number of years by Reverend J.C. Shearer, the secretary of the Toronto-based Social and Moral Reform Council of Canada, "a federation of the social and reform departments of all the leading churches and temperance and reform organizations of Canada" and the "strongest force in the Dominion for the advancement" of social purity. The Social and Moral Reform Council was affiliated with social-purity organizations in the US and England. *The Light*—the official organ of the International American Purity Federation—reached a reported 75,000 readers in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and elsewhere.⁶⁷ The Canadian Purity Education Association, staffed by medical doctors, existed in Toronto from 1906–15.⁶⁸ The previously mentioned Society for the Protection of Women and Girls, led by D.A. Watt, which played a crucial role in law reform, was an important part of this movement.

The purity movement—moral reformers, clergymen, doctors, and members of the National Council of Women—focused their campaigns on the "social evil," usually referring to women sex workers but often referring to sexual immorality in general—masturbation, possibly same-gender sex, sex outside marriage, as well as sexual violence against women. Their definitions could include "self-abuse," or masturbation, and same-gender sex with "perverse" practices. For example, *Jack Canuck*, the Canadian equivalent of the *Police Gazette* in its sensationalizing of the underworld, once warned in an article of the white slave trade "of boys being led astray by moral perverts."⁶⁹ It is not clear who the "moral perverts" are here, but there is a suggested linkage between women sex workers and boys engaging in masturbation or same-gender sex. In 1912 the social-purity-inspired Vigilance Committee listed in a pamphlet as one of its objectives

to support “efforts to aid in preventing boys being led astray by moral perverts.”⁷⁰ Here the mobilization of this expression against male same-gender sex was part of a broader social-purity campaign against sex work, immoral plays, and indecent pictures.

Many women engaged in casual forms of sex work as a means of survival.⁷¹ The social-purity campaigns, in alliance with business interests and the police, took advantage of white middle-class fears about the character of “public” space to stigmatize and criminalize sex workers. Yet at the same time they created an image of the sex worker as a “victim” in the “white slave trade.”

Belief in the essential vulnerability of women precluded recognition of the fact that a woman may not have been duped at all, but may have acted on her own evaluation of her position and alternatives.⁷²

The social-purity perspective ignored women’s financial reasons for involvement in the trade, simply calling for state “protection” rather than looking at women’s social, class, and sexual situations. They also ignored many young working-class women’s desires to actively explore and experience the pleasures of city life.⁷³

Social purity helped establish a number of commissions to investigate and survey the “social evil.” In 1913 a Social Survey Commission was set up in Toronto at the request of the Toronto Local Council of Women.⁷⁴ The Commission was made up of members of the Young Men’s Christian Association, the Toronto Local Council of Women, the Roman Catholic Archbishop, the Salvation Army, the city’s medical health officer, other religious figures, and academics. Their report, released in 1915, relied on various other vice commission reports, including the report of the Chicago Vice Commission. While noting that they found little evidence of the “white slave trade” in Canada, they criticized police indifference to sex work and recommended the “total suppression” of prostitution. They also generated a new concept of the “occasional prostitute,” referring to women who went out on dates with men to parks and ice cream parlours and may have had sex with them.⁷⁵ Among the causes of the “social disease,” they listed poverty, overcrowding, boarders—“which necessarily lead towards immorality”—and the great tide of immigration which brought with it “foreigners” with different standards of sexual morality and the growth of “feeble-mindedness.” There were five thousand unmarried men in Toronto with no living quarters except a bedroom, said the report.

At the same time, their major focus was on young, white, unregulated working women who were tempted by the amusements of the city to engage in occasional sex work. Poverty itself was not seen to be the cause of this, since some women working for wages survived on low wages and managed to protect “their virtue,” but was seen instead as a moral failing. The report associated feeble-mindedness with “sexual immorality” and pronounced that sex work was caused by “abnormal sensual propensities and lack of moral perception.” “Feeble-minded” women (often including unwed mothers) were linked with low morals. The report also linked the increase in infant mortality and sexual diseases like syphilis with sex work and “promiscuous sex relations.” A sexual appetite was natural in men, it said, but in women “...the desire for motherhood [was]

the primary factor.... The abnormal development of sex desire when it does occur; is, however, more pronounced in women than in men."⁷⁶ There were a number of social-purity-inspired initiatives to attempt to suppress women's erotic agency. The report recommended social-purity education to deal with the "perversion of natural instincts by bad social environment" and also suggested raising the age of consent for sexual acts to sixteen.

While "social evil" generally meant women engaged in sex work, there were also references to sexual immorality and perversion. "Perversion" in social-purity discourse usually referred to non-reproductive sex but was sometimes used in a broader sense. In the Chicago Vice Commission report, a section entitled "Sexual Perversion" noted an increase in same-gender sex and referred to "colonies of these men who are sex perverts," but who did not often come into contact with the police or physicians.⁷⁷ These men adopted the "carriage, mannerisms and speech of women," were "often people of a good deal of talent," and had a "vocabulary and signs of recognition of their own."⁷⁸ The report also referred to "female impersonators" and men who dressed as women and solicited other men for "perverse practices." It recommended the "practical ideal of a straight and pure sexual life both before and after marriage" and tougher legislation.⁷⁹ Another section of the Chicago report discussed "pervert methods" in the higher-priced prostitution houses, apparently referring to oral sex.⁸⁰ The Toronto study included no such exploration of pervert practices.

Social-purity rhetoric combined notions of "feble-mindedness," moral degeneration, and race degeneration, from the language of Social Darwinism, with the Christian terms of "immorality," "vice" and "evil."⁸¹ The social purists advocated the prohibition of all non-matrimonial and non-reproductive sex, but they also proposed and indeed instituted a particular form of sex "education."⁸² J.S. Shearer called for educating boys and girls

...in the purpose and problems and perils of sex, including information as to the awful penalty nature imposes in the forms of social diseases, such as syphilis and gonorrhoea, well designated the Black Plague upon those who violate her laws of sex.⁸³

Sexual Advice: Sex Education for Purity

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, social-purity advice literature was widely available, and lectures were heard by thousands. In the early 1890s, Reverend W.J. Hunter was reportedly lecturing to as many as 1,500 men a night at St. James Methodist Church in Montréal. He addressed such topics as prostitution, masturbation—the "solitary vice"—and puberty. He defended sexual purity as necessary to the vigour of the race, since "loss of semen is the loss of blood."⁸⁴

According to the Methodist Church, the best-selling sex-advice literature in Canada between 1900 and 1915 were the eight volumes of the *Self and Sex* series.⁸⁵ These books were based on the "spermatic economy" theory of a limited-energy model of sex and development. "Self-abuse" was equated with waste and with moral and physical

degeneration. Two Canadian doctors had in their respective 1865 and 1877 reports supported this “self-abuse” scare.⁸⁶ *The Dominion Medical Monthly* and the *Ontario Medical Journal* had both concluded that in single men, masturbation led to insanity. The *Self and Sex* series was favourably reviewed in the *Canadian Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, and leading Canadian doctors supported this sexual discourse. Dr. Maurice Bucke, who we will meet again in another context, not only linked masturbation with insanity, but operated on the “insane” to correct the “problem.”⁸⁷

There also began to develop a sense that something was wrong with close same-gender intimacies. This affected friendships and emotional support networks among both men and women. “Proper” non-erotic friendships were promoted, in contrast to the horrors of same-gender perversion. In *What a Young Woman Ought to Know*, part of the *Self and Sex* series, Dr. Wood Allen warned:

I believe in reserve even in girl friendships. Girls are apt at certain periods in their lives to be rather gushing creatures. They form the most sentimental attachments for each other. They go about with their arms around each other, they loll against each other, and sit with clasped hands by the hour. They fondle and kiss until beholders are fairly nauseated, and in a few weeks, perhaps they do not speak as they pass each other, and their caresses are lavished on others. They are a weakening of moral fibre, a waste of mawkish sentimentality. They may be even worse. Such friendship may degenerate even into a species of self-abuse that is most deplorable.

When girls are so sentimentally fond of each other that they are like silly lovers when together, and weep over each other’s absence in uncontrollable agony, the conditions are serious enough for the consultation of a physician. It is an abnormal state of affairs, and if probed thoroughly might be found to be a sort of perversion, a sex mania, needing immediate and perhaps severe measures.

I wish the friendships of girls were less sentimental, more manly. Two young men who are friends do not lop on each other, and kiss and gush. They trust each other, they talk freely together, they would stand by each other in any trouble or emergency, but their expressions of endearment are not more than the cordial handgrasp and the unsentimental appellation, “Dear old chap.”

I admire these friendships in young men. They seem to mean so much, and yet to exact so little.⁸⁸

Josephine E. Young, MD, warned that the affection of a girl for an older woman “is abnormal and unwholesome and should be positively dealt with as a manifestation of sex perversion.”⁸⁹ Social purity was now applying the notion of perversion more specifically to same-gender erotic activities, although here it seemed tied to age distinctions as well.

The Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) and evangelical churches hired purity reformers such as Beatrice Brigden, William Lund Clark, and Arthur W. Beall to tour the schools warning young people against self-abuse and promiscuity and educating them for a “pure” life and character. It was felt that a proper Christian upbringing required proper sex education, not an ignorance of sex. Ignorance, it was

thought, left young people without the fortitude to resist temptation. Brigden and Clark were hired by the Canadian Methodist Church.⁹⁰ Brigden spoke to girls and women from 1913 to 1920. After being hired in 1913, she was sent to the home of American purity leader B.S. Steadwell for three weeks of intensive training and reading on sex. She specialized in “The Girl and Her Problems” and argued for pure living and citizenship.⁹¹ Brigden was also influenced by currents within feminism and later became involved in supporting working-class activism.⁹²

Clark, as we have seen, had already been busy giving lectures to boys and it was apparently he who urged Brigden to “take on a similar task among girls, to lecture and counsel on sex hygiene and social problems.”⁹³ He was much more influenced by masculinist and patriarchal writings on sex than Brigden.⁹⁴ A Methodist report commended Clark for having “given careful and long study to the life problems of boys and young men.”⁹⁵ He urged boys to avoid degrading influences, wrong thoughts and wrong pictures, and the company of “immorally clothed young women.” He recommended that they drink neither tea nor coffee and refrain from dancing, and that they seek improved ventilation and take frequent baths.⁹⁶ Through these means they could produce a strong character and a pure self. Clark toured Canada and the United States with this message.

Beall lectured between 1905 and 1911 to a reported 13,463 schoolboys on behalf of the Ontario WCTU.⁹⁷ Lesson Nine of Mr. Beall’s classes in sex education instructed the boys to repeat after him, “The more you use the penis muscle the weaker it becomes; but the less you use the penis muscle the stronger it becomes.”⁹⁸ This would likely have been the boys’ first introduction to this naming of their genitals and would surely have led to erotic experimentation and play as well as the intended self-repression. Beall stressed the national importance of sex hygiene and its importance in producing the “character” needed for Canada. Beall was hired by the Ontario Department of Education in 1911 and he worked there until the 1930s.⁹⁹ Rather than social purity opposing sex education, it actively promoted its own form of sex education and, at least in Ontario, had some success in introducing it into the schools.

Venereal Disease (Sexually Transmitted Infections): “Polluting the Race”

In the years preceding World War I, the social-purity movement made much of the reported increase in venereal disease (now referred to as Sexually Transmitted Infections or STIs). VD was seen as a challenge to the health of the Anglo-Saxon “race.”¹⁰⁰ As Lucy Bland explains when discussing the mood in England, VD stood as a metaphor, “condensing and ‘carrying’ many of the fears of the period—the concern with the falling birth rate...concern with national efficiency and physical deterioration of troops and civilians.”¹⁰¹

By 1912 the Canadian Methodist Church was demanding that all cases of VD be reported to medical health officials. Its association with “feeble-mindedness” was made perfectly clear with the naming, in 1918, of the Ontario Government’s Royal Commission on Venereal Disease and Feeble-mindedness, which linked sexually transmitted

infections with mental health related disabilities. World War I and a push by public-health agitation around venereal disease provided the basis for the establishment of a Canadian Department of Health in 1919. State regulation now took the form of “public health” legislation and management of sexual disease, sex work, sexual “promiscuity,” and “deviance.”¹⁰² Laws were directed against sex working and “loose women.”

In Canada, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there were a whole series of measures, often social-purity-inspired, to try to wipe out the “social evil.” In 1918 the Canadian government moved to further regulate women sex workers. It stipulated that “no woman who is suffering from Venereal Disease in a communicable form shall have sexual intercourse with any member of His Majesty’s forces or solicit or invite any member of the said forces to have sexual intercourse with her.”¹⁰³ Notice that in this discourse there was no responsibility placed on the men involved. Government educational pamphlets during these years included such statements as, “Practically all prostitutes and loose women are diseased,” and “Prostitution cannot be made safe.”¹⁰⁴ Sex working and “loose” women were constructed as the “problem” in the spread of VD. Clearly embedded in this official and professional discourse were sexist or patriarchal double standards. The regulatory focus was on the women and not the men, as women’s “sexual deviance” came increasingly to be defined as “promiscuity” and sex work. The precedent was set for more state intervention into the realm of bodies, desires, and pleasures.

The Emergence of Sex Psychology

It is within this social context that the psychiatric and medical professions began to import the sex-scientific knowledge being developed in Europe and the United States. As Xavier Mayne put it, “The topic of simisexuality is taboo in the United States and in Canada except through observation by and for medical students and physicians.”¹⁰⁵ An article entitled “Perversion,” for instance, by Ezra Hurlburt Stafford, M.B., First Assistant Physician at the Asylum for the Insane in Toronto, was published in 1898 and read before the Toronto Medical Society.¹⁰⁶ The article discusses the degree to which perversions are a disease and the degree to which they are a product of evolution, explaining that long-suppressed characteristics may appear and take hold of isolated members of the species. “Many cases of sexual perversion,” Stafford argues, “may be set down as a reversion or a miscarriage in the chain of evolution.” Stafford uses most of his article, however, to deal, with two different types of perversion:

These cases of perversions form not a distortion of a natural instinct, but an excrescence apparently completely foreign, and not so often of the nature of a physical defect as of a mental aberration, and therefore a form of insanity.

These perversions referred to sex working women and sex between men (he never uses the word “homosexual”). He refers to the work of Krafft-Ebing, in naming and describing the sex perversions, but he also calls Krafft-Ebing’s work the “bible of the bawdy

house.” Here Stafford exhibits an understanding of the potentially two-sided dynamic of sex-scientific theories. On the one hand, the perversions are named so that they can be identified and contained. On the other hand, the very naming of the perversions provides the opportunity for people to identify with them and to develop resistance to sexual rule. Stafford explains that there exist forms of perversion other than sex work that “occupy a place of their own in the lives of nations—forms of perversions long familiar to readers of the late classical writers.” After an examination of the writings of Ancient Greece and Rome, he tells us that “even in Corinth, a thoughtful man would surely have been forced to admit that these usages constituted a wilful and mischievous trifling with the laws of nature.”

He associates this perversion with “periods of racial degeneration.” He uses the work of Cesare Lombroso to justify his position that the sexual overuse or misuse of an organ leads to an imbalance of the nervous system and degeneration. “Society” exists in a rather artificial situation of highly structured relations between the sexes, Stafford contends, of intense religious sentiments and the repression of “natural” physiological inclinations, and this has led the race into “an abnormal condition” whereby perversions are acquired. “These things [sex working women and sex between men] may lead to the tragedy of our species.” He links these perversions to an “insidious process of degeneration which is taking place in the inmost structure of modern civilization.”

Stafford’s analysis is rabidly anti-Catholic: he even suggests that the Roman Catholic Church itself led to abnormal lust, associating perversion with conversion to the Catholic faith—all this in the context of middle-class Anglo-Saxon anxieties over increasing birth rates among Irish and French-Canadian Catholics. While there was always a tendency in sex-scientific literature to blame “foreign” cultures for perversions, Stafford’s analysis takes on a particular Anglo-Canadian character with its anti-Catholic fervour.

Stafford’s work is rooted in the popularization among Canadian doctors of the works of Lombroso and Krafft-Ebing. The main themes of European sex-scientific debates are reproduced in his article, such as the debate over whether same-gender sex practices are innate or acquired, whether congenital or representative of moral degeneracy.¹⁰⁷

Resources for Queer Cultures

The literature of forensic psychiatry regarding sex perversion and later sex psychology began to be taken up in professional circles in Canada as networks of men who engaged in sex with each other became more visible in the larger urban centres. Some of these networks grew out of earlier urban networks of men who had sex with men within the military and the interactions between younger men and boys and elite men. Sex-scientific classifications of “perversion” and “inversion” began to be used against the men.

Some of these networks were associated with cross-dressing. In Montréal it was reported in *La Presse* in 1886 that she-men (*hommes-femmes*), would gather in the evening behind the Court House. There they were reported to “hold their filthy revels” and to treat “passers-by to the spectacle of their vile pastimes.” Police constables apparently

entrapped some of the men but *La Presse* complained that light sentences allowed them “to slip quickly back to the pleasures of their kind.” Here we get a sense of these gathering places, organized through the cultural practices of cross-dressing. There was also a certain awareness of these networks as a “social threat” generated through the media and police action.¹⁰⁸

Steven Maynard reports on the 1894 arrest of Mary Cullen in Halifax, Nova Scotia:

Mary, a tailoress, was arrested at her home when several of the men she had been dating discovered that—as the newspaper put it—“Mary was not all she pretended to be.” When Mary, who was identified by authorities as Thomas Cullen, was asked why he dressed as a woman, he replied he could fool the “chappies” and “nearly every evening” he could “stroll down Hollis Street and be sure to make a pick up.”¹⁰⁹

These examples suggest the development of networks that had some similar characteristics to the “fairies” that George Chauncey describes in New York City from the 1890s into the early twentieth century. These working-class fairy cultures were defined by taking up certain aspects of “effeminacy” and sometimes cross-dressing.¹¹⁰ Maynard suggests that, in Toronto, by 1912, some of the men were being referred to as “sissies” and “fairies.”¹¹¹ This may have been one of the ways to which a distinct group of men who had sex with other men were referred.

In the nineteenth century, there were also many reports of passing or cross-dressing white women in Canada.¹¹² They cross-dressed to gain access to the economic and social privileges enjoyed by men, and perhaps also to establish intimate and erotic relationships with other women.¹¹³ A woman who dressed in men’s clothes was described in 1872 as follows: “her demeanour was so masculine as to put in doubt her sex. Was she man or woman or hermaphrodite?”¹¹⁴ Before the emergence of specific homosexual or lesbian categories, these women were seen as odd for challenging gender practices but were not necessarily considered sexually suspect. By the 1880s, there were already, in some professional circles, “two distinct types of womanhood.” On the one hand, there was the “timid, confiding, trusting woman” who “comes to realize that her mission in this world is a domestic one.” On the other, there were “the self-confident, self-asserting, self-reliant, fearless, masculine women” for whom “domestic duties have but a secondary attraction.”¹¹⁵ With the emergence of the “homosexual” and the “lesbian,” same-gender passionate friendships became suspect. Cross-dressing now became associated with sexual inversion; the history of gender-crossing women formed one of the foundations for lesbian cultures.¹¹⁶

A number of men who were influential in the formation of homosexual “identities” visited Canada in the late nineteenth centuries. Oscar Wilde visited English Canada in the 1880s, prior to the homosexual scandals in which he was involved in England in the 1890s.¹¹⁷ Newspaper coverage of Wilde’s trip reflects an ambiguous and hostile response to a (pre-homo) English dandy.¹¹⁸ Walt Whitman visited Canada in the summer of 1880 and kept in close contact with Dr. Maurice Bucke, who he met earlier as superintendent

of the Mental Hospital in London. Whitman influenced not only Dr. Bucke and Edward Carpenter (who himself visited Canada in 1884), but also Upper Canadian intellectuals such as the feminist-activist Flora MacDonald Denison.¹¹⁹

Denison, one of the few Canadian suffragists to call herself a feminist, was profoundly influenced by Whitman, as well as by the American feminist Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Victoria Woodhul, August Bebel, Olive Schreiner, and Edward Carpenter.¹²⁰ Denison was involved in the Canadian Theosophical Society, whose early publications included many poems by Whitman. She held progressive views for her day on questions of divorce, sex work, and sexuality, although she certainly mobilized racism against immigrants.¹²¹ She believed that sex work was fundamentally an economic rather than a moral issue. She was opposed to violent punishment and flogging. Denison's ideas about sexuality itself were influenced by her Whitmanite spiritualism. In her view "sex was not only necessary for both men and women, it was an exalted function."¹²²

In 1910, Denison bought a cottage at Bon Echo in southern Ontario as a combination summer hostel and avant-garde spiritual community dedicated to Whitman. In 1916 a Walt Whitman Club was formed at Bon Echo. The club published a magazine, *The Sunset at Bon Echo*, from 1916 to 1920, a consistent theme of which was male friendship.¹²³ It seems likely that this group would have attracted gays and provided a supportive community as they tried to come to terms with coping with the hostile world outside.¹²⁴

This development also suggests possible overlaps between early feminist, socialist, sex-radical, lesbian and male homosexual networks, especially among the white intellectual middle class. On Denison's death, *The Canadian Theosophist* concluded that "...no one in the present generation of Canadians has done more for the 'institution of the dear love of Comrades' than Flora MacDonald Denison."¹²⁵ Her funeral service was sponsored by the Whitmanite Fellowship of Toronto.

The Greek "ideal" may also have played an important role in the making of homosexual identifications among middle- and upper-class and intellectual white men,¹²⁶ although the effect of classical literature on the identity formation of white middle-class homosexuals in Canada has yet to be explored. It was apparently feared by some that classical literature might inspire "self-abuse." Reverend James Carmichael, writing in 1877, refers to Socrates:

He faced the most disgusting and abhorrent lusts, thank god, almost unknown by name to western civilization, with a joking nod of recognition...Fancy our handsome boys listening to the great Athenian. Our girls would be safe but for the sake of pure boy life we would raise and fling the teacher from our ruddy hearthstone.¹²⁷

Elsa Gidlow's account of the formation of her lesbian identification in the years 1914–19 in Montréal gives us a rare and precious glimpse into the formation of the lesbian and male homosexual worlds in the early twentieth century.¹²⁸ In those days, before the demarcation of a specific lesbian identity, male and female homosexual identity formation

could have shared features. Gidlow tells us of her early sense of being an “outsider” as she struggled to survive as an independent woman. By now, many young women were challenging convention by getting waged jobs and taking rooms in boarding houses, which became possible as some women gained more economic independence. Gidlow heard another woman labelled a “mofredite” (slang for “hermaphrodite,” a word that could then be used for people involved in same-gender sex). This gave Gidlow an introduction to the naming of another sexuality.¹²⁹ Through a writer’s group she met a young homosexual man, Roswell George Mills, whom she describes as follows:

He was beautiful. About nineteen, exquisitely made up, slightly perfumed, dressed in ordinary men’s clothing but a little on the chi-chi side. And he swayed about, you know. We became friends almost instantly because we were both interested in poetry and the arts.¹³⁰

Through Roswell, she was able to begin exploring and naming her sense of difference. He introduced her to the writings of Sappho and Wilde. Together they read Havelock Ellis, Edward Carpenter, and the works of Kraftt-Ebing, Lombroso, and Freud.¹³¹ She describes how the “trial and jailing of Oscar Wilde were not far in our past and very real.”¹³² Gidlow and Mills delved “into the mores of Ancient Greece” and the writings of “homosexuals” throughout history, which gave them “reasons for loving ourselves and each other.”¹³³ Here we see a process through which Gidlow and Mills were able to name their difference through the sex-scientific category of homosexuality, and were able to transform it into an affirmation of their desires against social denial. The various influences in this identity making included the sex-scientific literature itself, media portrayals of the Wilde trial, a clear homosexual cultural influence on Roswell, as well as a certain reading of the classical Greek tradition.

Mills was given a “Four-F—physically, mentally, emotionally and morally incompetent” rating, and hence was not drafted into the armed forces during the war,¹³⁴ perhaps because of his “gender invert” characteristics. Such military labelling may have helped to create early homosexual networks, by cutting some homosexual men out of “normal” social interaction, as it did on a smaller scale in World War I and a more extended scale during and after World War II.¹³⁵

These experiences of Gidlow and Mills offer valuable insights into the formation of white lesbian and homosexual identities among intellectuals and artists during the World War I era. The white, European-derived character of much of this construction of “homosexuality” (and “lesbianism”) is important to stress. The reading they produced of sexuality in Ancient Greece, the sex-scientific literature they read, and the references to Oscar Wilde all referenced them to “traditions” within white, European “civilization.” Carpenter was a limited (and only partial) exception. Men and women with different cultural, intellectual, and social experiences would not have been able to identify their experiences and desires with this image of homosexuality. For them other “traditions,” literatures and experiences were drawn upon to define their experiences of sexual and gender differences.

Men of the “Oscar Wilde Type”

References to same-gender sex began to appear in Canadian literature during these years. Toronto journalist C.S. Clark’s *Of Toronto the Good*, published in 1897, makes a number of references to sex among “boys” (adolescent boys and young men it seems) and men.¹³⁶ Clark’s major purpose in his book was to demonstrate that Toronto was not “the good” but rather was one immense house of ill-fame. He charged that “loose” women could be found everywhere. Clark was also concerned about the lives of unregulated, often homeless poor white boys. This was part of a broader social construction of concern over street youth and urban space that was then being generated. Clark argues that the repression of women sex workers through bawdy-house raids has led to cases like that of Oscar Wilde in England, and to the blackmailing of these types, many of whom, he says are of “wealth and high standing.”

If saintly Canadians run away with the idea that there are no sinners of Oscar Wilde’s type in Canada, my regard for the truth impels me to undeceive them. Consult some of the bellboys of the large hotels in Canada’s leading cities...and find out what they can tell from their own experiences. A youth of eighteen once informed me that he had blackmailed one of Canada’s esteemed judiciary out of a modest sum of money by catching him in the act of indecently assaulting one of the bellboys connected with a hotel in that city. This is one case only, but they are countless. Some of Canada’s leading citizens could be implicated just as Oscar Wilde was implicated, if some of these bellboys chose to make public what they knew. I know two different merchants in the city of Toronto who have a similar reputation...Both these men are so well known in Toronto that there is scarcely a boy who does not know of their reputation. I have no doubt that, notwithstanding the positions they occupy, both would be punished to the full extent of the law, could the police catch them. But this fact serves to demonstrate how little is actually known to the police of what is taking place...while these very men and their acts of indecency are the talk of boys all over the city. Where under heaven people ever learned such appalling things God only knows and humanity can only conjecture that the people in the places I mention appeal to the degraded tastes of their patrons simply because they are paid for it... Houses of ill-fame are blots on the morality of a country...because everyone knows of them, and the fact of their being public is what constitutes the sin.... These other places [sites of same-gender sex] are not usually known to the public, and consequently they thrive, and no effort is made to suppress them, as far as I am aware.¹³⁷

The “Oscar Wilde type,” given meaning by coverage of the Wilde trials, was of the wealthier classes and seems to pay for sex with bellboys and working-class street youths. The emergence of this “type” is an important part of the transition to a more defined homosexual category, but it also constructs this “type” with a particular class character. References to the “Oscar Wilde type” were common around the turn of the century in Canada.¹³⁸

Clark’s highly ideological account suggests the existence in Toronto of subterranean networks, involving elite and middle-class men and working-class boys and young men.

Although less developed, this shared a number of features with emerging homosexual networks in England—the importance of sex work, for example, and the existence of sexual relations between middle-class men and working-class youths. While some of these youths took advantage of the social and legal prohibitions to blackmail the men, most never went to the police, which suggests that they participated for either pleasure or money, or both. This suggests that, within the constraints of the class and social relations in which these young men found themselves, they acted to try to get benefits from their erotic relations with this “type” of man. And even though Clark dismisses this possibility, reading against the grain, we can see that many of these young men and boys did get erotic pleasures from these encounters. What Clark does not tell us is whether these boys and young men also had sex among themselves.¹³⁹

These activities were not very visible to the police, says Clark, and therefore could not be suppressed. He may be lamenting the lack of a major public scandal which would direct police activity against these networks; police surveillance of city streets and hotels was not yet very extensive, but it was growing, and Criminal Code classifications were beginning to direct the police against men who had sex with other men and boys.

Working-Class Men and Queer Sex

Steven Maynard’s research, which has been critically examining court, police and reformatory records from 1880–1930 in Ontario—especially Toronto—is very useful here. He reports that his research has turned up clerks, barbers, shoemakers, porters, painters, carpenters, peddlers, machinists, plasterers, and numerous labourers who were charged with offences relating to sex between males.¹⁴⁰ The majority of the men charged were working class, both “skilled” and “unskilled.” Among skilled workers there were tailors, butchers, printers, and illustrators, reflecting the significance of the clothing, food, and printing industries in Toronto. Among the unskilled, labourers were the most numerous. There were also clerks, bookkeepers, sales workers, and other office employees. Most of these men were white Anglo-Saxons but there were also Italian, Jewish and eastern European men involved. The middle-class men involved in these activities often travelled from the suburbs into the more working-class areas of the city core for sex. Many working-class men also had sex with other working-class men.¹⁴¹

As new and more social spaces opened up with urbanization and industrial capitalism in Toronto, more men began to seize some of these spaces to meet other men for sex, and this in turn provoked a response from moral reformers, social-purity advocates, the law, and the police. These men met for sex not only in commercial establishments, homes, and the rooms they rented or boarded in, but also in parks, laneways, and lavatories. Many of these working-class men, even if they did live apart from their families would have been residing in boarding houses or in other working-class households.¹⁴² This would have restricted these men’s access to any sort of “private” or intimate space, leading some of them to search for sexual contacts in more “public” spaces.

Men who had sex with other men seized certain urban spaces for their activities. Parks that were frequented during these years included Memorial Square (at the corner

of Portland and Wellington Streets), Allan Gardens and Queen's Park, and parks associated with amusement areas such as Sunnyside Beach and the Exhibition Grounds. Men took advantage of the city's maze of laneways to seek out other men for sex. Men also used the lavatories of Queen's Park, Allan Gardens, Union Station, Sunnyside Amusement Park, certain hotels, and the YMCA. In some of these lavatories, men used "gloryholes" (holes in the partitions between cubicles) to facilitate their erotic counters.¹⁴³ According to Maynard, "it was the park that figured most prominently in the sexual struggle over urban space."¹⁴⁴ City authorities attempted to regulate the use of parks by working-class youth, as well as the young women and men who sometimes resorted to parks to have sex.¹⁴⁵ More lighting and policing was proposed as ways of tightening regulation.

New spaces were also being opened up in this period. Toronto, according to Maynard, "embarked upon something of a lavatory building boom" in the early 1900s.¹⁴⁶ The opening of these spaces unintentionally increased the number of places men could meet other men for sex. Maynard points out:

Aspects of the city-building process, along with the spread of wage labour, established some of the material conditions for the emergence of a subculture, while class and ethnic differences structured sexual relations between men and shaped their journey to sex.¹⁴⁷

Public-health campaigns were mobilized to regulate outhouses and lavatories. These campaigns raised both health and moral questions.¹⁴⁸ Park attendants were urged to report any holes made in the partitions between cubicles in the lavatories. In response to sexual activity, some of these were covered over.¹⁴⁹

Many of the men who participated in these activities may have begun to see themselves as homosexual, while others rejected this labelling. Others may have seen themselves more as fairies or queers.¹⁵⁰ This was during a period before "homosexual" had secured its hegemony as a definition for men who had sex with other men.

Partly in response to the emergence of these networks, and given legal developments in England, there was an intensification of the regulation of same-gender sexual activities between men.

Legal Categories: Gross Indecency, Sexual Surveillance, and the Making of Criminal Perverts

It is in the context of these changing social relations and the initial emergence of same-gender erotic networks in Canada that a homosexual "type" began to emerge, partially shaped by the development of legal discourse, judicial institutions, and police organization and activity. Legal and police administration in Canada followed the English model in the nineteenth century.¹⁵¹ In the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, drawn up in 1859, "buggery" with man or beast was punishable by death.¹⁵²

The need for a new Criminal Code after Confederation was met "principally through the wholesale borrowing, with minor adaptations, of English statutes."¹⁵³ Stephen's

draft code, which had not been accepted in England but had been made available for export to the colonies, was used in proposals for Canada's first Criminal Code in 1890.¹⁵⁴ Alex Gigeroff wrote:

One can trace back the sex offences in the present Criminal Code of Canada to our earliest criminal legislation in 1869 only to find that most sections had been borrowed almost word for word from the earlier English statutes.¹⁵⁵

The social relations in which English legal history and practice had developed were thereby integrated into the foundations of the Canadian state. Confederation also divided responsibility between Parliament, which enacted criminal law, and the provinces, which administered it. The Canadian statute governing buggery varied very little from the English until the early 1950s.¹⁵⁶ In the 1869 Act respecting offences against the person, buggery was classified as an "Unnatural Offence"; in 1892, it was placed under "Offences Against Morality" where it stayed until the 1950s. In 1886, the legal category of "indecent assault" was restricted to males, thus creating the "first distinct male homosexual offence" in Canada—only one year after the Labouchere Amendment in England had defined "gross indecency" between men.

Gross indecency was introduced into Canadian statute law in 1890 and entered into the first Criminal Code when it was adopted in 1892. It covered all sexual acts between males not already covered by buggery and applied to anyone

who in public or private is a party of the commission of or procures or attempts to procure the commission by any male person of any act of gross indecency with another male person.¹⁵⁷

Punishment was set at a maximum of five years with provisions for whipping.

The introduction of gross indecency as an offence occurred in the midst of agitation for social and sexual purity. D.A. Watt, the driving force behind the Society for the Protection of Women and Young Girls, had responsibility for some of the fundamental changes in the first draft of the bill. Watt was strongly influenced by W.J. Stead's social-purity campaign in England.¹⁵⁸ Stead's campaign had culminated in the passage of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, which raised the age of consent for sexual acts from twelve to fourteen years, and in the Labouchere Amendment, which included the offence of gross indecency. Sir John Thompson, the originator of the Canadian code, supported the inclusion of gross indecency. In 1890, while moving second reading, he said:

The third section of the Bill contains a penalty for acts of gross indecency committed in reference to a male person. We have upon that subject very little law, and we have no remedy for offences which are now notorious in another country, and which have made their appearance in this county. It will, therefore, be necessary, I think, that a clause of that kind, which is in the English Act, shall be adopted here. I propose, however, in

committee to enlarge the maximum term of imprisonment from two years. In this class of offences which, as I said, have obtained notoriety in the mother country, and which have made their appearance here in one or two places, the maximum of two years imprisonment, I think, is entirely inadequate.¹⁵⁹

Thompson suggested that a five-year sentence be substituted for the original proposal of two years. Sir Richard Cartwright asked whether

the words he has used, "gross indecency," are not sufficiently precise, and might lead to consequences he does not intend? I am quite aware that the particular crime which he has in mind is one which, I very much fear, has been on the increase in certain sections of society, and can hardly be punished too severely. In my opinion the words are not legal words, and it strikes me that consequences might flow from the phraseology which the honourable gentlemen does not contemplate.¹⁶⁰

Thompson responded:

I think it is impossible to define the offences any better. The provision is the same as the English provision.... It is impossible to define them any better, for the reason that the offences aimed at are so various. The notorious cases I mentioned a few moments ago are not the same in their characteristics and the description which would cover them would not apply to these cases which have been brought to my attention as occurring in Canada within the last few months. I think it is better to leave it in this form. It is no more vague than the English Act.¹⁶¹

Mr. Blake, who doubted "very much whether there is any other class of cases in which there is more danger of brutalizing people than in the class of cases dealt with in this clause," argued that the penalty of whipping be added to the clause. Mr. Charlton, who we met earlier, and Mr. Mitchell argued that gross indecency be specifically defined so that, in Mr. Mitchell's words, "there may be no mistake about it."¹⁶²

During final reading in 1892, after discussion of the vagueness of what constituted an "indecent act," the following exchange took place in the House of Commons:

Mr. Laurier: What makes the objection stronger is that in the next section you make a gross act of indecency an indictable offence. It is difficult to know what is a gross act of indecency and what is not.

Sir John Thompson: You get the higher judge for an indictable offence.

Mr. Mills (Bothwell): All these offences against morality have crept into the common law from the earlier ecclesiastical law, and they were rather sins than crimes, not being attacks upon property or life, or upon any other members of the community. The offences are wholly subjective and altogether different in that respect from the other crimes embraced in the Statute book; and it is a question whether crimes of this sort should be punished by long terms of service in the penitentiary. I do not think they should. I think that

flogging, or something of that sort, and the discharge of the prisoners is preferable, and a far better deterrent than anything else.

Sir John Thompson: There is a distinction, I think. We only punish them as crimes when they are offensive to people, or set a bad example. As to Section 178, relating to acts of gross indecency, I have no objection to reducing the term of imprisonment, considering that whipping accompanies it. It is impossible to define these cases by any form of words.¹⁶³

While Thompson argued that this new legal category was necessary because certain offences notorious in England were now becoming common in Canada, he did not cite any specific Canadian cases.¹⁶⁴ The English Act, and the scandals surrounding it, were enough to justify adoption of the new offence.

Through this process legal categories relating to sexual offences became more specific, defining specifically homosexual offences and helping to define the “homosexual” as a criminal suspect and subject. The new legal definitions moved beyond “sodomy” and “buggery,” which were retained as well, grouping together various kinds of non-reproductive sex and instructing the police to clamp down on emerging homosexual networks. Not only were medical and psychiatric definitions important in the emergence of knowledge about “the homosexual,” but so were the police and the courts.¹⁶⁵ The offence of “gross indecency” encouraged the police to direct their attention against sex between men.

Between 1880 and 1930 in Ontario, Maynard reports that there were 313 reported cases of sexual “offences” between men. Of these, 113 were from the City of Toronto.¹⁶⁶ Both Carolyn Strange and Steven Maynard report that the numbers arrested for “buggery” and “gross indecency” were low until 1900 and began to increase in the 1910s and 1920s.¹⁶⁷

In order to detect these activities, new means of surveillance were required. Some men having sex with other men were discovered by constables on the beat in working-class and poor neighbourhoods. Others were captured by park caretakers who patrolled the parks. The police also conducted surveillance operations in and around the men’s lavatories in Queen’s Park and Allan Gardens from 1918 to 1922.¹⁶⁸ The police used a hole in the wall in the back of the lavatory, ladders, light, and photography (to establish the scene of the sexual crime) to survey men and to construct the “facts” or “particulars” of the case against the men who were charged. This defined the reported activities as sexual-offences as they were classified in the criminal law; in this case, as “gross indecency.”¹⁶⁹ This evidence could then be used against the men in court.¹⁷⁰

The policing of sex was under the jurisdiction of the Morality Department. As Maynard reports:

In 1886, Toronto mayor and reformer William Howland appointed David Archibald to the position of staff inspector of the new Morality Department. Various described by historians as “an ardent moral reformer” and the “city’s moral watchdog,” Archibald is a key figure in the history of homosexuality in Toronto...Archibald made it clear from the beginning that police action against men having sex with other men would be one

priority of his department. In his first report in 1886 Archibald made reference to “several cases” involving sex between men.¹⁷¹

Maynard reports that police concerns with public lavatories began by the 1880s. In 1887, a committee of Toronto City Council recommended that the police inspect the various urinals two to three times a day “to prevent persons from using them for any other purpose than that for which they are intended.”¹⁷² The powers of the Morality Department to police same-gender sex between men was greatly expanded with the enactment of “gross indecency,” which led to an increase in the charges laid. However, this increase was gradual and uneven until an intensification of policing of same-gender sex between men beginning in 1913 and reaching its peak in 1917 and the two years following the end of the war. The intensification of sexual policing led to the collection and production of statistics that moral reformers and social-purity activists could use in their campaigns against sex between men and also produced the basis for print-media reports of same-gender sex offences between men. These were both new and more extensive forms of social surveillance and new forms of power/knowledge relations.

Maynard reports that this escalation of sexual policing was shaped by the social-purity agitation focusing on “white slavery” and the “social evil” that also seemed to produce an intensification of police surveillance of same-gender sex in “public” places and by the war-time conditions that motivated increased police action between 1917 and 1922.¹⁷³ In the first period, this concern was generated by social-purity groups, the Toronto Social Survey Commission (mentioned earlier in this chapter) and local clergy, the Toronto Vigilance Committee, and Morality Department campaigns against “sexual immorality.” These campaigns were largely directed against “public” activities on city streets, in parks, in lavatories, and in commercial establishments and theatres. They were not largely directed to what went on in “private” households. The Vigilance Committee tended to single out sissies, fairies and “moral perverts” as part of its broader purity campaign.¹⁷⁴ This suggests an important linkage between social-purity agitation, the municipal state response, a heightened media focus, and stepped-up police activity.

The second period of escalation was shaped by wartime conditions and mobilization. The large number of soldiers in training in the city led to a focus of concern on women sex workers. But soldiers were also involved in sex with civilian men and with other men in the military. This included soldiers propositioning men for sex on the street. The large numbers of military men in the city increased some of the possibilities for erotic interaction between men, and sexual policing also focused on these interactions.¹⁷⁵ Heightened policing of sex between men was related to concerns over sex work and sexual purity.

Some men attempted to resist arrest by running away; others made up explanations for their activities even though many of these attempts failed.¹⁷⁶ Even in these circumstances, men tried to resist suggesting the growth of networks that made these forms of non-cooperation possible.

Sexual policing, organized through the categories of the Criminal Code,¹⁷⁷ develops in response to the visibility of networks of men having sex with other men as well as

social-purity agitation, concerns by municipal authorities, and through concerns generated regarding wartime mobilization. As Maynard suggests, this social process brings together concerns over social spaces that could be used for queer sex, the activities of men who had sex with men, as well as the response of the legal system and the police. This brings together analysis of ruling sexual discourse and the emerging regime of sexual regulation and the emergence of cultures and networks constructed by men who had sex with other men. Maynard refers to the interaction between these men who had sex with men and policing as a reciprocal process—“the dialectics of discovery.” In this dialectic, the men were surveyed by the police, but it was also through this policing that a certain popular consciousness regarding the existence of “homosexuality” was created, which played a part in the emergence of a distinct homosexual consciousness and identification.¹⁷⁸

There were also concerns generated over “unnatural practices” in prisons. An official from the Central Prison for Ontario wrote in 1885 that:

Owing to the crowded state of the Prison, scores of cells have two convicts in each. On grounds this is most undesirable; the practice of Sodom’s sins did not die with the fiery destruction of that city.¹⁷⁹

And from a number of years later:

Another common belief of that period...is that inmates of prisons were particularly prone to homosexual behaviour. On March 23, 1912, the newspaper [Jack Canuck] complained that “unnatural practices” were common among the inmates of the city’s gaol, with the facility’s greenhouses providing the requisite “shelter and opportunity” and with the result that a great deal of disease was being transmitted among the inmates.

While there is no reason to believe that such practices became more common throughout the period in question, the authorities became more sensitive to the idea. While the rules of the prison system in Ontario in 1903 had forbidden only “indecent behaviour and language,” by 1922 “unnatural” intercourse between prisoners had been specifically added to the list of impermissible activities.¹⁸⁰

During these years of transition in sex/gender relations, the same general features discerned for England and the US can also be uncovered for Canada. The emergence of capitalist social relations led to increasing urbanization and created the opportunity for men, and later women, to live at least partly outside family relations or on its margins. A new regime of sexual classification and policing took shape, rooted in legal and policing changes, medical and scientific discourse, and state formation. Networks of homosexuals and later, lesbians adopted the category of “homosexual” to identify their own needs. The specific character of the Canadian experience lies in the derived nature of Canadian legal and professional developments in relation to England and to a lesser extent the US. The major missing dimension in this work of historical recovery are the voices of those who themselves engaged in same-gender pleasures, especially

those who were not middle class and not white. With the formation of many of the contemporary institutions of the Canadian state and with the generation of social and family policies, the assumption of heterosexuality would now become institutionalized in state policy.

Heterosexual Hegemony and the Welfare State

World War I left Canada with an ever-increasing corporate concentration of capital and with a hierarchy of finance, business, Parliament, the judiciary, the civil service, and various professional groups and agencies forming ruling institutions and relations that were constructed in opposition to working-class and other social struggles.¹⁸¹ The war brought with it increasing state intervention in the realms of social and economic life and introduced “scientific management” techniques.

American companies were now doing more and more business in Canada, bringing with them the social relations found south of the border. Agriculture, however, did not lose its leading economic role until the 1930s, and because of its dependence on other powers, Canada did not develop a strong industrial base. The 1920s and 1930s were the years of monopoly capital’s boom and bust. It was only in this environment of corporate capitalism and the initial creation of the welfare state that heterosexual hegemony became fully established in Canadian social formation.

Beginning with the federal Department of Health and the Division of Child Welfare in 1919, the institutions of state social regulation were put firmly in place. Dr. Helen MacMurchy, first chief of the Division of Child Welfare, who had earlier been Ontario’s Superintendent of the Feeble-minded, felt that “the decent wish for a true woman is to be a mother”¹⁸² and used her position to “educate” women in the areas of reproduction and motherhood. Her widely circulated “Little Blue Books” signalled motherhood as the highest form of patriotism, for if “No Baby—No Nation.”¹⁸³

In the 1930s and 1940s, the foundations of the welfare state were laid after protracted social and political struggles for family allowances and unemployment insurance.¹⁸⁴ But the form these benefits took was not that which the social and union activists had been demanding. For instance, the original struggles for unemployment insurance saw it as a fund that only the employers should pay into. The provision of services in many cases also served to justify extended state and professional surveillance and regulation of working-class and poor people’s lives.

Women’s social, economic, and sexual dependence and institutionalized heterosexuality were cornerstones of these state social policies, so that the heterosexual family unit became the only legally and socially sanctioned way of life.¹⁸⁵ State agencies enacted legislation

constitutive of a family in which dependence of women and children...became legally enforceable and...progressively incorporated into the administrative policies of welfare agencies, education, health care, etc.... The man as breadwinner and the woman as dependent become the legally enforceable and administratively constituted relation.¹⁸⁶

At the same time, the corporatist perspective of the Mackenzie King government attempted to integrate the unions into the workings of state agencies with government management of negotiations and collective bargaining.

All this transpired in concert with the emergence of mass heterosexual culture and the 1920s' "companionate marriage." This cultural revolution had a dramatic effect on the lives of ordinary people. Sexual intercourse between women and men was defined as "normal" and "natural," and women who were not erotically turned on by men, whether they were labelled "spinsters" or "lesbians," were considered a "social problem." The mass media, with its advertising, the entertainment and amusement industries, and the opening up of new consumer markets all led to the proliferation and eroticization of heterosexual images. The new heterosexual culture was also produced socially in dance halls, movie theatres, ice cream parlours, and among young women and men in factories and schools. Some young men and women developed relationships including erotic ones that broke away from the previous conventions of different-gender sex that had been regulated by families and reproduction.¹⁸⁷

Mass consumer culture helped bring about the fragmentation of working-class cultures. Associational life outside the factory was increasingly replaced by privatized family activities and by commercialized leisure activities.¹⁸⁸ The family, ever more separated from community and kinship networks as it became an even smaller consumer unit, was no longer at the centre of production for the household.¹⁸⁹ By the 1920s, it was actually possible for a minority of men working for wages in the manufacturing sector to live up to the ideal of the family wage and earn enough income to support an economically dependent wife and children.¹⁹⁰ Later there was the construction of national consumer markets and the development of department stores, especially for white middle-class women.¹⁹¹

The English-Canadian media was influenced, if not dominated, by US economic interests and advertising. This brought to Canada social relations in which American gender and sexual images were being reproduced. The nascent Canadian film industry was eclipsed by the development of the US industry. Homosexuality was generally denied by its exclusion from films. However, Vito Russo describes the "sissy" as a presentation of male homosexuality according to the model of gender inversion—an image of improper masculinity.¹⁹² As such it was a humorous presentation of what a man should not be. At the same time, some queer-influenced images did enter into films and plays during these years. Homosexuality and lesbianism in films was banned from the screen under the US film industry's Motion Picture Production Code in 1934.¹⁹³ This was part of what George Chauncey describes as the exclusion of homosexuality from the public sphere in the 1930s in response to the previous visibility of queer networks and was part of constructing the relations of "the closet."¹⁹⁴ This had an important impact in Canada as well.

More than three hundred American mass-circulation magazines entered the Canadian market in the 1920s, led by *Ladies Home Journal*, *Saturday Evening Post*, and *McCalls*.¹⁹⁵ This was a period of both change and continuity in white women's magazines.¹⁹⁶ More women were being schooled and entering into the wage labour force.

By the 1920s, it was assumed that a woman would work for wages outside the home for a few years before marriage, while a husband's social status continued to be measured by his ability to keep a wife working at home. The magazines clearly opted for marriage as opposed to a career, but they also expressed the tensions which women felt in having to choose. On the subject of child-rearing, biology was no longer enough: women had to be trained for motherhood.

[It was] no longer assumed that natural instinct, trial and error, or practice with young siblings taught a woman to be a mother. Now a professional approach must be taken: women must be trained for the task.¹⁹⁷

Not only was the white middle-class housewife expected to be "educated," the modern woman was also expected to have some business experience before marriage in order to be socially competent and to properly oversee the "socialization" and schooling of her children. The magazines attempted to maintain racist and patriarchal sex/gender relations while also endorsing contemporary ideas of capitalist rationality and efficiency.

By the late 1920s, neo-Freudian ideas, including the notions of "proper" and "deviant" mother/child relations and heterosexuality as the norm, began to enter into popular discussion.¹⁹⁸ These ideas would later be propagated through the marriage, sex-advice, and child-rearing manuals that would reach their heyday in the post-World War II period.¹⁹⁹

The household was further reorganized by state-provided compulsory schooling and everything that went with it. This led to the lengthening of the socially organized period of adolescence. Schooling led to a reorganization of working-class women's labour so as to prepare children for school. This set new standards for children's health, cleanliness, and "character."²⁰⁰ In the white middle-class family, the mother provided the communicative skills which would help the child do well in school, and, if it was a boy, to advance into a professional career (doctor, lawyer, manager, executive). The work of the housewife/mother was organized, in part, by the imperatives of the school system.

Adolescent peer-based cultures now emerged often seizing or moving into the new social spaces opened up by consumer-capitalist relations. These were not simply a reflection of dominant trends; indeed, they often faced stiff opposition from parents and school and other authorities. But although teenagers did rebel against adult restrictions, their cultural forms were generally heterosexual and male-defined. Sexuality was central to teenage social interaction and culture but in a patriarchal and heterosexual context, including sexual coercion and violence against women. Adolescent forms of rebellion and resistance against rigid forms of reproductive marriage relations ironically helped create some of the basis for the new heterosexual "norm."

Despite the construction of heterosexual hegemony and the enforcement of institutionalized heterosexuality, there were those who resisted. They sought out others of the same gender for pleasure and companionship, establishing some of the resources for the subsequent formation of gay and lesbian communities. For instance, in Toronto in the 1920s, homosexually-inclined men picked up soldiers in Queen's Park and in the

1930s cruised the Bay Theatre at Bay and Queen.²⁰¹ Many Canadian women who loved or had sex with other women were profoundly affected by Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness*, published in 1928. This book and the controversy surrounding it provided a naming for their sexual desires and also provided the media with an image of "the lesbian." In a review written by journalist S.H. Hooke in *The Canadian Forum* in 1929, the censorship of *The Well of Loneliness* was criticized, and Hooke, despite using the language of "abnormality" in relation to lesbians, took up a relatively tolerant view. He ended the review with the following insight:

But by the irony of life, society's blind reaction in the censorship to certain facts of life defeats itself. As a result of the ban upon *The Well of Loneliness*, thousands upon thousands of people have read the book and become aware of the facts of inversion who would ordinarily never have seen the book, nor become cognizant of the facts which it deals with.²⁰²

Women inspired by Hall's novel and men who picked up sailors and cruised theatres would open up some of the spaces for the expansion of queer networks in the 1940s and 1950s. It is to these stories and the conservative social responses to them that I now turn.

World War II, Coming Out, and Constructing Homosexuality as a National, Social, and Sexual Danger

War Mobilization and “Psychopathic Personalities with Abnormal Sexuality”

World War II has been described as “a nationwide coming out experience” for the United States.¹ Mobilization uprooted millions of Americans, weakening the hold of the heterosexual family and separating women and men from each other in the armed forces, in war production, and in industry. A new setting for same-gender erotic liaisons was thus created.

Homosexuals were officially excluded from military service.² Disciplinary state organizations like the military and the police had come to embody heterosexual masculinity as a central organizing ideology, and prohibitions against lesbianism were directed at regulating the lives of all women in the military as they started to enter its ranks.³ On the one hand, the military through its bringing together of men and women in gender segregated contexts facilitated same-gender erotic friendships and activities; on the other, it developed disciplinary regulations against these very same-gender erotic practices. This set up a contradictory situation for the military, which it attempted to handle through new administrative policies and regulations.

Even though, at the height of the World War II mobilization in the United States prohibitions against homosexuality were relaxed in the interests of the war effort, homosexuals could still be routinely discharged.⁴

The military assigned the task of identifying homosexuals to draft-board members and military doctors...Standardized psychiatric testing, developed after World War I, made their job easier. Millions of men were asked at induction physicals if they ever had homosexual feelings or experiences. For many, this was the first time they had to think of their lives in homosexual terms. This mass sexual questioning was just one of the ways that homosexuality became an issue during the war.⁵

This was part of the incursion of the psychiatric and later the psychological professions into the work of social administration, including the areas of gender and sexual regulation, at first in the military, and then in other areas.⁶ People determined to be

homosexual could be given “blue discharges,” which disqualified them from military pensions and other benefits and decreased their chances of finding civilian employment. Thousands of these men and women who carried the stigma of homosexuality after being discharged during and after the war joined the developing lesbian and gay networks in such cities as New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

War mobilization also affected sex/gender relations in Canada when thousands of women entered industry for the first time. At first, only single women were hired; then came married women without children. This situation was portrayed as only a temporary sacrifice: women’s “proper place” was still in the home.⁷ This shift, however, had a major effect on the social fabric of Canadian life.

The 18th Annual Report of the United Church of Canada, Division of Evangelism and Social Services, published in 1943, expressed moral-conservative concern. “War-time conditions are having a serious effect upon family life,” said the chairman, warning of child neglect and an increase in both “illegitimate” births and “juvenile delinquency.”⁸

It is evident that wartime conditions are resulting in a serious disintegration of the family. That is not surprising when hundreds of thousands of men are absent from their homes on active service in H. M. Forces, and when the demands of war-time industry have necessitated the greatest migration in Canadian history. Sometimes both parents and all the older members of the family are working and younger children are often left without adequate supervision...many families have migrated to new communities, where they find unfamiliar conditions and new excitements and temptations, and where the old restraints no longer obtain. Many young people receiving war-time wages have larger amounts of money to spend at a premature age...This problem is aggravated further by the prevalence of pernicious theories of sex relationships derived from the so-called “new psychology” and the unjustified currency which has been given the doctrines of “self-expression” in certain circles.⁹

Sexual indulgence was denounced:

Evidence points to widespread laxity and promiscuity in sex relations and to a dangerously indulgent attitude on the part of large numbers. The use of contraceptive devices, the prevalence of sexual intercourse outside marriage, the frequent lack of shame or condemnation for sexual license, the tendency to regard the moral standards of the past as out-moded “taboos” are very disturbing.¹⁰

The Department of National Defence was criticized by the Church for its policies on venereal disease (now STIs).¹¹ Venereal disease once again became a symbol for moral anxiety over shifting sex and gender relations. Under the rubric of fears of VD and sexual activity came issues ranging from children being left without supervision, to industrial upheaval, to the separation of thousands of men and women because of active service.

Fears of “sexual promiscuity” and VD were compounded with concerns by ruling social agencies when thousands of women joined the military and were deemed to have lost their sexual respectability.¹² A look at the VD-control programme in the Canadian Women’s Army Corps offers a valuable glimpse into the military attitudes of the time. The army’s concern reached a fever pitch in 1943. The campaign was primarily directed against sex workers and “loose women,” who were considered “carriers.” This sexist policy was based on a flagrant double standard. There was no focus, for instance, on men who transmitted disease to their wives or women partners. There was no equivalent “loose man” to that of “loose woman.” Women who violated the code of sexual propriety were labelled “promiscuous.” Women were the scapegoats in the VD scare. The impact of VD policies on sex between men during these years remains to be explored.

While there was an attempt to escalate the sexist regulation of women’s sexual lives during the war, its effectiveness was limited by the very upheavals of war. People did not necessarily obey or believe the official proclamations. While the war mobilization clearly made possible same-gender liaisons in the military and among women in industry, there is still less evidence that World War II fostered coming out and the formation of lesbian and gay networks in Canada than for the experience in the United States. However, there are some wonderful first-hand accounts I mention in the next section.

One of the main differences between Canadian and United States military regulation of sexuality was in the classification of “sex deviates.” From 1943 on, American military recruits were actually asked upon induction whether they were homosexual or whether they had ever been in love with someone of the same sex; in Canada, however, the military placed homosexuals and lesbians under the heading “psychiatric disorders” (which included psychoneurosis and psychosis) and more specifically as “anti-social psychopaths” and “psychopathic personalities” with “abnormal sexuality.”¹³ While thousands of Canadian men and women were discharged as such, many of them for same-gender sex, there was less specific labelling of homosexuals than in the United States. They would have been classified as sub-groups of these broad psychological collecting categories and not as a specifically demarcated homosexual type. Clearly, this association was an important feature of military categorization but at the same time it was an inscription into a highly psychiatrically defined concept that privileged “psychopathic” personality and not same-gender sexuality.¹⁴

At the same time, as one American study conducted in 1943–44 concluded, “The problem of sexual psychopathy in the military service is essentially that of homosexuality.”¹⁵ In 1921 the American army had established its first written regulations excluding men who were sexual “perverts” or “psychopaths,” and during World War II both the army and navy were diagnosing homosexual men and women as “sexual psychopaths.”¹⁶

This also raises the question of whether during these years as Freedman suggests, “psychopath served in part as a code for *homosexual*.”¹⁷ One of the concepts psychiatrists brought with them into military administration was “psychopath,” which originated in the late nineteenth century within forensic psychiatry as a “collecting category”

to classify habitual criminals who exhibited “abnormal” social behaviour. It was used by Heinrich Kaan and Richard von Krafft-Ebing in regard to “abnormal” sexual activities.¹⁸ Forensic psychiatrists were called upon to testify in court as to a person’s mental soundness at the time of committing an offence. An important and lasting interconnection was established between these psychiatric knowledges and criminal proceedings. At first those categorized as psychopaths were “hypersexual” women, and unemployed or transient men who lived beyond the boundaries of familial and social regulation. By the 1930s, the category was used more to classify men deemed to be sex deviants and criminals.

The sexualization of the male psychopath took place in the United States in the 1930s. This decade saw psychiatrists and psychologists investigating gender and sexual “deviance.” In the process, they were creating a sharper definition of heterosexual masculinity. Those who were deviant in their “masculinity” increasingly became targets for psychiatric and psychological investigation. In the 1930s in the United States, the man who was a sex deviant began to be seen as a danger to children and it was during this decade that homosexuals began to emerge as an important part of this psychopathic category.¹⁹

There was an unevenness of conceptualizations used in different discourses and institutional sites. In some, *homosexual*—taken from sexological and psychological discourse was used—and in others, *sexual psychopath*—taken from psychiatric discourse—had more currency. This was part of the unevenness of developments in official and popular discourses where, in some, “homosexuality” per se, was being used; in others, “homosexuality” was part of broader administrative collecting categories. In some discourses, homosexuality was not clearly distinguished from other sexual deviances or had been re-conflated with broader psychiatric categories as part of larger diagnostic units. The social conceptualization of “homosexuality” was still only in the process of being generalized within official and more popular discourses.

At the same time, there were other popular and professional discourses in which homosexual “labelling” was more directly taking place. Even though official military language might use psychiatric terms, a person discharged from the military could still be identified as “queer” by other unit members. Sidney Katz writes in a *Maclean’s* magazine article that, “Every Canadian serviceman can recall at least a few instances where one of the fellows in his outfit was suddenly sent home for discharge because he was a ‘queer.’”²⁰ Even if one was disposed of as a “psychopathic personality”—if word got round that it was because of same-gender sex—because of other available discourses and popular cultures, he or she could still be labelled as “homosexual” or “queer.”

Military mobilizations before and during the war created a series of problems that psychiatric personnel, among others, were called upon to manage. As people with “abnormal sexuality” were identified as a “danger” or a “disruptive influence” in the military, an official course of action was put in place to deal with this “problem.” This involved bringing together the work of military classification and discipline with medical and psychiatric discourse and professionals.

Medical records and statistics were kept throughout the war as part of a documentary form of administration in the military. A documentary reality of files and records came to define the recruits' relation to the military. This was organized by, and provided an opening for, psychiatric and psychological classifications as part of these administrative regulations. The military came to be increasingly organized through forms of textually mediated discourse that mandated courses of action in military procedure and discipline. These administrative policies were designed to make the war effort more "efficient" and to get rid of "unfit men" so that they "are not permitted to impede the fighting forces."²¹

On induction, each man had to undergo an Order Medical Examination. Physicians classified recruits according to the categories laid out in the *Physical Standards and Instructions for the Examination of Recruits* (1938), which considered recruits with "nervous or mental disorders" to be "unfit for service." In 1942, this manual was criticized by medical and personnel officers because it did not allow them to match recruits with military positions. That same year, military psychiatrists introduced the Psychiatric Questionnaire, which was designed to test the emotional stability of recruits and was used in conjunction with the standard medical classifications.

Originally in the war effort, there was no specific psychiatric screening although some was initiated in the summer of 1941. The original manuals and regulations that were designed for a smaller professional army were found wanting in the context of a rapidly expanding draft army. New procedures and classifications were required to manage the new problems that were emerging for military administration. These were in part to be provided by psychiatry and psychology and by training military personnel in these disciplines. As the Feasby official military history reports, "the psychiatrist in the Second World War developed a new relationship to administrative authority."²² Psychiatric practices thus became integrated with military rule. Military practices after enlistment were focused on those who showed "unusual" behaviour or who were "emotionally unstable."²³ These were considered problems within military organization.

However, "homosexual" was used in the *Physical Standards and Instructions for the Medical Examination of Serving Soldiers and Recruits* (1943) where it was mentioned under "psychopathic personality."²⁴ In military psychiatric practice the Feasby text reports that, "a group of cases was met for which the name psychopathic personality" became defined (only in professional discourse do people become "cases").²⁵ In the official account of the Canadian Medical Service it is reported that "opportunities to study this group of cases are particularly plentiful in times of war."²⁶ The people who were claimed by this category were various individuals and groups who could not adapt or conform to institutionalized military life.

In the 1943 instructions under "Stability (s)," the following is stated as instructions to assist doctors and psychiatrists in diagnosing "psychopathic personality" (section 195):

The chief characteristic of this disorder is inability of the individual to profit by experience. Men with this disorder are unable to meet the usual adult social standards of

truthfulness, decency, responsibility and consideration for their fellow associates. They are emotionally unstable and absolutely not to be depended on. They are impulsive, show poor judgement and in the army they are continually at odds with those who are trying to train and discipline them.... Among this group are many homosexuals, chronic delinquents, chronic alcoholics and drug addicts. All such men should be regarded as medically unfit for service anywhere in any capacity.²⁷

This reference to “many homosexuals” would have provided a guide for detection and diagnosis for military doctors.

This category of “psychopathic personality” contained a diverse range of behaviour and problems, even “psychopathic personality with abnormal sexuality.” In 1942 a committee on the nomenclature of mental disorders concluded that these “cases”—and the Feasby text quotes positively from it—“exert a bad influence on their fellow soldiers and are therefore unwanted in any unit.”²⁸ Psychopathic personality with abnormal sexuality” was the “diagnosis used when abnormal sexuality is the basic feature of the case, and is not apparently based on mental deficiency, psychoses or psychoneurosis.”²⁹ The job of military psychiatrists was to “facilitate the disposal of [these] cases.”³⁰

If a “problem” was detected among military personnel, a doctor or psychiatrist would be called in to make a diagnosis. Some of those examined would be diagnosed as “psychopathic personalities” with “abnormal sexuality.” If military doctors and psychiatrists could successfully fit or “inscribe” those they were examining into this classification, they would be given an s-5 rating (s for suitability) as laid out in the *Physical Standards and Instructions for the Medical Examination of Serving Soldiers and Recruits*, which meant they were “Unsuitable for service anywhere in any capacity because of instability.”³¹ This would then mandate discharge from the military bringing into action the administrative discharge proceedings of the military.

From 1939 to 1945, the navy rejected a reported 10,734 males and 775 females for medical reasons.³² This group included a reported 387 men and forty-nine women in the period May 1941 to September 1945 because of nervous and mental disorders.³³ Under category E, “unfit for service,” 5,535 men and 159 women were rejected from September 1, 1939 to September 30, 1945.³⁴ As for the army, 1,127 recruits were rejected because of “psychopathic personality” in 1944 alone.³⁵ Unfortunately, the statistics do not differentiate between “psychopathic personality” and other “disorders,” let alone between various “problems” and “psychopathic personality with abnormal sexuality.” We are therefore left with no recorded “pervert” count. It is clear, nevertheless, that thousands of men and women were labelled “psychopathic personalities,” many of them for suspected same-gender erotic interests. How they reacted to this classification has yet to be investigated.

Significant for our purposes is that the classification “psychopathic personality” did not have the same impact as the more explicit homosexual labelling in the United States. Not only was it a more psychologically and technically defined term, it also grouped together various “problems,” some of them having little or nothing to do with sex. As an ideological classification it had very little to do with the actual lives of men and women

engaging in same-gender eroticism. Many women and men engaging in same-gender sex would not have exhibited the characteristics associated with “psychopathic personality” allowing for many of them to be overlooked. In many ways it would have been an ineffective means of policing and excluding same-gender eroticism.³⁶ At the same time, this “psychopathic” classification would be built upon in the policing and regulation of same-gender sex in the post-war years in Canada in the military and within state relations more generally.

Coming Out and Queer Doings

There were those, however, who managed to slip through the apparatus of military sexual policing to explore their same-gender desires and to participate in homosexual and lesbian networks in large cities and naval ports. Official military and psychiatric classification of their sexuality as “psychopathic” didn’t stop them from having same-gender erotic pleasures. The following little gems culled from a few sources give us a sense of these very “unofficial” stories, which also make visible a line of fault between these lived experiences and the official categories used to police sexual life. These accounts have a very different character than official military/psychiatric accounts. In them we can begin to see how the experiences of men engaging in sex with other men were socially organized and how they would help to lay the basis for post-war expansion of gay networks. They also begin to reveal very practical aspects of the social organization of same-gender sex between men and begin to pose and answer such questions as “where to go to meet men for sex?” or “how to tell if another man is interested in sex with men?”³⁷

Bert Sutcliffe describes his experiences:

I joined the army when I was twenty-three, in 1940. I was completely unaware—I had never heard the expression gay, homosexual, lesbian or faggot. Not even negatively... When I was a young teenager I was aware of the fact that men appealed to me. But I had no idea about anything until myself and a sergeant were sent to England in 1941... We went to the dance on New Year’s Eve and then went back to our quarters... We had a few drinks and he said, “Well, c’mon, let’s sleep in my quarters,” and of course one thing led to the other. He was the one who began my education. He took me into the first gay bar I’d ever been into, London during the war time was heaven, really—people on leave, and all kinds of gay clubs. I made sure before I came home to ask the men I knew overseas who were gay: okay, where do you go in Toronto? They told me of two or three places. None of these places was exclusively gay and you had to be cautious. You had to feel your way and make sure the guy you were working on was in fact gay.³⁸

Sutcliffe writes in his autobiography that

it should be understood that many young men who were to enter the Community of gays during the war were able to do so because they were free from family control...A few of

these young men may have returned to the “so-called straight and narrow path” on returning to Canada, but to use an old adage, “How can you keep them down on the farm after they have seen Paris?”³⁹

Sutcliffe learned a lot from his encounter with English same-gender erotic male cultures and military sex experiences and was able to use some of this practical knowledge when he got back.

I came home with a number of facts. One, there were a number of steam baths where one could meet...I never did use this outlet. Two, that certain pubs and bars in Toronto were popularized by members of Toronto's gay Community: The King Edward Hotel, the Ford Hotel (to a lesser extent).⁴⁰

His companion Ralph Wormleighton remembers that during the war, “In my outfit, it was generally known certain men were gay. Nothing was ever done about it.”⁴¹

Several of Maurice Leznoffs gay “informants” in his 1954 thesis on homosexual men in Montréal refer to their wartime or military experiences as pivotal to their “coming out”—to themselves and to friends:

At about the age of 19 I met up with my first genuinely homosexual experience in the army. I met this one particular chap at the training camp we became fast friends.... This attachment existed for a long time until we eventually drifted into bed.... Neither of us had the courage to suggest such a thing, nor the knowledge of homosexuality. I think it was more than a physical attraction. It occurred in London on a weekend leave. We were both a little high and had come home from a dance...without asking any questions I simply got into his bed. It was a question of instinct rather than technique. Neither of us felt any regrets. It was certainly primitive but genuinely homosexual and the first that either of us had experienced. After this we often had sex together and advanced all along the way in a completely parallel course of development. At one point we danced together in the privacy of our room and afterwards kissed. That had been the first time that either of us had kissed another man.... Another curious thing about the whole affair was that neither of us considered ourselves homosexual.... We both went back to university, too. I remember that I had keen sexual powers. Then we began a new practice.... We used to take out the girls on a double date, get ourselves worked up, take the girls home, and then go home together, and have sex.... The separation from him was perfectly ghastly. Even now when I think about it I am a little saddened. It was at this point that we both realized that we were homosexual.⁴²

Canadian men cruised abroad during the war:

I remember once in London during the war. Capital Square was as gay as hell. And the blackout made it a cruising paradise. Every night you could go out and just bump into hundreds of gay people. Americans, Canadians, British, Australians, everything. I picked up this Australian fellow and we went back to my room to have sex.⁴³

The effect of such experiences on life back in Canada is a subject worthy of further exploration. One man discusses his own experiences:

Nothing really happened until I got to London during the war. I was a secretary in the air force. I lived all through the war in London. I knew that I was gay all this time, but I wasn't doing anything about it...London was very gay. Then one night at the theatre one of the comedians made a joke about the blackout being as thick as the queers in P.C. That's how I knew where to go and I made a b-line for P.C.... I had my first gay experience there and I went back very often afterwards...I was getting a special living-out allowance so that I had my own quarters.... My closest friend all this time had a room in the same house... we used to go out cruising together and we would have a hell of a lot of fun just talking to each other and telling each other what we picked up I don't know what I would have done without Charley...I felt miserable and well...just perverted by what I was doing but the fascination of it kept me going back for more. Charley knew what I was going through because he went through the same thing himself. I owe him a hell of a lot. He convinced me that it wasn't my fault I was gay and the only thing to do was accept it and make your life as happy as you can in spite of it.... By the time I got back to Canada, gay life was just about natural to me. I went to university...I found out that universities could have their gay people too, and I made a lot of contacts there.⁴⁴

Another gay man explains the difference between the wartime and peacetime moods:

During the war people were scattered all over the place and morals were very loose. At the same time facilities became numerous. I mean places where homosexuals could go and also the number of practising homosexuals. This was because of the close association of people in the services. After the war there was this period of unsettlement. On the other hand, I think that in a period of peacetime and the necessity of settling in a job, people became more sedate...It was no longer as easy to lose oneself as long as people were permanently established in one particular place and with a steady job.⁴⁵

Wartime circumstances led to the expansion of gay and lesbian networks. A post-war tightening up of sex and gender regulations would have left these networks stranded outside the social mainstream, which in turn would have facilitated further networking and community formation for group support.

Reconstructing Patriarchal and Heterosexual Hegemonies: Contending Strategies of Regulation

The end of the war brought with it a reconstruction of the gender division of labour in Canada. Women were removed from industry and daycare centres were closed. Heterosexual hegemony was reconstructed after the war in response to social changes, at the same time, building on, and transforming, previous forms of heterosexism. Sexual organization, however, was also shifted over the post-war decades. The 1940s and 1950s reinforcement of the family and reproductive heterosexuality gave way, by the 1960s

and 1970s, to new forms of class and family organization. By the late 1960s, membership in a “proper” heterosexual family unit was no longer always essential for advancement in the corporate and professional worlds, especially the lower rungs. While women’s unpaid reproductive labour was still needed in the rearing of children, corporate capital’s commitment to the “proper” heterosexual family was not what it had previously been.⁴⁶

There were now new struggles over homosexual and lesbian definitions. A “liberalizing” or rationalizing tendency emerged with the Kinsey studies, the expansion of sex research, and new psychological knowledge. This was partly shaped by the expansion of gay and lesbian networks. A more conservative trend also surfaced, one that focused on the homosexual as a national, social, and criminal sexual danger. This image built on the previous association of homosexuality with national degeneration and decay and the homosexual as “child molester,” which, in turn, was derived from the earlier image of homosexual men “preying” on adolescent boys.

During the 1950s and 1960s, two contending strategies of sexual regulation were struggled over as part of the transformation of a range of relations in post-war capitalism, including class, gender, sexual, and state relations. The main strategy to be explored in this chapter is that of the extending criminalization strategy that constructed homosexuality as a social and sexual danger. This includes the US-influenced criminal-sexual-psychopath and later dangerous-sexual-offender sections of the Criminal Code, but also the “national-security” campaigns. Put in place in the 1950s, this regulatory framework was shifted over the next two decades to a second strategy, the public/private partial decriminalization frame of regulation identified with the 1957 Wolfenden Report, which will be explored in chapter 8. This shift in focus included active contention and struggle and the subordination of one strategy to the other in the social construction of hegemony. This had an important impact on both professional and popular discussions.

The Kinsey Earthquake and New Psychological Knowledges

The 1948 publication of Alfred Kinsey’s *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* in 1953 challenged some of the commonsense notions of heterosexism formed in the pre-World War II and immediate post-war years.⁴⁷ Kinsey’s studies demonstrated that the number of men and women engaged in same-gender sex was much larger than previously imagined. The study on men also showed that masturbation among boys and men was regular and widespread. The Kinsey reports were widely circulated and publicized and generated numerous reviews in professional journals and popular magazines.

Using a research method derived from the natural sciences, Kinsey asserted that he was producing “value-free” facts. He was not interested in questions of sexual meaning, identity, consciousness, or how sexual experiences were socially organized, but only with what he saw as the development of a “scientific” classification of sexual behaviour.

His approach focused on orgasm/ejaculation. Central to the Kinsey Institute's work was "sexual outlet," which measured the number of genital sexual contacts. Since Kinsey's methods were not concerned with social meaning, they ripped apart people's actual experiences, separating "outlet" from social context and practice.

Kinsey was not interested in notions of homosexual (or heterosexual) identity. Indeed, he questioned whether there was any such thing as homosexuality beyond what he called "homosexual sexual outlets." These limitations mean that the Kinsey data is not very illuminating on the subject of the formation of homosexual cultures and identities. His work is, however, very important to an examination of the social organization of sexual knowledge and the social and political struggles over the meanings and consequences of this knowledge.

While the Kinsey studies revealed some shocking information for some about the extent of same-gender sex, it generally championed heterosexual and male-defined forms of intercourse. In a sense, these reports expanded the existing definitions of heterosexual normality—to include, for example, limited homosexual fooling around at points in people's lives.

Kinsey classified people according to their sexual outlets. His famous continuum of sexual behaviour placed people along a scale from exclusive heterosexual acts (0) through to exclusive homosexual acts (6). Kinsey challenged the stereotype of homosexuality as a form of gender inversion. He defined the capacity to participate in homosexual acts as a relatively common "inherent physiologic capacity" that should not be punished.⁴⁸

The Kinsey findings highlighted the significant number of male homosexual acts, but established that only a small proportion of men were involved in exclusively or predominantly homosexual activity. As Chauncey suggests, these statistics may be capturing traces of a somewhat earlier form of organization of same-gender sex among men before the full hegemony of institutionalized heterosexuality. This may have allowed for more of a combining of same-and different-gender erotic activities.⁴⁹ For instance, fifty percent of the white males interviewed admitted erotic response to other males, and thirty-seven percent of men in all occupational groups admitted at least one homosexual experience to the point of orgasm between adolescence and old age. Only four percent, however, were found to be exclusively involved in homosexual activity throughout their lives: thirteen percent reported more involvement in homosexual than heterosexual activity for at least three years of their lives.

The Kinsey researchers asserted that female sexual responses were not that dissimilar to those of men and argued that men and women's orgasms were equivalent physiological phenomena. They reported that twenty-eight percent of women said that they responded erotically to their own gender, that thirteen percent had experienced orgasms with other women, and that the number of women exclusively or primarily involved in activity with other women were from one-third to one-half of the equivalent figures for men. The Kinsey study thereby perpetuated hegemonic social assumptions about women's general lack of sexual autonomy.

The release of these findings was met with moral outrage in the context of the initiation of the Cold War and the “national-security” scares that also targeted homosexuals. Sexual conservatives simply refused to believe these statistics. The most vehement attacks were levelled at the volume of female sexual behaviour.⁵⁰ Some US conservatives used the findings to magnify the danger of homosexuality, arguing that it was an epidemic sweeping the nation.⁵¹ The findings were used in the context of the McCarthyite witch hunts to whip up hatred and fear against lesbians and gay men. However, the relatively small percentage of those reported to be engaged in exclusively homosexual acts was used to visualize homosexuality as “deviant” behaviour practised by only a small minority of the population, thus buttressing notions of heterosexual normality for the vast majority.⁵²

The Kinsey Institute research and publications were a primary reference point for sexual policy and discussion throughout the post-war years. The reports legitimized the discussion of sexuality in newspapers, magazines, and on radio and television. The Kinsey findings were taken up by the agencies and institutions that administer and regulate our erotic lives. They were also used by the new homophile and gay movements in the 1950s and 1960s as a way to legitimize our existence. It provided the basis for the claim that gays and lesbians are ten percent of the population, even though Kinsey himself never argued this. In the 1950s, Kinsey himself urged the officers of the Mattachine Society, an American homophile group, to avoid “special pleas for a minority group” and to restrict themselves to aiding “qualified research experts,” in the process reinforcing tendencies toward caution, accommodation, and reliance on professionals.⁵³

The Kinsey perspective on homosexuality served to inform Canadian medical, psychological, and popular literature in the 1950s and 1960s. Early 1950s medical and psychological articles often combined use of the Kinsey statistics with Freudian-derived psychological theories.⁵⁴ These articles used psychological theories to explain homosexuality, such as the familiar argument that homosexuality is caused by “mothers who blocked their [sons’] masculine tendencies, encouraged their feminine interests, and tied their sons to themselves emotionally.”⁵⁵ There was an uneven and gradual shift away, nevertheless, from the theory of gender inversion and toward the idea of homosexuality as a sexual-object choice.

The Kinsey statistics were used to show that the number of exclusive homosexuals was quite small, and that those who only occasionally participated in same-gender erotic activities should not be labelled as such but encouraged to take up a heterosexual life through therapy and adjustment. These articles were often clearly intended as instructions for doctors and health professionals. Their advice to those who could not change was to live “as normal a life as may be possible”—to live in the closet and pretend to be heterosexual. This professional advice was an active part of the social construction of the relations of the closet. This also called for “further scientific and objective treatment of the problem”⁵⁶—coincidentally, this research would be undertaken by these very same medical doctors, psychiatrists, and psychologists. This knowledge would play an important role in professional practice and eventually in popular discussion. It would be used to diagnose and “treat” homosexuals in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s and later.

Freud Rules OK?

The 1950s saw neo-Freudian ideas enter popular discourse in a major way. Psychiatric and psychological definitions of sex deviation and homosexuality became more firmly established, displacing older categories of “perversion” and “criminality.” Models of “treatment” were now developed, including aversion therapy and other forms of psychological and physical terrorism. Aversion therapy was directed at creating an aversive response, including physical pain and vomiting, to homosexual images as part of attempts to “cure” homosexual men and lesbians. Johann Mohr and R.E. Turner of the Toronto Forensic Clinic reported that

in sporadic homosexual behaviour, where the major question is one of control of impulsive acting out, aversion may be induced by showing homosexual stimuli in conjunction with mild electric shocks or emetic drugs.⁵⁷

Psychological testing had been developed on the basis of surveys of American soldiers in wartime and became more generalized in personnel and social administration in the 1950s and 1960s.⁵⁸ In the 1950s, the US Employment Service developed many standardized tests that were used by private vocational-guidance agencies, mental hospitals, employment agencies, and school counsellors and psychologists. They were used in personal assessments, for determining aptitude, and in rehabilitation programmes in Canada as well as the United States in the 1950s and 1960s. It was not until the early 1970s that their use was widely challenged within the professions.

These tests were also based on the development of MF (masculine/feminine) scales and psychological testing based on them. These tests embedded concerns over “proper” gender attributes in the practices of social administration in a number of different sites. “Homosexuality” came to be central to the articulation of these gender tests, as notions of gender inversion were crucial to the assumptions upon which they were constructed.⁵⁹

A number of the tests used in Canada classified homosexuality as a “disorder.”⁶⁰ One of these defined heterosexuality as an expressed need “to go out with or be in love with one of the opposite sex” and “to tell or listen to sex jokes.” More men than women responded positively to the questions regarding “heterosexuality.” Forty-two percent of the women responded to five questions or less. Scoring low on the heterosexuality scale could have serious consequences, however. One could be identified as sexually deviant or homosexual, and then subjected to more testing.⁶¹ Another test defined the homosexual as highly anxious, neurotic, tender-minded, depressive, and submissive. Homosexuality among men was associated with other deviant behaviour. Male homosexuals supposedly suffered from “guilt-proneness,” “frustration-tension,” and “emotional immaturity.” If preliminary testing confirmed the diagnosis, then various forms of therapy, including the use of certain drugs, were recommended.⁶²

Nonetheless, the 1950s also saw the establishment of gay and lesbian networks in major centres across the Canadian state. The rule of “homosexuality as mental illness” or “deviance” was neither monolithic nor total.

Gay Life in 1950s Montréal

In May 1954, a remarkable thesis was accepted by McGill University in Montréal. “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” by Maurice Leznoff,⁶³ particularly through its many excerpts from interviews with gay men, offers important glimpses into gay male life in Montréal (which Leznoff tries to disguise by calling it “Easton”). Because hiding the location was important to Leznoff, the language question and tensions between the English and French were not focused on. This is unfortunate for learning about the intersection of language, nation, class, and gay-network formation during these years. While the study of homosexuality had been virtually ignored by sociologists, Leznoff argued, “the most relevant theoretical statements that may be applied in analyzing homosexual society are to be found in the sociological theory.”⁶⁴ Here he was drawing on the ethnographic approach of the Chicago School of Sociology that had some influence at McGill.⁶⁵

This work marked a shift from a preoccupation with the origins of homosexuality and the various psychiatric, medical, and legal means of regulation to a recognition of a developing homosexual culture and an attempt to understand its “deviant” features as a response to a hostile society. Leznoff examined how gays, through association and participation in a subcultural system, sought satisfaction of needs not legitimately sanctioned in society. He was interested in how homosexual men survived, how they built their own social groups and avoided the social controls of heterosexual culture, and “how homosexual society is functionally integrated on a sexual basis.”⁶⁶ He refers to the works of Krafft-Ebing, Havelock Ellis, Freud, the Kinsey study on male sexual behaviour, and Donald Webster Cory’s *The Homosexual in America*, quoting a long passage from Cory on cruising and gay slang.⁶⁷

Using cross-cultural and historical examples, Leznoff argued that homosexuality is universal. He held the ahistorical view that homosexuals have remained basically unchanged throughout history while levels of social tolerance for homosexuality have varied, becoming more hostile in recent centuries. Leznoff was also influenced by the notion of sexual orientation as the distinct feature separating homosexuals from heterosexuals, which was in some discourses beginning to replace the theory of homosexuals as gender inverts: “It is the object of his sexual drive that distinguishes the homosexual from other men.”⁶⁸

Leznoff made contact with a group of thirteen or fourteen Montréal homosexuals (his “informants”) through a client at a social-welfare agency. This man was part of a homosexual group whose “queen’s” name was Robert.⁶⁹ The “queen” played a central role in the organization of gay male networks at that time, providing a place for meetings and sexual affairs. He helped finance members in distress, made sexual contacts for them, controlled membership in the network, warned of potential problems like dangerous “tricks” who might prey upon them, and even negotiated with the police. Often the queen was an older homosexual who had wide experience in the gay world.⁷⁰ Leznoff labels Robert and his group the “overts” because they lived almost exclusively within the homosexual culture, as opposed to the “coverts” who lived outside these networks.

This distinction between overt and covert homosexual groups, which was so central to Leznoff's work, continued to be a mainstay in sociological writings on gays in the 1960s, and even entered into Evelyn Hooker's psychological work on the emotional stability of gay men.

Leznoff accompanied these men to house parties, restaurants, and bars for about eight months. His thesis relies on observations made during these outings as well as interviews with forty homosexual men (both overts and coverts), surveys of twenty others, and an examination of letters from one gay man to another. The letters were written by a travelling salesman who described gay life in various Canadian cities. Leznoff had difficulty meeting and talking to professional and middle-class men, the "coverts," while the overts, who were usually working class, were more accommodating.⁷¹

The awarding of a Canadian Social Science Research Council grant for his thesis project was made public just as a park used for cruising came under heavy police surveillance, resulting in a number of arrests. Many of Leznoff's contacts blamed the press coverage for the police activity and held him personally responsible.⁷² There were also fears that Leznoff's data, including the interviews, would be turned over to the Research Council. He therefore found it increasingly difficult to get cooperation from his "informants," and his research came to an end.⁷³

The crucial distinction for Leznoff was that of overts and coverts. "Overts" lived mostly within homosexual networks and were not overly concerned with concealing their homosexuality, while "coverts" were likely to live most of their lives in the heterosexual world and were very fearful of being discovered. Class, occupation, and social status played a central role in Leznoff's distinction between the two, which he relates to the different strategies of concealment necessary to evade occupational controls.⁷⁴ The need to hide one's homosexuality was greater in some occupations than in others. Professionals could not afford to be identified with homosexuality, so they "adapt themselves to society through concealment and secret participation in homosexual activity." The overt group, on the other hand, tended to work in areas where homosexuality was more tolerated. Of the forty men interviewed, most identity-concealing were professionals, students, managers, businessmen, and upper-level clerks and salesmen. Among the non-concealing men, most were clerks and salesmen, artists, waiters, and hairdressers. Clearly Leznoff was discovering an aspect of the social relations of class as they related to gay network formation.⁷⁵ Remarks one of Leznoff's informants:

I know a few people who don't care [that it is known they are homosexuals]. Those who don't care are really pitiful. They are either people who are very insignificant in position or they are in good positions but are independent...I have to care a lot.⁷⁶

A manager of a small appliance shop states:

My promotions have made me more conscious of the gang I hang around with. You see for the first time in my life I have a job that I would really like to keep and where I can have

a pretty nice future...if word were to get around town that I am gay I would probably lose my job...I don't want to hang around with Robert [the queen of the "overt" group] any more or any of the people who are like Robert.⁷⁷

The threat of discovery also influenced the selection of occupation or career. Says a student:

I wouldn't like to end up with a job that requires mixing with normal people too much I would never think of going into law. I would like to go into the type of job where you can be more or less your own boss.⁷⁸

Leznoff's coverts formed a number of overlapping social groups with no queen figure playing a central role.⁷⁹ They were also involved in groups associated with their paid work; indeed, their social lives were often organized through the heterosexual worlds of the professions and business. They therefore tended to regard the overts "as a threat to their social position [because the coverts] think of themselves as different from that category of homosexuals who are not similarly motivated towards concealment."⁸⁰ They even saw overts as "riff-raff"—as "low-class people with low-class manners."⁸¹ Yet, since in both groups there was a taboo on sex with friends because this caused tensions within the group, coverts and overts developed erotic relations and coverts were forced to frequent homosexual spots to meet sexual partners.

Ross Higgins, in his important account of Leznoff's thesis, describes the overts:

These took little or no pains to conceal their homosexuality, though some did at work. Some had jobs where it was possible to be out, as artists, waiters, hairdressers, or low-level clerical and sales staff. At their head was the "queen" Robert/Roberta. He was an older man with a wide experience of gay life (his address book contained three thousand names). He sponsored younger men in the "life," provided a place where they could gather to "let their hair down" (sometimes a place they could bring someone for the night) and mediated their fights.⁸²

The coverts stayed away from "the gay world" as much as possible, but the overts developed "effeminacy" and swish behaviour as an affirmation of their gayness. For them, the homosexual group was a vital support. "Effeminacy" in this context should not be understood as acting stereotypically feminine, but rather as a particular cultural form produced among gay men based on the taking up and exaggeration of certain attributes associated with femininity. It was both a deconstruction and reconstruction of gender. This was a crucial component of the cultural production of gay men until the last decades, and continues today in important forms.

While the coverts feared public exposure by an overt, the overts often disliked the coverts. One who referred to the coverts as the "intelligentsia" said:

Sometimes they stoop down and have an affair with somebody from our gang. They even come to a party over at Robert's sometimes but they never hang around for very long I think you could say they mix sexually but not socially.⁸³

What was at the root of this tension and resentment between the two groups? The social organization of class has an important effect on our erotic lives and on homosexual cultures. Advancement in the business and professional worlds of the 1950s required that social life be tied to the corporation or the professional group—ideally, it required a nuclear family. It would have been next to impossible to be openly gay, so the “coverts” had to live a double life in the extreme: passing for straight and maintaining a secret homosexual life on the side. This was an important part of the construction of the relations of the closet. We also begin to see how the social relations of the closet are articulated unevenly to the social organization of class. The social pressures of “the closet” and living a “double-life” were much stronger in the lives of these middle-class and professional men.

At the same time, capitalism continued to open up social spaces in which people could more fully live beyond heterosexual family networks, and also created low-status jobs around which there was relative indifference towards homosexuality, or even a possible grudging acceptance, and which gays came to occupy. Indeed, some occupations came to be stereotyped as gay preserves such as hairdressing and interior decorating. In these often dead-end jobs and job ghettos one was not as required to organize one's social life through paid work or through heterosexuality. Men in such jobs, as well as artists and self-employed people, were able to create their own networks and their own cultures. Some of the earlier roots of these “overt” networks may also lie in the fairy networks that George Chauncey writes about in New York City earlier in the century.⁸⁴ Concealment was not a major constraint on their lives. It was these men who would create and fight for visible gay space in the 1950s and 1960s.⁸⁵

It is this social organization of class that created the tension between Leznoff's coverts and overts. These distinct social groups were shaped by the social relations organizing class relations outside gay networks and their effect on class formation within emerging gay community formation.

Leznoff's thesis pointed to other aspects of gay life in the 1950s. Increasing urbanization, for instance, meant that homosexual men could escape familial and religious regulations that were often still stronger in rural areas. Big cities often offered greater opportunities for sexual and social contacts.

On the subject of the police, Leznoff reported that none of those interviewed said they had ever been the target of police action.⁸⁶ He suggested that legal and police action was effective only against the most flagrant displays of homosexuality. The response of his “informants” to the arrests in the park, however, indicates a very real fear of the police.

Leznoff's work includes valuable information on cruising and contact techniques, on cruising areas, homosexual slang, and the bars, restaurants, and street corners

frequented by gays in Montréal. He produced a remarkable, if sometimes flawed, window into the past. For instance, the following wonderful tale:

I know a guy who gets dressed up in tight slacks to cruise the harbour area. He likes sailors. He'll get dressed up in these slacks and go to the taverns around the harbour. You can pick up a sailor that way pretty easy.⁸⁷

Seizing Queer Spaces: Butch/Femme Cultures, Bar Dykes, Facing Violence, and Queer Sites

Just as the “overts” Leznoff wrote about struggled for social space in the 1950s, so did working-class lesbian butch/femme cultures struggle for lesbian space and to affirm dyke identities.⁸⁸ Butch lesbians were not attempting to be “male,” but were developing a specifically lesbian cultural and erotic style in concert with the femmes that appropriated certain cultural forms from hegemonic masculinity and femininity but put them together in a new lesbian context. Many lesbians, given the gendered division of labour where women were segregated into lower-paying forms of wage-labour and the need for these women to support themselves, their partners, and sometimes their children, needed relatively higher-paying jobs. This is why many may have entered or tried to enter into “non-traditional” jobs that were generally done by men at this point. In these jobs, they would also have been able to get away with being more “butch” and not face as much pressure to conform to the standard codes of “femininity.” Line Chamberland, in her study of lesbian bars in Montréal stresses the important part played by working-class lesbians in establishing lesbian public space and also points to the class-related divisions among women and the class and job-related constraints on lesbian expression during these years.⁸⁹

In Toronto in the 1950s, women came together at the Continental, a hotel bar located in the middle of Chinatown. Straight men, sex workers, and “gay women” who were mostly working class gathered at this bar. For some lesbians, this became the centre of their lives, except when they were working to survive. For women who worked in factories or in low-paid service jobs, the Continental was the place to socialize. According to El Chenier who has done oral histories with fourteen women who went to the Continental, an “uptowner” was a woman who passed as straight during the waged work week and spent the weekends at the Continental. The working-class women who hung out at the Continental used “uptowners” to describe gay women who lived in greater secrecy and material comfort. A “downtowner” was a woman who spent much more of their time at the bar, usually every day and who did not regularly attempt to pass as straight. Mostly these “downtowners” were out and butch. Sex work, occasional or full-time, was common among these “downtowners” as a way of surviving.⁹⁰ Women who frequented the Continental in the 1950s and 1960s faced considerable police harassment including for some, being taken by the cops to Cherry Beach and then being beaten up. At the same time, there were also more suburban networks of lesbians who

had little contact with the women at the Continental, and women's baseball teams in various centres provided a basis for lesbian networking.

In the 1960s, downtown Toronto's Street Haven, a shelter for poor street women, many of whom were sex workers, tried to "rehabilitate" lesbians. Becki Ross tells us that crucial to their efforts were attempts to make butch lesbians into more "feminine" women by removing their tattoos and getting them to dress more "femininely." "Butch" lesbians were clearly seen as the major problem since more "feminine" appearance was praised and rewarded.⁹¹

Other women read the lesbian-themed pulp novels that were produced during these years, trying to read past the death or punishment of the lesbian character(s) at the end of the novel to find some reinforcement for their erotic desires for women. Some read the more lesbian-positive lesbian pulps, often written by lesbians like Ann Bannon.⁹² One of these lesbian pulp novels was *The Women's Barracks*. In 1952, the National News in Ottawa was charged with "obscenity" for carrying *The Women's Barracks*. Even though the defence argued that the book actually warned against lesbianism, it was decided that the presentation of lesbianism was too frank. National News was convicted.⁹³

Men in a number of centres used parks to cruise and meet men to have sex with. These were not only sites of pleasure but also danger. In 1946 in Windsor the "Windsor Slasher" targeted gay men in Windsor's riverside parks, attacking five and killing two. This led to the formation of the Auxiliary Service Patrols, in association with the Windsor police. These patrols were also directed against men using the parks for cruising and sex.⁹⁴

Men in Toronto and other cities in the 1950s were able to create what David Churchill calls "gay sites" in parts of cities also used for other purposes. This included parks, washrooms, bars, and the back rows of old movie theatres in downtown Toronto.⁹⁵ In the Ottawa area gay men began to congregate in a section of the Chez Henri bar in Hull, in the old rail yards, in the Honeydew near the Chateau Laurier, in the parks and train station near the Chateau, and in the tavern at the Lord Elgin. It was during World War II, that the Lord Elgin—built to house itinerant military officers—began to become a gay meeting place. Officers would even pick up enlisted personnel there.⁹⁶

Jim Egan: Canada's First Gay Activist

As gay gathering places expanded in the large cities, gays and lesbians began organizing on social and political levels. A few Canadian lesbians and gays subscribed to US homophile publications like the *Ladder*, put out by the lesbian organization the Daughters of Bilitis, *The Mattachine Review*, published by the Mattachine Society, and *One*, a homophile magazine. Homophile was generally used in early gay/lesbian groups to describe a relatively moderate orientation that expressed concerns about homosexual issues but was not necessarily defined as gay or lesbian.

In its March 1957 issue, *One* reprinted a letter from Canada Customs and Excise stating that one of its associated publications, *Homosexuals Today*, 1956, had been stopped

at the border because of its “immoral and indecent” character.⁹⁷ A letter in the October 1959 issue from a Mr. E. in Toronto again mentioned the problems *One* was having with Canadian Customs. The same letter told of police raids on Toronto theatres frequented by gays. In one raid, a reported fifty men were arrested.⁹⁸

Jim Egan, a gay small businessman who lived in the Toronto area until 1964, began writing letters and articles for various publications in 1949 with great persistence, commitment, and energy. Egan criticized anti-homosexual articles and defended the humanity of homosexuals, inspired by extensive readings of the literature on homosexuality—the writings of Walt Whitman, John Addington Symonds, and Edward Carpenter. He also read the US homophile publications, attended a conference organized by *One* magazine, and was part of the original sample of “well adjusted” gay men that Evelyn Hooker used in her psychological study.

In the 1950s Egan also wrote to various government committees on sex-related matters.⁹⁹ In 1955 he wrote to the Parliamentary Legislative Committee arguing for law reform. His letter included:

The Negro “problem” was created by the white majority; the Jewish “problem” by the Gentile majority, and the homosexual “problem” by the heterosexual majority—who alone can take the necessary steps to bring this problem to a speedy end.¹⁰⁰

Egan submitted material to “respectable” publications, like the *Toronto Star* and the *Telegram*, as well as to the scandal sheets or “yellow journals” whose lurid and homophobic accounts of the arrests and trials of gay men, says Egan, were just about the only news on gay issues.

The only place you could get published information about homosexuality was in the scandal sheets. I would read those things and I would be absolutely outraged. If you didn’t read those then there was very little opportunity to be exposed to it. The large newspapers like the *Star* and the *Telegram* did not give very much publicity to this sort of thing. Of course, there was absolutely nothing even mentioned on a news broadcast.¹⁰¹

The “yellow journals” responded to pressure from Egan for more positive coverage of homosexuality. *Justice Weekly* ran two series of his pioneering columns on homosexuality under the initials “J.L.E.” The first series, “Homosexual Concepts,” run in 1953–54, recounted developments in England and discussed the Kinsey Report, the Mattachine Society, *One*, and many other topics. The second series included a discussion of the ways in which legislation criminalized homosexuality, the “national-security” campaigns against gays in the US government, a defence of the term “gay,” and an argument against the notion of gays as “corruptors” of youth.¹⁰² Egan was the primary gay activist that we know of in 1950s Toronto.

Egan also convinced *Justice Weekly* to reprint articles from the US magazines *Mattachine Review*, *One*, and *The Ladder*, and, for a number of years, it regularly published excerpts from these publications. *Justice Weekly* may have doubled as an import-

ant source of information for gays and lesbians. Egan's columns, the reprints, and some advertisements provided a homophile or gay subtext. A regular advertiser in the mid-1950s, for instance, was the St. Charles Tavern. The working-class gays who frequented the tavern may have glanced at *Justice Weekly* and thus been introduced to the existence of a homophile movement for the first time, or a reader of *Justice Weekly* may have been able to figure out that the St. Charles was a gay hangout and had the information to find his first "gay site." One woman that the Lesbians Making History Collective interviewed reported that she read some of these "scandal sheets":

And of course there was a magazine, called, little crummy magazines—something like the National Enquirer, but in these magazines there were advertisements, and they would be for gay women or gay men.¹⁰³

This is how this woman found out about the Toronto lesbian and gay scene and through reading this publication found her way to the Continental. These articles and advertisements may have had double meanings that were capable of being read in a subversive fashion by gay and lesbian readers. Yellow journals also existed during these years in Montréal.¹⁰⁴

Egan, an important link in the piecing together of Toronto's and Canada's gay histories and who has remained involved in an important legal challenge in the 1990s, will turn up again later in this chapter and in chapter 8. In a column published in the *Toronto Star* in 1963—prefiguring later campaigns in Ontario for sexual orientation protection in the 1970s and 1980s, when the "respectable" media finally began to print his submissions—Egan argued that: "The Ontario Human Rights Code must be amended so as to provide the same protection for the homosexual now accorded every other minority group in Ontario."¹⁰⁵

Cleaning Up the Law?

Legal discourse surrounding the regulation of homosexuality began to shift in the post-war period, and in 1949 a federal commission was appointed to deal with inconsistencies in the Criminal Code.¹⁰⁶ When the Commission was instructed to prepare a draft bill in 1951, its terms of reference directed it to "revise ambiguous and unclear provisions," "adopt uniform language," "eliminate inconsistencies, legal anomalies, or defects," and propose "procedural amendments for the enforcement of the criminal law." As a result, in 1953–54 the Criminal Code was revamped, and while most of the changes simply represented a rationalization of the existing law, there were some substantive revisions regarding sex-related legislation. Sexual offences were shifted from "offences against morality" to a new section called "Sexual Offences."¹⁰⁷

The revised code applied buggery only to acts between humans, separating it from bestiality, although they remained part of the same section. Most significantly, "gross indecency" was broadened from a male homosexual offence to cover "everyone who commits an act of gross indecency with another person." It remained undefined and

even though by and large it continued to be used against gay men largely for oral sex, it now covered heterosexual and lesbian acts. This represented a significant departure from the development of “gross indecency” in England, where it continued to apply only to homosexual acts between men. “Criminal sexual psychopath” legislation was also expanded to include “buggery” and “gross indecency” as “triggering” offences, and this would have very serious consequences in the future as we will see later in this chapter.¹⁰⁸

In the early 1950s, a select committee was appointed by the Ontario government to look into the problem of “delinquent” individuals in “reform” institutions.¹⁰⁹ Their report included a section on “sex deviates,” defined as a threat to decency and morality, especially to children and women. The committee’s major concern was whether these sex deviates were physically or psychologically sick and whether they could be cured. They were worried about releasing people who could not be “cured” in custody because they were removed from “normal sexual outlets.” “Sex deviates,” to the committee, included homosexuals as well as people who engaged in other types of sexual “offences.” They also made a distinction between passive sexual deviates—who had accidentally developed “abnormalities”—and what they described as “sex perverts” or “psychopaths,” who needed special treatment. The report relied on information provided by doctors, psychiatrists, scientists, and institutional personnel.

While the select committee reported relatively low conviction rates for buggery and gross indecency, they were disturbed by what they perceived as the widespread incidence of homosexuality, which they felt was not captured in these statistics.

Relatively few inmates are incarcerated for the crime of homosexuality because of apprehension. It is a generally disturbing fact...that homosexuality exists in our society to a disturbing degree...Homosexuality is a perplexing problem which custodial institutions attempt to handle with inadequate facilities and inadequate staffs.¹¹⁰

The report expressed fears that the custodial system, with its gender segregation, only facilitated homosexuality. It recommended outlawing the dormitory system, and it also expressed the need for psychologists, doctors, and other trained personnel. Calling for indefinite sentences for sex offenders so that they could be treated and kept out of circulation, the report also argued for more scientific study into these matters.

Keeping Queers Out: Homosexuality and Immigration

An early component of Canada’s participation in the US-inspired national-security campaigns against homosexuals was an amendment to the Immigration Act to keep homosexuals out.¹¹¹ Now, for the first time, an act of Parliament explicitly referred to the homosexual as “a status or a type of person.” Previously, only the acts—“buggery” and “gross indecency”—were officially discussed. The new 1952 Canadian Immigration Act treated homosexuals as “subversives.” The previous act had contained a clause

denying admission to people who had been convicted of “moral turpitude,” and this was used to bar people with a record of gross indecency and buggery.¹¹² People with “constitutional psychopathic personality” were denied entry as well, and this terminology could very well have been used to keep out lesbians and gay men.

The decision to revise the Immigration Act had been made in the fall of 1948 and an interdepartmental committee was struck to draw up the proposals. The first draft called for the exclusion of “prostitutes, homosexuals, lesbians and persons coming to Canada for an immoral purpose.” Later, in 1951, the proposal to include “lesbians” was dropped, and a clause that included “living on the avails of prostitution or homosexuality” was added. While there was some controversy over barring homosexuals, the RCMP was strongly in favour.¹¹³ It should be kept in mind that this same year the anti-gay and anti-lesbian security hunts were reaching a fever pitch south of the border.

When the bill came up in the House of Commons in June 1952, there was no debate on the section relating to homosexuality, and it was quickly passed. The status of homosexuals in the Immigration Act was not changed until 1977 after a series of commissions had heard protests regarding this policy from many lesbian and gay groups.¹¹⁴ While the effect of this legislation on prospective immigrants is not entirely clear, it is known that many lesbians and gays did enter Canada during that period. It was, however, another weapon that could be used against lesbians and gay men. The inclusion of homosexuals and “homosexuality” in the Immigration Act, however, was symbolic of the Cold War hostility to homosexuality that extends into the 1970s.

Queers, Commies, and “National Security”

The dominant political themes in the Western world of the late 1940s, the 1950s and into the 1960s were those of the Cold War. This climate helped set the stage for McCarthyism and anti-communist and anti-homosexual purge campaigns, and for increased police activity against homosexuals. Many gay men and lesbians were purged from the US civil service and military. But these campaigns also sparked forms of lesbian and gay organization, such as the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis in the United States.¹¹⁵ Forms of non-cooperation and “resistance” developed in Canada, as well.

In right-wing, conservative, and often liberal discourse, homosexuals were either associated directly with communism and spying for the USSR or seen as an easy target for blackmail and therefore a risk to “national security”—whose security? We might ask. These campaigns in Canada were directed not only at communists and homosexuals but also at socialists, peace activists, trade unionists, immigrants, and the Black community in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in the late 1960s for suspected connections with the US Black Panther Party.¹¹⁶ Once someone was defined as a “national-security risk” they were cut out of regular social interaction, surveillance was mandated, and denial of basic human, civil and citizenship rights was justified.

Homosexuals were seen not only as violators of sexual and gender boundaries, but also as violators of class and political boundaries as well.

Homosexual officials are a peril for us in the present struggle between West and East: members of one conspiracy are prone to join another...many homosexuals from being enemies of society in general become enemies of capitalism in particular. Without being necessarily Marxist they serve the ends of the Communist International in the name of their rebellion against the prejudices, standards, ideals of the "bourgeois" world. Another reason for the homosexual-Communist alliance is the instability and passion for intrigue for intrigue's sake, which is inherent in the homosexual personality. A third reason is the social promiscuity within the homosexual minority and the fusion of its effects between upperclass and proletarian corruption.¹¹⁷

A series of trials and scandals in England meant that "homosexuality came to be associated with spying and treason."¹¹⁸

Both in the United States and in Britain homosexuality came to be associated with moral unreliability and, like Communism, with treason. Guy Burgess represented the archetype of the unreliable pervert, in whom one proof of his sinister nature was his sexuality, another his Communism.¹¹⁹

In Canada, the anti-communist witch hunts were less extensive, although they were partially inspired by the US investigations as well as pressure from American military and security officials.¹²⁰ Initial security screening focused on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Film Board.¹²¹

A security panel established in 1946 as a small, secret committee of top civil servants and Mounties had formulated a policy of transferring to less sensitive posts civil servants about whom there were doubts. Then in 1948, the departments of national defence and external affairs were designated as "vulnerable" to subversion. In Canada, within the security regime, at first homosexuals were associated directly with communism. Later they were seen as vulnerable to "blackmail" since they suffered from a "character weakness" and had something to hide. In contrast, gay men and lesbians located the problems of blackmail that they faced in their lives in the practices criminalizing homosexual activities and the "security" campaign itself.

In the following decades, homosexuals in the civil service feared discovery and dismissal as scores of people were fired. Hundreds lost their jobs for "security" reasons in the late 1950s and 1960s. Within the security regime, a focus on homosexuals as the major "character weakness" making people vulnerable to compromise developed in 1958-59.

The External Affairs department in Ottawa and its embassies around the world were seen by right-wingers as "a notorious cess-pool of homosexuals and perverts" in the 1950s.¹²² No department, with the possible exception of the navy, was perceived to harbour more "queers." In 1960, therefore, all known homosexuals were arbitrarily fired from the department and surveillance was intensified.¹²³

To get a taste of how this campaign was organized in Canada. I begin with an excerpt from the official construction of homosexuality as a security problem in a national

security text: “Sexual abnormalities appear to be the favourite target of hostile intelligence agencies, and of these homosexuality is most often used,” stated a 1959 Security Panel memorandum. The document goes on:

The nature of homosexuality appears to adapt itself to this kind of exploitation. By exercising fairly simple precautions, homosexuals are usually able to keep their habits hidden from those who are not specifically seeking them out. Further, homosexuals often appear to believe that the accepted ethical code which governs normal human relationships does not apply to them. Their propensity is often accompanied by other specific weaknesses such as excessive drinking with its resultant instabilities, a defiant attitude towards the rest of society, and a concurrent urge to seek out the company of persons with similar characteristics, often in disreputable bars, night clubs or restaurants. The case of the homosexual is particularly difficult for a number of reasons. From the small amount of information we have been able to obtain about homosexual behaviour generally, certain characteristics appear to stand out—instability, willing self-deceit, defiance towards society, a tendency to surround oneself with persons of similar propensities, regardless of other consideration—none of which inspire the confidence one would hope to have in persons required to fill positions of trust and responsibility.¹²⁴

The preceding quote comes from the previously secret government documents on the anti-gay/anti-lesbian purge campaign in the Canadian civil service that Canadian Press secured the release of through the Access to Information Act in 1992.¹²⁵

The firings and transfers were carried out at the urging of the security panel and were based on confidential reports. These were mandated by the ideological constructions of “national security” and “character weaknesses.” First, a series of groups were defined as risks to “national security,” and second, some of these were seen as risks to national security because they suffered from a “character weakness.” This character weakness conceptualization was increasingly homosexualized in Canada.¹²⁶

One question that I am interested in is how it was that the major focus in the Canadian national-security state against homosexuals took place from 1958–59 on, while in the United States it began much earlier in the 1950s. I am not suggesting that there were no anti-gay security investigations prior to 1958 in Canada since there clearly were many, but that it seems that it was in 1958–59 that a more specific focus on homosexuality as a “security threat” developed in the Canadian state and the concept of “character weakness” basically became homosexuality. There seems to have been an event in the late 1950s that focused RCMP and Security Panel attention on “the homosexual” as a “national-security threat.”

There was a tie-in with the investigations following Leo Mantha’s murder of his estranged boyfriend Aaron Jenkins on September 6, 1958 on the Naden naval base, at Esquimalt, BC, and the initiation of a more central focus on homosexuals as a security threat. In 1959, Mantha was the last person to be hanged in British Columbia. He had earlier been discharged from the navy in 1956 partly for his homosexuality. While discussions on clarifying the security panel’s policies regarding “character weaknesses”

had been initiated prior to Jenkins being murdered, the report that initiated the more specific focus on homosexuals as a security threat, and from which I just quoted, was presented on May 12, 1959.¹²⁷

As part of the investigation of the murder of Jenkins by Mantha, RCMP officers were sent to Victoria from Ottawa to assist in the investigation. They found a diary as part of the evidence in the case that belonged to Jenkins and included the names of a number of gay men in the military, merchant marine, and civilian gay networks on the west coast. We know that a number of men in the military and outside it were interrogated as part of this investigation and that a number of men presumed to be gay were either purged or transferred.¹²⁸ Bruce Somers, who at that time lived in Victoria, comments that prior to the murder the gay networks that linked together men in the navy with civilians through a network of bars, washrooms, house parties, and even beach parties were relatively open and not highly policed. Following the murder and the subsequent investigation, this all stopped as many feared they would be called in for questioning.¹²⁹

This investigation may have alerted the RCMP and the security panel to the extent of the possible homosexual “national-security threat” and sharpened the focus on homosexuality in these discussions on the security panel and within the RCMP. The Mantha investigation may also have alerted the RCMP and Naval Intelligence that the conceptualization of homosexuality as “gender inversion” was not adequate for detecting homosexuals.

The Mantha case gives us some insight into the gender assumptions of the anti-homosexual practices in the military. Bud (Aaron) Jenkins, who Mantha would later kill, went to get help from a navy neuropsychiatrist Dr. Douglas Alcorn after he was stationed at HMCS Naden in 1957. Alcorn diagnosed Jenkins as a “homosexual of the feminine type,” but in the same report concluded that the other sailors with whom he had been intimate were “simply individuals who have fairly normal tastes, but who wish to experiment in other ways.”¹³⁰

This suggests that at this time there was still a certain distinction being made in the military between men who engaged in sex with others who had some of the marks of “gender inversion”—who were in some ways the real “homosexuals”—and men who might occasionally have sex with other men but in all other ways were “normal” and “masculine.” These men were not “real” homosexuals. This distinction was still largely oriented around the gender-inversion conceptualization of homosexuality. George Chauncey has found similar examples from the United States Navy earlier in the century.¹³¹

With the emergence of homosexuality as a sexual-object choice, as a sexual orientation, and as a “character weakness,” both these groups of men would now become suspect. Even the man who occasionally engaged in sex with other men but was otherwise “masculine” could be blackmailed because he suffered from a “character weakness” and had something to hide. To a certain extent the homosexualization of “character weakness” and the identification of homosexuality as a major “national-security risk” were also part of renegotiating the boundaries between homosexuality and heterosexual masculinity that conflicted with other social trends I previously mentioned.

Occasional participation in same-gender sex now could place one beyond the boundaries of heterosexual masculinity. Now all men who had sex with other men—not just those who were “effeminate”—could be targeted within the military and through the security campaigns. By expanding homosexuality to cover not only those men who were “effeminate,” the number of men who could be homosexuals was expanded and the borders of proper heterosexual masculinity were narrowed. However, this process took place unevenly within the practices of the military and the RCMP with many of the assumptions of gender inversion continuing to inform their practices into the 1960s.

Of the more than 150 civil servants fired between 1956 and 1963, two-thirds lost their jobs because of a “character weakness” such as homosexuality, which supposedly left them open to subversion.¹³² Dean Beeby recently gained access to security documents showing that Prime Minister Pearson was directly involved in mandating the course of action leading to the RCMP interrogating and the resulting death of former Moscow ambassador John Warkins in Montréal in 1964 in circumstances I would describe as close to “torture.”¹³³ Earlier in 1952, at the height of anti-communism in the United States, a homosexual working in the Communications Branch, which intercepted radio signals from the Soviet Union, was asked to resign. Others were “discovered” at the Communications Branch in the late 1950s, and in 1963 a “ring” of homosexual code clerks was uncovered. Some were transferred, others were fired. Philip Girard argues that the homosexual witch hunt in Canada was much stronger than any campaign against leftists, socialists, or communists.¹³⁴

RCMP policy, meanwhile, was to fire all known homosexuals even if they had no access to security information.¹³⁵ RCMP policy was also informed by the criminalization of homosexuality and, like the military, by a policy that prohibited the membership of lesbians and gay men in its own ranks. The RCMP set up an investigative unit within the force, called A-3, to hunt down, identify, locate, and purge homosexuals within its own ranks and in government generally. Informants watched bars and parks frequented by gays. They took photos of men going into bars and even inside the bars that gay men frequented. Ottawa-area parks were swept to ensnare gay men and to try to collect the names of homosexuals.¹³⁶ Homosexual men were known to inform on others, but lesbians apparently resisted, and their circles were not very accessible to RCMP officers who at that point were all men. The RCMP developed interrogation techniques to unearth homosexuals, who were then either forced to resign or were transferred. By 1963 the A-3 unit produced a map of Ottawa using red dots to designate homosexual activity. The map was soon so covered with red dots as to be practically useless.

By the mid-1960s, the security mood in the public service mellowed somewhat and there were fewer filings;¹³⁷ however, the RCMP fought any narrowing of the campaign and won at least tacit support for its broader ranging campaign. It initially maintained that all homosexuals were a security risk, then that they should be fired because homosexuality was illegal and the government should not be condoning it. It held to its view that all homosexuality was a criminal offence and a character weakness. Meanwhile, the RCMP discovered a “ring” of homosexuals in its own central records section and created its own internal homo-hunt unit; it developed a series of indicators of

homosexuality, ranging from driving white cars, to wearing rings on pinkie fingers, to wearing effeminate clothing. The RCMP's internal investigations reportedly reached their peak just about when, in 1967, Justice Minister Pierre Trudeau introduced the proposal to partially decriminalize acts of buggery and gross indecency in private between two consenting adults. They collected close to nine thousand names of "suspected" and "confirmed" homosexuals by 1968 mostly, but not entirely, in the Ottawa area.¹³⁸ At the height of the security scares, the Security Service investigations extended to the universities and the community at large. By the 1980s, the Mounties had compiled files on 800,000 Canadians, including thousands of lesbians and gays.¹³⁹

Many people's lives were affected by these security investigations including lesbians and gay men who may have been investigated for "communist" or "socialist" connections. Lesbians Making History collected the following story from one lesbian they interviewed. She is describing her sexual and personal relationship with another woman who was from the United States:

We got together every weekend we could. We used to camp for the summers, and that was great. We had four kids together and everything was fine until this McCarthy thing came up. We both espoused left-wing causes, she more than I. She was left-wing and her husband was a communist.... She and I ran some camps, international, interracial, and left-wing—it was advertised in the left-wing newspapers, you know, the *Tribune*.... My husband was working for the Department of National Defence at this point, in the early 1950s—it was the wrong time, and we got caught up in the Rosenberg murders—you know they were murdered, of course—and we were really working to try to prevent them from being murdered.... But when all this happened to us, W. [her husband] was told he had to resign. And it was even mentioned, you know, the Rosenberg thing. So he lost his job and I was told I might lose mine.... Somebody in the Department told W. they'd been following us; we'd been under twenty-four-hour surveillance because she had come up to Canada to live with us. And this is what the guy told W.: "The reason that this has happened is that friend of your wife's. Get rid of her." And so he came home and the whole world just collapsed again. They threatened me with losing my kids as well as losing my job. In fact they suggested that I give up teaching. It was "too sensitive a job" to work at!¹⁴⁰

There were also, however, signs of obstruction and resistance within security discourse itself based on the expansion of gay and lesbian community formation in the 1960s. The RCMP faced problems in its investigations with non-cooperation from homosexual "informants." In 1962–63 they reported that:

During the past fiscal year the homosexual screening program...was hindered by the lack of cooperation on the part of homosexuals approached as sources. Persons of this type, who had hitherto been our most consistent and productive informers, have exhibited an increasing reluctance to identify their homosexual friends and associates.¹⁴¹

For 1963–64 the RCMP reported that given a “growing reluctance on the part of homosexuals to identify their associates, additional emphasis is being placed on establishing close liaison with the morality branches of police forces, particularly in the larger centres...”¹⁴² The “resistance,” or non-cooperation of homosexuals in the face of this security campaign forced the RCMP to devise a new strategy to secure the cooperation of homosexual informants.¹⁴³

The RCMP responded by developing working relationships with the morality branches of various police forces and enlisting local police support to procure homosexual informants. Given the criminalization of all homosexual activity, this meant that the police could “lean on” those who had committed “offences” and on street informants in order to get them to provide information to the RCMP. This extended RCMP powers of surveillance through local police forces and once again gives us a sense of the “power/ knowledge” relations actively constructed through this security campaign. Later RCMP reports suggest that the situation improved in terms of getting homosexual informants to provide information after this relation with morality branches was put in place.

In September 1968, the Royal Commission on Security released its report. While the findings were never officially acted upon, we can see that the Commission condoned the generally anti-gay, anti-lesbian employment practices in the higher echelons of the public service, particularly in those areas relating to security and defence.

In general we do not think that past homosexual acts or even current stable homosexual relationships should always be a bar to employment with the public service or even to low levels of clearance. We feel...that in the interest of the individuals themselves as well as the interest of the State, homosexuals should not be recruited if there is a possibility that they may require such clearance in the course of their careers and should certainly not be posted to sensitive positions overseas.¹⁴⁴

Although the scale of the RCMP homosexual hunt decreased in the public service in the 1970s, it continued officially until the late 1980s at a lower level of intensity.¹⁴⁵

Attempting to Develop a “Fruit Machine”

During the 1960s, there was an attempt to develop a more efficient and “scientific” way of detecting lesbians and gay men which came to be known as the “fruit machine.” This was both a continuation of and a shifting of earlier psychiatric and psychological practices for “detecting” homosexuals or “sex deviates” which had been institutionalized in the military in detection and disposal strategies for “psychopathic personalities with abnormal sexualities.” Now homosexual was differentiated much more fully from these broader collecting categories, and increasingly from notions of gender inversion, for purposes of this security campaign. As in most other research, the “normality” of heterosexuality was assumed and homosexuality was defined as the problem.

Following up on the approval for such a study in the security-panel memo to cabinet in early 1961, Professor Wake of the Carleton University psychology department was funded to go to the US by National Health and Welfare to research and study detection tests and technologies regarding homosexuality. He produced a report in 1962 which got the “fruit machine” research going.¹⁴⁶ This research continued to be funded by National Health and Welfare. A critical analysis of Wake’s special-project proposal gives us insight into the social character of this research and its interrelation with the social-power relations mobilized through the security campaign. This is why I spend a bit of time here analyzing this research attempt.

This “fruit machine” arises both from an interest by Wake in doing research on homosexuality (disguised as an interest in “suitability” for employment) and also to establish a more effective, efficient and cheaper mode of surveillance and investigation than that of RCMP field investigations.

The name “fruit machine” was given to this project, according to John Sawatsky, by members of the RCMP who did not want to be recruited to be the “normals” who were to be tested on it.¹⁴⁷ The technique used included the measurement of pupils while showing the subject pictures including those of naked men and women. The “fruit machine” project involved psychiatrists, psychologists, and the departments of national defence and national health and welfare for a period of four years, but it never worked, and the Defence Research Board eventually cut its funding. The research suffered from major technical problems as well as problems with getting the numbers of “research subjects” that were needed for the research; there were problems getting gay men, and especially lesbians, to participate in the “fruit machine” detection research.

Dr. F.R. Wake, in his 1962 “Report on Special Project,” stressed from his review of the research—especially in the US—that there was no single method of tests that can detect homosexuality and that instead a battery of tests is necessary. Wake’s report and research are based on a review of the professional literature and his investigations of detection research while he was in the US. He takes up a general standpoint that there is something wrong with homosexuals which makes them unsuitable for certain positions, that they can be identified, and their behaviour controlled.

Wake was quite aware of the “liberal” psychological and sexological work then going on in the US, including the work of Evelyn Hooker critiquing the notion of male homosexuals as “unstable” and the Kinsey reports. He is even aware of the distinction being made between overt and covert homosexuals used by Hooker that was developed in the work of Maurice Leznoff on male homosexuals in Montréal.¹⁴⁸ Although Wake knew about and used this more “liberal” work, he linked it to a more investigative and control-oriented perspective. Later he stated that “The general run of opinion is that homosexuals almost always are maladjusted,” even though he referred to Hooker as holding a contrasting opinion.

As a result of his research, he argued that there is no distinct homosexual personality type. This is a shift away from notions of homosexuals as gender inverters and away from notions of homosexuals as psychopathic personalities. Since Wake argued there was no single, distinct homosexual personality type there could be no single test. Under

“Methods of Detecting Homosexuality,” he surveyed the various detection tests and procedures that had been used to try to identify homosexuals. These ranged from psychiatric interviews, to medical examinations, to various tests for changes in emotional conditions.¹⁴⁹

In his commentary, Wake suggested that the Palmer Sweat test would be best used in conjunction with a “word association” test. Words with definite homosexual meaning according to the appended list include queen, circus, gay, bagpipe, bell, whole, blind, bull, camp, coo, cruise, drag, dike (dyke), fish, flute, fruit, mother, punk, queer, rim, sew, swing, trade, velvet, wolf, blackmail, prowl, bar, house, club, restaurant, tea room, and top men.¹⁵⁰

Wake found the Pupillary Response test to be quite “productive” in looking for homosexuals. It measured different interest patterns by means of a machine which simultaneously projected a visual stimulus and photographed the pupil of the eye. This procedure was supposed to produce an involuntary “response that cannot be controlled by the subject.” Wake discovered this procedure and technology through his research in the United States. E.H. Hess and J.M. Polt, researchers at the University of Chicago, had developed this test and apparatus. Professional- and academic-knowledge relations are directly tapped into in this security-based research.

Wake’s report refers to a study done using the Hess-Polt apparatus by Hess’s graduate student Allan Seltzer. In Seltzer’s study the “stimuli were slides made of pictures from physical culture magazines (some of which were near pornographic) plus neutral pictures of good paintings and at least one modified picture of Christ on the cross.” This use of physique magazines, which often had a large gay male readership,¹⁵¹ seems to have become common in the United States by this point; they were also being used in aversion therapy. It also suggested some awareness of the formation of gay men’s cultures during these years. Wake argued that

the results clearly permitted Seltzer to distinguish the homosexual subject when the results of all pictures were compared. No single picture would determine who was homosexual and who heterosexual. Not only was the change in size of pupil indicative of the direction of sex interest but the pattern followed by the eyes (and recorded on film) was very important (e.g., the homosexual who could not take his eyes away from the genital area of the vaguely-seen Christ on the Cross)...Perhaps the most important incidental finding in this experiment was the confession of a homosexual subject who reported that he had done his best to defeat the machine but knew he had failed...Here, then, is a most promising instrument for detection, not only of homosexuals but of homosexual potentiality.

Wake proposed the following research experiment that would combine

the Hess-Polt pupillary test with suitable visual stimuli; a measure of skin perspiration...; the plethysmograph with a modification to measure pulse rate. Subjects: Fifteen normal males; fifteen normal females; fifteen homosexual males; fifteen homosexual females. As

the experiment progresses, additional normal and homosexual subjects in unspecified numbers. All subjects to be supplied by the RCMP...¹⁵²

The RCMP, which was the chief investigative arm of the security campaign, was also to provide the “research subjects.” Here we have another side of the construction of power/knowledge relations in this research context. Also notice the language through which heterosexuality is constructed as “normal.” At the same time, heterosexuality is also not specifically named as such since this was prior to “heterosexuality” more fully emerging as a popular term which historically follows the rise of gay liberation and lesbian feminism in the 1970s and 1980s. Also notice the equal emphasis placed on “homosexual females” in the research design.

Then Wake outlined the procedure to be used:

The experimental stimuli will be pictures designed to elicit the subject’s interest in males and females...The first sixty subjects will be processed to determine the reaction patterns of normals and homosexuals. Then, using these patterns as criteria, the experimenter will attempt to distinguish homosexuals presented by the RCMP, where nothing of the subject is known to the research team. Those methods proving successful will be retained for continuing research.

This research is more psychologically oriented than earlier studies that sometimes focused on biological anomalies (like marks of gender inversion on the body for instance).¹⁵³ It is directed at finding a “scientific” means to test “involuntary” responses that demonstrate sexual orientation. This is based on a series of assumptions about the relation between stimulus and response, about the power of visual images as stimulators, about common responses of homosexuals as viewers, and an assumption of there being two, and only two, dichotomous and essential sexualities (men or women who were sexually interested in both men and women undermined their assumptions).

Predictably, there were many problems in trying to get this experiment to work. In a 1963 memo to the secretary of the security panel, J.R.M. Bordeleau, RCMP Assistant Commissioner and Director of Security and Intelligence, wrote:

While we are most anxious to assist Dr. Wake in his research programme we feel that we cannot meet his request in its entirety. We are in the process of contacting known male homosexuals in this area [Ottawa] and soliciting their cooperation in the proposed tests, however we are not yet in a position to determine how many will volunteer for the project... We have no contacts within the female homosexual community in this area and no safe ground upon which an approach might be made to these persons. In this respect, we would suggest that other government departments, who will benefit directly from the results of the tests, might be requested through your office, to solicit the co-operation of female homosexuals known to them...We have some doubts also as to the propriety of our soliciting normal females to participate in the tests. We believe that this should be undertaken by some government department or departments which have a large pool of

female employees under their control. Similarly we believe that the required number of normal males should be drawn from the government service at large.¹⁵⁴

The RCMP had very little contact with lesbian networks during these years and were quite apprehensive about approaching “normal” women for this research. This account also suggests that there was resistance to participation in this research from RCMP members themselves. As Sawatsky suggests, RCMP members did not want to be determined to be “fruits” through participating as “normals” in this experiment.¹⁵⁵

The 1965–66 DSI Annual Report reported that “to date the tests have been inconclusive, the main obstacle to the Program being a lack of suitable subjects for testing purposes.” In the same report of 1966–67 they stated that, “although the research group has made some progress, the objective has not, as yet been achieved.” A major problem in the operationalizing of the experiment was with perfecting the technology itself, which had to be adapted to deal with people of different heights, with different-sized pupils and different distances between eyeballs.¹⁵⁶ The assumption was that there would be some sort of discernible difference in the responses of homosexuals and “normals.” They were never able to demonstrate this and their underlying assumption of a difference in response in relation to homosexuality/heterosexuality was destabilized. The “fruit machine” never worked and it was abandoned in 1967.

The Armed Forces and “Sex Deviates”

During these years, as part of the “national-security” campaigns, the armed forces routinely discharged lesbians and gays upon “discovery.” Earlier prohibitions of sodomy and buggery, and the classification of “psychopathic personality with abnormal sexuality,” were carried over into contemporary military organization.¹⁵⁷

Women in the military were routinely purged as suspected lesbians during these years under military regulations. For instance, a Franco-Ontarian woman was discharged from the Royal Canadian Air Force in the mid-1950s for being a lesbian. She was given an honourable discharge for medical reasons and was deemed to be unsuitable for further service. There was also mention of the danger of blackmail because she was a lesbian.¹⁵⁸ In the 1970s and 1980s women have been the most visible of those purged from the military. While the military is dominated by men, it also provides for economic and social survival for women who wish to survive outside marriage and family. Anti-lesbian policies, however, have worked to keep all women in line as part of the military’s sexist organization.

In 1966, the Toronto gay magazine *Two* printed an interview with George Marshall, who had been involved in *Gay*, another mid-1960s Toronto publication. Marshall reports that discharge for homosexuality during the Korean war would have prevented him from receiving a pension. He had been in the army for twelve years and says that the buddy system worked as a cover for his gay affairs. His “army marriages” were long lasting—one surviving as long as five years. Homosexuals were automatically given a special rating, says Marshall, since “according to government authorities (all)

homosexuals are emotionally unstable—unable to accept authority, unable to tell the difference between right and wrong.”¹⁵⁹ While it was possible for privates or corporals to be closeted homosexuals since they needed only a Confidential Clearance, officers required a Secret Clearance, which meant a security check involving an RCMP investigation. Marshall repeatedly got drunk in order to avoid promotion, since “promotion would mean exposure.”¹⁶⁰ When he was finally being processed for promotion, the RCMP investigated his life for a full ten years prior to his joining the army. He describes them as “pretty ruthless” when it comes to this sort of thing. He was subjected to various tests which showed him to be “extremely masculine” and to a questionnaire of 350 multiple-choice questions from one of the masculinity/femininity tests. But the RCMP discovered him to be homosexual: “They even claimed I’d been a homosexual prostitute. The bastards even knew I’d been buying pornographic physique photos from a firm in Sweden.”¹⁶¹ Marshall had to fight for an “honourable discharge” and was successful only because of a conflict between the psychiatrists and the medical doctors over his case because of his “masculine” appearance. Some of them apparently still accepted that only “gender inverts” were “true” homosexuals.

Bert Sutcliffe, whom we met earlier, was purged from the military for his homosexuality in 1962. Just prior to his being posted to the Pentagon as an integrated Canadian officer in G-2 (intelligence), the director of military intelligence told him, “The RCMP has confirmed that you are a Homosexual.” Within three days, Sutcliffe’s career was over. He was honourably discharged.¹⁶²

The 1969 reform which partially de-criminalized adult acts of buggery and gross indecency in “private” was not extended to the armed services. Men and women may no longer have been able to be expelled for engaging in “private” acts with one other adult under article 103.61 (“Offences Against Other Canadian Law”) of the military’s Queen’s Regulations and Orders, which is based on the National Defence Act.¹⁶³ There existed, however, a number of other provisions under which they could be discharged. These included: article 103.25, “Scandalous Conduct by Officers”; 103.26, “Cruel or Disgraceful Conduct”; and 103.60, “Conduct to the Prejudice of Good Order and Discipline.” People accused of engaging in same-gender sex have also been dismissed under Release Section S.D. of the Queen’s Regulations, “Not Advantageously Employable.” A 1967 version of the Canadian Forces Administrative Order (CFAO 19-20, 1967) calls for the removal of homosexuals and others displaying a sexual abnormality. The order, “Sexual Deviation—Investigation, Medical Examination and Disposal,” clearly lays out the procedure for dealing with sex deviates.¹⁶⁴ The deviant behaviour is to be reported to the commanding officer, who will then investigate the case with the help of a medical officer, the military police, and other means “at his disposal.” If the investigation substantiates the allegation, the commanding officer will call in the Special Investigative Department (SID, later SIU), who will carry out interrogation and surveillance of personal correspondence. All this in a situation wherein the suspect has few rights under military law—in other words, anyone suspected of lesbianism or homosexuality is subject to unrestricted surveillance and harassment.¹⁶⁵ If necessary, a psychiatric

examination can be ordered. A copy of the investigation report, the SID report, and the medical report are then forwarded to the Canadian Forces Headquarters along with the base commander's recommendations. If the behaviour has "scandalized" other service members, or "brought discredit" to the forces, disciplinary action will be taken. If not, they will simply be "disposed" of—to use the military's own language.

Criminal Sexual Psychopaths and Dangerous Sexual Offenders

A central aspect of the strategy to regulate homosexuality by extending criminalization was criminal-sexual-psychopath legislation. This legislation participated in constructing homosexuality as criminal sexual danger.

In 1948, a section on "criminal sexual psychopaths" was added to the Canadian Criminal Code. It was tied into the same part of the Criminal Code as the "habitual offenders" section. A criminal sexual psychopath was defined as:

a person who by a course of misconduct in sexual matters has evidenced a lack of power to control his sexual impulses and who as a result is likely to attack or otherwise inflict injury, loss, pain or other evil on any person.¹⁶⁶

The legislation mandated a course of action linking state and professional sites together—the Criminal Code, the police, the office of the Attorney General, psychiatry, and the prison system. The course of action first required a police arrest and conviction on certain specified "triggering" sex offences. These "triggering" offences were largely offences that could only be committed in the "public" realm. They did not include incest and, given prevailing legal and police practices, they ignored most sexual violence and harassment in the household or domestic realm. Also, given the legal impossibility during these years of a husband raping his wife, they were focused on men who committed sexual offences coming from outside the domestic/familial realm.

When dealing with these certain named sexual offences (not including in 1948 buggery or gross indecency but including "indecent assault" on a male), a court could now hear evidence as to whether the offender was a "criminal sexual psychopath." Following conviction on a triggering offence or offences, a sentencing procedure to declare a person a criminal sexual psychopath could be initiated with the approval of the attorney general. If the defendant was thus sentenced (in part based on psychiatric testimony) as to whether he fit the definition of criminal sexual psychopath, he could be sentenced for an "indefinite period." This legislation was passed after criminal-sexual-psychopath laws had been enacted in more than half the US states following Michigan's example in 1938 (which, incidentally, was later ruled unconstitutional).¹⁶⁷ The language used in the Canadian legislation was taken from a 1947 Massachusetts statute.¹⁶⁸ These Canadian and American criminal-sexual-psychopath laws were the result of a media focus on violent sex crimes, particularly against children and organizing efforts by psychiatrists, other professionals, and some politicians. There was the construction of an attempted

moral panic on these questions. In this context, US legislatures turned to psychiatrists for answers, and it was at their urgings that many of the new laws were passed. These laws and the discussions surrounding them generally recognized homosexuality as a socially threatening disease.

In Canada, “buggery” and “gross indecency” were added to the list of offences that could trigger criminal-sexual-psychopath legislation in 1953. These homosexual-related offences then became triggering offences. Homosexual sexual activity discovered or reported by the police and resulting in conviction could then make one subject to the criminal-sexual-psychopath procedure. This further blurred the distinction between various sexual activities, lumping together violent and non-violent and consensual and non-consensual acts. It also further intensified the focus on sexual danger being in the public realm. As part of this procedure, psychiatric evidence was crucial. In establishing whether the person fit the criminal-sexual-psychopath definition, this procedure was organized at two different levels of “inscription”: first through the “triggering” sex offence of the Criminal Code, and second, through the definition of criminal sexual psychopath at sentencing.

The criminal-sexual-psychopath process of “inscription” is therefore more complex than just the transformation of people’s activities (which might have been experienced as sexual pleasure) into sex-offence categories. The procedure is coordinated and organized at a number of sites. Through this procedure, psychiatric and criminal practices intersected to regulate the lives of some gay men.

Philip Girard points out that this law has generally been most severe when used against homosexual “offenders,” even when no violence is involved and when the relationships have a consensual character.¹⁶⁹ In a situation where all gay sex was technically illegal, when these became “triggering offences,” this section could be used in a more severe fashion against men having sex with other men and with adolescent boys than against people engaging in heterosexual acts that may in contrast have involved violence and force. In official and police circles, the rape of a woman by a man was seen as more of a “normal” crime and therefore much less likely to be captured within criminal-sexual-psychopath definitions than if one committed a homosexual act or an activity with a young person, even if less or even no violence or coercion were involved. As Freedman states referring to the US situation:

As long as he did not mutilate or murder his victim, the rapist might be considered almost normal and certainly more “natural” than men who committed less violent, and even consensual, sexual acts such as sodomy and pedophilia. Accordingly, men diagnosed as psychopaths were more likely to be accused of pedophilia and homosexuality than of rape or murder.¹⁷⁰

“Psychopaths” were visualized as a small group of men that suffered from a lack of power to control their sexual impulses. The ideological framing of homosexuals as sex-crazed melded easily with this sexual psychopath frame.

The criminal-sexual-psychopath definition and procedure focused on “deviant” males outside local, familial forms of regulation as the sexual danger. Criminal sexual psychopaths were not usually family members of those they were convicted of committing offences in relation to (in particular the fathers or husbands) when we know that much sexual violence against women and young people was taking place in these contexts.¹⁷¹

Public and political controversy surrounding the inadequacy of this legislation led to the appointment of a Royal Commission in 1954 (known as the McRuer Commission, after its chair) to study the criminal-sexual-psychopath sentencing procedure. The major problem for the government and the mass media was that there did not seem to be enough sentences under these provisions. This set up a contradictory situation with media coverage producing a sense of fear and anxiety which was out of proportion to the numbers actually sentenced as criminal sexual psychopaths. This allowed the legislation to be criticized for not being effective enough, for letting sex criminals slip through its grasp, and to be released where they could again be a “threat.” There were even criticisms that these men were being released without any “treatment.”

Royal Commissions are textually mediated processes.¹⁷² The terms of reference given to a Royal Commission by the government are central to guiding how it accomplishes its work.¹⁷³ The mandate given to the McRuer Commission did not question the “triggering” sex offences in the Criminal Code or the indefinite detention provision. The commission was not asked to study sexuality or sexual danger as it was experienced in all its diversities. Rather, its mandate focused on sexual danger in the “public” realm to which the triggering offences referred.

The work and terms of reference of the commission thus presupposed the basic features of the criminal-sexual-psychopath section and related triggering offences; it presupposed the criminalization of homosexuality. Its terms of reference allowed for the holding in place while shifting—from a limited administrative standpoint—of this sentencing procedure and this section of the Criminal Code. This served to remove the focus of the commission’s work from the heterosexual family and household as a terrain of sexual danger. The terms of reference therefore provided for a patriarchal and heterosexist account of sex and gender troubles since they ignored the social and historical grounds of the organization of violence against women and young people. In the work of the commission in trying to determine who was a criminal sexual psychopath, or their preferred conceptualization of dangerous sexual offender, “homosexuality” was often the main example used. Homosexuality thereby became central to the work of the commission. These terms of reference also provide the basis for excluding the accounts and experiences of gay men, as we will see, and also for the exclusion of the Wolfenden law-reform perspective.

The McRuer Commission was composed of the Chief Justice of the High Court of Ontario, an assistant medical superintendent, and a County Court Judge. One of the researchers was Professor Wake of Carleton University whom we have already met. It held hearings in thirteen cities providing an opportunity for the media to construct

“public opinion” on these questions across the Canadian state. It heard the testimony of many “experts”—psychiatrists, psychologists, lawyers, doctors, professors, social workers, police officers, and government bureaucrats, and relied on RCMP records as well as studies of “sex offenders” in England, California, and Michigan.¹⁷⁴ The work of the commission was embedded in networks of ruling state and professional relations.

It also received several letters and at least one private-session submission from gay men. Much of the proceedings were taken up with a debate over whether “sexual psychopath” was an adequate classification and whether the prison system or psychiatrists and doctors should have jurisdiction over these offenders. This was part of a conflict then going on within and between the psychiatric and legal profession and criminal justice system over the definitions of sex offences and who should treat and confine the offenders. Many of the psychiatrists, as well as the commission itself, suggested substituting “dangerous sexual offender” for “criminal sexual psychopath” to emphasize that the person so designated is likely to inflict injury or pain on others. The conceptual framework of the commission report was defined by an argument for changing the definition in this sentencing section. It argued that dangerous sexual offender would be less psychiatrically defined, and therefore would be an easier category under which people could be sentenced.

The report of the McRuer Commission grouped together homosexual offenders and “dangerous sexual offenders.” While some of the depositions that the committee heard argued that all homosexuals should be imprisoned as such, others suggested that only those engaged in “public” acts or those involved with boys should be dealt with harshly.¹⁷⁵ There were a range of submissions, including some that had a more “liberal” character that were influenced by the emerging Wolfenden reform approach, and that even mentioned the problems of “blackmail” that the legal situation created for homosexuals.

Rev. Francis Howard Kelly Greer of St. Mark’s Rectory in Halifax, referring to a young person involved in sex with an older man, said:

The thing that happens in a certain number of these cases is that a quite young person, quite an inexperienced person, is faced with the full majesty of the law, which is a more terrifying experience in some ways...than the actual sexual encounter itself may have been. One of the things that we would like to see a change made in is possibly the legal process by which some of these cases are handled.... I can give you an example of that kind of thing that happened when I was doing seaman’s welfare work. There was a boy of, I think he was over sixteen, who came to Halifax looking for a job and was picked up by a rather older man with whom he lived in a homosexual relationship for some time. The reason that that happened was the boy was here all alone and the older man was decent to him in one way or another. For some reason this came to the attention of the police, and they were hauled into court and the boy was sent to serve a sentence at Rockhead, which of course was very unsatisfactory also, because all that happened there was that he learned rather more about what he already had begun to do.¹⁷⁶

Greer also stated:

In some of the sexual offences the way that the law reads now there is a terrible danger of a kind of blackmail which does go on...This man, who is an overt homosexual, was robbed and quite badly beaten by somebody he knew, but he was unable to do anything about it because he would have been charged...with an offence that would have gotten him fourteen years, or five years and lashes...

Greer also suggested the commission look to the work currently going on in England pointing to the discussion in some church circles and the initiation of the Wolfenden committee. In response, McRuer interrupted and responded to this local "liberal" social-work account telling Greer that this did not come "within the scope of this Commission" and he basically narrowed the mandate of the commission to the definition clause of the criminal-sexual-psychopath section. Greer also suggested that the situation might be improved if this activity was not always dealt with as criminal and that this would decrease the possibility of blackmail. In response to Greer's concerns McRuer asserts:

I do not think it comes within the purview of our Commission, within our terms of reference, to decide what changes ought to be made in the criminal law with respect to these various offences. I think we are restricted to this classification of the so-called psychopathic sexual offender as defined in the Code.

The terms of reference were used here to exclude interest in the Wolfenden reform process which had just been launched and also to exclude the concerns of blackmail regarding gay men. This gives us a glimpse into the work process of the commission.

The final report of the commission was released in 1958, a year after the Wolfenden Report came out in England, and argued that mere conviction for a homosexual act should not be grounds for an indeterminate sentence but that the matter should be left up to the courts.¹⁷⁷ The relationship between "dangerous sexual offender" and homosexual "offenders" would become an important terrain of legal and political struggle in the 1960s.

Axel Otto Olson: "I don't believe the sex deviate...is the main problem"

There was, however, one gay voice in protest to the commission itself. At one of the commission's private sessions, Axel Otto Olson, then living in Toronto, raised several objections. He was one of the few "non-expert" witnesses to give testimony before the commission. He is, in part, the "other" (the "sex deviate" speaking for himself) that the McRuer Commission totally denies in its final report. There is not a trace left of his submission for those reading the final report; it has been completely obliterated as part of the construction of a consensus on the criminal "problem" of homosexuality.¹⁷⁸

Olson, speaking in a very different first-hand voice than that of the authoritative commissioners and their counsel, detailed in his testimony, blackmail attempts against himself and other men which followed accusations of homosexuality and which were carried out by “certain police officers, court officials, and members of religious youth organizations.” Like other gay men during these years, he located the very real problems of blackmail that they faced in the laws criminalizing homosexuality, in police actions, in the “security” campaigns, and in heterosexist social practices. He described being falsely charged with having sex with boys and being dragged to the police station and through the courts in Montréal where he was kept in jail for several weeks. He was denied the right to make a phone call and spent a week at the Bordeaux jail without seeing anyone. His experiences led him to a somewhat speculative and conspiratorial account of the organization of police activity since he could not fully grasp from his local situation the broader social organization of police activity. At the same time, he does make visible how the anti-gay campaigns of the 1950s had powerful support in sections of the state apparatus.

Olson went on to argue that there were not “any more sex offenders to-day than there was twenty-five or fifty years ago” and that the current furore was largely a media scare. The government, he said, was investigating and blackmailing men in the civil service. It was “almost impossible to teach school,” said Olson, “because if you are friendly with the pupils you run the risk of being accused of being homosexual or a sex deviate.” In his opinion, the blackmailers were the “most serious problem.” This was an important reversal or inversion of hegemonic discourse. He went on:

There are a minority of people, who from no fault of their own, most of them from birth probably, have never been able to love a woman or have any sexual relations with a woman. Apparently such persons were meant to be female, but by some freak of nature had the outward appearance of being a male person, but inwardly they had all the characteristics, all the feelings and desires, of a woman. The doctors and psychiatrists, I have talked to some of them, and they claim there is no cure whatsoever for these people; so what are they going to do?

In this reverse or counter discourse, Olson used the congenital-invert theory¹⁷⁹ to argue against legal persecution. Later in his testimony, after referring to André Gide’s *Corydon*, he stated:

This author claims that by nature it is natural for any person, regardless of sex, to fall in love with another person of the same sex, and it is only by convention and by enforcing laws trying to put men and women together and so on that it has been possible. I believe that about fifty percent of the male population at some time or other during their lives have had sexual relations with another person of the same sex.

Olson also offered this view:

I believe as far as the state and the police are concerned, sexual relationships between persons of the same sex—or a different sex; it doesn't matter—in private, if the person is over sixteen years old, should not be considered an offence as far as the state is concerned.

In taking this position, Olson was influenced by some of the European experiences of sexual-law reform, particularly law reform in his homeland of Denmark. He was also influenced by homophile organizing in Europe and possibly in the US and the emerging Wolfenden perspective.

An account based on the experience of a gay men was clearly what the commission did not want to hear. Throughout his presentation, Olson was interrupted by the examiner for the commission. At one point Chairman McRuer stated:

I cannot see that what you are saying is relevant to our terms of reference. If you have something to contribute about our specific law and what amendments ought to be made to it, then we want to hear you, but this record is not for the purpose of reviewing complaints about the administration of justice...

Then Olson stated that: "I believe that blackmailing should be a very serious offence." Justice McRuer responded that blackmail was "not one of the things within the compass of our terms of reference."¹⁸⁰ This was the active mobilization of the terms of reference as an exclusion device typical in official commission-work processes. Olson had more to say but the commissioners were eager to put an end to his testimony. The Chair concluded: "Well, I think probably what you have stated will be quite sufficient for us."¹⁸¹

Olson's remarkable story of resistance, albeit couched in the available psychiatric, sexological and homophile languages of the day, as well as the commission's treatment of him, says much about the clash between the world of official legal discourse and the experiences of gay men. The prevailing heterosexist social relations and the commission's restricted mandate precluded its hearing what Olson had to say. What he was telling them was outside their interpretation of their mandate since they were attending to quite different concerns and were unable to take up the standpoints of gay men. The evidence, knowledge, and data that the work of the commission and its report relies on and embodies, which is largely of a police or psychiatric character, has an administrative relation to the lives of gay men. Again, the terms of reference given to the commission play a crucial part in this organizing "out" of the experiences of gay men. A rupture or line of fault exists between the official discourse of the commission and the experience and narrative provided by Olson. As Robert Champagne comments regarding Olson's testimony:

The Royal Commission provides us with a means to explore the tendency of officially mandated commissions of inquiry to ignore, subvert and reinterpret the actual lived experiences of gays and lesbians and to construct accounts of our lives as problematic and in need of regulation.¹⁸²

“Homosexuality is a constant problem for the Police...”

The commission believed, in contrast, that there were “profound problems raised by homosexuality.”¹⁸³ On this matter they relied heavily on police data and depositions. A submission by Chief Constable John Chisholm of the Toronto Police Force was quoted extensively in the final report:

Homosexuality is a constant problem for the Police of large cities, and if the Police adopt a laissez-faire attitude...city parks, intended for the relaxation of women and children and youth recreation purposes, will become rendezvous for homosexuals. In addition to his immoral conduct, the homosexual requires Police attention, as he is often the victim of gang beatings, or robbery with violence, and is easy prey for the extortionist and black-mailers. Homosexuals have been stabbed and wounded and in a few cases have been murdered. The saddest feature of all, however, is that homosexuals corrupt others and are constantly recruiting youths into their fraternity.¹⁸⁴

Chief Chisholm was later reported as saying that “marital status of suspects is no guide to the Police in sex investigations, as both married and single men are found in the ranks of homosexuals and other sex offenders.”¹⁸⁵

Jim Egan would later brilliantly contest and deconstruct Chisholm’s account, and it is worth quoting extensively from it as a critique of Chisholm’s remarks and of the standpoint the commission adopted. After reading the final report of the commission, which included Chisholm’s comments, Egan wrote the following:

The Report under discussion lists 81 organizations and 100 individuals who either submitted briefs or personally appeared before the Commission. Need it be said that no reference appears to any representation on behalf of the homosexual minority? Is it any wonder, then, that the Commission findings as regards homosexuality were much less than fair or favorable. Since it is largely upon the briefs and evidence that the Commission bases its findings, it is hard to see how they could have arrived at conclusions other than those set out in their Report.... On the other hand, apparently deemed of such value as to warrant inclusion in the Report itself, we have excerpts from the evidence of Chief of Police (Toronto) Chisholm relating to homosexuality. His evidence which follows, with comments, is a typical masterpiece of libel, distortion, innuendo and gross misrepresentation.

“Homosexuality is a constant problem for the Police in larger centres”: note the word “constant.” It insinuates that every day and night the police are dealing with homosexual offenders or “problems”—obviously untrue. Not even “some of the police” but “the police”—every one of them. When do they have the time to arrest bankrobbers or put parking tickets on cars?...

“And if the Police adopt a laissez-faire attitude toward such individuals, City Parks, intended for the relaxation of women and children and youth recreation purposes will become rendezvous for homosexuals”: certainly no one will accuse the Chiefs

uninformed bully-boys of a “laissez-faire attitude”—but despite this lack there are a number of Toronto parks that are, and have been for years, homosexual rendez-vous without interfering in the slightest with the “relaxation of women and children etc.”

The reason for this, which the Chief just forgot to mention (an honest slip, no doubt) is that the homosexual who “cruises” the park invariably does so long after dark and long after the women and children are so relaxed as to be sound asleep at home...

“In addition to his immoral conduct, the homosexual requires further Police protection, as he is often the victim of gang beatings, or robbery with violence, and is easy prey for the extortionist and blackmailer”: note the skill with which the phrase “his immoral conduct” is used. Not “some homosexual conduct” but his—implying that all homosexuals are per se: immoral. And just imagine! Not only are all homosexuals immoral, but they (deliberately) get beaten up and murdered just to make more work for the long-suffering Police—who, one might think, if properly attending to the “constant problem,” should be able to prevent the “robberies with violence and gang beatings”—or do they really care? No doubt it escaped the Chiefs attention that only the unjust anti-homosexual laws make it possible to beat, rob, murder and blackmail the homosexual with virtual impunity. And by the vindictive manner of the laws’ enforcement by both police and courts, the criminals are actually encouraged to victimize the homosexual.¹⁸⁶

Unfortunately, the voices of Olson and Egan were not listened to in the work process of the McRuer Commission. Instead, the commission took up the standpoint of the police against gay men. Invoking its terms of reference in this way enabled the commission to exclude the experiences of gay men, to rule that blackmail and violence against gays was not relevant to its task.

In the conclusion of its report, the commission argued for the establishment of a new category, “dangerous sexual offender,” to replace “criminal sexual psychopath.” The report formalized the official intersection and interaction between psychiatrists and the police, courts, and penal system. In order to label someone a “dangerous sexual offender,” the court would have to hear the testimony of at least two psychiatrists.¹⁸⁷ The report also called for the extension of out-patient services to released offenders, for the education of parents, teachers, and those who care for the young, on the topic of sexual deviation, and for intensive “research in all aspects of sexual deviation, with a view to the development of means of correction and punishment.”¹⁸⁸

Parliament did not deal with the McRuer proposals until 1961, when the recommendations regarding “dangerous sexual offender” were adopted. Meanwhile, the legislation drafters at the department of justice added a new clause: “Or who is likely to commit another sexual offence,”¹⁸⁹ apparently to give an alternative definition so that the sentencing rate would increase. As we will see, this added clause would come to mean that someone convicted of “gross indecency” with consenting men or adolescent boys could be classified as a dangerous sex offender. The legislation was passed in 1961. The strategy of extending the criminalization of homosexuality, while shifting it in a limited way from criminal sexual psychopath to dangerous sexual offender, was fundamentally held in place.

This helped set up a dynamic tension to be explored in the next chapter between the extending criminalization of homosexuality strategy being enacted in Canadian law versus the “liberalization” or Wolfenden approach which began to be used to organize support for homosexual-law reform. This was also a tension between US versus English legal influences in the Canadian context.

The deliberations of the McRuer Commission were also affected by the organizing on “sex deviates” that took place outside its state-mandated confines that I now explore. People influenced by emerging more “liberal” approaches to sexual regulation argued for the expansion of psychiatric clinics, for the extension of more state resources to such facilities whether they were within state jurisdictions or organized more “privately,” and for more funding for sex research.

Child Molesters, Shrinks, and Clinics

The 1950s were the years in Canada during which the notion of child molestation as a social problem became more generalized through the work of the professions, the police, and mass-media coverage. Molestation was identified as coming from strangers in the “public” realm who were often visualized as homosexuals.

This was partly a social response to the “disruptions” of the World War II mobilizations on Canadian social life and part of an attempt to reconstruct “proper” family, gender, and sexual relations after the war. While women had entered into more “public” defined areas of waged work and social life during the war mobilizations, white women were now being pushed back into the realm of the family, the household, institutionalized motherhood and heterosexuality. As part of this, sexual danger came to be identified with the “public” realms of social life. “Public” in this context covered the social worlds outside the domestic familial realm, especially city streets and downtown areas. Part of this was also the social construction of homosexuality as a national, social, and sexual danger during these years through a series of regulatory practices I have already sketched in and the identification of homosexual danger with these “public” spaces.

The post-World War II years were a period of rapid urbanization and suburbanization transforming working-class and middle-class life. Workers now travelled further to get to and from waged work, which, in turn, meant increased separation of the sites of waged work and leisure for working-class men. Pre-World War II communities were broken down in favour of subdivisions and urban developments. In the suburbs, housing was spread out so that family, kinship, and community networks were fragmented and dispersed. This could give rise to a sense of insecurity that could be quickly mobilized against “strangers.”

In this social environment when sexual violence and assaults on young people occurred, it was easier to organize “child molester” scares, and with it an association of homosexuality and child molestation.¹⁹⁰ The image of the “child molester” was created from a number of social constructions. The media and professionals established childhood and youth as a particular area of concern, building on earlier concerns over

masturbation and sexuality. The idea of “innocence”—the asexual and vulnerable nature of children—was itself a product of the historical separation of childhood and adolescence from adulthood, which the compulsory school system and the lengthening of the period of childhood and youth dependence served to strengthen.¹⁹¹

By the later 1950s and early 1960s, there emerged concerns about youth cultures, youth “crime waves,” and the effects of rock ‘n’ roll. There was a gendered construction of sexual delinquency with sexual “promiscuity” often being seen as the major form of delinquency among girls and young women. These “social problems” were often blamed on the mother who worked for wages outside the home and therefore supposedly neglected her children.¹⁹² This played on the moral regulatory power of being a “good” mother by defining some mothers as “deficient” or as “bad” mothers who produced the problems of “juvenile delinquency” and “sexual deviance.”

It was in the context of these anxieties and fears that the mythology of homosexual “seduction” and “corruption” of young people was organized and took root. There emerged the image of the child molester as an anonymous stranger, often an older, homosexual man. The media played an active part in constructing this image,¹⁹³ feeding on the very real fears of city parents, especially mothers given the prevailing gender division of labour regarding parenting and childrearing. Mothers were warned to keep an eye on their children and to alert their children to the dangers of talking to strangers. Very real fears of sexual danger were focused against an image of the sex deviate as a stranger who was often homosexual. This operated to displace sexual danger from the realm of the “private” and from “normal” family men to the realm of the “public” and the “deviant.” This not only participated in the normalization of matrimonial heterosexuality but also constructed it as safe in contrast to the dangers of homosexuality. There was a relational character to this process with the private realm being constructed as safe while the public realm and the homosexual were constructed as sexually dangerous. Actual danger, however, was often much closer to home. The vast majority of sexual assaults on children concern heterosexual-identified men attacking and harassing girls, very often within the heterosexual family.¹⁹⁴

This hegemonic social narrative of sexual danger¹⁹⁵ led to looking in the wrong places for those responsible for most sexual violence and harassment. It helped to construct the heterosexual family as safe—and the realm outside it as dangerous—even though heterosexual familial relations were often very dangerous for women and children. The organizing of this social consciousness in Canada during these years has to do with media coverage on this topic, professional work during these years, the mobilization of “concerned citizen’s groups” like the Parents’ Action League that I will mention in a moment, and the development of the criminal law relating to sexual offences I have just examined.

In late 1955 and early 1956, there were reports of a series of violent sex crimes in southern Ontario. There were reports of several cases of violent rape and sexual assault in Hamilton, and a number of young girls were murdered in London and Toronto. These crimes became a major media event and led to demands for both tougher laws and more stringent enforcement of the existing law.¹⁹⁶ Sexual assaults and murders were

often presented in the media through the frames already articulated in relation to sex deviates and criminal sexual psychopaths. The mood was heightened when a series of sex-related child murders and assaults occurred in Toronto. This media produced outcry influenced the proceedings of the Royal Commission. The media response was in part organized in relation to the commission hearings and the social spaces they provided for public organizing. The Parents' Action League and the *Toronto Star* Forum—which I mention shortly—interacted with and helped to shape the context of the work of the commission.

The media was not monolithic in its approach; parts were associated with more liberal reform approaches, while others amplified more “law and order” and moral-conservative approaches. “Popular” organizations like the Parents' Action League were organized through media and the interventions of psychiatric professionals. This organizing also had a direct relation to the campaign for the establishment of a forensic clinic, and the expansion of the psychiatric domain to capture more funding and resources.

The Parents' Action League (PAL) was founded by four white middle-class Toronto housewives in 1954–55 who were rather well-connected with the political and social elite. They were concerned about assaults on women and children and felt that something needed to be done. They were not particularly concerned about homosexuals at first. As an organization of parents, they could claim to have a special interest in this matter. The objectives of the original group were shifted through their reliance on male psychiatric experts and the crucial tie-in of PAL with mass-media coverage.

With psychiatric and media influence and involvement, PAL campaigned to disseminate information about sex deviation to encourage research into the causes, treatment, and prevention of sex deviation, to encourage the establishment of “treatment” clinics for sex deviates, and to influence government with respect to legislation, control, and treatment of sex deviates.¹⁹⁷ While PAL was generally associated with the more liberal treatment-oriented regulatory strategy for sex deviates they were not opposed to incarceration and confinement. PAL did, however, earn the opposition of those who wanted a widespread clampdown on all sex deviates and from those opposed to the sickness and treatment framings of sex deviates.¹⁹⁸

It was through the local press that PAL's initial contacts were made. Following a series of attacks on women and girls, one of the founders of PAL had a letter published in the *Telegram*. PAL members called lawyers, medical officials, and politicians to get assistance. Some of the connections were made through the relatives of the founding women's group. The print media played a central role in putting some of these people in touch with each other and in organizing consciousness of this “problem.”

After “Lotta Dempsey, of the *Toronto Globe and Mail* wrote a column about us...our phone never seemed to stop,” PAL members said.¹⁹⁹ Evelyn Dorfman, a PAL member, visited the editors of the *Telegram*. They published articles on their activities and “the paper also let us use its staff writers to help cope with inquiries.” “Almost overnight,” they go on, “it seemed, we had a big-league organization.”²⁰⁰

While PAL began at the white middle-class family and community level, it soon gained establishment support. At the same time, its ability to portray itself as speaking

for parents and mothers was crucial to its success. The PAL executive included Allan Grossman, Conservative MPP, as its vice-president, and psychologists, psychiatrists, and lawyers sat on its Scientific Advisory Committee. While this was an attempt by the original organizers to achieve legitimacy and respectability that their middle-class social and family networks allowed them to draw upon, it also profoundly shaped the character of the organization. These professional connections were part of the middle-class reliance on experts that was quite prevalent (and was being extended) during these years. This professional reliance was being intensified in relation to the regulation of familial relations, especially in relation to white middle-class families.

Dr. Gray, the chair of PAL's Scientific Advisory Committee, stated at the "Star Forum on Sex Deviates" that early in its development PAL had set up this advisory committee with the object of bringing to PAL, its directors, and members whatever information was available on the subject.²⁰¹ PAL founders were quoted as stating that, "As housewives, we've discovered many things from the experts" particularly that the most pressing need now is for more research.²⁰² Here we can begin to see how PAL began to become defined organizationally by the social interests of these professional experts. As Rose suggests, in the twentieth century, campaigns for family reform have often been influenced by professionals and experts, and while family members have participated in reforming campaigns, they have called upon scientific expertise to back up their proposals with claims to authority based in science.²⁰³ In this realm, it added to the work of mothering, especially for middle-class women reading this professional literature as well as the more "popular" versions of it directed at women and mothers, but also as a standard for all mothers: it was their responsibility to raise their children not only to avoid molesters but also so that they don't become molesters. Since it was suggested that many sex deviates were "bred in the home,"²⁰⁴ mothers were in part blamed for producing sex deviates. To prevent this, they needed to rely on expert advice from professional white men. This was an uneven intensification of the professional regulation of mothering work and family relations establishing relations of "dependency" of mothers in the home on professional power and knowledge.

PAL lobbied the provincial government to establish a system for collecting information on sex deviates and to open a "treatment" clinic.²⁰⁵ These proposals, which met with some major success, were themselves part of constructing the relations of psychiatric research on sex offenders and the establishment of forensic clinics, which in turn would be important institutional sites for the production of psychiatric knowledge, the linking together of psychiatric testimony to courtroom decisions, and psychiatric probationary treatment in sex-related cases.

The Star Forum

On January 26, 1956, the *Star* sponsored a Citizens' Forum on Sex Deviates at Massey Hall, which was attended by more than 2,000 people. As James Fraser put it, "The partial list of guests at the Forum reads like a Who's Who in government, law enforcement and social services."²⁰⁶ The platform was packed with members of the social welfare,

medical, legal, and religious establishment, and several MPPs. Among them was the mayor of Toronto, Nathan Philips.

The *Star*'s own motivation for the forum is provided in a letter dated January 20, 1956, inviting the mayor to attend:

You are likely aware of the increasing public concern in recent weeks over the problem of sex offenders.... The *Star*, in an effort to channel this interest in a constructive path, has arranged a panel discussion"—a "Citizen's" Forum on Sex Crimes.²⁰⁷

"Unconstructive" responses would be based on ignorance that this educational forum was meant to remedy by relying on professional experts. The *Star* specifically organized this forum to get distinguished officials and the elite of society there and to tie-in with the hearings of the Royal Commission to be held in Toronto in the following weeks. It was part of organizing a perspective that relied on psychiatric experts and was a crucial part of the campaign for a forensic clinic. The introduction to the meeting explicitly referred to the criminal-sexual-psychopath legislation.

Four white men spoke on the subject of sex deviation: Dr. Kenneth Gray of the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital and chief consultant to PAL; Dr. Fred Van Nostrand, chief of neurological services of Ontario's department of reform institutions; Dr. Guttmacher, chief medical officer of the supreme court bench in Baltimore, Maryland; and Dr. Ralph Brancale, director of New Jersey's diagnostic centre for sex offenders.

Dr. Gray defined sex deviation as "an act performed for sexual gratification other than sexual intercourse with an adult of the opposite sex." Notions of sex perversion were now replaced with those of sexual deviation. In distinguishing between various sex deviates, Gray described only two types as dangerous: sadists and pedophiles. He defined pedophiles as engaging in the "sexual molesting of young children," and he spoke on behalf of PAL calling for facilities to categorize and treat sex offenders.

Taken together, the "experts" presented somewhat contradictory views. Guttmacher, for instance, said that "homosexuals are usually the result of a bad child-parent relationship." Again, the focus seems to be on "defective" mother/child relations. Yet he argued that homosexuality "should be considered a private matter unless it involves force or is an affront to the public."

Van Nostrand focused on "problem families," arguing that "time after time comes the pathetic story of a family of six, seven, or eight living in one or two rooms, and the actual sleeping together of children up to teenage, and following through with incest and some perversions." This resonates with earlier claims going back to the nineteenth century that incest was produced by poverty and crowded living conditions. The relations carried in this statement are part of organizing "respectable" ways of life as "ideals" for the working class, despite the financial situations of working-class and poor households including the lack of affordable and suitable housing, which often precluded more spacious sleeping accommodations. While the focus was put on the "public" character of sexual danger, the roots of this danger were traced back to bad mothering practices, especially in poor and working-class homes.

Guttmacher and Van Nostrand both warned parents against their children being friendly with people much older than themselves. Gray, however, reported that more than seventy-five percent of the men involved in molestation knew the child beforehand. This did begin to challenge the “stranger” myth of the child molester. Brancale discussed the now familiar image of the homosexual teacher as child molester: “It has been found that children have often been molested—not only by men they knew—but men who are in constructive positions such as teachers or counsellors at boys’ clubs.” This shifts attention to “public” institutions like schools and boys’ clubs and away from families, households and relatives.

These “experts” stressed more reliance on professional experts and treatment than on penalties and punishment. They were arguing that not all sex deviates were dangerous and that only the psychiatrist could tell for sure. They wished to preserve and extend psychiatric and psychological hegemonies over the regulation of sexual deviations. The *Star* basically took up the perspective produced by PAL and Dr. Gray in its editorial on the Forum.²⁰⁸

The citizen’s forum and PAL²⁰⁹ were expressions of the organization of “public opinion” on this issue. This also highlights how these concerns were organized and mobilized through the media and the involvement of psychiatric and medical experts. The motivation for the psychiatric and medical involvement would appear to be to expand the psychiatric domain and the opportunity it provided to capture more resources (including government research grants and clinic facilities). This organizing was important to the establishment of the eventual hegemony of the mental-illness conceptualization of homosexuality and lesbianism. It expanded the power of medical and psychiatric discourses and practices within sexual regulation more generally, including in relation to parents, families, and young people.

PAL, Dr. Gray and the *Star* achieved success in their clinic campaign. In 1956, under the provisions of the Ontario Mental Hospitals Act, a forensic clinic was established as a division of the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital in affiliation with the department of psychiatry at the University of Toronto.²¹⁰ This later became the Forensic Service of the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry in 1966. Here the interlocking character of the relations established between lobbying by a “parents” group, the media, and the state agreeing to set up an institutional site, its connections with a professional academic discipline and institution, and the expansion of psychiatric jurisdiction is visible.

New Sexual Types: Pedophiles, Transvestites, Transsexuals

The forensic clinic at the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital had as its mandate to undertake research into the nature of sexual deviation. The clinic was created under the leadership of Dr. Peter Thomson, who had already done work on the subject. He argued that about forty percent of all homosexuals suffer from some form of neurotic or psychotic mental disorder and that those at the lower end of the Kinsey scale (those not exclusively homosexual) could attain complete heterosexuality through psychotherapy.²¹¹ There was an argument generated for extending the jurisdiction of the forensic clinic

into “education” in relation to parents, the school system, and other institutions in attempts to prevent young people from becoming sex deviates. In the 1960s doctors and researchers from the clinic regularly advised magistrates and the police on methods of identifying and treating sex deviates.²¹²

Johann Mohr and R.E. Turner reported that forty to sixty percent of the people they studied at the clinic were referrals from the legal system and about one-third were from what they called “community sources,” including hospitals, clinics, and doctors in private practice. They reported that eighty percent of “adult-oriented” homosexuals were referred from these “community” agencies and twenty percent from the legal apparatus.²¹³ These statistics are an indication of how doctors and psychiatrists regulated the lives of gay men, and indeed how at least some gays came to accept the theory of homosexuality as an illness.²¹⁴ In 1963 only about fifteen percent of the people seen at the clinic were classified as homosexual. Lesbians were apparently harder to deal with and few came to them or were referred. Still, Mohr and Turner argued that homosexuality could be treated in individual cases, sometimes through the use of aversion therapy. “Treatment is possible for most cases if not in terms of a cure at least in terms of an amelioration of problem situations.”²¹⁵

There were also attempts to break up or break down broad collecting categories like “sex deviates” or “criminal sexual psychopaths” and even the “homosexual” in the 1950s and this expanded in the 1960s. Emerging psychiatric and psychological approaches also suggested, as we have seen, that while some sexual activities were “dangerous,” heterosexual activities that were not geared to reproduction and not between a wife and her husband might be anomalous or immoral but not criminal. Some of this work began to differentiate between “dangerous” sexual acts and more acceptable acts such as masturbation, premarital petting, and heterosexual oral and anal sex if done in “private.”²¹⁶ The boundaries of heterosexual normality were being expanded.

Mohr and Turner conducted some of the work creating pedophilia as a separate and distinct concept.²¹⁷ The creation of the “pedophile” was part of the mobilization of concerns over children and youth during these years as well as being part of the creation of new sexual types. Pedophilia was defined as “the expressed desire for immature sexual gratification with a prepubertal child.”²¹⁸ There was a limited attempt at that time to distinguish between homosexuality and pedophilia in much psychological and sexological work. A new sexual being thus emerged—the person defined by sexual interests in children.²¹⁹ Mohr also made a distinction between heterosexual and homosexual pedophilia,²²⁰ however “homosexual pedophilia” continues to be associated with homosexuality in general and most often continues to be used in standard media coverage. There has also been a process both within media and popular discourses—but also professional ones—of the homosexualization of the pedophile. While psychological and sexological discourse defines pedophilia technically as a sexual interest in the pre-pubertal child, the media often uses the term when covering homosexual acts involving post-pubescent adolescents as well.

Again, this construction of “pedophilia” leads to a focus on “deviant” men as the sexual danger. It focuses on sexual assaults and harassment of young people as being

carried out by “mentally ill” and “deviant” individual men and not to a broader focus on the social relations of power and the practices leading to violence and harassment against young people. Both homosexuals and pedophiles are defined as being found outside families and households²²¹ and identified with the “public” realm. These processes constructed sexual danger as being in the “public” realm from “sex deviates” and not from “normal” men in “normal” families.²²² This also participated in shifting social attention away from the major social sources and sites of sexual danger.

The different “liberal” and more “conservative” currents in professional discourse all agreed on one thing, however: heterosexuality was the undisputed social norm. In this period, however, there developed

the gradual emergence of a newer and quite different conception based not upon gender ideas but upon the notion of “sexual object choice” or “sexual orientation” which came to be defined independently of gender identity.²²³

This uneven and partial separation of the concept of homosexuality from notions of gender inversion that had earlier hegemonized this concept allowed for the articulation of new sexual and gender types. At the same time, earlier conceptualizations associating “queers” with gender inversion were still very much alive and could still be re-mobilized.

The classifications of transvestism and transsexualism, as distinct from homosexuality, were made in this period.²²⁴ “Effeminacy” was now less identified with male homosexuality in general.²²⁵ In the 1950s and 1960s, with a number of publicized transsexual operations beginning with the celebrated case of Christine Jorgensen, the transsexual was the centre of attention for sexologists and psychologists interested in gender and sexual “disorientation.” State agencies, for a number of administrative, economic, and social reasons, laid down the criteria for determining gender assignment on the basis of genital features at birth.²²⁶ There was the beginning of the self-organization of those identifying as transsexuals and later as trans people who shifted and transformed these categories.²²⁷ Those who did not easily fit into these rigid classifications therefore provoked anxiety, concern, interest, and study. Gender-identity clinics were established, one of which was set up in the 1960s at the Clarke Institute in Toronto. Work centred on the development of procedures to allow for the firm maintenance of male/female gender dichotomies by establishing an early “core gender identity” that could actually conflict with biological sex at birth.²²⁸ This would then be used to justify operations to bring the individual’s anatomy into line with their “core gender.” At the same time, pre-operative transsexuals living and being taken as the gender they wish to be seen as, also challenge the rules of the “natural attitude” to gender and show how gender is a continuous social accomplishment.²²⁹

These new sexual and gender categories were created in the context of broad post-war shifts in gender and sexual organization. Part of this process was a shift in the practices of some professional and social agencies, especially those that adopted a more “liberal” approach. They now became less interested in homosexuals and lesbians in

general and more concerned with what they saw as specific anomalies—transvestism, transsexuality, and pedophilia. This helped to set the stage in the 1960s for the expansion of gay and lesbian cultures, for the emergence of a small but important homophile movement in Canada, and for homosexual-law reform.

The Struggle for Law Reform

Wolfenden: A New Strategy of Sexual Regulation

A government report clearly expressing the shifting character of sexual regulation, particularly concerning homosexual offences, was produced in England in the 1950s. This text had a major impact in the organizing of law-reform discussions of Criminal Code sex offences in Canada in the 1960s. The way it was read and used played a major part in opening up further space for tendencies toward law reform that began in the 1950s and in bringing them together for more coherent and successful law-reform efforts in the 1960s. This was a very different strategy of sexual regulation from that articulated in the extending criminalization of homosexuality approach that informed the criminal-sexual-psychopath and dangerous-sexual-offender strategy with which it comes into contention in Canada in the 1960s.

The Wolfenden committee was formed by the Home Secretary in response to media-amplified moral outrage and an attempted “moral panic” over sexual vice and sex work. The media in England portrayed a rapid escalation of homosexuality and prostitution in the early 1950s. The committee was formed in the immediate aftermath of the Montagu-Wildeblood trial for homosexual “offences” in 1954 and in the context of the Cold War spy scandals, which sharpened the dividing line between the “normal” and the “deviant.” It therefore had similar roots to the context in which the extension of criminalization of homosexuality had taken place in Canada in the 1950s. An interdepartmental committee under the chairmanship of Sir John Wolfenden was established in 1954 to investigate the “nauseating subject” of male homosexuality and prostitution, the connections between the two having been established historically in the nineteenth century through the notion that both were signs of “moral decline.”¹ This belief was part of the post-war reassertion of “traditional” heterosexual family relations. Women sex workers along with homosexual acts among men were seen to be a threat to heterosexual companionate marriage.²

Pressure from the Public Morality Council, the National Vigilance Association, and the Church of England Moral Welfare Council helped to lead up to the formation of the Wolfenden committee. Although most pressure for a commission focused on homosexuality, prostitution was included in the terms of reference of the Wolfenden committee in the context of an attempted “moral panic” over the visibility of women sex workers on city streets, particularly in London.³ The question raised for the Wolfenden committee

was how to manage large-scale deviations from what was defined as “normative” sexual relations—to search for a more effective means of regulating “sexual deviance.”⁴

The Wolfenden committee heard testimony from police chiefs, medical associations, and government departments, doctors, and psychologists.⁵ Its work and the report it produced were lodged firmly in the social relations of ruling, managing, and administering sexual life. It heard only one individual deputation from a gay man—Peter Wildeblood himself.⁶

The terms of reference given to the committee directed it to consider.

- (a) the law and practice relating to homosexual offences and the treatment of persons convicted of such offences by the courts; and
- (b) the law and practices relating to offences against the criminal law in connection with prostitution and solicitation for immoral purposes, and to report what changes, if any, are in our opinion desirable.⁷

These terms of reference clearly assume homosexuality and prostitution to be social problems, but, aside from this underlying assumption, the terms are fairly open. Regarding homosexual offences they direct the attention of the committee to the criminal law and the treatment of people convicted under the criminal law. The terms of reference for prostitution are more restricted and there is no mention of treatment.

Within this framework the committee is given a wide latitude to work over and propose shifts to these sexual regulations. This opens up some space for innovation. The terms of reference allow both for the holding in place and also the shifting of proposed regulations. The space for possible shifting is much wider than that allowed for in the terms of reference given to the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths. This allows the Wolfenden committee to develop concepts for the reform of the law regarding sexual regulation more generally. The regulatory strategy it articulates must be able to cover both homosexual offences and female prostitution. Public/private categories allowed for this innovative conceptual handling of the diversities of the regulation of both homosexuality and prostitution.

Public/Private Regulation

The overall framework for the *Wolfenden Report* and the regulatory strategy it outlines is the distinction between “public” and “private”: “There must be a realm of private morality and immorality that is in brief and crude terms not the law’s business.”⁸ At a general, abstract level, it argues that the purpose of criminal law should be to preserve public decency, not to enforce private morality:

Its function...is to preserve public order and decency to protect the citizen from what is offensive and injurious and to provide sufficient safeguards against exploitation and corruption of others, particularly those who are especially vulnerable because they are young, weak in body or mind, inexperienced, or in a state of specific, official, or economic

dependence...it is not in our view the function of the law to intervene in the private lives of citizens, or to seek to enforce any particular patterns of behaviour.⁹

The committee is not arguing for the abandonment of sexual regulation but rather for the mobilizing of sexual and moral regulation through the broad “public” conceptualization of regulation developed in the *Wolfenden Report*. Throughout the *Wolfenden Report* the committee attempts to translate this conceptual distinction between public/private into ideological and policy terms that are then made available to ruling agencies to be taken up as part of the practical activities of regulation and policing. This public/private conceptual distinction allowed for the holding together of the *Wolfenden Report*’s more restrictive proposals regarding “public” prostitution and its less restrictive proposals regarding “private” homosexual acts.

The public/private distinction created the basis for a series of public and private classifications within official discourse and practice as a strategy of policing and regulation. The *Wolfenden Report* stresses the distinction already established in English law between crime and sin.¹⁰ It therefore applies to the sexual realm the distinction between “public” and “private” domains that were themselves organized through state and professional practices.

Public/private was a legal distinction that emerged within the framework of capitalist society, for instance, in the writings of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. These “classical” texts continued in some ways to actively inform the conceptual framework of the *Wolfenden Report* and the ensuing debates. These categories only seemed to really become legally cogent in this sex-related terrain in this social and historical context. In these views, state intervention in “private” was seen to be justified only to prevent “harm” to others. An “offence” to “public decency” is however much broader than Mill intended when he referred to direct harm to others.¹¹ Moral discourse in the sexual realm was not abandoned in this strategy but instead moral arguments were tied to a mobilization against public indecency and nuisance that in general disapproved of homosexuality.

Actual experiences of the delights and dangers of erotic life were transformed or inscribed in this language into categories of public and private sex. In the ideological world view articulated by the *Wolfenden Report*, there exists a private moral realm, which it argues, should be free of direct legal intervention. This “private” realm seems to have an almost natural rather than a social character to it.

Judging homosexuality to be a “state or condition” that cannot come under the purview of criminal law, the committee reported that the number of homosexual offences had increased considerably and that this was a “serious problem,” particularly when the men involved were in positions of trust and responsibility.¹² They argued against any simple notion of homosexuality as an illness that they felt would undermine the responsibility of these men for their acts and also because there was no clear “cause” or “cure” for homosexuality.¹³ At the same time they did accept the importance of psychological approaches in addressing homosexuality. In the section of the report focusing on homosexuality they tended to rely on and integrate “liberal” sex-scientific work on

homosexuality. The report was also shaped by the growing presence and visibility of gay networks in England.

The report clearly embodies fears over homosexuality among teachers and other people in contact with the young, arguing that men found guilty of homosexual offences should not be allowed to continue teaching or be youth leaders. It relates this apparent increase in homosexual activity to the wartime conditions that had loosened family ties and separated the genders for prolonged periods. It suggested:

it is likely that the emotional insecurity, community instability and weakening of the family inherent in the social changes of our civilization have been factors contributing to an increase in homosexual behaviour.¹⁴

The discursive organization of such statements ties the report to the regulation of gender and age relations. As Bland, McCabe, and Mort point out in their critical analysis of the report:

For “emotional insecurity” read problem families and depraved children, for “community instability” read the breakdown of the old pre-War patterns of community, for “the weakening of the family” read the contradictions thrown up by the increase in waged work among married women, the concern over the growth of antagonistic youth cultures, and the faint beginnings of sexual permissiveness.¹⁵

The *Wolfenden Report* suggests, in a number of places, that a “happy family life” can curtail a homosexual “propensity.” The report clearly embodies the standpoint of heterosexual hegemony, even if it does suggest a new form for this hegemony. Heterosexuality, in the shape of heterosexual matrimonial monogamy is constructed as the undisputable social norm. In its historical context, however, the report had certain limited progressive consequences and presented new opportunities for gays, lesbians, and others.

The report recommends that the police deal with homosexual offences in public places. It articulates a new classification for “private” homosexual activity between two adults, arguing that it be decriminalized and regulated through non-judicial agencies such as psychiatric, psychological, therapeutic, and medical agencies and the disciplines of social work and sociology. These recommendations played an important part in establishing adult homosexuality among men as a “condition,” reflecting the bid by psychiatrists and medical doctors to increase their regulatory terrains. At the same time there was no simple professional “conspiracy” pushing in this direction.

The committee stopped short of including navy and armed forces personnel in its recommendations. Within services with a disciplinary regime, says the report:

it may be necessary, for the sake of good management and the preservation of discipline and for the protection of those of subordinate rank or position, to regard homosexual behaviour even by consenting adults in private as an offence.... The service authorities

may...consider it necessary to retain Section 66 of the Act [The Army Act, 1955] (which provides for the punishment of, inter alia, disgraceful conduct of an indecent or unnatural kind) on the ground that it is essential, in the services, to treat as offences certain types of conduct which may not amount to offences under the civil code.¹⁶

Here again the military was viewed as a particular form of organization that made it a “special case,” so that even the limited forms of decriminalization being proposed would not apply to it. Similar arguments would get mobilized regarding the military and the police in the Canadian context following the initiation of law-reform discussions.

The *Wolfenden Report* deals with three major arguments against the decriminalization of homosexual behaviour in “private.” These arguments were the main strains of heterosexism formed earlier in the twentieth century: that homosexuality threatens the health of society; that it has a damaging effect on family life; and that homosexuals may turn their interest to boys.

The Cold War homosexual-security scares were very intense when the report was commissioned but had died down somewhat by the time of its release. While they agreed that homosexuality may exclude gays from certain types of state employment, they did not feel that this was a sufficient reason for making private homosexual acts with one other consenting adult a crime. They took the issue of the possible danger to family life very seriously, admitting that homosexual behaviour may very well hurt the family that the report regards as the basic unit of society. The committee argued, however, that it had no reason to believe that male homosexuality is any more damaging to the family than “adultery, fornication, or lesbian behaviour.”¹⁷ They felt that the law can do little to prevent homosexuality in “private,” and other means of regulation must be found, says the report, but it also warns that society should not condone or approve male homosexual behaviour.

It is important that the limited modification of the law which we propose should not be interpreted as an indication that the law can be indifferent to other forms of homosexual behaviour, or as a general license to adult homosexuals to behave as they please.¹⁸

The committee also took very seriously the possible “menace to boys.” Homosexuality is seen not as a single entity but as comprising both men who seek other adult men as partners and “men who seek as partners boys who have not reached puberty.” The homosexual “pedophile” was thus created (although here the term tends to be applied to any man interested in young men under the age of twenty-one). They added to their public/private strategy of regulating homosexual sex an important, and more extensive, prohibition against any homosexual act involving anyone under the age of twenty-one.

In the public realm, which is broadly defined as any situation wherein more than two people are present, homosexual sex should be dealt with rather severely. The police should vigilantly patrol “public” spaces, says the report, such as public lavatories.

The committee was particularly concerned with the young and the “immature,” and the possibility of a young man being led astray from a “normal” adult life. It argued that

we should not wish to see legalized any forms of behaviour which would swing towards a permanent habit of homosexual behaviour a young man who without such encouragement would still be capable of developing a normal habit of heterosexual adult life.¹⁹

Here the committee argued for a distinct form of protection for “normal” heterosexuality with the demarcation of homosexuality as “abnormal.” The myth of youth seduction by older homosexuals was used to argue that the special characteristics of male homosexuality justified more intense treatment in the criminal law. It was implied that male homosexuals presented a higher “social danger” to youths than heterosexuals.²⁰ In this area, the *Wolfenden Report* overlapped with aspects of the more right-wing anti-gay criminalization strategy I detailed last chapter in the Canadian context.

The committee relied on state and legal definitions of “juvenile” and on notions of the supposed special vulnerability of adolescent males. The committee therefore chose twenty-one as the age of consent for homosexual acts, in spite of the much lower age of consent for heterosexual sexual acts. The report accordingly recommends severe penalties for adult/youth homosexual sex. This perspective has continued to inform Canadian sexual legislation until recently.

It also called for harsher penalties for men engaging in sex work with other men. The committee was particularly horrified by homosexual buggery since it “involves coitus and this simulates more nearly than any other homosexual act the normal act of sexual intercourse.”²¹ It toyed with the idea of retaining buggery as an offence, applying to all same gender acts of anal intercourse between males, both public and private.

A psychiatric report would be ordered for convicted offenders under twenty-one so that a proper course of “treatment” could be formulated. The report claims that while homosexuality cannot be cured it can be treated. The report outlines various forms of medical and psychiatric therapy: “there is a place for the clergyman, the psychiatric social worker, the probation officer and, it may be added, the adjusted homosexual, as well as the doctor.”²² This “adjusted homosexual” is a reference to the self-regulated, “respectable,” closeted or semi-closeted homosexual.

Probation would be accompanied by medical treatment in some cases so that informal social regulation would be extended. The report also recommends the use of estrogen (a hormone) in certain cases in order to diminish sexual desire. It also advocates more inter-disciplinary research into the causes of homosexuality and of course not into the “causes” of heterosexuality. This research would, of course, be based on prison populations of homosexual offenders and those already undergoing “treatment.” A number of factors, according to the report, would discourage homosexuality in the long run. These include

the desirability of a healthy home background; moral guidance of parents and children; sensible sex education in matters of sex, not only for children but for teachers, youth leaders and those who advise students. Particularly, it is urged that medical students should be given more information about homosexuality in their classes, and that clergy

and probation officers should be better equipped to deal with the problems about which they are often consulted.²³

Again, the standpoint of heterosexual hegemony that the report takes up is clear. This was also a suggestion for an extension of the professional guidance of parents among others.

When applied to women sex workers, this public/private distinction carries somewhat different results. The report takes the visibility of street-walkers to be an affront to public order and decency.²⁴ It was the prostitutes—not the customers, they argue—who did the parading; “the simple fact is that the prostitutes do parade themselves more habitually and openly than their prospective clients.”²⁵ They also argued:

We feel that the right of the normal decent citizen to go about the streets without affront to his or her sense of decency should be the prime consideration and should take precedence over the interests of the prostitute and her customers.²⁶

The standpoint constructed and adopted here is that of the “normal decent citizen” and not that of the women sex worker. Integral to this public/private distinction is the social organization of gender, patriarchal relations, and a number of sexist assumptions. The woman is assigned to the “private,” and when she transgresses the boundaries into the “public” realm, legal regulation, is called for.²⁷ The report calls for clearing the streets of “public prostitutes.” The report and the resulting legislation did not stop the police from also arresting sex workers working in more “private” areas. In its broader applications to gender and sexual regulation, this strategy focused on regulation in the socially defined “public” realm and not on sexual violence and harassment in the “private” realm. Sexual dangers and troubles were identified with terrains outside families and households.

The main Wolfenden recommendations on prostitution were quickly implemented in the Street Offences Act of 1959. Here, the report is much more conducive to the hegemonic moral and political climate of the day. Its controversial proposals on homosexuality were opposed on the basis of a heterosexism formed in interaction with nationalism and imperialism. National decline and loss of Empire were associated with the spread of “perverse” and “degenerate” sexual practices.²⁸ The government argued, therefore, that it did not have enough support to implement the proposals. The report’s value, it said, would lie in its educational effects. The recommendations would be adopted only after a series of homophile inspired law-reform campaigns and debates within the legal profession, in church circles, and elsewhere. They would not be passed in England and Wales until 1967, with the Sexual Offences Act,²⁹ and were not extended to Scotland and Northern Ireland until the 1980s.

These reforms would be adopted in a different political and social conjuncture from that in which the committee was set up and in which the report was released. This would be within the context of other reform and “liberal” legislation in the 1960s. By the

later 1960s, after years of debate and organizing, the report's proposals were increasingly seen in official circles as a more effective way to regulate homosexuality. In this sense, the *Wolfenden Report* strategy does not simply passively reflect social changes but is actively used by homophile reformers, the media, liberal churches and eventually by liberal and social democratic politicians in the reorganizing of social and moral regulation. Reform efforts regarding the criminal law relating to homosexuality and many other sex-related matters came to be organized through its conceptual strategy in England, Canada, and many other countries.

The *Wolfenden Report* is part of a transformation in sex/gender, state, class and race relations. Since World War II, sexuality and sexual discussions had assumed a previously unthinkable social centrality in many people's lives. The post-war years saw a shift in family organization, particularly the integration of white married women into the wage-labour force despite women in the gender division of labour continuing to bear major responsibility for unpaid domestic and reproductive labour, the development of new birth-control technologies, and the generation of new sexological knowledges. The expansion of consumer capitalism led to increasing commercialization of social life, including sexuality, with women's bodies being used to sell commodities and social values through advertising and the communications and entertainment industries.

As sexuality became more visible in these forms, there emerged the voices of those who wanted it to be less public. Reverend W.C. Berry of Toronto expresses the moral-conservative view in a 1959 United Church Report: "Sex today is not only out in the open; it stalks nakedly down the city street, and the village lane. It stares nudely at us from almost every magazine and weekend newspaper."³⁰

It is in this context that the new strategy of sexual and moral regulation outlined in the *Wolfenden Report* was developed. The distinction between public and private was an attempt to relax aspects of moral, sexual, and gender regulation in some areas. Sexuality, particularly its "deviant" forms, was being kept in the socially organized private realm. These public/private categories of sex administration defined the work of social agencies in managing sexual "problems." These classifications were able to write a certain coherence into sexual and social regulation in a number of different terrains. This was especially the case given that social changes and the expansion and visibility of gay networks had begun to undermine the effectiveness of previous regulatory strategies that focused on extending the criminalization of homosexual sex. The cogency of these earlier strategies began to be undermined and they began to be seen as generating growing problems. The abstract character of the public/private distinction meant that this classification system could be taken up more easily in widely different state contexts as an administrative classification. This is one of the reasons why the *Wolfenden* approach has had such extensive influence. The same general social changes in sex/gender relations had also taken place by the late 1960s across the "advanced" capitalist countries making the *Wolfenden* strategy a possible and often cogent response to pressures for law reform.

The *Wolfenden* strategy, then, which was one both of sex reform and sexual rule, was part of a shift in social organization.³¹ It shaped sexual legislation and discussion

for decades to come. “We continue to occupy a space that was very much formed in the aftermath of Wolfenden.”³² Preparing the social field for subsequent legislation and discussions, it identified public/private categories as central elements of sexual regulation that could then be applied to debates on a series of sex, gender, and moral questions. These distinctions have continued to influence British legislation and they are still central to debates over sexual questions in Canada given the continuing use of public/private and adult/youth regulatory frameworks.³³

The Wolfenden perspective prepared the ground for what has been called “permissive,” but what might be better termed “liberal” legislation, in England and Canada. As Stuart Hall argues, “...descriptively, we may agree that the tendency of the legislation was to shift things in the general direction of a less rigid, looser, more ‘permissive’ moral order.”³⁴

This legislation can, however, be described as permissive or “liberalizing” only within narrow boundaries, since it also outlined a tightening up of sexual regulation:

[Wolfenden] is “permissive” in that it opens up an area of private, individual “consent” while maintaining if not tightening its control of the public manifestations of “irregular” sexual conduct.³⁵

The report facilitated the “decriminalization” of homosexual acts between adult men in a limited private realm; it also attempted to remove homosexuality from the “public” sphere. It therefore affected gay-community formation both “positively” and “negatively.” Public discussions of homosexuality and recommendations for very partial decriminalization of adult homosexual sex between two men opened up social spaces for the expansion of gay networks and cultures. At the same time, this strategy of regulation directs this cultural formation in a privatized direction—toward ghettoization and a strategy of containment. As Mort writes, the 1967 Act that implemented the Wolfenden homosexual reforms

constructs a new homosexual subject, understood as operating in the private sphere; a subject who in matters of sexuality and morality is defined as consenting, private and person-focused. In fact what the reformed version of the law does is to continue to reproduce the structures through which the gay male subculture had developed over the previous hundred years, while now decriminalizing it. One can speculate...that the structuring of the law across this public/private divide may have had much to do with the particular ways in which the gay subculture, and latterly the commercial gay scene, has developed from the late nineteenth century onwards.³⁶

The *Wolfenden Report* drew upon a number of definitions of public and private, developed in different discourses and institutional locations. “Private” included the individual moral realm that was not the law’s business—a private dwelling space—and not being visible to public view. This conflated the realm of moral choice with the realm of the private home, while the public became the broader social world. The idea of

privacy was associated with private property and ownership.³⁷ There was no focus on the social practices people engage in to actively construct and accomplish privacy and intimacy. These public/private classifications were instead deployed as administrative regulations.

When it came to homosexual offences, “public” was defined rather broadly and “private” much more narrowly. The committee was very clear that a “public” washroom is indeed a public place and therefore that homosexual acts that occurred there would be illegal. The police were to be mobilized against public homosexual sex and against all homosexual sex involving males under the age of twenty-one. In the four years after the 1967 reform was passed in England, the conviction rate for homosexual offences shot up by 160 percent.³⁸ After the Wolfenden perspective was extended to Northern Ireland in 1982, there was also increased police activity against gay cruising and all forms of homosexual “public display.” One observer expressed the police position as “now that you are legal, this should be done in your homes.”³⁹ The implementation of the Wolfenden perspective actually led to an increase in police activity directed against gays. We will see that this is also how this played itself out in the Canadian context.

The Hart/Devlin Debates: Law and Morals

The *Wolfenden Report* gave rise to a lively debate in contemporary legal philosophy in the West and especially in the English language: that between H.L.A. Hart and Lord Patrick Devlin.⁴⁰ This debate affected discussions in Canada as well and became a standard part of law school curriculum.

Devlin gave evidence before the Wolfenden committee and was basically in favour of its proposals. It was the duty of society, he felt, to prevent youths from being led astray, and that the law against buggery should be retained for private acts as a deterrent to the corruption of youth and the social acceptance of homosexuality. Devlin disputed the committee’s distinction between public and private morality, however, on the grounds that it could not be applied to other issues and that there should be uniformity of the law. There could be no such thing, in his view, as a private realm impenetrable to the law. Furthermore, society would fall apart without conformity and a shared public morality. Devlin saw immorality as what every “right-thinking man” thinks is immoral and he felt that law must be based on Christian morals. The error in Wolfenden, he said, was their attempt to find a general principle to explain the distinction between sin and crime.

Hart, on the other hand, was interested in individual freedom. He observed that the underlying principles of Wolfenden were close to the views expressed by John Stuart Mill in *On Liberty*. He related the public/private distinction to Mill’s theories of opposition to government intervention against the individual for beliefs or acts that adversely affect no one. A reading of Mill’s work played an active part in forming Hart’s position. In Hart’s view, homosexuality in private that caused no “harm” to anyone was not a form of treason, sedition, or crime.⁴¹

Hart accepted Wolfenden’s ideological distinction between “public” and “private,” obscuring that this was a social rather than a natural distinction, and postulating an in-

dividual private sphere somehow outside social organization. Devlin saw this distinction as arbitrary, since no truly individualized private realm can exist. From his morally conservative standpoint, Devlin was able to see some of the contradictions that would plague the approach in the years to come. In the end, Devlin supported the criminal law reform that took place in 1967.

In Canada, the Wolfenden perspective was challenged by moral conservatives. An early 1957 review from *The Church Times*, reprinted in the 1958 Annual Report of the United Church of Canada, Board of Evangelism and Social Services, welcomes the report's recommendations on prostitution but parts company with the committee on the matter "that homosexual behaviour between consenting adults in private be no more a criminal offence." The state has an obligation to maintain standards of sexual behaviour, argues the review, to keep the nation "healthy and sound." They were particularly concerned about the effects of these recommendations on the young.

It is all very well to put heavy penalties upon the adult man who tries to pervert adolescents; but they are not going to be protected if sodomy is accepted by society as an odd, but permissible habit of some grown-ups.⁴²

Others, meanwhile, including homophile law reformers in England and in Canada, saw the *Wolfenden Report* as a progressive document and adopted its perspectives as their own. The public/private regulatory strategy provided a certain opening for gay and lesbian activists that the extending criminalization strategy actively denied them. Unlike the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths' report, the *Wolfenden Report* could be useful for gay reformers. It was not yet clearly seen, however, that the report was not only a "liberalizing" document, but that it also set the stage for a new set of oppressive regulatory practices. Psychiatrists, doctors, and lawyers also debated and often adopted the perspectives taken up in the report. These various groups produced different readings of the report—and uses for it—but it remained a reference point facilitating and helping to shape law-reform efforts.

In North America, the reception of the *Wolfenden Report* tended to place more weight on the sickness or mental-illness concept of homosexuality than there was in the ambiguous formulations in the original report. In the introduction to the "authorized American edition" of the *Wolfenden Report*, Karl Menninger, MD, writes,

From the standpoint of the psychiatrist, both homosexuality and prostitution constitute evidence of immature sexuality and either arrested psychological development or repression...there is no question in the minds of psychiatrists regarding the abnormality of such behaviour. Not all such abnormalities can be cured, but some homosexuals...can be and are benefited by treatment.⁴³

This introduction provided instructions for reading this text for the North American audience providing a way for accomplishing a "sickness" reading of the report. This reading of the report would play an important role in how this reform perspective would

get taken up in official circles in Canada. It was argued that if homosexuals were “sick” or “ill” they should be in a doctor’s or therapist’s care and should not be simply addressed as a criminal problem. This reading of this partial de-criminalization strategy rearticulated the medicalization of homosexuality away from the extending criminalization strategy and toward this new approach. The conceptualization of homosexuality as an illness was maintained while its deployment was shifted.

At the heart of the Wolfenden reform process was a central contradiction: it did provide a limited but important basis for the expansion of gay, and in a different way, lesbian community formation. This community growth, however, would soon move beyond the boundaries of the private sphere (in the sense of clearly defined private places like bedrooms), since gay cultures involved men meeting other men and erotic and social interaction in bars, clubs, cruising areas, and eventually gay districts of cities. The police would try to contain this visibility. A struggle would then ensue over what constitutes public and private space as gays tried to extend the boundaries of the areas free of direct state and police intervention. The gay-liberation movements of the 1970s would eventually recognize that the Wolfenden strategy of “privatization” was not enough to bring about gay and lesbian freedom, since it also established new ways to keep us in subordinate positions.

This exploration of the *Wolfenden Report* has been included as necessary background to the Canadian Criminal Code reform of 1969. I will now turn to an examination of the law-reform process in Canada with particular emphasis on the emerging gay and lesbian cultures and the organization of a small but significant homophile movement. This is what set the stage for movement in media, professional, and eventually official political circles.

Gay/Lesbian Cultural and Community Formation

During the 1950s and 1960s, lesbian and gay networks were expanding and seizing more social space for themselves and for those of us who would come onto the scene later. Central to gay men’s networks were meeting places such as bars and steam baths, and cruising areas like parks and washrooms. Lesbians met in bars that women could frequent, at house parties, within butch/femme cultures, in some waged workplace networks, on women’s baseball teams, and in more suburban networks. I will look at Toronto and, to a lesser extent, Vancouver and Montréal, in this brief exploration of the emergence of gay men’s cultures and lesbian community formation in Canada, some key features of which were already sketched in the last chapter.

For both lesbians and gay men, the emergence of bar space they can occupy is especially important. As Esther Newton explains, “bars are central social institutions in the gay community.”⁴⁴ They are places where we can congregate, socialize, make sexual contacts, and meet lovers away from the hostile pressures of the heterosexual world. Before exclusively gay or lesbian bars were established, lesbians and gay men would frequent those that catered to a mixed gay and straight clientele. In the late 1940s in Toronto, for instance, Bert Sutcliffe went to bars at the King Edward and Ford Hotels.⁴⁵

In Montréal, in the 1930s and 1940s, gays went to the Lincoln and Monarch Taverns. Michel Tremblay offers a portrait of a *poulailler* (henhouse), the gay section of a 1940s bar, in *La duchesse et le roturier*. P.J.'s was Montréal's main downtown gathering place in the 1950s, and the only place where men could dance together—on Sunday afternoons only, of course. There were also the *tapette* (pansy; literally, “flyswatter”) sections of a number of taverns.⁴⁶ In Vancouver, women went to the Vanport in the 1960s.

In Toronto, bars at an area called “the corners” at Bay and Queen were frequented by men interested in sex with men from the late 1930s on.⁴⁷ By the 1950s, the Municipal Tavern, Malloney's Studio Tavern, the Hotel Metropole, the Red Lion Bar of the Westbury Hotel, Leno's, the St. Charles Tavern, and the Parkside were being frequented by gay men.⁴⁸ These establishments were owned and managed by heterosexuals, however, and this sometimes created a negative and alienating atmosphere for gays and lesbians, even though we ourselves established them as part of queer space. As mentioned previously, lesbians in Toronto frequented the Continental, but also the King Edward Hotel, Letro's, the Candlelight Lounge, the Juke Box Club, the St. Charles, and the front of the Parkside.⁴⁹

In the early 1960s, gay men and lesbians also frequented the gay-owned Regency Club and the Melody Room. The Maison de Lys/Music Room was opened by Sara Ellen Dunlop and Richard Kerr in 1962 as a late-night unlicensed club, which meant that it could be patronized by younger gays.⁵⁰ Social and politically oriented discussions continued to take place at the club on a regular basis, according to Jim Egan.⁵¹ Richard Kerr was also involved with the gay magazine *Two* in the mid-1960s.

Sara Ellen Dunlop, an important figure in Toronto's lesbian history, continued to be active in lesbian and gay organizing into the 1970s, and gained a considerable reputation as a lesbian singer and musician. In the later 1960s, she was part of an all-women band that toured southern Ontario, and was later the founder of Mama Quilla I. I remember her powerful piano and singing performance at the Canadian lesbian and gay conference held in Toronto in 1976. She died of cancer in 1977.⁵²

It is likely that men interested in sex with men first used steam baths to meet other men for sex early in the twentieth century, if not before. A homosexual-oriented steam bath, the Oak Leaf, opened in Toronto in 1941.⁵³ In the 1950s, gay men went to the Sanitary Baths.

They also frequented several theatres, including the Bay Theatre at Bay and Queen (which was torn down to make way for the Simpson's Tower) to meet men and have sex. Other favourite cruising spots included Philosopher's Walk at the University of Toronto, Allan Gardens, David Balfour Park, Queen's Park, High Park, Hanlan's Point on Toronto Island, and Winston Churchill Park.⁵⁴

Gay men and lesbians lived with their parents, in boarding houses, or in marginal apartments. Zoning regulations in Toronto suburbs prohibited unrelated persons from living together in houses classified as family dwellings. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation issued mortgages only to people conforming to the heterosexual nuclear family form. Some gays spent the summer in Centre Island cottages. When Queen's Park and Hanlan's Point became known by the authorities as gay cruising spots, the

bushes were cut down to make this more difficult.⁵⁵ When it was discovered that gay men cruised Philosopher's Walk, morality lights were installed. Liquor laws also restricted the development of gay and lesbian bars.⁵⁶

Gay- and lesbian-oriented commercial activity was limited by capital investment in what were generally small businesses and was shaped by the profitability of the bars and baths, as well as state licensing and policing practices. These were part of the regulation of queer social space. At the same time, lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and trans people fought for, and opened up, social spaces for our communities, establishing many of the places that we take for granted today. Our very right to go to and frequent gay and lesbian establishments rests on the struggles of those in the past.

Gay men's cultures were being created, some of the defining features of which were drag, camp, and physique photography and magazines.⁵⁷ At the Music Room in Toronto, there were drag shows every Friday and Saturday night from 1962 to 1966.⁵⁸ It is only through a process of cultural support and approval that "the drag queen creates himself."⁵⁹ Newton also refers to "street fairies" in the United States during the 1960s, whom she describes as often jobless homosexual men who built their lives around the gay cultures. They often lived at least partially outside the law and they played an important role in fighting for gay turf.⁶⁰

Camp sensibility, which has been the subject of some controversy since the rise of gay liberation and lesbian feminism, played a formative role in the making of distinct gay cultures.⁶¹ Camp plays with elements of incongruity, theatricality, and humour.⁶² As well as glorifying certain female stars, it borrows images from Hollywood and transforms them into a distinct cultural context. Camp helps manage the contradictions between our particular experiences of the world as gays and the institutionalized heterosexuality that hegemonizes society. It provides a creative way of dealing with social stigma—a way of fully embracing it, thereby neutralizing it and making it laughable. This form of cultural production embodies both opposition to oppression and seeming acceptance of it. On the one hand, it "denaturalizes normality" and makes fun of heterosexuality. It helps gays survive our oppression and provides us with a good deal of humour. At the same time, the camp homosexual can also agree "with the oppressor's definition of who he is." While the camp may put on a good show, he also can accommodate himself to his oppression and thus undercuts rage and rebellion. As Esther Newton expresses it, "camp is a pre- or proto-political phenomenon."⁶³

In the United States, especially in New York City, there is also a history for some Black and Latinx gays of drag in the drag balls of Harlem and elsewhere that is captured in the film *Paris Is Burning*.⁶⁴ This drag is an attempt to deal not only with heterosexism but also with racism and class inequality. This form of drag includes the performance of, and the taking over and transformation of white cultural symbols. Through these performances, these non-white gay men and trans people are able to assume positions of glamour and social status unobtainable in real life given the racist, heterosexist, and class-divided character of this society. This form of drag culture—which provided important support against racism as well as forms of accommodation with a

white-dominated society⁶⁵—was also practised in Canada during these years on a more limited scale.⁶⁶

Another important component of gay men's culture was the large number of physique magazines produced in the post-World War II period. Building on a history of gay erotic photography and films in the United States prior to the war, and the explosion of gay culture following the war, a physique-magazine trade developed in the 1950s. While these magazines often insisted they were produced for artists, nudists, and other people interested in the non-erotic beauties of the male body or in body-building, many of them were a source of erotic inspiration for gay men and helped lay the basis for the gay porn of the 1970s and 1980s. Mark One Studio in Lachine, Québec, began publishing its own photographs in a magazine called *Face and Physique*, and by 1962 this little magazine was beginning to cut into the US market. To get around Canadian obscenity laws, it was printed in the United States.⁶⁷ Physique photos were also published in Toronto's gay magazines *Two* and *Gay* in the mid-1960s.

Historically, there is a key importance of battles against state censorship in the opening up of erotic spaces for gay men and lesbians. This included repercussions in Canada from the United States like that of the important *One* magazine Supreme Court case in 1958, which allowed for the distribution of at least some types of information on homosexuality through the United States mail.⁶⁸

As mentioned last chapter, lesbian cultures were also developing during these years, with some focused around the affirmation of butch/femme codes and the claiming of lesbian erotic space. As Joan Nestle puts it:

Butch-femme relationships, as I experienced them, were very complex erotic statements, not phoney heterosexual replicas. They were filled with a deeply Lesbian language of stance, dress, gesture, living, courage, and autonomy.⁶⁹

Lesbians established spaces for themselves in bars and also organized socially through house parties and participation on women's sports teams. Lesbian cultural interactions varied in relation to class and race, but it was butch/femme lesbian cultures that were the most visible during these years.⁷⁰ Some lesbian networks also overlapped with women involved in sex work.⁷¹

These forms of cultural production were integral to the formation of lesbian and gay cultures. Without these sources of identification and affirmation, little collective political practice would have been possible.⁷²

The bars, clubs, and other gathering places were not simply "private" places; they were community gathering places, and as they became more visible, they came under police surveillance. Police surveillance and activity developed in relation to the expansion of the gay and lesbian commercial scenes as well as gay and lesbian visibility. In Toronto, police targeting of gay establishments in the 1950s may have been signalled by such statements as that made by Police Chief Chisholm before the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths that I quoted last chapter. There were police-generated

concerns over the “sex perverts” infesting parks, particularly the public lavatories in High Park and Union Station.⁷³ The opening of gay-frequented and gay-owned establishments in the early 1960s only led to the escalation of police interest.

The early 1960s marked a new phase in police/gay relations. Undoubtedly the police were aware of such places as Malloney’s.... But they were clearly straight places where gays hung out. It was not until The Music Room opened on Yonge Street north of Wellesley in late 1962 that the police were able to perceive an organized community.⁷⁴

After the Music Room opened, Inspector Herbert Thurston of the Morality Squad warned that “sexual perversion is spreading. These people are no longer ashamed to admit what they are.”⁷⁵ It should be remembered that the Music Room was an unlicensed non-alcoholic after-hours club, which meant that the police could not use liquor laws and their age restrictions against this establishment. Sidney Katz wrote in 1964 that the police believed the clubs would cause young people to become homosexuals.⁷⁶ Said Michael Hanlon of the *Globe and Mail*:

Metro Police are reported worried by the growing popularity of clubs for homosexuality.... And police wish they could take action against them. What worries the police is the fact that they are gathering places for homosexuals and as such offer a chance for homosexuality to spread by introduction.⁷⁷

A Detective Belcher arrested two dancers at the Melody Room in 1965 and charged them with “gross indecency.” The charges were later thrown out of court, but Belcher returned to the club to try to provoke an incident.⁷⁸ There were also some “bawdy house” related charges reported during these years, including at the International steam bath in Toronto, following which the names of those charged as “found-ins” were printed in the papers. Such charges were also laid at a steam bath in Windsor.⁷⁹

Lesbians in Toronto were harassed in and around the Continental, and sometimes this was tied up with harassment and violence against sex workers and drug dealers who also hung out at the bar and sometimes overlapped with the lesbian clientele. As previously mentioned, some were also taken to Cherry Beach to be beaten up by the cops.⁸⁰ There were many complaints of police harassment and brutality throughout these years without any independent means of redress given the police department’s own internal investigative procedures.

In Montréal, there were a series of police actions against homosexual institutions in the years 1960–63, ranging from the arrest of more than a dozen men on “gross indecency” charges at the Colonial Baths, to the arrest of thirty men at the Tapis Rouge Bar and fifteen at the Puccini Restaurant. Accusations by the police had not the slightest connection with what the men arrested had actually done. Arbitrarily choosing pairs of accused, the police would tell them: “You have committed indecent acts together.”⁸¹ The police could basically invent accounts of their surveillance work (that is, actually witnessing “indecent acts,” masturbation, or “gross indecency”—oral/genital sex) to

lay charges and to contextualize the “facts” of the case in their reports and for any testimony required in court. This testimony and the reports must conform to the proper mandated course of action for these offences. They must report having seen the masturbation that they describe as an “indecent act” or the cocksucking that they describe as “gross indecency.” This then allows for the arrest, a charge, and a court case.⁸² There was often a police assumption that the men would plead guilty in order not to be exposed, and this was often quite accurate during these years. A name being published in the paper relating to gay sex could have severe consequences.

Police surveillance of a washroom at Vancouver’s Stanley Park in 1963 resulted in eight men being charged with “gross indecency.” Their names were published in the newspapers and at least one man hanged himself in jail as a result.⁸³ Police claimed to be acting on “complaints.” “Complaints” activate the mandated course of action for police surveillance⁸⁴—leading to the allocation of police personnel for surveillance work that led to the observance of sexual acts followed by arrest on “gross indecency” charges. In 1964, the Vancouver police reported that “there had been more prosecutions involving gross indecency in the past six months than in the previous two years.”⁸⁵ There were also police raids for “obscene” literature on the Fraser Book Bin in the early 1960s for gay-related titles.

Bruce Somers, a gay man who was the first president of the Association for Social Knowledge in Vancouver, says in 1964 that “if you were a homosexual you were harassed,” and describes the ever-present fear of police action. Doug Sanders, however, the second president of the Association and still straight-identified in 1964, says that in the 1960s the police were neither a persistent nor consistent problem for Vancouver gays.⁸⁶ This may in part be related to their different social standpoints at this time and their different relations to the gay scene. Sanders also reports that in Vancouver there was little press coverage of these police arrests both in the Stanley Park washroom arrests and later in February 1967 when the vice-president of a federal Crown corporation was arrested for sexual activity with a twenty-one-year-old “female impersonator.”⁸⁷ This points to the unevenness of the intensity of sexual policing across the country organized through police operational policies and the discretionary powers granted to the police in the enforcement of the Criminal Code.

Homophile Groups and Gay/Lesbian Organizing

The expansion of these cultures in the 1950s and early 1960s laid the basis for gay and lesbian self-organization in Canada. While the Mattachine Society in early 1950s California had radical origins, under the pressure of the McCarthyite and anti-homosexual witch hunts, it moved in a more conservative direction, deposing its early leaders.⁸⁸ Leftists and progressives of various persuasions were also involved in gay and lesbian organizing in Canada.⁸⁹ After such radical beginnings, the homophile groups of the 1950s and early 1960s were generally identified with a reliance on medical, psychiatric, and sexological experts to educate the public and legitimize homosexuality. This began to shift in the 1960s again with the influence of the Black civil rights and Black Power movements,

the student movement, the anti-Vietnam war movement, and the new left. The 1960s were the years when some of the social changes of the post-war years were coming to fruition with the opening up of public discussions on sexuality in a more critical context and with sexuality becoming a more focused topic of political mobilization.

Some limited but important homophile organizations emerged in Canada as well. In the early 1960s, Jim Egan suggested during discussions at Toronto's Music Room that a chapter of the US group and publication *One* be formed in Toronto.⁹⁰ The most significant Canadian organization, however, was to be founded on the West coast.

The Association for Social Knowledge

The Association for Social Knowledge (ASK) was officially formed in Vancouver in April 1964. John MacKinnon, one of its founders and the first treasurer, says the group had been proposed a couple of years earlier.⁹¹ In early 1964 a group of gay men met at the home of Bruce Somers. Somers and Gerrald Turnbull, a library student at the University of British Columbia and a member of the collective household that Somers also lived in, provided the strong combination to get ASK rolling. Somers had been inspired by a visit to the Mattachine Society in San Francisco, where he had met Hal Call. There was an important American homophile influence on the founding of the group. Somers was to become ASK's first president.

[None of the founders] had really suffered any particular injustices but we were very conscious and we certainly knew people who had been beaten up cruising. It was always there in the back of your mind that society was ready to kick you in the crotch.⁹²

According to Somers, only men attended the first meeting—although this account is contested by at least one lesbian ex-ASK member. But according to Somers, the men's lesbian friends soon got involved in the group and played an important role. Through Gerrald Turnbull, the group gained the support of a number of local Quakers, including a then straight-identified articling lawyer by the name of Doug Sanders and a heterosexual woman, Dorothy Sheppard. Sanders, who became ASK's legal advisor when he was brought in to help the group incorporate, was also spokesperson for the Committee to Aid American War Objectors. Over seventy-five people attended the first organizational meeting. When Bruce Somers moved to Ottawa in late August 1964, Sanders became president of ASK. He describes these early experiences: "We had tremendous apprehension about what we were doing.... There was a feeling that we were taking risks the nature of which were not clear."⁹³

"The problem in Canada," says Sanders, expressing the view he developed during these years, "was not persecution but the pervasive view that gays didn't exist."⁹⁴ Police entrapment was not as widely practised in Canada as it was in the United States, he felt, although there seems to have been more consistent police activity in the 1960s against gays in Toronto, Montréal, and Ottawa⁹⁵ than in Vancouver.

ASK was generally a fairly balanced gay-male/lesbian group, which was unique for homophile organizations of the period. The founders wanted ASK to be a serious and respectable organization dedicated to educating the “sex variant” and the public on questions of sexual variation. “The initial “objectives” of the group were:

- (a) To sponsor projects of education of the general public so as to give them a better knowledge concerning sexual variation and correct general misconceptions, bigotries and prejudices resulting from lack of accurate information concerning sexual variation.
- (b) To sponsor projects of education of sexual variants so that they may better know not only the possible causes and conditions of variation, but formulate an adjustment and pattern of behaviour leading to positive and responsible citizenship.
- (c) To aid in the adjustment to society of such persons as may vary from the normal moral and social standards of society and to aid in the development of a highly ethical, social and moral responsibility in all such persons.
- (d) To sponsor and finance medical, social, social-hygiene, pathological and therapeutic research of every kind and description and publish and disseminate the results of such research as widely as possible.
- (e) To propose and support reform of the laws dealing with sex variants to the end that the laws protect the integrity of the individual and the community and be in harmony with the findings of leading psychiatrists and scientific research organizations.⁹⁶

This embodied the homophile orientation of the group, including its reliance on experts and the “adjustment” of homosexuals to society, but also its commitment to law reform. It brought into the organization of ASK and the relations established among its members and supporters similar organizational features that had developed in the 1950s and early 1960s in US homophile groups. Reflecting the early basic homophile orientation of the group, but at the same time almost questioning it, Sanders wrote in the June 1965 issue of the *ASK Newsletter*:

Lectures by heterosexual experts reinforce to some degree the image of the homosexual as someone who needs to be dealt with in some special way. But at this stage of the struggle for understanding we have few alternatives to the intellectual appeal to reason.⁹⁷

ASK initially included heterosexuals like Sanders (although he would soon come out) and Dorothy Sheppard. They also tried to involve social workers; clergy (only the Unitarians responded, along with a few individual Catholics, Anglicans, and members of the United Church); psychiatrists (whom Sanders describes as basically ghastly in their responses—one psychiatrist said that “homosexuality was a pathology” and that therefore there was a “problem of biological fit”); and lawyers. When the articles of incorporation were drawn up, Lionel Tiger, then a professor at the University of British

Columbia, was one of the signatories. Like Mattachine, ASK in its first period was influenced by liberal psychologists and sexologists like the American Dr. Evelyn Hooker, whose work disputed the hegemonic psychological theory that gays were sick.⁹⁸

While ASK was affiliated with neither the Mattachine Society nor the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB), a US lesbian group, it was clearly inspired and influenced by homophile organizing south of the border. Mattachine was its initial model. The influence was not only one way, however. When a woman member of the first executive moved to San Francisco she, along with a woman friend, made the Society for Individual Rights (SIR) into a mixed organization using the ASK model. The ASK Newsletter reprinted material from Mattachine, DOB, which published *The Ladder*, and *One*, bringing US news to Canada. Doug Sanders helped found the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO) and served as its secretary. NACHO's members included ASK, Mattachine, SIR, DOB, and the US Council on Religion and the Homosexual.⁹⁹

Membership in ASK was open to anyone over twenty-one (which meant that when it was founded, Gerrald Turnbull, one of the most active people involved, was too young to be a formal member), and, according to Sanders, membership for heterosexuals was "a defensive measure of the times."¹⁰⁰ ASK stated that its membership included lesbians, homosexual men, and heterosexuals, although after its initial stages it became largely a lesbian and gay group. In the early years when members were asked about their sexual orientation, they would often say that this was nobody's concern. The term "homophile," which can refer to a person interested in homosexual issues but who is not necessarily gay or lesbian, provided a shield against exposure. For Sanders, it actually delayed his coming out for a number of years because he didn't have to be out, or to deal with his homosexual tendencies, to belong to ASK. At the same time, Somers and Turnbull were quite sure he was gay from a much earlier point. But since Sanders did not identify as gay, his reaction

to the issue of cure or conversion would be different than others. I saw it as an open question in a technical sense...I'm not sure whether anybody else saw it the same way as I did.¹⁰¹

While Sanders still did not see himself as gay, he could view the question of whether gays were ill as an academic or technical one. After he came out and his experience and social standpoint shifted, he found this position less and less tenable.

ASK applied for registration as a provincial non-profit organization, but the application was not taken seriously on the grounds that its objects did not fall within those specified in the BC Societies Act. Given that ASK defined itself as an educational society, and this was one of the specified objects in the Act, heterosexism was at work here. ASK appealed the decision but the matter was not pursued further since Sanders, as legal adviser, did not feel that non-profit status was necessary at the time. As he puts it, "it was an example of discrimination but it wasn't anything that really disadvantaged the organization and we never did anything about it." Later, when ASK was running

a community centre, it incorporated without any hassle as a commercial corporation—“The ASK Community Centre”—with no mention of homosexuality.

The ASK Newsletter was published from April 1964 to April 1965, with a lapse of eighteen months before it published again from December 1966. Its initial circulation was more than 250 copies. The last issue appears to have been put out in May of 1968.¹⁰² In 1968, Sanders wrote to a correspondent in Montréal that “We are currently not publishing a newsletter, but may begin again fairly soon. It is a very time-consuming job and right now we have other things to do.”¹⁰³

The newsletter was a valuable means of communication between ASK members and other lesbians and gay men in Vancouver and across Canada. It played an important part in organizing ASK and developing connections between homophile activists across the country. It provided an oppositional discursive focus for gay and lesbian activists. The newsletter discussed the *Wolfenden Report*, the Kinsey studies, the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, and homosexual-law-reform efforts in Canada. It carried news of the homophile movement south of the border, including the Mattachine pickets; the COC (a homophile group in the Netherlands) and its community centre; an interview with R.E. Turner from the Toronto Forensic Clinic; mention of a novel by lesbian writer Jane Rule;¹⁰⁴ books by Donald Webster Cory; and John Rechy’s *City of Night*. The newsletter also contained information on gay and lesbian life in Toronto, Montréal, and smaller communities. ASK had some contact with the Toronto gay publications *Two* and *Gay* that started publishing in 1964, shortly before the ASK Newsletter came on the scene.

In its first year, ASK focused on education. “Gab ’n’ Java” informal discussions were held in people’s homes as a way of attracting new members. A series of public meetings featured speakers: Don Lucas of the Mattachine Society on “The Homosexual Cause: The Aims and Activities of the Mattachine Society”; Rev. J.M. Taylor of East Burnaby United Church spoke to sixty people on “The Church and the Homosexual”; and Doug Sanders spoke on “Legal Reform and Homosexuality.” Finding a public hall for these meetings was not easy, however. The first forum was held in *The Sun* building, but when it was learned what the meeting had been about the space was denied for future use. ASK was also refused meeting space by the YMCA. The Unitarian Church eventually offered its hall. According to Sanders, however, interest began to wane after the initial enthusiasm, because the lecture format had limited appeal.

As Sanders put it, “The obvious need in the community at that point was...a decent social centre,”¹⁰⁵ since there existed few decent bars and clubs in the city. Also, there were tensions within the group between those interested in group and public education and those more interested in social activities. While fund-raising events like “dollar parties” were a regular part of ASK life, the priority for the first year was clearly education, which reflects the group’s initial fear of being seen as actually promoting homosexuality by providing a place for lesbians and gays to meet. A social centre feasibility committee, nonetheless, was struck at ASK’s general meeting in March 1965. The idea was influenced by the COC clubs in Holland that were funding that group’s counselling and

lobbying efforts and the commercial clubs that were being established in Toronto. ASK therefore decided to “support but not participate in the formation of a centre,”¹⁰⁶ an autonomous group—“The Circle”—was to establish the centre by getting one hundred people to donate twenty dollars each. But just as the group was beginning to gear up to meet this need, in the summer of 1965 it disbanded, bringing the first phase of ASK’s history to a close.¹⁰⁷

ASK resumed activity in 1966 and opened its community centre at 1929 Kingsway with a New Year’s Eve Ball.¹⁰⁸ This was the first such centre in Canada, and it was quite successful in attracting lesbians and gay men. They were forced to move to a larger and more expensive location a year later, however, when their landlord discovered the purpose of the centre. For a period it was Canada’s largest gay and lesbian club. Membership in ASK stood at 150 in November 1967, says Sanders, but at its height there could be as many as two hundred people at the centre for its regular Saturday night dances.¹⁰⁹ The ASK centre was also used for business and executive meetings, a lending library, facilities for the production of the ASK *Newsletter*, and some counselling and referral services. They provided speakers on such topics as the homosexual subculture and the homosexual rights movement. ASK members went on radio talk shows to provide public education for anyone who would listen.

By 1966–67, ASK had drawn up a more comprehensive statement of purpose that was significantly different from their first one reflecting the transformations within homophile organizing as the group shifted more clearly to a gay and lesbian identification:

1. To seriously confront Canadian society with the fact of its homosexual minority and challenge Canadians to treat homosexuals with justice and respect.
2. To maintain a community centre.
3. To facilitate and encourage research into homosexual and minority rights.
4. To work for the reform of the criminal laws relating to sexual activity.
5. To co-operate with other homophile organizations in other parts of the world.

It is important to note the transformation in the character of the organization suggested in this new statement of purpose. There was an important shift in the language that was used. There was more affirmation and assertion, and less reliance on professional experts. This both embodied and helped to bring about a transformation of the organization.

Girls and Boys Together?

There were some tensions and debates among and between the men and women in ASK over drag and over butch/femme “roles.” As a mixed organization of women and men, ASK encompassed gender differences that in the United States led to the formation of separate lesbian groups, like the Daughters of Bilitis. While the ASK *Newsletter* gives the impression of a pre-feminist, organization dominated by men, this was not entirely the case. Almost from the beginning there were a number of strong and dynamic women

involved in the group. While none of the women would have identified as feminists at this time there were a number of articles on specifically lesbian concerns, the problems of men and women working together, and an appeal for more women to work on the newsletter entitled “Come on Girls, We need You”: “become a member and join the paper, with only one girl and all those males, it’s lovely but lonely! So join us and help us make an even better paper of interest to both sexes.” The author goes on:

Have you ever worried what might happen if your families or your employer were to find out that you were a lesbian? Then help us to educate the public so that, if not in our time, in the generations to come they can hold their heads high, tell their families, tell their bosses and friends without fear of being disowned or losing their jobs or a friendship; so they can take their proper place in society.¹¹⁰

In the fall of 1967, Norma Mitchell became president of ASK, a position she held until the organization disbanded. When ASK decided to reduce the size of the newsletter, she wrote, “For the girls there is the DOB magazine.” In the April 1967 issue she outlined her perspective on “transvestism” and generally put down the working-class “dyke.”¹¹¹

Mitchell also wrote an article in the September 1967 issue on homosexuality among women and was interviewed in the *Georgia Straight* (a Vancouver counter-cultural paper) series, “The Lesbians,” in 1968.¹¹² Mitchell is quoted as saying that:

We have the finances, the backing, and the resources to stand up and say we are homosexuals and that we are here and society is going to have to deal with us.... If they don’t accept us peacefully then we are going to have to go for stronger action. We’ll go to court and we’ll fight if necessary.¹¹³

Says Doug Sanders:

You would get people griping every once in a while. Some of the guys would gripe now and then that the organization was being taken over by the women. Some of the women would occasionally gripe that there weren’t very many women in the organization. There was always a consciousness of the relationship and if you looked around the city you found that generally speaking you did not have much mixing.... You never had a situation after the group got going in which the leadership [of ASK] was all male.¹¹⁴

Rumblings in the Churches

Homophile activities influenced religious discussion and church support for more liberalized attitudes to homosexuality and for law reform. ASK gained some very important early support from the Quakers and the Unitarians. “Towards a Quaker View of Sex” published in 1963 was quite progressive for Christian circles in its day, suggesting that homosexual affection could be as worthy as heterosexual affection.¹¹⁵ The local Friends group was very supportive of the founding of ASK and in 1967 wrote a letter to

the federal government protesting the Supreme Court decision in the Klippert case. Sanders also presented a paper on homosexuality to the Pacific Northwest Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. It was not able to be adopted, even though it got widespread support, because of a consensus decision-making requirement.

When J.M. Taylor of the United Church spoke to ASK in April 1964, he was not new to the topic. He had previously had an article published in the *Mattachine Review* on the need for prevention of homosexuality rather than punishment. In his address to ASK, Taylor stated that the United Church had gone on record as deploring imprisonment for homosexuality and that many United Church people supported the Wolfenden reforms. He outlined four moral problems that homosexual conduct presented for Christians: that it was an offence against the proper expression of sex in monogamous marriage; that it was a misuse of natural functions; that it led to the destruction of “neighbour love” through the involvement of someone of the same sex; and that it undermined a stable society based on heterosexual marriage and family responsibility. He strongly advocated the establishment of medical centres for the treatment of homosexuals and more effective sex education programmes for the young.¹¹⁶

In the letters pages of ASK *Newsletter*, two ASK members criticized Taylor’s attitude and questioned the sickness theory of homosexuality.

One statement he made with regard to setting up a clinic for the “cure” of voluntary homosexuals seemed rather incongruous when he went on to say he knew of no such “cure”! What about those of us who don’t want to be cured of a way of life that is all we have known?... I was also annoyed at his inference that homosexuals should not live together as partners...I would urge Rev. Taylor to come out into “gay” life as an observer, see it from our side, and then report on it factually and fearlessly.¹¹⁷

Says Bruce Somers of Taylor’s talk:

He was not really sympathetic. He wasn’t as down on us as a lot of others but we were trying to be objective in holding public meetings but we found very little in the way of sympathetic support.

On members’ attitudes to the sickness theory of homosexuality in the early days, Somers says “there was quite a division among the various people who attended the [Gab ’n’ Java] meetings as to whether or not being a homosexual was a sickness that should be treated.”¹¹⁸

Sickness and mental-illness models of homosexuality were still quite strong in “liberal” church circles during the 1960s. The United Church of Canada report on Christian Marriage and Divorce, published in 1960, includes a section on homosexuality.¹¹⁹ The report gives credence to psychological and conditioning theories, and also argues that homosexuals are not usually dangerous and do not necessarily engage in sex crimes. It makes an untenable distinction between homosexual feelings and conduct, and suggests that while it is difficult for a homosexual to establish a good (heterosexual)

marriage, this is not impossible. The report calls for Christian sympathy, charity, help, and understanding.

There were battles over homosexuality within the various churches. The United Church's Evangelism and Social Services 1964 Annual Report reprinted an article that interestingly enough is partly a polemic against the self-organization of homosexuals and all attempts to "glamorize" homosexuality.¹²⁰ It argues that the Mattachine Society, *One*, and *Ladder* "do homosexuals more harm than good." Vulgar Freudian-derived theories of the acquisition of homosexuality are accepted, as well as the idea that it is curable through hypnosis, hormone treatment, electro-shock "therapy," psychotherapy, and psychoanalysis, while imprisonment would merely spread the "disease" among the inmates. Christians should neither condemn nor condone homosexuality, says the report, but the reforms suggested by the American Law Institute and the Wolfenden committee could provide needed legal changes. In the meantime, the church could engage in redemptive and counselling work, and homosexual marriages should be banned.

The North American Conference on Church and the Family, held in Hamilton in 1966, became the centre of debate when Rev. Johnston, principal of the United Theological College of Montréal, expressed the view that the church should never approve nor condone homosexuality, that it was impossible to be a practising homosexual and a practising Christian. The Canadian church would not object to the implementation of a Wolfenden-type reform, said Rev. Johnston, but this would be an act of society, not of the church. Christians should instead encourage people to get more enjoyment out of heterosexual relations within marriage, he said. Johnston was responding to charges that church attitudes on homosexuality were out of date and that homosexuality was "natural" for some people.¹²¹ By this time, after some early law-reform efforts, the Wolfenden reform strategy was beginning to shape discussions in the churches and the mainstream media.

The Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual

The Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual (CCRH) was formed in Ottawa in 1965 on the initiative of Gary Nichols, who had earlier founded the Committee on Social Hygiene in Stittsville. This organization was, according to Bruce Somers, "in fact pretty well just him." Nichols was a gay federal civil servant who worked on a series of contracts for the government and was an "aspirant to the clergy" of the Anglican Church.¹²² He was involved in a series of homophile and law-reform efforts in the 1960s in Ontario, particularly in Ottawa. He worked very hard, often full-time, and often it seems behind the scenes in these efforts.

The Council also involved Bruce Somers, who had moved to Ottawa from Vancouver in 1964, several official representatives from the Anglican Church and unofficial ones from the Roman Catholic Church, a number of gay federal civil servants, MP Arnold Peters, and several doctors and psychiatrists. Perhaps three dozen people were involved in the Council's activities. Most of the church representatives, especially those

from the Anglican church, were heterosexual. In a rather exaggerated statement, the February 1967 *ASK Newsletter* reported Bruce Somers's connection with the Council:

The founding of the Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual was largely the work of the first president of ASK, who moved to Ottawa about eight months after ASK's formation.

Arnold Peters, a New Democratic Party MP, described his feelings about the Council during the 1969 Criminal Code reform debate in the House of Commons:

We believed that homosexuality was abnormal and that it was something in respect of which they could use help. I was joined by many people of the religious community who were aware that many people in the community faced this problem.¹²³

According to Somers, even though the Council sent information to the United Church there was never any support; the Anglicans provided the main support. The Council, the first of its kind in Canada, held its first general meeting at St. George's Anglican Church in Ottawa on June 16, 1965, and was open to anyone over twenty-one years of age, regardless of sexual orientation. Philip Rowsell, an Anglican minister, was elected chairman.

One of the group's beliefs was that sexual acts in private by consenting adults as laid out in the *Wolfenden Report* should be of no concern to the law. The Council made plans for discussion groups with psychiatrists, lawyers, and the families and friends of homosexuals. The Council also submitted a brief to the Ontario Select Committee on Youth, which quoted from the *Wolfenden Report* in arguing for law reform as well as making proposals for sex education in the schools.¹²⁴

According to Bruce Somers, in 1966 Professor Wake of Carleton University's Psychology Department—whom we met last chapter as the designer of the “fruit machine” research—approached the CCRH to have its homosexual members fill out a questionnaire. It was apparently between six and twelve pages in length and was to be filled out anonymously and returned in brown manila envelopes to Wake. Wake presented himself as doing psychological research on homosexuality, but these questionnaires may very well have been used to provide the “fruit machine” research with some homosexual responses to their questionnaire for comparative purposes.¹²⁵

Gary Nichols, the central figure in holding CCRH together, suffered from periodic episodes of depression, according to Somers. The September 1967 *ASK Newsletter* reported that the Council had disbanded “but there are several clergy still interested in the group ...ASK sincerely hopes that CCRH will once again become active, and urges all our members and friends to give support to this fine organization.” The group did fall apart, however, says Somers, because of Nichols's periods of depression, lack of cohesion, and tensions among its members, with some gay members using it as a place to meet other gay men while others wanted a more “serious” organization, and because it was making little headway with the churches beyond the Anglicans. Somers told me

that the gay civil servants who were members of the group were quite fearful of disclosure of their identities. They were opposed to receiving any CCRH information through the mail. This was in the context of the security campaigns against homosexuals in the public service in Ottawa during these years.

These changing attitudes toward homosexuality and support for law reform within some of the churches—in interaction with homophile organizing—paralleled developments in the United States and England.¹²⁶ Limited as they were, these shifts represented a general change in social institutions and helped lay the basis for law reform. This was especially significant because of the relation of churches to issues, like this one, that were constructed as moral ones.

Penal Reform and Forensic Clinics

In its early years, ASK agitated for penal reform and for treatment of sex offenders rather than imprisonment and punishment, although this was never a major focus for the organization.

In June 1964, the executive director of the John Howard Society addressed a meeting of twenty-five supporters of ASK. The previous month, the Canadian minister of justice had called for clearer policies in the federal correctional field, including the parole system, which was a hint that the government might be interested in penal and criminal-law reform. ASK responded positively to a brief by the John Howard Society of British Columbia, which argued the case for penal reform and which basically made the demand for a forensic clinic in the province a public issue. Doug Sanders was the ASK liaison person with the Society. In an interview in 1964, he expressed the hope that a hospital would be established in BC along the lines of the Forensic Clinic in Toronto, which was the institutional site that had come out of campaigning by PAL and the *Toronto Daily Star*.

An issue of *ASK Newsletter* carried a special report on a 1965 meeting between the John Howard Society and Dr. R.E. Turner of the Toronto Forensic Clinic as well as excerpts from an interview with Turner.¹²⁷ Sanders had hoped that the John Howard Society would use this interview to push for a clinic in BC, but he discovered that “they weren’t all that enthusiastic about flogging our newsletter in their cause.”

ASK and Law Reform

ASK was always concerned with law-reform issues, although its priority at first was education and later the social centre. It was often suggested that, with growing public education about homosexuality, law reform would naturally follow. The *ASK Newsletter* referred frequently to the *Wolfenden Report* as an indication that similar reform was possible in Canada, and it devoted an entire issue to the topic of law reform. As Sanders expressed it, “Wolfenden had legitimated the arguments for homosexual-law reform in England so the issue was discussable.” Although the major influence on Canadian homophile organizing was from the United States during these years, there was also

some awareness of the Homosexual Law Reform Society and homophile-influenced lobbying efforts in England.¹²⁸

Yet in 1964 law reform appeared as a rather distant goal, and Ottawa, the focus for criminal-law reform, very far away. There was also more generally a tension between the local character of the politics and everyday lives of members of ASK and the extra local and “national” character of the Criminal Code, and the official politics relating to the Criminal Code and its possible reform.

At an ASK forum in October 1964, Sanders, who as a law student and then lawyer was able to articulate ASK to legal discourse, spoke on the history of legal reform. This included the *Wolfenden Report* and recent proposals for reform in the United States, from the revision of the penal code in the state of Illinois in 1961 to the model penal code developed by the American Law Institute in 1962. He argued:

the enforcement agencies are making no attempt to enforce the law relating to homosexual offences...the law in practice is not as it stands on the statute books. To this extent, we have a type of implementation of the *Wolfenden Report* in Canada. Public opinion is not yet ready to make express what is already the legal reality.¹²⁹

Here he is observing that the police were not arresting large numbers of homosexuals for acts in “private” because of their limited resources and powers of surveillance.

A special issue of the newsletter roots the laws against homosexual men in the Judeo-Christian tradition and contrasts these prohibitions with the widespread homosexual and lesbian activity reported in the Kinsey studies. Says the *ASK Newsletter*:

Moral and legal condemnations of homosexual activity do not apply equally to men and women, being uncommonly severe with male homosexuality and generally ignoring like behaviour in the female.¹³⁰

This position ignores the specific character of lesbian oppression that has not been so specifically focused around sex offences in the Criminal Code and the oppression that all women face, including a general denial of any autonomous sexuality among women.

The article concluded by calling for special psychiatric treatment for sex offenders and for law reform. This takes up the “treatment” as opposed to the criminalization frame in relation to homosexuality:

It would seem to this writer that today’s legislators, judges, police officials, and other assorted defenders of public virtue no longer have the excuse of ignorance to justify their intemperate and inhumane attempts at sex suppression.¹³¹

This position suggests that lesbian and gay oppression was simply a product of ignorance and lack of accurate information and that with further public education law reform would be automatic. This had a lot to do with the character of homophile politics and organizing, which was unable to centrally address the social relations organizing gay

and lesbian oppression and their transformation. Instead, while homophile reformers broached the crucial question of criminal-law reform, they often viewed gay oppression as simply the result of unenlightened or backward ideas. Historically, this was crucially important politically, but it also had limitations.

ASK and its members were involved not just in educational work and discussions, however. They also pushed for Wolfenden-type reforms in Canada. In the spring of 1964, Arnold Peters, NDP MP for Temiskaming, Ontario, announced that he would present a private-member's bill to modify the Criminal Code such that homosexuality would be a crime only in the case of an adult assaulting a young person, and would allow for two adults to participate in consenting homosexual acts in private. Apparently, Gary Nichols supported Peters on this—as Somers puts it, “pushing him on.” Peters was a controversial New Democrat who also formulated a private-member's bill for legalized abortion in the case of pregnancy as the result of rape or when a woman's health was in danger and also pushed for more liberalized divorce. ASK wrote to Peters informing him of their existence and requesting a copy of the private-member's bill. They also informed their members about it:

It is our intention to study it, to circulate it widely and initiate a letter campaign to all members of parliament...the Board of Directors must request the co-operation of each and every one of you. It is most imperative that your MP be written immediately urging serious consideration of Mr. Peters' bill.¹³²

Unfortunately, Peters never replied. “I remember a sense of frustration in ASK,” says Sanders, “that Arnold Peters would not answer letters.” The bill never reached the floor of the House of Commons, but it did give ASK its first real encounter with law-reform activity and generated publicity for homosexual-law reform. In July of the same year, Peters participated in an attempt to form a homophile reform society and became involved with the Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual.¹³³ In 1969, during the Criminal Code reform debates, he reminded the House that

individual members of parliament should be given a great deal of credit for introducing legislation which has not been popular and sometimes dangerous. When I presented the bill...I showed it to members of the press in order to get some comment...I suggest this was the forerunner of the amendments which later related to the homosexual sections we are now considering.... There was considerable comment about this amendment.¹³⁴

In August 1964, Sidney Katz, then associate editor of *Maclean's* magazine, whom we met previously, announced the formation of the Homophile Reform Society based in Ontario. Again, it appears that Nichols was the moving force behind the scenes. It often seems that if you scratch the surface of early homophile organizing efforts you find an early gay activist. The group, to be chaired by Katz, would have a six-member planning committee. Their first objective was amendment of the gross-indecency section of the Criminal Code. The group apparently had the support of Arnold Peters and

certain civil servants, journalists, and broadcasters.¹³⁵ Two reported, however, that “all attempts to contact the group had been conspicuously unsuccessful.” It went on: “We regret the apparent grounding of this operation and urgently request anyone interested in the formation of a similar group to contact the editors of Two.”¹³⁶

Doug Sanders, ASK’s legal advisor and president for much of its existence, played an important role himself in initiating law-reform discussions. In 1966, along with Sidney Simons, another Vancouver lawyer, he proposed changes based on the Wolfenden perspective to the Criminal Law Subsection of the BC Division of the Canadian Bar Association.¹³⁷ Unlike what Wolfenden recommended, they proposed the age of consent of eighteen for private consensual homosexual sex and suggested decriminalizing such acts in private between participants over the age of fourteen provided that the difference in their ages was not more than two years. They supported Wolfenden’s public/private regulation but went beyond it on the age question. Sanders describes the meeting where their proposal was discussed:

I remember it being buried at the last session it came up at.... People weren’t happy with the issue but they didn’t have good responses to it. What we were seeking was a resolution from the group supporting homosexual law reform...I remember it being killed by a groan of disgust...I gave a statement in which I made simply a passing reference to sodomy and a man who is now a judge...said something like “UNNNNNNGH!” and that won the day and the vote was lost. It was a guttural reaction of disgust at the word and it was game over at that time.¹³⁸

In 1967 Sanders also prepared and circulated an ASK paper, “Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders,” which was also printed in the *Criminal Law Quarterly*.¹³⁹ Originally prepared as part of a sentencing plea in the Boisvert case in Vancouver, which I examine later, it sets out to demonstrate that the sentences in “gross indecency” cases were relatively light. Half of these sentences were for acts in “public” places, according to Sanders (eight in public washrooms in Stanley Park and four others in parked cars). Only one was judged by Sanders to be in “private.” Most arrests for homosexual offences were made in public washrooms, parked cars, or public parks, writes Sanders, and the great majority of “gross indecency” cases were heard before a magistrate. Since these cases were rarely discussed in legal reports, writes Sanders, “it is difficult for lawyers to locate precedents for sentences.” He reports on twelve unreported cases (they had not been recorded and reported in the law reports) between 1961–67 involving twenty-four men and, in particular, on the sentencing of these offenders. This was explicitly undertaken as assistance for other defence lawyers and for judges making sentencing decisions in these cases. He summarizes the cases he knew of, a number for which the sentence included treatment at a mental-health clinic or “treatment” by a medical doctor or psychiatrist, as well as prohibitions against loitering, or simply being in any public park as part of the sentence. In this latter restriction, we can continue to see how the homosexual threat was constructed as a particular kind of “public” problem in parks. The sentences

requiring psychiatric and medical “treatment” displayed the continuing connections between medical and psychiatric practices and the criminal justice system.

In some of the cases reported, we can see the construction of legal/psychiatric relations. In one case where the defence argued that a private, homosexual act (fellatio) between the consenting parties did not constitute an act of gross indecency, the magistrate ruled that even though society’s moral standards were changing on this question his job was

to interpret it [the gross indecency section] as I think society would want it interpreted and as I think the legislature intended it to be interpreted. So that this perhaps has been my conflict, in knowing what I would perhaps like to do as opposed to what I feel I must do in properly interpreting the law.¹⁴⁰

Here he is suggesting that the law is the law and as a judge he can only enforce it but at the same time he is suggesting that morality is changing and law reform might be called for. This suggests that some pressure for clarification of the law, and even law reform, was beginning to emerge from the strategies of defence lawyers and in the remarks of judges.

In the cases he reported, Sanders found that almost all accused persons got a fine or a suspended sentence—the courts generally treated the homosexual charges as a relatively trivial matter. Sander’s article also reports that in three of these cases, a male person was dressed as a woman and that in two of these cases, the “unsuspecting” party was not charged. This points to police discretion in the enforcement of the law, “and it may well be that the police decided not to prosecute the ‘innocent’ man in return for testimony against the impersonator at trial.” The “true” homosexual may still have been seen by some of the police and the Crown as the “gender invert.” The range in sentences was wide—fines from one hundred to seven hundred and fifty dollars; sentences reduced to two year’s probation; suspended sentences; and sentences of one day, one month, three months, and three years on three counts of the same offence. Sanders attempted to show that the law as it stood is effective only for cases of “public” acts, and basically used the Wolfenden regulation approach. He made very active use of “public/private” classifications. Sanders also mentioned the infamous Klippert case (which will be dealt with later in this chapter), then still before the courts. He attempted to show that the law as it stood was effective only for cases of “public” acts.¹⁴¹

Sanders further reports on the very interesting Boisvert/Lupien case that he acted in. It involved two French Canadians, Lupien, who was a top civil servant with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and Boisvert, a young hustler who wore women’s clothing.¹⁴² Lupien claimed in his defence that he thought he had picked up a woman. He brought in psychiatric testimony that claimed he had a psychological aversion to homosexuality and therefore must have thought Boisvert was a woman or else he was suffering from lack of sleep, or the consumption of alcohol had impaired his judgement. This became a much-cited legal case over the admissibility of psychiatric evidence.¹⁴³

Sanders interviewed Boisvert in jail because he did not have the money for bail, and he ended up defending him. Here we get a sense of the class dimensions of the criminal-justice system and how this could impact in the lives of working-class hustlers. Sanders remembers:

The young guy simply wanted to get back home to work in Montréal and so he just pleaded guilty and I submitted an article that was eventually printed in the *Criminal Law Quarterly* which results from my sentencing plea in this case.¹⁴⁴

Boisvert ended up getting a modest fine, which was his objective. The police, for their part, apparently initially thought this was a case involving a women sex worker and followed Boisvert and Lupien to a hotel, after they spotted them together in a taxi.

After following them to a hotel the officers went to the room they had gone to. One officer testified, “I remained outside the door of this room and by placing my ear to the door I could hear voices coming from inside the room. They were speaking in a language I did not understand [French].” The officer then got the key and opened the door.

As I entered I noticed the light in the room was on. I observed a bed in the northwest corner of the room and I observed two male persons on the bed, both completely nude at this time. At this time Boisvert was wearing a female’s blond wig. He was lying on the south side of the bed and he was lying on his right side. His head was propped up on his right arm.¹⁴⁵

This complicated description of body placement on the bed is to establish that the officer could have seen what he describes. He continued, describing Lupien’s body placement:

He was lying with his head on his right side and it was immediately adjacent to Boisvert’s privates, and at this time I noticed a white towel on the bed, and was immediately under Boisvert’s head.... As I entered the room Mr. Lupien immediately rolled away from Boisvert and turned himself around on the bed so as to be the right way on the bed, and covered himself up and at this point his privates were not exposed to my view. Boisvert then sat up on the bed and stated, “What is the matter? He is an old friend of mine from Montréal and we came up here to make love. What is the matter?”

Boisvert was informed they were going to be charged with “gross indecency.” Boisvert was reported as getting dressed in female clothes and the police associated his “cross-dressing” with his homosexuality.

The Crown Attorney asked the officer, “When you first went into the room, could you see the state of erection or otherwise of Boisvert’s penis?” he answered “Yes, Your Worship...when Boisvert sat up on the edge of the bed and made a statement, I noted at this time that his penis was erect.”¹⁴⁶ This was to construct the particulars for the inscription of what the police reported they saw into “gross indecency.” It seems here that

a police report of an erect penis and a head adjacent to “privates” was enough to constitute “gross indecency” for the police and Crown Attorney in this case. That Sanders was able to get his analysis printed in the *Criminal Law Quarterly* was a significant intervention into legal circles on this matter.

On January 10, 1968, in reference to the proposed sexual-reform legislation by Justice Minister Trudeau, a letter from ASK to its members stated we: “hope [the bill] will improve our position, and we feel that our club, through the efforts of our lawyer, has had a small part in what we feel is progress.”¹⁴⁷ In a letter to Paul Bédard of Montréal in 1968 Sanders wrote:

As far as I can tell the homosexual reform bill will probably be debated in October. We want to ensure that there is public debate and discussion at that time. We intend to have posters printed up urging people to write to their member of parliament in support of the bill. We plan to have people going door to door with a petition supporting the bill. We want some publicity on armed forces policies in relation to homosexuals. We would like to co-ordinate this to some extent with Montréal and Toronto.¹⁴⁸

Unfortunately, it appears that there was little response from the east to this attempt at cross-country organizing. Sanders describes his analysis of the 1960s situation:

I had developed this kind of analysis in the period and suggested within the organization that the strategy for dealing with the law-reform proposal should be an attempt to make gays more visible. The issue was not getting the reform because the reform was guaranteed.... It was going to come through without any kind of change in public attitudes and that was a problem.... So I proposed to the association that the strategy should be to make the issue more visible and we should go door to door with petitions and this was accepted very reluctantly at one meeting and then killed at the next one.¹⁴⁹

This bold petition-campaign proposal was vetoed by members who thought that the chances of reform could be hurt if they rocked the boat or if gays and lesbians were too visible.

In the February 1968 issue of the newsletter, Sanders reports on the proposed legal change and on his interview with Everett George Klippert in the Prince Albert Penitentiary. Sanders got to see Klippert, he says, by just demanding as a lawyer to see him. The editorial in the same issue calls for quick action from the House of Commons on law reform.

In 1968, Sanders made a submission to the Royal Commission on Security,¹⁵⁰ focusing on debunking the two main arguments used to deny homosexuals government employment and security clearance put in place during the Cold War security “scares”: that homosexuals are not emotionally stable and are more subject to blackmail. Referring to the Kinsey studies and the work of Dr. Evelyn Hooker, Sanders argued that there are no distinct homosexual personality traits and “the idea that homosexuals, as a group, are less stable than heterosexuals is not supportable.” On the subject of blackmail, he

argued that homosexuals have no character defects and that the potential for blackmail had been overrated in Canada. "There had been no homosexual 'witch hunts' in Canada," he argued, creating the impression that homosexuality had never been the concern in this country that it had been south of the border. This may be partly accounted for by the secret character of the security campaigns but also by Sanders's position as a civilian on the west coast who had nothing to do with government employment. This was despite the policies of the RCMP which was brought in for "security" screenings in many state agencies and that of the military that was to purge homosexuals and deny them "security" clearances.

Regarding employment, Sanders sent letters to government departments, and in their responses they claimed they had no general policy of excluding homosexuals. This included the Department of National Defence. One ASK member challenged this military assertion at a meeting raising memories of purges of homosexuals in the military on the west coast.¹⁵¹

Sanders again pointed out that most arrests for homosexual offences concerned acts committed in public. He referred to the work of Gigeroff in cooperation with the Forensic Clinic of the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, who also suggested this same pattern of arrests making visible the inter-textual character of law-reform discourse. Sanders concluded by supporting Trudeau's Criminal Code reforms and asking the federal government and the Department of National Defense to make clear their employment policies and their position on the granting of security clearances to homosexuals.

ASK collapsed a few months before the Stonewall riots. The social centre, which had become a major financial and administrative burden, was taken on by Norma Mitchell as a commercial venture. It later failed. Toward the end, ASK was doing little educational work. Throughout its history, it had encompassed a number of divergent tendencies and needs, ranging from educational, social-service, and counselling work to social activities and more traditional political and legal lobbying. As well, the group managed to involve both women and men throughout its history. These diverse pressures pulled the group in several directions, yet ASK was able to span most of the period 1964-69 while other homophile and lesbian/gay groups across the country collapsed after a couple of years at most. Sanders provided much of this continuity.

The social centre, which filled a real need in the city, also helped keep the organization afloat for a number of years, even if in the end it was its downfall. The relative absence of police harassment during this period in Vancouver may have contributed to both ASK's survival and its collapse. "One of the clear factors is that nobody was beating us up," says Sanders. "There was no local police harassment to organize against. Nobody's back was up against the wall." Protest was never a priority for ASK, he says:

ASK played a role in the period which was positive. The limitations of it I think were the limitations of the period. It helped some individual people.... It broke ground in a sense for gay liberation. We passed on a gay consciousness. It seems to me it had to precede gay liberation.¹⁵²

And:

The organization could not have had much impact on general public opinion because there was simply not the media coverage. The media was not willing to publicize the existence of the organization...it could [have had an impact] in limited circles like the John Howard Society and the Unitarians and the Quakers and some people at UBC [University of British Columbia].... Some people would have been exposed to the issue.... In a sense I have felt that the existence of the homophile organizations, in general, was sort of a necessary prelude to the gay liberation groups. We proved that something modest was possible and so something more adventurous was more possible.... What it comes down to is that the major impact would have been on the individuals who were connected with it. It increased understanding and self-confidence considerably.... Oh, we had a lot of fun.¹⁵³

Gay and Two

While ASK was the most significant pre-1969 gay/lesbian organization, two gay magazines started publishing in Toronto in 1964, *Gay* and *Two*.

Gay, later called *Gay International*, was put out by the Gay Publishing Company “to present the homosexual viewpoint.” The first issue appeared in March 1964. Claiming a circulation of more than 6,000 in the Toronto and Montréal areas, *Gay* included a news section, a few lengthier articles, and classifieds. It later printed physique photos from Can-Alt Studios of Toronto. It also produced two information pamphlets: “What To Do in Case Of Arrest” and “How to Handle a Federal Investigation.”¹⁵⁴ *Gay* carried news of the New York Mattachine Society; a story from *One*, news of homosexual pickets of the White House in 1965; an essay by Dr. Franklin E. Kameny, who led the new east-coast homophile militancy influenced by the Black civil rights movement,¹⁵⁵ an address to the East Coast Homosexual Conference in Washington, DC, in 1964; news of local police busts; an analysis of the Kinsey Report; and critiques of media articles. The publication also argued for legal reform. An article entitled “The Philosophy of Law,” by Don Philip stated, “one major change in the law is most urgently demanded: that acts occurring in private between consenting adults be legal.”¹⁵⁶ The two main references in this article were to the *Wolfenden Report* and the American Bar Association model law code.

Two was published first by Gayboy and then by Kamp Publishing, which was located at 457 Church Street, the address of the Melody Room. A letter in the ASK Newsletter referred to *Two* as the “official mouth-piece” of the gay-owned Music Room and the Melody Room, and both regularly advertised themselves as “Toronto’s original after-hours gay clubs.” *Two* modelled itself after the journal *One* in the United States.¹⁵⁷ Its first issue declared:

Our purpose is to promote knowledge and understanding of the homosexual viewpoint among the general public and to educate homosexuals as to their responsibilities as

variants from the moral and social standards. It is hoped to find others who will agree with us and join us in our effort to establish these rights and responsibilities.... The much maligned homosexual community has long been in dire need of a voice to speak for itself and offer some rebuttal to the irresponsible attacks periodically made upon it.¹⁵⁸

Most issues included book reviews, news items, and physique photos, some of them taken by Rick Kerr of the Music Room. In accordance with obscenity legislation, none of these photos showed sexual activity or frontal nudity, but this did not stop the police morality bureau, in 1966, from raiding the Kamp Publishing bookstore—which contained a large number of titles of interest to gays¹⁵⁹—charging them with possession of “obscene” literature for the purposes of distribution. This contributed to the publication’s demise, a result that once again demonstrates the significance of censorship and obscenity legislation in regulating gay materials and gay organizing.

The first issue discussed the current wave of publicity about homosexuality—articles in *Maclean’s* and the *Toronto Telegram*. It also refers to “female impersonators” who were an important part of the emergence of gay cultures.

The second issue, while endorsing police activity against sexual acts in public, argued that the recent arrest of two men dancing together at the Melody Room “gives rise to doubts as to police integrity and has focused attention on the meaning of the charge of ‘gross indecency.’” Here we get a sense of conflict over varying interpretations of “public” and “gross indecency.” The police (or at least one officer) were attempting to define men dancing together as “gross indecency.” “Gross indecency” would then include any sort of homosexual activity, expanding this offence to include not just overt sexual/genital activity, but any intimacy between men in a gay club. In contrast, *Two* asserted that gay clubs were not public places and that men dancing together did not constitute “gross indecency.” According to the everyday local experience of gay men, men in a gay club were in a private gay space, not an area that could be defined as “in public,” and men dancing together was not “gross indecency.” *Two* attempted to actively use and shift the emerging public/private frame to defend gays and gay clubs.

Another issue printed a guest editorial by Jim Egan in response to a series of articles by Ron Fulton on “Society and the Homosexual” in the *Toronto Telegram*.¹⁶⁰ Egan had sent his point-by-point rebuttal to the *Telegram* but they had refused to publish it. He concludes:

Homosexuality is a problem in modern society only because of the ignorance and prejudice that surrounds it. The solution to the problem just as in the case of the Negro or Jewish problems, lies in the abolition of prejudice and ignorance.¹⁶¹

Other issues reported on Sidney Katz’s address to the Humanist and Unitarian Society in which, paraphrasing the *Wolfenden Report*, he stated that adult private homosexuality is “in the field of morals, not the field of law.” Also included were: a profile of Tracy Roberts, “the only coloured boy working as a female impersonator” in Toronto;¹⁶² a reprint of Freud’s famous letter to an American mother about homosexuality; news of ASK; and mention that *Gay* had stopped publishing, but that it was seeking refinancing

and would reappear soon. Issue nine reported on Citizen's Alert, a group formed by the Council on Religion and the Homosexual in San Francisco to provide lawyers, photographers, and other assistance to gays, lesbians, Blacks, Chicanos, and hippies experiencing police brutality.¹⁶³ "It appears that one will soon be needed right here in Toronto," it added.

At the same time, there was only one explicitly lesbian article in *Two* titled, "What is a Downtown Butch?" As mentioned last chapter, downtown butches referred to those working-class lesbians who worked and lived downtown as opposed to "uptowners," who were often more middle class and lived in the suburbs.¹⁶⁴

The pages of both *Two* and *Gay* give a sense of the police activity directed against Toronto's expanding gay world. The *ASK Newsletter* reported that since the death of *Two*, which had likely been caused by the legal charges against Kamp Publishing, there had been no gay publication in Toronto.¹⁶⁵

A short-lived and rather mysterious homophile organization also existed in Montréal in the late 1960s. Paul Bédard, who previously had been involved in the Mattachine Society in the United States, set up International Sex Equality Anonymous (ISEA) in August 1967, affiliated with the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO). He was in correspondence with *ASK* and Doug Sanders during this period.¹⁶⁶ ISEA aimed to be both educational and social. Bédard, its founder, president, and main member, also opened a small private night club in the east end of Montréal. The police arrested a club member and several youths, and charged Bédard with committing "immoral" acts and "contributing to the delinquency of minors." They claimed that he was running a male "prostitution" ring. Bédard was tried and acquitted in 1968 while the other club member was sentenced to two years.

In April 1969, Bédard opened a new club, Gemini I, which apparently kept out men dressed as women and vice versa and did not allow touching on the dance floor. A portrait of Pierre Trudeau on the club's wall was referred to by Réal Caouette in the Commons debates on the 1969 reform.¹⁶⁷ The club folded after only a month, partly as a result of police harassment according to Bédard,¹⁶⁸ and Bédard disappeared for a number of months. The Gemini reopened at another location later in the year but Bédard had left the scene by the early 1970s. Bédard was featured in a *Weekend Magazine* story entitled—with characteristic media-hype—"Canada's Leading Homosexual Speaks Out" on September 13, 1969.¹⁶⁹ Bédard is a rather ambiguous figure. He made some significant efforts on behalf of organizing gays and publicizing the need for law reform. At the same time, he was also interested in profit and advantage for himself.¹⁷⁰

This gay/homophile organizing led to increasing church, media, and professional discussions of homosexuality, laying some of the preconditions for law reform. At the same time, the concerns of grass-roots gay and lesbian activists were transformed as they entered into the worlds of official discourse.

Homosexuality as a "Public" Issue

During the 1960s, as gay and lesbian networks expanded and as law-reform discussions began, the mass media started to investigate and survey homosexuality and the gay

community. The reports usually centred around some media framework of the “social problems” presented by homosexuality. They focused on gay men to the exclusion of lesbians, with journalist Sidney Katz even arguing that “Lesbians are less obtrusive, less discriminated against and raise fewer social problems.”¹⁷¹ There was a movement away from the earlier official silence on homosexuality and past frames of “perversion” and “criminality” toward various versions of the sickness model of homosexuality that was often combined with the Wolfenden law-reform framework.

An early series of articles by Sidney Katz appeared in *Maclean's* in 1964.¹⁷² Here, if we scratch the surface, a gay homophile activist can be found as a motivating force. Katz had sought out Jim Egan before taking on the work because he had seen some of Egan's writing. According to Egan, Katz knew nothing about homosexuality when this all started, although Katz had written one of the early articles that contributed to the establishment of the criminal-sexual-psychopath section.¹⁷³ There is an important shift away from Katz's earlier acceptance of the criminalization of homosexuality strategy in these articles. Working on these articles also led to Katz's connections with homophile reform efforts.

Egan brought Katz to the bars and clubs, and appeared under the pseudonym Verne Baldwin in the first of Katz's two-part series, “The Homosexual Next Door: A Sober Appraisal of a New Social Phenomenon.” Interestingly, Egan met with some opposition from within the gay community for his cooperation with Katz and for publicizing gay issues generally. He was told that a number of middle-class gay men were upset because this publicity violated the code of secrecy they felt protected them from exposure. Perhaps he was encountering opposition from a network of “covert” homosexuals. They felt that making more people aware of homosexuality would only make it worse for gays. Egan was urged to break off his collaboration with Katz, but he refused on the grounds that publicity was needed and that the articles could only improve with his help.¹⁷⁴

The first of Katz's articles was relatively liberal for its time and was based on various discussions with gay men. Although he argued within the framework of “the homosexual problem,” he also argued that “the average homosexual is a much-maligned individual, unfairly discriminated against by our laws and society” as he emphasized the “respectability” of most homosexuals.¹⁷⁵ In this construction of public images of the homosexual, Egan participated behind the scenes, but did not control the media image that was produced.

The second instalment, “The Harsh Facts of Life in the ‘Gay’ World,” was a less sympathetic account of the problems of the homosexual world and relied more on interviews with psychiatrists, doctors, and other “experts.” Aspects of the sickness approach to homosexuality were discussed, although it was clearly admitted that homosexuals cannot be cured. Katz cited the *Wolfenden Report* on this point.¹⁷⁶

A CBC Television show in November 1964 produced a generally more tolerant view of gays. In July 1965, an article was published in the *Vancouver Sun* by William Nichols, an Anglican priest who was the head of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of British Columbia. He had spoken at an ASK forum in 1964 calling for law reform along Wolfenden lines. He viewed homosexuality as a condition the homosexual

could do little about.¹⁷⁷ The discussion of the Criminal Code reform sparked further media investigations, a number of which supported reform.¹⁷⁸ An editorial in the *Vancouver Sun* in 1966 supported law reform along Wolfenden lines, and also mentioned the attempt by Simmons and Sanders to get the criminal-justice committee of the BC Branch of the Canadian Bar Association to support homosexual-law reform. This was all part of the media organization of “public opinion” and how homophile-inspired efforts influenced, and were entered into, public discourse.

By the mid to late 1960s, there were also some media explorations that focused specifically on lesbians. In 1966, Renate Wilson wrote, “What Turns Women to Lesbianism,” in *Chatelaine*, where she quoted from some middle-class Vancouver lesbians. Wilson portrayed lesbians as “abnormal.”¹⁷⁹ In the professional publication *Canadian Nurse* in 1967, lesbianism was defined as a “deviation,” as “an addiction,” and as “retarded psychosexual development.”¹⁸⁰

Developing a Professional and Legal Consensus for Reform

Debate also took place in professional circles, which in turn provided “expert” opinions that could enter into the media coverage. *The Canadian Medical Association Journal* carried a number of articles on sex deviation and homosexuality encompassing a broad range of opinions.¹⁸¹ By the 1960s, these articles were generally accepting different variants of the sickness or mental-illness approach. A curious piece by an “anonymous homosexual” was published in 1962, in which the author says he is “handicapped by homosexuality,” believing it to be a psychological disorder. He supports the general premise of the *Wolfenden Report* and appeals for liberal tolerance. It is interesting that this layperson’s account was published in a medical journal. Clearly, someone wanted the psychological disorder and Wolfenden approaches put forward by a homosexual himself.¹⁸²

Groups within the medical, psychiatric, and legal professions supported reform for their own reasons, many having to do with the internal dynamics within these groups, but also because it could extend the jurisdiction of medicine and psychiatry in the regulation of social life. The reasons the Wolfenden perspective was taken up by doctors, psychiatrists, and lawyers differed markedly from those of the grass-roots homophile and gay and lesbian activists. These activists attempted to use it as an opening for popular education while professional and state bodies read the *Wolfenden Report* in an administrative fashion—as a document of sexual rule.

In the field of criminal law, there developed a general consensus that law reform was necessary. Law professor Alan Mewett, who would be consulted during the 1969 parliamentary discussions on law reform, early on accepted the arguments of Wolfenden, but went somewhat beyond them regarding adult/youth regulation:

Homosexuality is unquestionably undesirable even though this does not mean that it should be legislated against.... All homosexual activities—male or female—should be criminal activities where the accused is over 21 and the partner under 21, but otherwise

where both parties are over 21, or both parties under 21, be removed from the Criminal Code. This differs somewhat...from the recommendations of the Wolfenden Committee.¹⁸³

A legal pocketbook by Raymond Spencer Rodgers written with the assistance of Mewett entitled *Sex and the Law in Canada*, featuring a foreword by Kenneth Gray—whom we met last chapter as the legal advisor to PAL—was published in 1962. It argues that penalties for “deviant” behaviour not dangerous to others were excessive or unnecessary.¹⁸⁴ This text was intended to open up discussion for law reform and to call on the government to “appoint a Royal Commission on the Law as it relates to Sexual Behaviour.”¹⁸⁵

The Wolfenden and law-reform frameworks were beginning to enter into courtroom discussions, trials, and sentencing hearings in Canada by the mid-1960s. They were also entering into appeals and producing some pressure from the courts for clarification of the law. This may have led to difficulties in getting convictions, or getting the sentences that may have been possible previously. The relatively light sentences often handed out in these cases was used, as we have already seen, in the Sanders’s article to argue for law reform since the full penalties were rarely being enforced.

Alex K. Gigeroff based his argument for legal reform on research carried out at the Forensic Clinic in conjunction with the University of Toronto. Most of the research was undertaken in the early and mid-1960s, and his main work, based on his thesis, was published in 1968.¹⁸⁶ His *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law* was twice referred to in the 1969 parliamentary debate on Criminal Code reform. In his foreword to the book, Kenneth Gray explains that Gigeroff has amassed a great deal of empirical data that allow him to build a bridge between psychiatry, the social sciences, and the law, “clearing the ground so that the normative judgements that the law represents can be seen in terms of actualities of human behaviour.”¹⁸⁷

Gigeroff saw his work as preparing the way for legal reform. He was basically supportive of Trudeau’s 1967 proposal for Criminal Code reform but criticized its vagueness on the definitions of “gross indecency” and “in public.” His studies had financial assistance from the Ontario Mental Health Foundation and help from the Ontario Provincial Probation Service and the Metro Toronto Police Department. Viewing this type of research as the proper basis for reform, he criticized the last round of Criminal Code reforms in the early 1950s, which were limited, he argued, to “simplification” of the code and correction of outstanding errors—amounting merely to neater packaging of a nineteenth-century product. He pointed to the need for input from various professional disciplines. Contrasting the Canadian experience with the reform process in England, he explained that the government there had based its work on expert studies and analysis of sexual offenders. He called for a similar process in Canada. Gigeroff reflected the concerns of those psychiatrists and doctors who advocated placing adult-oriented homosexuals under their jurisdiction, rather than under the direct legal, judicial, and penal apparatus of state agencies. In his view, public acceptance of such reforms could be won through the media, the churches, and professional organizations.

Gigeroff quotes in his book extensively from the transcript of a Toronto “gross indecency” court case that took place in 1965 as part of his argument for reform and for the more precise definition of legal categories. This gives us both a sense of the legal pressures mobilized in court cases for reform as well as a glimpse into the social organization of the sexual policing of gay men during these years. The transcript reports that two men were charged with committing “gross indecency.” One man pleaded guilty and the other not guilty. At first there was a dispute over what evidence would be admissible. During this dispute the Crown Attorney stated:

The Crown’s evidence will be and it is my submission from the observation with reference to the accused C.D., it would appear he was standing in the rain and every time a lone male driver would come up Yonge Street he would rub himself in the area of his privates. The [police] officers felt, “Here we have something,” and finally parked further along Yonge Street and he lured the accused A.B. into his clutches and they went in the car and committed an act of gross indecency.¹⁸⁸

This reference to “committed an act of gross indecency”—is not an actual description of the sexual encounter that took place but is already inscribed into an “offence” category in the Criminal Code. This is dependent on the police report on which the Crown Attorney’s remarks are based. When the police survey this man rubbing his “privates” they see the possibility of an arrest. These two men then become the targets of police surveillance until the police felt they had enough “evidence” to make an arrest.

In introducing his case, the Crown Attorney stated that one of the officers went over to the car in which the two men were “and found the accused before the Court with the other gentleman’s penis in his mouth, doing something.... This is gross indecency.”¹⁸⁹ An observed sexual act is inscribed into the legal category of “gross indecency.” The Crown Attorney then called his first witness who was one of the arresting detectives. The officer stated (his testimony was no doubt based upon his notes on this arrest and the report he and his partner wrote up following the arrest):

Then I approached the car in question on the passenger’s side and upon looking in the window I saw the accused man bent over and had the passenger’s penis in his mouth. The passenger had an erection and the accused man was moving his head up and down sucking the passenger’s penis.

This is the necessary construction of official police evidence—the “particulars” or “facts” are established through this testimony to intend a “gross indecency” inscription and conviction. Sucking another man’s penis only becomes “gross indecency” when it is inscribed as part of police evidence and intends this categorization as part of a court case. If the police had not been present this activity would not have been able to be constructed as a “crime” or as “gross indecency.” This then is an instance of an ideological circle where the possible sex acts these men were engaged in is read as the criminal offence of “gross indecency.”

“Gross indecency” is hardly what these two men in the car were thinking about prior to their intimacy being intruded upon by the police. This is again a rupture in experience—the experienced pleasures of cocksucking versus “gross indecency.” The men had taken steps to remove themselves from public view and to establish a degree of privacy and intimacy for themselves.

In this legal case, an erection and the sucking of it by another man become the “facts” of “gross indecency” in the Crown’s case. The legal concept of “gross indecency” lays out the procedures that allow for the organizing and concerting of the work of the police and the Crown Attorney. These become the “facts” of the case because of what the police report states, not because they are necessarily “what actually happened.” Only the men charged could tell us what was going on for them and this is no longer recoverable and is irrelevant under the law. The Crown Attorneys case, then, comes to be based on these police “facts.” It is upon these “facts” that he argues his case. The detective continued:

I then opened the door, turned my flashlight on the accused man and the passenger, told them I was a police officer and immediately the accused man remarked, “Please leave us alone. It will cause trouble. Just leave us alone. We will go away.” I informed the accused man he and the other party were both under arrest and would have to accompany me to the police station.

On the basis of this evidence, the prosecution rested its case feeling this was sufficient to establish “gross indecency.” The Crown Attorney relied entirely on police testimony and called no “expert” witnesses.

In contrast, the defence argued that the prosecution had not proven its case since it had not brought in any scientific evidence as to the definition of “gross indecency.” The defence argued that “the only fact before your Honour is a physical act. There is nothing more. There is nothing to say it is indecent.”¹⁹⁰ He argued that the prosecution did not link this evidence with case law, precedent, contemporary “community standards” or psychiatric evidence. This allowed an opening for his defence argument. He argued:

In view of the recent findings in the *Wolfenden Report* and the Kinsey Report I do not think evidence of this kind is indecent, that the Court can take judicial notice that it is indecent behaviour or homosexual behaviour is indecent. The *Wolfenden Report* indicates 37 percent of all males have some form of homosexual behaviour and that report says this [is the] kind of conduct the criminal law should not associate itself with.¹⁹¹

This was an instance of pressure for law reform being raised at lower levels in the courts and coming to influence courtroom strategies and proceedings. The defence argued that the prosecution had not proven its case. It was becoming more difficult to accomplish gross indecency convictions. What the police/Crown attorney presented as

evidence in this case would have been sufficient previously to secure a conviction. Now a man charged with this sex offence and his lawyer were challenging this way of proceeding. In response to a question from the judge, the defence lawyer stated:

My view is it [the activity the men were charged with engaging in] should not be criminal. The Criminal Code says it is gross indecency. Indecency is a matter of custom and the Crown should have to show the normal range of behaviour before it can term this conduct "gross."¹⁹²

Later the defence lawyer again referred to the *Wolfenden Report*, stating that "it is not the function of the criminal law to enter into the private lives of some citizens under certain conditions." Here he raised and used the public/private regulatory distinction as part of his legal argument. And he said, "My friend has not brought before this court a grain of law to say because you are a homosexual you are a criminal."¹⁹³ Here he disputes the course of action put in place through the extension of criminalization strategy that I investigated in the last chapter that a homosexual is per se criminal. The *Wolfenden* law-reform framework shapes his defence at the courtroom level. But he also goes further.

The defence also raised the important question of what constitutes privacy. He says that where these men were arrested "There were no pedestrians, no other people. This was not on the street. This was not on the City Hall steps." And surely "grossness or monstrous must be something that extends beyond a private act between two consenting male adults."¹⁹⁴

The active presence of the *Wolfenden* Reform perspective and the debates over it that were not yet legally valid or established in the Canadian context opened up a space for this kind of defence argument. Again referring to *Wolfenden* the defence lawyer argued:

The *Wolfenden Report* has said in England that this act in private is not even gross indecency¹⁹⁵...they have recommended that act not be considered gross indecency and be removed from the Criminal Code because the Code should not bring the private lives of citizens within its sphere.¹⁹⁶

To a certain extent, the arguments of the defence lawyer against the Crown and to some extent the judge can be seen as a dramatization of the contention between the *Wolfenden* framework and more "old style" criminalization arguments. The judge is even forced to adapt a bit to the public/private regulatory framework that then had no actual legal jurisdiction in this area of Canadian law.¹⁹⁷ The jury in this case has to accomplish the inscription and conviction of "gross indecency" following the judge's instructions, and it has some difficulties in this project. The jury returned to ask whether there was any definition in the law of "gross indecency" and to ask if there were any legal precedents that could help them. Eventually they find the defendant guilty but

they strongly recommend “leniency and treatment.”¹⁹⁸ The defence lawyer stated during the sentencing hearing that he had spoken to a doctor at the Forensic Clinic and his client was prepared to go there for treatment. The accused got a suspended sentence and probation with the condition that he attend the clinic for treatment. He was entered into legally mandated psychiatric relations. During these years, accepting the need for “treatment” or “therapy” may have also been a strategy used by gays and defence lawyers to get light sentences.¹⁹⁹

By the mid-1960s, a trend toward a consensus for criminal-law reform was becoming evident. The most significant single influence on professional and official debate was the *Wolfenden Report* and the resulting legislation in England and Wales in 1967, demonstrating once again the referencing of Canadian history to English legal tradition. Other significant influences were the emergence of visible gay and lesbian cultures in a number of cities and the growth of a small homophile movement that organized limited popular education and law-reform initiatives. Some church circles, partially influenced by this homophile movement, also began building a certain consensus for reform.

The Klippert Case: Facilitator of Reform

The controversial Everett George Klippert case played a central role in speeding up this process of reform, especially in getting the Wolfenden reform strategy taken up by government. As Doug Sanders expresses it, “it wiped out any middle ground in the debate” since the “most sophisticated argument for retaining the anti-homosexual laws was that changing the law was some form of approval” of homosexuality and that those opposed to changing the laws were “happy with not enforcing the laws but in leaving them on the books.”²⁰⁰ This position became quite untenable with the Klippert decision, suggesting that continuing engagement in gay sex could lead to life imprisonment. This was the continuing legal resiliency of the extending criminalization of homosexuality strategy put in place in previous years that now came sharply into conflict with the partial decriminalization reform strategy.

In the course of an RCMP investigation into a case of arson in 1965 at Pine Point, Northwest Territories, Klippert, a mechanic’s helper, told the police that he had been a homosexual for twenty-four years and admitted to certain sexual acts with men and adolescent boys. He was charged with four counts of “gross indecency.” All acts were consensual. There was no suggestion of violence or that children were involved. While some of the “offences” involved adolescents, this was not legally relevant at the time since all homosexual acts were illegal under the letter of the law.

Klippert pleaded guilty and was sentenced on August 24, 1965 to three years for each of the charges, to be served concurrently. He was convicted solely on the basis of his own testimony. While in jail in Saskatchewan, Klippert was visited by two psychiatrists on behalf of the Crown. He had not been given any warning about these interviews and was not aware that the government was attempting to have him declared a “dangerous sexual offender.” Sanders, after talking to Klippert in the Prince Albert Penitentiary, wrote that three months following his imprisonment

an RCMP officer visited Klippert in the Penitentiary. He handed Klippert official notice that the Crown was proceeding with a hearing to have him declared a “dangerous sexual offender.” Klippert was stunned.²⁰¹

Klippert’s experience of being stunned can be accounted for since he had no idea until he received the official notice that outside his immediate world in the Penitentiary, in his cell and daily routine, his “case” had been entered into the relations establishing someone as a “dangerous sexual offender.” Klippert’s life had been entered into an official course of action of which he had no knowledge and which would allow him to be held in indefinite detention. He was entered into a web of legal and psychiatric relations shaped through a procedure laid out in the Criminal Code.

Klippert’s problems had begun a number of years earlier in 1960 when a complaint had been laid against him by the father of one of his sexual partners in Calgary. It was often standard police procedure to grill gay men about their sexual contacts. When interrogated by the police, Klippert mentioned sexual activities he had engaged in with eighteen men and adolescent boys. As far as Klippert knew the police never investigated these incidents any further. In the hope of avoiding publicity, he pleaded guilty without ever consulting a lawyer. Given the character of the police-judge relation, gay men like Klippert generally knew that the judges would go with the police testimony in court proceedings regarding homosexual sex. Klippert served four years in prison on these “gross indecency” convictions.

He then moved to Pine Point where the police informed him that they knew of his record. Clearly, his record followed him, contributing to this police warning and perhaps continued surveillance. In 1965, when he was questioned by the police, Klippert recounts that he was told that unless he pleaded guilty to “gross indecency” he would be charged with “arson,” although there was no evidence for this charge. This displayed the arbitrary powers of the RCMP granted to them through the criminalization of homosexual activity. Again Klippert pleaded guilty without any legal advice and was sentenced to three years on four counts of “gross indecency.” His experiences of consensual sex were again transformed into “gross indecency.” Police and courtroom work transforming his sexual adventures into “gross indecency” then allowed his case to be entered into the dangerous-sexual-offender sentencing procedure since “gross indecency” was one of the “triggering” offences.

While Klippert knew from his own experience the punitive consequences of his convictions for “gross indecency,” he had no idea that the Crown prosecutor and the police were applying to have him sentenced as a dangerous sexual offender. The police reports from Calgary mentioning his previous “gross indecency” convictions were an important “fact” enabling them to proceed with this application. In the application to have him sentenced as a dangerous sexual offender, the Crown counsel pointed out that as well as the four recent convictions, Klippert had also pleaded guilty to eighteen other such “offences” in Calgary. Prior to this sentencing hearing, Klippert was visited by the two psychiatrists and was successfully transformed into a dangerous sexual offender in sentencing.

It was the RCMP who laid the charges against him, who had a record of his previous convictions, and who clearly intended to apply through the Crown prosecutor for dangerous-sexual-offender status. The RCMP has a particular character as the police force of the federal state with law-enforcement powers over much of Canadian territory.

The application for sentencing as a dangerous-sexual-offender status was heard before Justice Sissons. Sissons was very impressed with the psychiatric evidence, says Sanders.²⁰² He wanted to get treatment for Klippert started as soon as possible given that one of the psychiatrists had made rather vague references to possibilities for treatment. Sissons believed sentencing Klippert as a dangerous sexual offender could allow him to be released quickly on parole where he could receive treatment outside the penitentiary. As Sanders put it:

No one seemed to be aware that paroles are extremely rare for dangerous sexual offenders. No one seemed aware of the futility of treatment for a man whose exclusive pattern for 25 years has been homosexual. No one seemed to be aware that any parole would have to be terminated if Klippert became involved once more in consensual homosexual activity.²⁰³

It is the very hegemony of the sickness and treatment frameworks that allowed for the judge's indeterminate sentencing in the first place, even though there was a major contradiction in his approach. There was very little actual "treatment" available.

On March 9, 1966, Klippert was indeed pronounced a dangerous sexual offender and was given a sentence of indefinite preventive detention as mandated by this legislation in lieu of the sentence previously imposed. The psychiatric evidence was key to this decision and future appeals, since an appeal would rest on the original court transcript, his previous criminal record, and the psychiatric testimony. On October 26 of that year, an appeal of this decision was dismissed without written reason.

In 1967, Brian Crane, Klippert's counsel, appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. Argument centred on the definition of "dangerous sexual offender." This appeal took place over a dispute regarding the proper mandated course of action, particularly over the definition section. This dispute focused on the interpretation of the clause, "or is likely to commit a further sexual offence," that had been added to the legislation in 1961. Crane contended that the evidence of the two psychiatrists did not prove that Klippert had shown "a failure to control his sexual impulses," which was the other central clause in the dangerous-sexual-offender definition. He referred to the statement in the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths Report that mere conviction for a homosexual offence should not itself warrant an indeterminate sentence. Here he attempted to read the report as establishing a legal precedent—but the report itself left this up to the discretion of the courts. Crane also quoted the original judge as stating that he was motivated by "how soon could we get this man [Klippert] out of the penitentiary and his treatment started."

Klippert's behaviour had always been non-violent, argued Crane, and "if the language of the statute applies to the conduct of Klippert it must apply to any homosexual."²⁰⁴

The defence view was shared by the decision of two dissenting judges who supported the appeal. Justice Cartwright wrote that the majority of judges were sentencing anyone

who appears likely, if at liberty, to continue such misconduct to “preventative detention,” that is incarceration for life. However loathsome conduct of the sort mentioned may be to all normal persons, I think it improbable that parliament should have intended such a verdict.²⁰⁵

While still taking up the standpoint of heterosexual hegemony, these judges adopted a more “liberal” view that could be used to facilitate the reform process. They argued that there had to be an element of danger to another person in any future offences for an offender to be classified as a dangerous sexual offender. They found that the Criminal Code’s reference to further sexual offences must be read as relating to others, otherwise it would imply that a person who was not dangerous must nevertheless be dealt with as if he were. Although Klippert would likely engage in further homosexual acts with consenting males, they argued, there was no danger he would use violence or coercion. Their argument was that this did not establish Klippert as a dangerous sexual offender and that he therefore should fall outside the course of action set out in this section.

The majority of the court found in contrast to the minority that this case did fall within the mandated course of action set out in the dangerous-sexual-offender section.²⁰⁶ The majority also made use of the earlier psychiatric and medical testimony. One of the doctors who had given “expert” testimony testified that Klippert would have the same drive toward homosexual relations in the future as he had in the past. This allowed Klippert to be inscribed into the “commit a further sexual offence” part of the definition since at this point all gay sex was technically illegal. Another medical “expert” contended that Klippert could not stop his homosexual activities for long periods of time on his own, which constituted a “failure to control” his sexual impulses—which was the other crucial part of the dangerous-sexual-offender definition. In the argument before the Supreme Court, the Crown contended that Klippert would continue to commit acts of “gross indecency.” This evidence allowed for the successful inscription of Klippert into this category and established a history of gay sex per se as a social danger and threat.

It was only with the case going to the Supreme Court that it generated media publicity. Until then it would only have been known to those directly involved. For Sanders it just “came out of the blue.” *ASK Newsletter* commented on the case in June 1967:

The Klippert case was argued before the Supreme Court of Canada in the last week of May.... If the conviction is upheld it means that any practicing homosexual in Canada can be convicted of being a “dangerous sexual offender” and sentenced to an indefinite sentence. It would not matter that the sexual activity was private, with consent and with adult persons.²⁰⁷

Doug Sanders had done the previously mentioned survey of sentencing for “gross indecency” and found that it was generally fairly light. As he put it: “The system with

Klippert became widely schizophrenic. What was considered a minor offence, suddenly if you repeated it branded you for life as a dangerous sexual offender.²⁰⁸ An offence that he argued was treated as minor, now suddenly became one of the most serious offences under Canadian law.

The final decision in the case, handed down on November 7, 1967, was based on a literal interpretation of the dangerous-sexual-offender category by the majority of the judges (three to two). The majority argued that while the provision was aimed at those who are a danger to others, references to “buggery” and “gross indecency,” by those who had previously been convicted of these charges, provided an “alternative element” to that of danger to others. This embodied a notion of homosexuality as a socially dangerous to others. Since “gross indecency” was one of the triggering offences, it was not necessary to show that a future offence would be a source of danger or injury to specific other persons. Their decision rested on the phrase “further sexual offences.”

Since “gross indecency” was one of the triggering offences, it operated as an abstract category obscuring the actual features of the activities Klippert was charged with. For instance, it obscured the age of his sexual partners, whether these acts were in “private” or not, that they were consensual and not abusive. At this time it was not legally relevant whether the sex engaged in was with youths, whether it was in “private,” or whether it was consensual. However, once these activities had been inscribed into “gross indecency” and then “dangerous sexual offender,” the actual local contexts of these sexual activities can no longer be recovered since they had already been transformed into ruling, ideological, legally mandated categories. As Gigeroff notes, referring to the Supreme Court majority, “it is not without significance that none of them considered the real situations that were represented by the words “gross indecency.”²⁰⁹

Ten years after the release of the *Wolfenden Report* and after the British government had adopted its recommendations on homosexuality in England and Wales, the Supreme Court of Canada majority affirmed a judgement that virtually deemed all sexually active homosexuals “dangerous sexual offenders.” A gay man convicted of “gross indecency” and likely to commit this act again was able to be incarcerated for life regardless of whether the act was committed with a consenting adult in private. The terms of this debate and such classifications as “adult” and “private” connected this debate to the conceptual framework of the *Wolfenden Report*. This set up a clash between the *Wolfenden* partial-decriminalization strategy and the more extensive criminalization strategy embodied in the workings of the dangerous-sexual-offender legislation. This set up a conflict between the general referencing of Canadian state formation—and in particular the Criminal Code—to legal developments in England and the institutionalization of homosexuality as a criminal sexual and social danger integrated into Canadian legislation from the United States. These contradictory influences on Canadian sexual policing pulled Canadian sexual regulatory practices in different directions, creating an opening for reform discussions with the controversy produced in the media and Parliament over the Klippert decision.

The majority decision included the following:

Whether the criminal law with respect to sexual misconduct of the sort in which appellant [Klippert] had indulged for nearly twenty-five years, should be changed to the extent to which it had been recently in England, by the Sexual Offenders Act, 1967...is obviously not for us to say; our jurisdiction is to interpret and apply laws validly enacted.²¹⁰

This could be read as a call for the federal state to address the possibility of changing the law, since this was not the proper mandate of the courts—a debate that is still with us—and also to address the recently enacted recommendations of the *Wolfenden Report* in England.

The decision to reject the appeal was very controversial. It fit into a framework of speeding up law reform. This ensuing process of governmental reform was basically framed and organized by the very active text of the *Wolfenden Report*, which provided the strategic framework for reorganizing relations and organizing for Criminal Code reform in the Canadian context.

The media and politicians were quick to respond to the Supreme Court rejection of Klippert's appeal. This response created a particular conjuncture of relations pushing toward reform organized through the *Wolfenden* strategic framework. T.C. Douglas, leader of the New Democratic Party, asked a series of questions in the House of Commons and proposed a committee similar to the *Wolfenden* committee for Canada. In response, Justice Minister Trudeau expressed approval for more liberalized laws and stated that the government would study the request for a special committee. The debate was not focused on reform of the dangerous-sexual-offender section itself but instead on the “gross indecency” and “buggery” sections of the Criminal Code that *Wolfenden* also addressed.

Toronto Daily Star headlines after the verdict screamed “Supreme Court Ruling Makes Homosexual Liable for Life,” and “Law on Homosexuals Will Be Amended.”²¹¹ A *Star* editorial entitled “A Return to the Middle Ages” agreed with the dissenting judges' position.²¹² A *Toronto Globe and Mail* editorial, “Not Parliament's Intention,” referred to the recent English reform.²¹³ Sidney Katz, in two *Toronto Star* articles, details the shocked responses of lawyers, psychiatrists, and what he refers to as “spokesmen” for Metro Toronto's homosexuals. He quotes one gay man as saying: “The court decision scares me. It makes me feel like a criminal. The decision is an open invitation to the police.” and “I want the right to live and be accepted as a homosexual. No law can make us conform, therefore the law must be changed.” In his second article, “Gentle George Klippert—Must He Serve Life?” Katz focused on Klippert himself.²¹⁴

There was an important framing of this as a key “issue” and a mobilization of support for law reform. This helped to construct a public consensus leading toward reform. The *Edmonton Journal* was one of the few mainstream media to editorialize against reform arguing that there was a tendency for homosexuals to prey upon the young.²¹⁵

“There's no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation,” said Pierre Trudeau in response to the Klippert decision and in arguing for his proposed reform legislation regarding buggery and gross indecency.²¹⁶ He said he would also amend the dangerous

offenders section in response to the Klippert case. Not until 1969, however, would the Commons Justice Committee propose exempting homosexuals who were not likely to cause “injury, pain or other evil” from this section. There would then have to be clearer evidence not only of a sexual offence but also of a “danger” to others.²¹⁷

In the specific context created following the Klippert decision, the Wolfenden perspective provided a cogent and available way to respond. A number of very significant organizations, especially in the legal profession, came out in support of reform. The Canadian Bar Association, at its 1968 conference, supported the decriminalization of homosexual acts in private and also suggested lowering the age of consent for such acts to sixteen.²¹⁸

The police, as the enforcers of heterosexual “law and order” and as an organization with a particular heterosexist character, vigorously and consistently opposed reform. The Toronto police opposed the 1967 reform in England, stating that “much crime can be traced to homosexuality.”²¹⁹ A senior officer claimed that Canadian reforms would “encourage homosexuality, lead to an increase in violence, and probably corrupt young people.”²²⁰ The Canadian Association of Police Chiefs voted at their 1968 annual conference to oppose the reform legislation because it would lead to depravity, robbery, and murder.²²¹ This association of homosexuality and criminality had become an integral part of police operational policy: gay men became criminal suspects.²²² Police attitudes were also shaped by a determination to preserve their turf against encroachments from the psychiatric and medical professions. They wanted to keep all “deviant” sexual behaviour under police jurisdiction, which put them in conflict with major aspects of the increasingly hegemonic view of homosexuality as an illness or “condition.”

The 1969 Criminal Code Reform: From Homophile Reform to Sexual Regulation

It was in this context that the 1969 Criminal Code reform took place. While grassroots gay and lesbian activists helped get the discussion going, the reform itself was part of a broad political project of the dominant sectors of the Liberal Party and Canadian ruling agencies. Unlike grass-roots homophile activists who stressed the need for public education, state agencies did not take up these concerns from a gay/lesbian standpoint. Again, we can see the transformation from local grass-roots activism, even if organized through a historically specific homophile framework, to official discourse and practice. As homosexual-law reform was made into an official “issue,” these more local community-based concerns were left behind. Doug Sanders’s comments on the 1969 reform are very instructive here. Trudeau’s remark about getting the state out of the bedrooms of the nation, says Sanders,

takes the gay issue and describes it in non-homosexual terms.... Unfortunately, legalization [what I would describe as limited, partial decriminalization] occurs in a way in which the issue is never joined. The debate never occurs. And so homosexuals are no more real after the reform than before...I felt that an issue had been stolen from us. That we had

forgotten that the reform issue was an issue that could have been used for public debate and it had been handled in such a way that there had been none. The only thing that had a promise of helping people was a public debate. It didn't happen.²²³

Lesbian and gay concerns, and our sexualities, were separated from our local everyday experiences and became questions instead of the regulation of sex in public or private along with whether it involved adults or youths. Clearly, aspects of homophile agitation such as claims to legitimacy and respectability through using the Wolfenden approach, and an earlier reliance on heterosexual "experts," facilitated the government in so interpreting homophile concerns. Still an important transformation took place in the late 1960s as homophile and lesbian and gay concerns were reduced to narrow issues of criminal-law reform.

While gay and homophile activists were moving far beyond the sickness model of homosexuality (the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations adopted the slogan "gay is good" in 1968, in the context of the social-protest movements of the 1960s),²²⁴ the government continued to use this sickness discourse to confine and limit the debate. Says Sanders, "Those arguments were over as far as gays were concerned, but they weren't over in any public debate because there never had been a public debate on these issues."

In a February 1968 editorial, *ASK Newsletter* challenged the age restrictions of the proposed legislation:

We congratulate the Justice Minister on his far-sighted Bill, however we deem to call it not enough. Why can a person of eighteen be old enough to enlist and fight for his country, yet not be considered old enough to choose the nature of his or her sexual habits.... It is though, our sincere hope that unless sex with those over eighteen and under twenty-one is contracted by financial arrangement, the law enforcement of Canada will turn a blind eye to those who choose the path they rightly consider their own.²²⁵

As secretary of NACHO, Sanders sent Pierre Trudeau a resolution from the NACHO conference in 1968. It read:

The North American Conference of Homophile Organizations expresses sharp disappointment that Mr. Pierre Elliot Trudeau...has seen fit to introduce the limited and inadequate provisions of the English homosexual law reform bill which makes 21 the age of consent for homosexual acts. Believing it to be offensive and unjustifiable for homosexual acts to be singled out for special treatment, the Conference encourages the Canadian government to ...enact provisions for age of consent which are identical for homosexual and heterosexual acts.²²⁶

They were able to criticize adult/youth lines of implementation of the Wolfenden strategy while basically accepting the public/private regulatory strategy. Unfortunately, the Canadian homophile movement was too scattered and weak (with *ASK* in the process

of collapsing) to take advantage of the law-reform discussions to develop and impose its own agenda. It was unable to oppose or shift this transformation of the concerns that it had initially raised, partially because of the difficulties of organizing across the vast expanse of the Canadian state. This also produced a rupture between homophile activism prior to the 1969 reform and the gay and lesbian liberation movements that would come after it.

As mentioned earlier, this law-reform process took place as part of a wider series of social changes. The development of the post-war “Welfare State” and the hegemony of Keynesian economic and social interventionism created a space for the incorporation of medical and psychiatric practices within state agencies. This led to new combinations of policies of sexual regulation linking psychiatric work with the criminal justice system and sexual policing. It also led to the incorporation of aspects of sexual regulation into state agencies increasingly outside the direct realm of the Criminal Code; for instance, into family and social support policies. Eventually this led some state and professional agencies to lessen their reliance on the police, courts, and Criminal Code in areas of sexual and moral regulation, e.g., for acts involving two adults in private. At the same time, given differences within ruling relations, especially over the necessity of heterosexual masculinity as an organizing ideology, the police, the military, and other powerful state agencies remained firmly committed to the criminalization of homosexuality.

This social process was full of contradictions. Shifts in class, racial, and gender relations gradually undermined the previous social organization of family and erotic life allowing lesbians and gay men to exist at the lower levels of class and professional organization where heterosexual ties were not a prerequisite. The development of corporate capitalism and increasingly national and extra-local forms of class and state organization meant that the heterosexual family was no longer as integral to the social organization of class and state relations. Rapid changes and developments in the markets for household goods, and a weakening and shifting of the previous gender specializations of work, meant that all men no longer needed to have wives for domestic labour or sexual services.²²⁷ This led to some profound changes in the organization of heterosexual masculinities, but also opened up new possibilities for gay men and, in a different way, for lesbians. State and various professional agencies tried to organize and contain the social spaces seized by gay men and lesbians as “private” where queer sex would not be allowed to subvert “normal” sexual, gender, and social relations.

At the same time, white professional and corporate executive men throughout the 1960s and 1970s still most often needed a wife, a home, and kids doing well in school. A heterosexual social practice was still in many ways crucial in the worlds of business and the professions. This led to a series of contradictions and social tensions. The public/private means of sexual regulation was a way of managing these contradictions, allowing queers to be tolerated in a limited and highly patrolled social space, while preserving heterosexual hegemony. The Wolfenden strategy and the 1969 criminal-law reform was not so much a break in hegemony as a recognition that earlier strategies of regulation were no longer effective.

The 1960s were a period of “liberal” reform and restructuring in a climate of general economic and social expansion and social struggle. The Liberals declared “war” on poverty and established Medicare. Social services were increased, schools and universities were expanded and liberalized, and divorce laws were broadened at the same time as a series of sex-linked discussions opened up in the media and in popular culture.

Trudeau’s accession to the leadership of the Liberal Party in 1968 highlighted the shift toward a “new morality,” although reform policies on abortion and sexuality had their roots in the 1967 Pearson reforms regarding capital punishment and divorce. Trudeau and the Liberal government, in the early years of his reign, attempted to bring together a social bloc of diverse groups and classes through the use of the rhetoric of the “Just Society,” one aspect of which was liberalization of social policies in the moral and sexual spheres. This “Just Society,” which was central to the political project of the Pierre Elliot Trudeau Liberals, focussed on individual and not social or collective rights. This was bound up with the White Paper which attempted to annihilate Indigenous rights to sovereignty, as well as a reconstruction of anti-Black and other forms of racism in immigration and multicultural policies.²²⁸

The reforms surrounding abortion and sexual offences were an integral part of this shift. The reform of the abortion law called for the establishment of a private moral realm—where in this case control was placed in the hands of the medical profession through hospitals and therapeutic abortion committees, on which sat at least three doctors. Abortions could now be approved for “health” reasons, but only in those hospitals that had established such a committee.²²⁹ All others remained criminal offences. This legislation followed the lines of the English reform, which required that each abortion have the consent of two physicians. These changes were part of a broader process of re-classifying homosexuals, sex workers, juvenile “sex offenders,” and people seeking abortions as “sick” or “inadequate,” but no longer as always criminal.²³⁰ It has been argued that the 1969 abortion reform merely de-criminalized and regularized existing hospital practice.²³¹ Similarly, it has been argued that, although it was sparked by the Klippert case, the sexual-offences reform merely codified the existing police practice of arresting gays only for acts in “public.”

On December 21, 1967, Pierre Trudeau, minister of justice, introduced the first version of the sex-offences reform bill. The bill called for the lifting of sanctions against “buggery” and “gross indecency” for private acts between consenting adults of twenty-one or older. The sanctions would be retained for all acts of buggery and gross indecency committed in public “or if two or more persons take part or are present” or if consent has been extorted, forced, or if a person “is feeble-minded, insane, or an idiot or imbecile.” The anti-disability language of the legislation is crucial to note.²³²

The debates on the 1969 Criminal Code reform in the House of Commons and in the justice and legal affairs committee, to which it was referred for study, provide insights into the shifting policies of sexual regulation within Canadian state formation.²³³ This also shows how textually mediated this debate was—including the extensive organizing capacities of the Wolfenden perspective and the sickness framework. As George Smith suggested, the record of this debate may be the most heterosexist document

in Canadian governmental history,²³⁴ although this is now rivalled by some of the debates in provincial legislatures over sexual orientation protection,²³⁵ family recognition rights and spousal benefits,²³⁶ and at the federal level over hate-crimes sentencing legislation and same-sex marriage.

For the purposes of analysis, the participants can be divided into two general camps. The first camp was made up of the Liberals, the New Democrats, and some Conservatives whose discourse was basically organized through the conceptual framework of the *Wolfenden Report* with a particular interpretation tying it into the sickness framework. In the second anti-reform camp, were the Cr ditistes (a rural Catholic-based Social Credit party in Qu bec) and other Conservatives. The Cr ditistes conducted a filibuster to hold off adoption of those sections of the bill dealing with abortion, gross indecency, and buggery.

The speakers were all men with the sole exception of the only woman MP at the time, New Democrat Grace MacInnes. The discursive frameworks of both camps were organized by variants of the sickness model of homosexuality. These arguments developed in relation to each other in the debate as each side tried to link the concept of homosexuality as illness to their position. The Cr ditistes and some Conservatives used religious and other arguments as well, particularly as the sickness argument came to be hegemonized by the reform supporters as the debate went on.

The debate can be seen as a layering of different discourses organized through the text of the *Wolfenden Report* and earlier discourses of sexual regulation. In reading the transcripts of the debates, the discourse of the *Wolfenden Report* and the discourses of homosexual social danger, and degeneration come to life. Voices and texts from the past continue to have an active impact in shaping this debate.

As then Justice Minister John Turner explained, this proposal had been formulated with the input of the attorneys-general of the provinces, the legal profession, including the Canadian Bar Association, and the medical profession, as well as Crown prosecutors. Many social agencies participated in articulating this legal perspective. In particular, Turner stressed the significance of the input that had been received from legal "experts."²³⁷ In contrast, lesbians and gay men were not consulted, and while various professional and government bodies were involved, there was no broad discussion through a public commission or public hearings. This was a much more contained and rapid process of official change than that of the previously analysed Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths since the *Wolfenden* strategy was already available to be taken up in the law-reform process.

Professor Mewett, whom we met earlier, appeared before the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee at the urging of Mr. Wooliams of the Tories.²³⁸ He reported that the reform would make the Criminal Code conform to actual practice; that private clubs would be covered as "public" places; and that in his view, homosexuality among consenting adults "is a health matter rather than a matter for criminal law."²³⁹

Turner introduced the bill with great fanfare. Bill C-150, the omnibus bill that included abortion, contraception, gambling, lotteries, and gun-control measures as well as reform of the sexual-offences laws, was, according to Turner, the "most important

and all-embracing reform of the criminal and penal law ever attempted at one time in one country." It contained "matters of deep social significance" and took a stand on "some of the controversial questions of our time." He felt the bill reflected "the delicate balance between law and morals and the historic ideal of the rule of law in a free society." No other review of the criminal law had aroused as much interest, according to Turner, because this was the first attempt to reform the criminal law in an "orderly and understandable pattern," repealing those "provisions which had become obsolete."²⁴⁰ Its ideas, he argued, had already been accepted by public opinion in the last election, and he explained that the government was dealing with the bill as an indivisible one, not as several individual items of legislation. The Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs would deal with a clause-by-clause review:

The government is of the opinion that this bill stands for the general principle of criminal and penal law reform and should be dealt with by the house on that basis.... We feel bound to the bill as the principal item of social reform in this session of Parliament. It is identified with our Prime Minister and our party.²⁴¹

The Cr ditistes and the Conservatives opposed this manner of dealing with the bill. They demanded separate reports, especially on homosexuality and abortion, so that they could vote on parts of the bill separately.²⁴² The Liberals and the New Democrats defeated the opposition on this point, establishing the tactical terrain for the debate. Those opposed to either or both the "homosexual" and abortion provisions had to vote against the bill as a whole if they could not amend the bill to their liking.

In defending the sections of the bill dealing with "buggery," "gross indecency," and abortion, the Liberals and the NDP relied on the public/private distinction and on differences between the realm of law and morality. This allowed them to bridge the gaps between these different sex-related practices through an administrative framework that tied together the regulation of these different practices. The Wolfenden strategy had a great deal of cogency in this context because it did this kind of work for supporters of the bill. Many of their arguments were lifted almost word for word from the *Wolfenden Report*. Said Turner:

All that is immoral has not been and is not now criminal. I agree with and support the view that in the field of sexual behaviour the basic function of the criminal law is to preserve public order and decency. In those certain areas of private behaviour which are more properly left to the conscience, which are in private and do not involve public order or corruption of others, particularly the young, we are of the view that this is no place for the criminal law.²⁴³

Within the justice and legal affairs committee, he spelled this out even more clearly:

We believe that the law and morals are two separate philosophical propositions...that there are aspects of human life and relationships between people, which...ought better

be left to private morality than subject to public order within the strictures of the criminal law.... As between two consenting adults in private...homosexual acts particularly—ought not to be within the purview of the criminal law.... This does not mean that the government is necessarily condoning, or promoting, or encouraging, this type of act between adults. It is merely saying that it is a matter of private morality and not a question of public law.... The fact that we are removing the public law in its criminal aspects from some types of conduct such as homosexuality between consenting adults in private and therapeutic abortion within the conditions specified in the bill has surely never been interpreted as...promotion or encouragement by the State, of this type of conduct.²⁴⁴

The government had more reaction from individuals on abortion than any other provision, said Turner. The bill was intended to clarify the law so that abortions approved by a committee of physicians in accredited hospitals would no longer be illegal, he stressed: “It does not promote abortion. It simply removes certain categories of abortion from the present place they have on the list of indictable offences.”²⁴⁵ The limitations of the abortion reform that did not guarantee a woman’s right to an abortion if that was her choice will be examined later. It still has a lot to do with shaping the continuing controversies over abortion clinics and reproductive rights following the Supreme Court decision of January 28, 1988 decriminalizing abortion.²⁴⁶

The Conservatives pushed for clarification of the word “health” in this context, while Wooliams, Tory spokesman for the debate, and others used “right-to-life,” anti-choice arguments. Opposition to abortion and opposition to homosexuality were linked in this debate. Some Conservatives, however, supported the government on the issue of abortion. The NDP supported the government’s position but also suggested that it go further and remove all references to abortion in the Criminal Code, as Grace MacInnes had suggested in her private-member’s bill, leaving the decision up to a woman and her doctor. The NDP went further in this area than in relation to the reform of homosexual related offences. The Cr ditistes as a bloc opposed this section with a series of Catholic and moral-conservative arguments, many of which also surfaced in the debate over homosexuality.

In motivating the sections of the bill dealing with gross indecency, Turner stated that these would

not apply to any act committed in private between a husband or his wife or any two persons each of whom consents to the commission...the bill strives to...exempt from the criminal law acts of gross indecency between consenting adults in private...it changes the substance of one particular offence under the criminal law.²⁴⁷

In Turner’s words, this section did not “legalize homosexuality,” it merely exempted certain private adult conduct from prosecution. Similarly, he argued that liberalization of divorce laws did not mean that Parliament condoned divorce: “We are not for a moment conceding that homosexual acts are in any way to be equated to ordinary, normal acts of intercourse.”²⁴⁸

Turner quoted extensively from the *Wolfenden Report*. It was used as an authoritative way of dealing with and attempting to silence critics. He also pointed out, in one of the few specific references to lesbianism in the debate, that unlike the case in England, gross indecency in Canada since the 1953 reform covered “acts between women.”²⁴⁹ Under questioning, Turner agreed that setting the age of consent at twenty-one was arbitrary, but necessary. “To make it perfectly clear that we are not involving minors in the situation it was felt that the amendment should apply only to consenting adults.”²⁵⁰

Steven Otto disputed the opposition’s contention that morality must be enforced by law: “By and large, the defining of morality and immorality is being assumed by technocrats and psychiatrists rather than by the state.” Like most of those supporting reform, Otto relied on the opinions of medical and psychiatric experts building the sickness model as a central organizing concept into arguments for public/private regulation: “members of the medical profession tell us that homosexuality is a sickness and that with present day knowledge there is no remedy for it.... These people should not be treated as criminal. This definition has nothing to do with the old concept of morality.”²⁵¹

Said Robert Kaplan, MP for Don Valley:

There are few Canadians who would believe that laws exist governing voluntary private conduct between a husband and wife or between unmarried couples of the opposite sex.... Surely conduct given this context is a matter of taste and not of morality, and any element of gross indecency is in the eye of the beholder.²⁵²

On homosexuality, Kaplan stated:

This is a form of sexual perversion which arouses a sense of horror in most people. But many Canadians feel an equal sense of horror about the present treatment of homosexuals in this country. For example, our government has been holding in prison under an indeterminate or life sentence, confirmed by the Supreme Court...one Everett George Klippert.²⁵³

He concluded, “in any event the problem does not threaten social order and should be taken away from judges and given to doctors and psychologists.”

The Conservatives were divided, especially on abortion and homosexuality. Wooliams called for a thorough review of the Criminal Code. He wanted a separate report on the sections dealing with homosexuality, but supported the bill’s proposals in this area while arguing for specific amendments to “clarify” it:

Our standing committee must reach the conclusion in the light of scientific, psychiatric research and knowledge that imprisonment is largely ineffectual to reorient those with homosexual tendencies...if the law is ignored, if a law is unenforceable, if it is indeed unjust, is that not grounds to make the change even though we may abhor legal permissiveness.²⁵⁴

He later outlined the dominant approach in the debate, although he is referring here only to adult acts in private.

I have always taken the position that we should not deal with homosexuality in the Criminal Code. This should be dealt with as a sickness or an ailment. It should be treated from a psychological or physical point of view by psychiatrists or doctors...I suggest that what we are attempting to do here is legalize acts between two consenting adults over 21 years of age, a man and a wife, indecent or homosexual, providing they are carried out in private.²⁵⁵

Conservative leader Robert Stanfield wanted to see the bill split for voting and was critical of the view that the government should not be concerned about morality in the private sphere; yet he supported the reform because he felt that the existing section was unenforceable.

The NDP supported the amendment. David Lewis, MP for York-South, suggested, however, that Turner was exaggerating his claims; that the reform on homosexuality, like that on abortion, did not legalize anything. Said Lewis:

I know that to normal people this practice is an odious one...but to make it a crime in all cases is to be insensitive and cruel because this deviationism obviously is due to certain psychological factors. This behaviour requires charity and treatment than criminal prosecution.²⁵⁶

And:

Those of us who are supporting the amendment in respect of homosexuality are just as repelled as they are by that act. We are just as anxious to make clear that it is an immoral and undesirable act, but we think the time has come to modernize the law.²⁵⁷

The NDP generally had a party line that homosexuals were ill and should be under a doctor's care and not in jail. Another New Democrat, John Gilbert, discussed homosexual acts in washrooms:

One of the problems with which many Torontonians have been confronted in respect to homosexuality is the frequency with which homosexuals hang around public washrooms and lavatories. In fact, members of the morality squad in Toronto take up positions in washrooms. They bore a hole in the wall and by that method of detection have brought some homosexuals to court. This seems to me to be a rather nauseating approach to criminal detection.... There must be protection for young persons who use the public parks and public lavatories. It has been suggested in the *Wolfenden Report* that municipalities pass by-laws to prevent loitering by homosexuals around public washrooms.... They also indicate there is a place for the psychiatrist, the clergyman, the social worker and the probation officer in helping to deal with this problem.²⁵⁸

Gilbert, however, expressed some scepticism about the sickness argument, noting that the *Wolfenden Report* had concluded that homosexuality was not a disease but a state or condition. New Democratic Party MP Ralph Stewart (Cochrane) also noted that homosexuals did not consider themselves to be abnormal: "Homosexuality is considered by some people to be abnormal, but among those who are homosexuals it is considered normal for them."²⁵⁹

Arnold Peters, whom we met before, pointed out that this kind of amendment had been kicking around for a long time, at least partially referring to his own efforts. Most homosexuals and lesbians with whom he was acquainted, he said, were opposed to prostitution and were not interested in "spreading their affliction" to the young, but wished to live "as near a normal life as possible." He used the argument that most homosexuals were "respectable" and tried to be "normal" to lessen the effect of arguments by the right wing. This also reflected some of the arguments for respectability put forward by the Council on Religion and the Homosexual with which he had been involved. He also pointed out that church attitudes toward homosexuality were changing.²⁶⁰

This is the closest anyone came to defending the civil and human rights of lesbians and gay men, let alone our sexualities. Only G.W. Baldwin (Peace River) who referred to the *Wolfenden Report*, the Gigeroff study, and the Klippert case suggested, "I think these sections should be out of the Criminal Code altogether," as part of an argument for a broader study of this section.²⁶¹ And as Tory Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley) stressed "I remind the house that no one [who] has spoken in the debate has approved of these practices. They have all expressed repugnance of them."²⁶²

The reform camp managed to link the sickness model to their distinction between the public and private spheres. Adult "private" homosexuality was no longer to be criminal, but was to be an illness and these individuals should instead be under a doctor's or a psychiatrist's care. A number of speakers struggled to try to separate this notion of "illness" from moral notions. Privacy was narrowly defined, public broadly. When pressed, Turner said the presence of a third person, and activities in homosexual clubs, would be public in character.

In this narrow, "private" sphere, gross indecency and buggery were to be partially decriminalized. In the broader public realm, same-gender sex would continue to be prohibited, and the debates and the reform itself contained clear instructions to the legal system and the police for sanctions to be retained and extended.

Opponents of Reform

The opponents of reform generally accepted a rather different sickness model of homosexuality, which was not tied to a public/private distinction. While they would have agreed more with the "moral conservative" position of Devlin in the Hart/Devlin debate on the need for a common (heterosexual/family) morality, they did not raise the debate on this level. Instead, they attempted to construct a course of action in opposition to that of the reform camp in which homosexuals were ill, but this would lead to detention and/or hospitalization rather than partial decriminalization. This continued aspects

of the “homosexuals as a social danger” notion of the dangerous-sexual-offender/criminal-sexual-psychopath course of action. It also continued those aspects of the broader criminalization strategy in which concerns over illness and “treatment” were mobilized to secure a course of action of criminal detention.

They referred to the legal reform as the “permissive clauses relating to homosexuality.”²⁶³ They instead argued that if homosexuals were really ill, then hospitals should be built for them where they could be treated. At times it seemed as though some of them felt that a determined “public health” campaign could wipe out homosexuality. They attempted to meld this perspective with strands of heterosexist discourse formed in previous periods, including religious-based arguments. This became more pronounced toward the end of the debate when they realized that the sickness argument had been effectively seized and used by the other side. They then generally shifted to the argument that there was insufficient evidence to determine whether homosexuality was criminal or an illness. As a result, this second camp was far more heterogeneous than the pro-reform group. The Cr ditiste MP Laprise accepted a version of the sickness thesis:

The duty of the government should be to protect these individuals by treating their sickness like that of any person.... With the appropriate means we can control homosexuality since we recognize and admit that it is a sickness.²⁶⁴

Laprise criticized the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for giving too much coverage to homosexuality, allowing “sexual perverts to express themselves freely and sometimes in an arrogant manner on the air.”²⁶⁵ Laprise referred to “sexual perverts” who seduce boys and engage in murder to satisfy their lust. He equated opposition to homosexuality with defence of proper gender roles. Cr ditiste leader R al Caouette also initially held to the sickness model:

Practically everyone agrees that homosexuality is a disease. Therefore instead of making it legal why not bring forward a bill aiming to build hospitals...instead of allowing adults to commit such acts together.²⁶⁶

Later he shifted to a different rhetoric.

Are we stupid enough to believe that man has been made for man? The Good Lord created woman for man. God created man and woman, that is normal, natural and proper.²⁶⁷

Other anti-reformers linked homosexuality with child molestation, “proselytization,” “compulsive conversion,”²⁶⁸ talked of it as an “evil,” as a “contagion,” as the “sin of Sodom,”²⁶⁹ as social decay, and as bringing about a falling birth rate. It was even claimed that “pernicious” perversions lead the nation to its destruction.” Cr ditiste Bernard Dumont (Frontenac) argued that homosexuality led to national decline:

Society is strongly opposed to sodomy as it punishes murder and theft, because it strikes at its roots, namely the family.... A resurgence of homosexuality and an increasing tolerance of its practices are inseparable from a declining civilization, are the stigmas of a decaying civilization.²⁷⁰

Lambert, a Conservative, developed this further:

We are basing our law on certain legislative amendments which have been introduced into the law of the United Kingdom.... But show me a country that is sicker at heart and sicker at soul than is Britain today...if you go back in history you will see that the same line of conduct has brought down nations.²⁷¹

Said the Cr ditiste Ren  Matte:

If you read the history of certain countries, you realize that those who have accepted such depravity have been brought down as if by mere coincidence. This is what happened to Ancient Greece and Rome.²⁷²

Matte called for a delay until further research into homosexuality—“that dreadful plague,”²⁷³ as he called it—had been carried out. Some of the contradictions of attempting to use the sickness argument to argue for continuing criminalization became evident when he stated that “Once you legalize a disease you must legalize all others.” He later declared that only one percent of homosexuals were “truly sick” and that the rest were just vicious. Homosexuality, he claimed, “leads youth astray, relaxes morals, brings about decadence, causes disorders, and paves the way for anarchy.”²⁷⁴ Contradictions became even clearer when, after a long speech by Cr ditiste Andr  Fortin (Lotbini re), the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, Jean-Charles Cantin asked:

Does the honourable member finally admit that homosexuals are not criminals...

Mr. Fortin: Exactly. They are not criminals, they are ill.

Mr. Cantin: Then is it not precisely the intent of the proposed amendment that they no longer be regarded as criminals except when the protection of a youth is involved.²⁷⁵

Other opponents brought up more clearly religious-based objections, even going so far as to quote the Pope himself. Legal reform undermined Western society’s roots in the Bible, they said. The Cr ditistes gathered a petition against homosexuality and abortion and collected many letters from Qu bec residents in support of their opposition to reform on religious grounds.

Former Conservative prime minister John Diefenbaker continued to view homosexuals as a “security risk.” He also associated abortion and homosexual reform with the growing “permissiveness,” which was undermining the Judeo-Christian roots of society.²⁷⁶ Diefenbaker called for defence of family life, which was presumably assumed to

be entirely heterosexual. Other opponents of reform advocated free psychiatric hospitals for homosexuals as well as education against homosexuality. Argued Downey:

Surely our young people also deserve protection. The urge of these people to convert young persons to their ways is established...the law should remain as a deterrent to protect average citizens, those who believe in the natural processes.²⁷⁷

This same MP said that he had doubts about whether “homosexuals are in reality sick to the extent that is often presented in their favour.”²⁷⁸ The sickness model continued to prevail in its different articulations on both sides of the debate, however.

The supporters of partial decriminalization of “gross indecency” and “buggery” managed to associate the sickness model with their position. After all, if a person is sick, he or she should be under the “care” of a doctor or psychiatrist, not locked up in prison. Some of the opposing speakers did question the sickness thesis and argued for other heterosexist discourses formed as part of earlier Social Darwinist, eugenic, moral-conservative, and religious, especially Roman Catholic discourses. These discourses were not dead or simply archaic but continued to play an active part in organizing debates and shaping social consciousness. They were shifted around and combined in new ways in this debate, especially in relation to sickness arguments.

The omnibus bill was passed on May 14, 1969, by a vote of 149 to 55 and received royal assent on June 27, 1969.²⁷⁹

The state, however, was not removed from the bedrooms of the nation. As Conservative Pat Nowlan, who also criticized the notion of a pluralistic society, put it in a comment that potentially deconstructed the crucial assumptions of the reform bloc: “The State does enter the bedroom every time we turn on the television set in the bedroom. Programs are under State regulation.”²⁸⁰ State and social regulation continued to be very much present in the private realm after the reform. It is important to remember that even these partial decriminalization or exemption proposals were not extended to the military and the RCMP given the particular character of these institutions and the lack of a clearly defined “private” place in these institutions.

Strategies of sexual regulation were shifted, however. Lesbianism and homosexuality were not legalized, and there was nothing done to establish the human rights of lesbians and gays, a social right to be lesbian or gay, or to uproot the heterosexist assumptions at the heart of social and family policies. Rather a distinction was established between public and private sex, and, for the first time in Canadian law, between acts of gross indecency and buggery involving two consenting adults and those involving people below an age of consent set at twenty-one. These reforms helped demarcate a distinct sphere of private, adult homosexuality, the regulation of which was transferred from the police, courts and penal system to psychiatrists, doctors and other social agencies. In a broadly defined “public” realm, all homosexual activities would be dealt with by the police and the criminal law.

There is, as I have suggested, a major difference between the ways in which people in our everyday lives go about socially producing privacy and intimacy for ourselves and

the ways in which “public/private” distinctions are deployed in the Wolfenden strategy and the 1969 Criminal Code reform as administrative classifications. As George Smith explains, referring to the situations established following the 1969 reform:

The Criminal Code defines “public” first in terms of a “public place.” According to Section 138, a public place is “any place to which the public has access by right or invitation, expressed or implied.” Secondly, section 158 of the Code...goes on to say that not only is a sexual act public and therefore illegal if it is committed in a public place, but it is also a public act if more than two persons take part or are present. What this means is that what is “public,” and again illegal as far as sex is concerned, is very broadly defined. It covers all possible situations but one—two individuals behind a locked door. This essentially relegates all sexual activity to the bedroom.²⁸¹

And he goes on:

Another important feature of the government’s definition of “public” is that it treats the relation between “public” and “private” as proportional, like pieces of a pie. Thus these two terms are thought to be mutually exclusive. What is public is public: what is private, private. The two do not overlap in any way. Thus the larger the slice given to the public, the smaller the piece left over for private.²⁸²

In the broader public realm, queer sex was to continue to be prohibited.

The reform clearly led to public discussion. The extending criminalization of homosexual sex strategy was displaced, although this did not do away with associations between gay sex and sexual and social danger as we will see. At the same time that the “sickness” model became firmly established as the official explanation of homosexuality, the reform also acknowledged the existence of adult homosexual networks and accorded them a limited and contained private space. Lesbians and gays would take advantage of this opening to seize more social space and to become more visible. Yet the broad definition of “in public” and the character of such legal terms as “gross indecency” and “indecent act” sent instructions to the police to step up their harassment and entrapment campaigns as queer networks became more visible. A perceptive critique of the reform in *Saturday Night* by a gay man points out that the police would continue to arrest gays and men engaging in homosexual sex in washrooms, baths, and parks.²⁸³ In the longer term, the strategy mandated more specific surveillance and policing of gay sex in “public.” The definition of “public,” which this strategy produced, stands over and against gays as another instrument in the regulation of our lives.²⁸⁴

In 1971, a Canadian coalition of gay and lesbian liberation groups produced a statement for what came to be called the We Demand rally and demonstration, which reads in part:

In 1969 the Criminal Code was amended so as to make certain sexual acts between consenting adults, in private, legal. This was widely misunderstood as “legalizing”

homosexuality and thus putting homosexuals on an equal basis with other Canadians. In fact, this amendment was merely a recognition of the non-enforceable nature of the Criminal Code as it existed. Consequently, its effects have done but little to alleviate the oppression of homosexual men and women in Canada. In our daily lives we are still confronted with discrimination, police harassment, exploitation and pressures to conform which deny our sexuality.²⁸⁵

Nonetheless, the space opened up through the reform helped set the stage for the emergence of gay and lesbian liberation movements and for the expansion of gay and lesbian networks and communities. However, it also set the stage for many of the practices of sexual policing and regulation we still face today.

Gay/Lesbian Liberation and Communities

Gay/Lesbian Liberation

In the late 1960s, there emerged new social movements focusing on gender and sexuality.¹ In “advanced” Western countries, patriarchal, racist capitalism was transformed through social struggles, the expansion of social services, increasing state responsibility for social reproduction, changes in social and family policies, growing numbers of white married women joining the paid-labour force, a declining birthrate, the development of birth control and abortion technology, and the expansion of consumer markets into new areas of social life. All this eroded previous forms of family, gender and sexual regulation, and led to the production of more visible sexual imagery and the emergence of visible gay and lesbian cultures. Sexuality was becoming more of a public issue in the media and advertising, aided by state adoption of more “liberal” sexual legislation.

“Sexual orientation,” which separated the questions of lesbianism and male homosexuality from gender inversion—as notions of sickness and deviancy—gained hegemony with the growth of medicine and psychiatry.² While we were still oppressed, these changes did allow more women, men, and eventually trans people to come out of “the closet” and begin to seize some social spaces from which we could more directly challenge the oppressions we faced.

Heterosexual reproductive sexuality was now the absolute rule only among moral-conservative and new-right fundamentalists, and ties between sexuality and procreation became tenuous as sexuality as a more autonomous locus of pleasure, identity, and meaning gained in importance. Capital and state agencies now depended less on the heterosexual family form than in previous periods. It was in the context of revolts by Blacks, Indigenous people, young people, students, women, workers, and the Québécois that lesbians and gay men also rebelled. The growing numbers of lesbians and gay men living at least partly outside of or on the margins of heterosexual family relations—organizing their lives through their own cultural networks—created the basis for the gay and lesbian liberation movements.³

In June 1969, trans women of colour, Puerto Rican drag queens, and bar fags and dykes fought back against a routine police raid at the Stonewall Tavern in New York City.⁴ Street and bar people came together with new left activists to produce this movement. Thus was born the modern gay liberation movement. The Gay Liberation Front

(GLF) and similar organizations were formed across the United States and throughout the Western world.⁵ The GLF took its name from the National Liberation Front in Vietnam, which was then fighting against the US government attempt to deny the people of Vietnam their right to self-determination. The social ferment of the late 1960s social justice and countercultural movements, earlier forms of homosexual and trans activism, experiences in the closets of the left, and the expansion of lesbian and gay networks, and commercial ventures combined to create the conditions for these social movements.⁶

These movements turned the stigmatized category of homosexuality back on our oppressors by articulating new, more positive lesbian, gay, queer, and trans identities and needs and desires. The struggle over homosexual/lesbian/trans definitions is the terrain upon which this identification and consciousness was built. These movements challenged the “internalization” of hatred for homosexuality by lesbians and gay men as a form of “self-oppression.”⁷ Inspired by the Black Power movements assertion that “Black Is Beautiful,” we produced a parallel and for some interconnected affirmation that “Lesbian/Gay is Good.” We challenged the privatization and invisibility of homosexualities; we affirmed the need for lesbians and gay men to come out and help build public communities. Through a process of contestation we affirmed, celebrated, and transformed our consciousness, laying the basis for the gay, lesbian, and trans communities and cultures of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Taking advantage of the openings provided by the contradictions in the “liberalization” of sexual and gender regulations put in place in the 1960s, we attempted to smash through the boundaries of oppressive sexual and gender regulation.

The early Gay Liberation Front groups viewed our struggle as linked to those of other subordinated groups and attempted in the United States to form alliances with the Black Panther Party and other groups. Unfortunately, there was often inadequate theorization of the basis for these connections and attempts at unity often broke up on the rocky shores of heterosexism and racism.

The early movement tried to unite lesbians and gay men and to ally itself with a feminist critique of sex and gender relations, but this initial unity was shattered as differences between lesbians and gay men exploded. Tensions also emerged between trans people and cis-gendered people. Gay liberation remained a largely male-dominated, white, and cis-gendered movement. Sexism among gay men did not disappear, and feminism in and of itself began to show its limitations as an organizing strategy for gay men. Many lesbians, who also experienced oppression as women, were very inspired by and very involved in feminist organizing although they often faced hostility and even purges in feminist groups in the United States and Canada.⁸ Many lesbians experienced a pull toward both feminist and gay organizing. For lesbian organizing, feminism remained a key reference point.⁹ Movement efforts were also hampered by underlying assumptions of a “natural” or essential gay or lesbian sexuality. The limits of this approach would not become fully visible until later.

The gay liberation movement emerged in an altogether different social context from that of the early German homosexual rights movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and that of the 1950s and 1960s homophile organizations. Social

changes in the intervening years put into question patriarchal and racist relations and ruling strategies of sexual regulation, allowing these new movements to go much farther. Influenced by the ideas of the new left and feminism, we no longer relied on the advice of “experts” as had the early homophile groups. Gay liberation challenged the power of the psychiatrists, psychologists, and doctors. We were creating new social needs, capacities, and pleasures.¹⁰

One of the first fronts of struggle was against the psychiatric and psychological practices constructing us as “mentally ill.” After a series of “zaps” and confrontations with the psychiatrists and medical professionals, the American gay liberation movement forced the American Psychiatric Association in 1973 to drop its classification of homosexuality as a mental disorder.¹¹ This had a major impact in Canada as well. The Association’s new position read:

A significant proportion of homosexuals are apparently satisfied with their sexual orientation, show no significant signs of manifest psychopathology, and are able to function as effectively as heterosexuals. Homosexuality, per se, therefore cannot be considered a mental disorder.¹²

American psychiatry recategorized homosexuality as a “sexual disturbance”—retaining the classification “sexual orientation disturbance (homosexuality)” in the case of people who were dissatisfied with their condition.¹³ Despite its significant limitations, this decision did serve to challenge a central strategy of heterosexual hegemony. In 1980 “sexual orientation disturbance (homosexuality)” was changed to “homosexual conflict disorder,” and in 1987 was included under “Other Sexual Disorders.”¹⁴ This has allowed for the continuing psychiatrization of some lesbians, gay men, and trans people including the use of aversion and “shock” therapy until relatively recently. Forms of “conversion therapy” continue to be used as forms of terrorism against young queer and trans people.¹⁵

It was only after years of campaigning by the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) that the World Health Organization (WHO)—the United Nations agency responsible for international public health matters—changed its policy defining homosexuality as a sexual deviation and a mental disorder in 1991 by removing it from the International Kodex of Diseases. This definition continued to have some jurisdiction in Canada. Statistics Canada’s *Manual for the Classification of Psychiatric Diagnoses*, which was published until the late 1970s, listed homosexuality as a mental disorder.¹⁶ The Canadian Public Health Association, which distributes WHO information in Canada in its *Mental Disorders Glossary and Guide*, used to list sexual deviation under “neurotic disorders”—including homosexuality, bestiality, pedophilia, transvestism, exhibitionism, and transsexualism.¹⁷ Homosexuality was defined as “exclusive or predominant sexual attraction for persons of the same sex with or without physical relationship.”¹⁸ These designations were offered as instructions for diagnosis. These practices continued to medicalize and psychiatrize some lesbians, gay men, and trans people.¹⁹

There existed a degree of homophile organizing in Canada in the 1960s, as we have seen, but it was of a fragmented character that did not endure. Many of the Canadian groups calling themselves homophile were not formed until after the Stonewall riots and the 1969 law reform, rendering the political composition and history of the Canadian movement different from the American. It may have been that the somewhat weaker development of gay and lesbian networks did not provide the basis for gay liberation and lesbian feminism in Canada until a few years later than in the United States. What I present here is not intended to be anything like a history of the Canadian lesbian, gay, and trans liberation movements in the 1970s and 1980s. I will suggest, however, a number of themes that may help in its recovery.²⁰

The University of Toronto Homophile Association was formed on October 24, 1969, more than two months after the criminal code reform came into effect, and four months after the Stonewall riot. Other groups using the term “homophile” were formed across the country in 1970–74.²¹ The Community Homophile Association of Toronto (CHAT), which grew out of the University of Toronto group, was formed in February 1971 and for a number of years it was the largest and most influential homophile group in the country.

The first Canadian gay liberation group, the Vancouver Gay Liberation Front, was formed in November 1970. In Montréal, francophones formed the Front de Libération Homosexuelle (FLH) in 1971, modelled after the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) and the Gay Liberation Front in an attempt to combine gay liberation and Québécois nationalist consciousness.²² Toronto Gay Action, which grew out of the political-action committee of CHAT, shared a number of characteristics with GLF groups; it coordinated the protest of two hundred lesbians and gay men on August 28, 1971 in Ottawa, which criticized the limitations of the 1969 reform. More than a dozen groups came together for this first ever Canadian protest demanding many reforms that took decades to win, including full human rights for lesbians and gay men, spousal and family benefits, the right to adopt children as lesbian and gay couples, age-of-consent-law reform, the repeal of the offence of “gross indecency,” and the right to be gay or lesbian and serve in the Armed Forces.²³

In the fall of 1971, the first issue of the Canadian gay liberation magazine *The Body Politic* was published by people associated with the Toronto Gay Action network. Most of the GLF-inspired groups became fragmented and disintegrated within a few years, in both English Canada and Québec. With the decomposition of the broader left and social movements coming out of the 1960s, which they were a part of, these groups were left socially isolated.

Gays of Ottawa was founded in September 1971, the Gay Alliance for Equality in Halifax in 1972, the Gay Community Centre of Saskatoon in 1973, and the Community Homophile Association of Newfoundland (CHAN) was formed in St. John’s in 1974.²⁴ These early groups spawned social service, self-help, and political organizations.

Tensions between lesbians and gay men, which were largely caused by sexism on the part of the men, led to the formation of lesbian caucuses in mixed-gendered groups and to independent lesbian groups. In 1972, a number of lesbian members of CHAT—fed up

with the sexism in the group—named themselves the CUNTS and stormed out of the group. Their declaration included:

As lesbians we are oppressed both as cunts and dykes. Until the gays of CHAT see the necessity of struggling against sexism, until the structure of CHAT is revolutionized, then CHAT will reflect the status quo through legalization and acceptance. Our energies will not be wasted on raising the consciousness of members of CHAT who should be raising their own. An independent lesbian group has been started. It is imperative that CHAT confront its own sexism.²⁵

A series of often short-lived lesbian feminist groups were formed across the country including the Lesbian Organization of Ottawa Now (LOON), the Atlantic Provinces Political Lesbians for Equality (APPLE) based in Halifax, and the Lesbian Organization of Toronto (LOOT).²⁶ Many lesbians went on to play a leading role in the feminist movement or were already involved in feminist organizing. In British Columbia, lesbian feminists formed themselves into the Lesbian Caucus of the British Columbia Federation of Women.²⁷

In many smaller centres that had no commercial facilities, lesbians and gays together built support networks and community centres, in some cases establishing self-help services ranging from phone lines to counselling centres. Others moved in the direction of fighting for gay civil and human rights. *The Body Politic* in Toronto, *Gay Tide* in Vancouver, and many newsletters kept gay activists informed and in touch. Many lesbians read the gay media but also relied on feminist publications like *The Other Woman* (Toronto), *Pedestal* (Vancouver) and lesbian publications like *Long Time Coming* (Montréal). Later lesbians would read feminist publications like *Broadside*.²⁸

From the mid-to late 1970s and, in many ways, throughout most of the 1980s, aside from when there were major periods of police repression, the main political current in the Canadian movement (generally stronger among gay men than among lesbians) was what was called the “human-rights strategy,”²⁹ which linked the fight for repeal of anti-gay legislation with the securing of human-rights protection for lesbians and gay men. The central focus of this perspective was the inclusion of sexual-orientation protection in human-rights legislation. This view was developed by such groups as the Gay Alliance Toward Equality (GATE) in Toronto and Vancouver, and Gays of Ottawa. These groups established several Canadian gay and lesbian rights coalitions that eventually broke down in the late 1970s under the pressure of their own internal contradictions, political differences, opposition from many of the men to parity decision making with the women involved,³⁰ and the difficulties of organizing across the vast expanse of the Canadian state. These groups and their strategy helped maintain the public and political visibility that would open-up social spaces and gain broader support for our rights. These campaigns for sexual-orientation protection laid the basis for important legislative and legal victories over the next two decades. Beyond Québec, major successes on the human-rights front would have to wait until the mid to late 1980s and 1990s.

The early wave of gay and lesbian liberation criticized the homosexual and lesbian commercial scene for its closetry, commercialization, and alienation. This critique was valid to a degree, but it also tended to cut gay and lesbian liberationists off from their potential bases of support in the bars and commercial ghettos. Among some lesbian feminists there was a rejection of “apolitical” and “nonfeminist” bar dykes and sometimes lesbians involved in butch/femme relationships.³¹ There tended to be a wholesale dismissal of earlier forms of lesbian and gay life that prevented our movements from learning from past resistance and community formation. Paradoxically, however, perhaps the greatest gain of gay and lesbian liberation was the creation of the social conditions through which more lesbians, gays, and later bisexuals and trans people, could come out and create a more positive and public character for gay commercial ghettos. In smaller centres and rural areas these movements helped foster important support networks, and important rural organizing was carried out by the Saskatchewan Gay Coalition across that province in the late 1970s.

White, middle-class gay men in the cities could now benefit from consumer capitalist culture as gay men. The early GLF-type groups had sometimes disputed the limiting and artificial social categories of “heterosexual” and “homosexual.” Paradoxically again, gay liberation and rights organizing tended to reinforce an exclusive gay identity and consciousness that often coded “gay” as white and middle class, as well. Nevertheless, the early wave of activism sparked many lesbians and gay men into public and political activity. Heterosexual hegemony was challenged in significant ways.

Toward Gay/Lesbian Communities

The 1970s witnessed the opening of more gay commercial facilities, ranging from bars and clubs to baths, from restaurants to bookstores. It was the period when the “ghetto has come out.”³² In Toronto, this visibility was intensified by the peculiarities of the emergence of gay space there and the city’s geographical development. Toronto’s gay commercial ghetto then lied astride the Yonge Street strip and beside one of the city’s most important commercial streets. The history of the gay scene in this area goes back at least to gay patronage of straight-owned bars along Yonge Street in the middle and late 1950s and the opening of the gay owned Music Room in the 1960s.

Openly gay businesses emerged in the 1970s. These included bars, baths, clubs, law practices, and restaurants, and their patrons helped define and consolidate a sense of gay identity and community. In March 1978, the Toronto Lambda Business Council was incorporated as the first Canadian association of gay business owners. Its 1986 directory listed close to ninety member businesses, ranging from bars and baths, to architects, florists, travel agents, real estate agents, and lawyers.³³ The Council includes only those businesses and professionals willing to be identified as gay. It did not represent large corporations in which public gay/lesbian identification was still largely an impediment to career advancement. Its main theme was “Buy Gay.”

Similar developments have taken place in West End Vancouver and in the “Village Gai” in Montréal. Generally, there have been far fewer establishments opened that

cater specifically to lesbians. In part this is because many women do not earn the same salaries/wages as men and therefore have less of a disposable consumer income. It is more difficult for lesbian entrepreneurs to amass the start-up funds for business ventures, and often credit and loans are not as forthcoming from banks for independent women; and more lesbians are caring for children, which cuts into their disposable consumer income. At the same time, some major lesbian businesses have been opened up in the larger centres. In the 1980s and 1990s more mainstream business interests have begun to market their commodities or services to the “gay market.”

There has been what has been referred to as a mass “sexual migration” of gays and lesbians from rural areas to the larger cities,³⁴ where our sexualities are often seen to be more acceptable, where heterosexual family connections are weaker, and more anonymity is assumed. There is also a regional dimension to this process with many lesbians and gay men leaving Newfoundland and the Maritime provinces to move to the larger centres in central Canada, which are often seen to have more to offer to younger lesbians and gay men. This parallels the process of regional economic and social underdevelopment taking place within Canadian state and social formation. At the same time, many lesbians and gay men do make lives for themselves in rural areas and stay in the Atlantic provinces.³⁵

This has led to concentrations of overtly gay men in certain urban neighbourhoods. Along with the commercial ghettos, there have also emerged gay residential “ghettos” in downtown Toronto and West End Vancouver, in close proximity to gay commercial areas. Lesbians are often perceived to be concentrated in different parts of these cities than gay men. Many open lesbians live along Commercial Drive in East Vancouver, although later this area also gets gentrified. It must be remembered, though, that most gays and lesbians do not live in these “ghettos.”

These residential concentrations have come to be considered gay electoral constituencies at all levels, with the most success being achieved at municipal levels.³⁶ In the 1993 federal elections ridings, in the West End of Vancouver, in downtown Toronto, and in the “Village Gai” area of Montréal were seen as having large gay voting blocs. Unfortunately, given class, race and other social divisions, many gays do not vote for progressive candidates and many non-gay voters live in these ridings. Gays who have become a media and often official politically identified “special interest group”³⁷ have created the social basis for openly gay or pro-gay politicians and have begun to exert some influence at the lower levels of state relations.

The unsuccessful Toronto aldermanic campaign of gay candidate George Hislop in 1980 was organized around these assumptions and was covered by the media within this framework.³⁸ This early effort prefigured the later successful efforts of Kyle Rae and later Kristin Wong-Tam in Toronto, Raymond Blain in Montréal, and Glenn Murray in Winnipeg. At the end of 1993, there were openly gay men or lesbians on city councils in Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Kanata, and Montréal. Federally, NDPer Svend Robinson enjoyed significant support from the gay and lesbian communities long before he came out in 1988 as the first gay MP, which was a significant event in official Canadian politics. Robinson had already built up a broad-ranging reputation in

support of social-justice struggles as a left NDPer before he came out. He and his office have been very helpful in a number of lesbian and gay rights and other social-justice struggles. Hostility to lesbian and gay rights from the Reform Party and Liberal backbenchers provoked Réal Ménard of the Bloc Québécois to publicly come out in 1994.³⁹

This concentration of some gays and lesbians in specific urban zones has provided a solid base for resistance, at Stonewall, but also against the light sentence given Dan White, the murderer of San Francisco Mayor George Moscone and gay city supervisor Harvey Milk, and against police raids on baths and bars in Montréal and Toronto as well.⁴⁰ Says John D’Emilio, “the bars proved themselves to be repositories of political consciousness and a place from which gay anger erupts.”⁴¹

The “Gay Market”

The 1970s witnessed the opening of the “gay market” that has developed in the 1980s and 1990s. Straight business interests began to target gay men as a particular market in response to the emergence of openly gay establishments, the increasing visibility of the gay community, and gay entrepreneurs’ and the gay media’s attempts to sell it as a good business prospect. Reads a 1975 *Wall Street Journal* headline: “Campaigns to Sell to Homosexual Market Are Being Launched by More Big Firms.”⁴² These types of headlines can be found repeated in the mainstream media, including the business sections, over the next decades. For instance, in 1992 the *Toronto Globe and Mail* reported that “Gay Marketing Is in the Pink.”⁴³

A major assumption of the gay market is that gay men have a higher-than-average disposable income, however, this premise is unsound and is a construction which gay business and the media have helped create. This image gives the impression that the gay community has a particular class and racial character—and no children or other dependents to support, even though there are gay men raising children and others involved in co-parenting. At the same time, as some are included in this construct of the “gay community” and “gay market,” others are excluded.⁴⁴

Peter G. Frish, when he was publisher of *The Advocate*, claimed “We’re the most influential of any minority.”⁴⁵ This claim was based on a survey of 73,000 readers, which found that the income of the average gay household (of 1.4 persons) was about fifty percent above the US national average.⁴⁶ This study and others like it deserve critical analysis. *The Advocate* is directed largely, but not entirely, at white professional, middle-class gays,⁴⁷ and while its readership is significant, it certainly does not reach all gay men. It is likely that it is the men who most mirror the ideals of publications like *The Advocate* who are most likely to respond to these surveys. Publishers of *The Advocate* themselves advertise that one of their readership’s key features is this high disposable income and consumer lifestyle. In a full-page ad in the *New York Times* in 1981, *The Advocate* claimed, “There’s an enormous amount of money in the gay market and it’s available to smart advertisers in *The Advocate*.”⁴⁸

The Angus-Reid Group conducted a somewhat similar survey for Toronto's *Xtra* magazine in 1993. *Xtra* summed up the survey by declaring that its readers are "educated and affluent, cultured and well travelled."⁴⁹ As Steven Maynard writes in his critique of the construction of the gay market, "Using data generated by such marketing surveys, the media plays a key role in producing the gay market."⁵⁰

The emergence of "gay capitalism" can be traced in Canada. A 1976 article in *Toronto Life* discussed the "rise of gay capitalism,"⁵¹ and quotes Peter Maloney, then a gay businessman: "[gays are] people with a high disposable income, no children to spend it on and the urge to socialize." After using Maloney to set the frame, the article recounts how bars, magazines, and other business ventures have achieved success. "A buck is a buck," it concludes. "Who the hell cares if the wrist holding it is limp?" At the same time the article criticizes gay "militants" like *The Body Politic* crowd.⁵²

This image of the gay market excludes lesbians, who generally do not have the same economic resources as men in this society, as well as lesbian and gay parents, workers, youth, and Black, Indigenous and racialized people, and serves to drive a wedge between groups within gay/lesbian community formation. Treatment by the mass media, and by much of the gay media, of gay men as a white, middle-class consumer market is in part a process of class and racial differentiation within queer communities, which excludes working-class gays and Black, Indigenous and racialized people from positions of power and influence.

Because heterosexual business interests accept gays as a consumer market, however, does not necessarily mean they support our rights, relationships, and sexualities. We are often only accepted because we have money, and because we are consumers who can buy their commodities and services, not because we deserve human rights. While access to consumer goods and services for queers opens up new social spaces for us, and social contradictions we can exacerbate, the "gay market" provides little protection against police repression, nor does it ensure us our rights.⁵³ Capital may invest in the very same markets that the agencies of sexual and moral policing target for containment and regulation. As Steven Maynard asks,

I think we need to ask ourselves if we are satisfied with the displacement of politics from the streets to the marketplace. How does a politics rooted in consumption speak to the many lesbians and gays who are excluded from the world of queer consumption in the first place? Or, how does a politics of the marketplace tackle such institutions as the police or the legal system?⁵⁴

Both straight and gay commercial interests have shaped gay practices and communities. Gay and lesbian business people, however, have generally been more sensitive than straight owners to their clientele and are more likely to be associated with or at least tolerant of the movement. The owners of the Melody Room and the Music Room in Toronto in the 1960s are remarkable examples of people involved both commercially,

socially, and politically. But most openly gay businesses are generally small, and, given their narrow profit margins, usually rather hostile to demands from their workers and unions.⁵⁵ They tend to take up a rather anti-working-class orientation in relation to their employees.

These gay businesses, and much of the gay media, would have us believe that “liberation” consists of adopting a gay sexual orientation, “buying gay,” being “out” in the ghetto, and frequenting gay establishments. In part this defines us by what we buy, as consumers, and the services we access. In a wonderfully subversive way, the *Queer Nation* slogan “We’re here, we’re queer and we’re not going shopping” is a critique of this approach.

Lesbians have a much smaller commercial scene. This discrepancy has continued throughout the 1970s, 1980s, and into the 1990s leading to important inequalities and differences in the social spaces available to lesbians and gay men, as well as for Black, Indigenous and racialized people, and trans people.

The concentration of gays in some urban zones, while it has had the positive aspect of creating possibly gay-friendly neighbourhoods—although often queer-bashings take place in these areas as well—has sometimes also been tied up with white, middle-class processes of “gentrification” and the displacement of poor, working-class, and Black, Indigenous, and racialized people from certain urban areas. This can also produce attitudes among some gay men that wish to preserve their real estate values and the quality of “their” neighbourhoods that can be mobilized against street people and street sex workers and in support of the police.

Gay advertising and many media articles project a consumer-oriented, white, urban middle-class lifestyle. This gay life becomes associated with “leisure time.” Readers enter into a world of images of what gay men are supposed to be like. This imagery generates new class and race stereotypes and norms, but it can also provide men just coming out with valuable information on how to meet other gay men as well as positive reinforcement for their queer practices.

New norms of sexual and social regulation are generated within gay community formation itself. We have to look at the forms of sexuality, which have

emerged as central to its capitalist organization, the “sexually alluring, “liberated” woman who graces *Cosmopolitan*, the swinging self-confident affluent homosexual male who lives in the pages of *The Advocate*. What we are witnessing is the creation of new sexual stereotypes which are potentially as limiting as the old stereotypes (the sexless “lady” of some nineteenth-century textbooks, the degenerate pervert of twentieth-century psychiatrists).⁵⁶

The expansion of ghettos for gay men was built on previous cultural resistance and has been transformed by the gay liberation movement itself, business interests, the media, and the cultural production of gays within the constraints imposed by the hegemonic social order.⁵⁷

Gay and lesbian cultures can be seen as attempts to deal with the contradictions presented to us by heterosexual hegemony and its mediation with other forms of oppression.⁵⁸ Gay networks were transformed in the 1970s, through a process of social organization, into the “gay community”—bars, clubs, baths, restaurants, social networks, and

a set of institutions, including political and social clubs, publications and bookstores, church groups, community centres, radio collectives, theatre groups and so on, that represent a sense of shared values and a willingness to assert one’s homosexuality as an important part of one’s whole life.⁵⁹

This “community” is organized not only by gays and lesbians: it is also relationally organized by the police, the mass media, and class and state organization. The community is not a natural phenomenon but is historically produced through constantly shifting struggles and relationships.

Gay and lesbian cultures and communities are defined by our sexualities. “Sex is a primary means by which we can express ourselves as it confirms our distinct identity.”⁶⁰ Our particularity, our social and “material” difference, is defined in relation to our sexualities—who we have it with, how we do it and all that gets built around this in our lives. Erotic cultures are produced not only by bodies at play in parks, cruising areas, private parties, houses, washrooms, but also in writings, photography, film and video, and in commercial establishments, bars, baths, clubs, bookstores, and gay and lesbian commercial pornographies.⁶¹ These commercial settings, along with the discourses and practices of masculinities and femininities,⁶² racialized constructions of sexualities, and hegemonic sexual and cultural imagery, set limits on gay, lesbian and bisexual eroticisms. In this sense bars, clubs and baths are not only businesses; as cultural and erotic institutions, they are also moulded to varying degrees by their patrons. The bars have been and continue to be a major

[focal] point of the gay and lesbian community. They are the most stable institution in a frequently unstable world. As such they shape the culture of gay life, even as they are shaped and change themselves. They contain within them all the contradictions and weaknesses of gay life. They, nonetheless, are our territory, even with all the control that the outside world exerts. They are the main places where gay people can be gay.⁶³

The sense of gay community has been strengthened by our defence of our social and sexual gathering places. At the same time, these establishments often engage in racist, sexist, anti-trans, anti-disability, and other anti-working-class and poor practices. The gay men’s baths in Toronto in 1981 were clearly viewed as our institutions, and an attack on them was an assault on the entire community. This was the case regardless of whether men went to the baths or not, just as defence of the bars has often involved people who do not frequent them. In the months following the bath raids and large demonstrations,

there was a heightened sense of community. This production of a sense of shared community can also occur through public and visible battles over lesbian and gay rights. The mobilizations prior to and following the defeat of Bill 167 in Ontario in 1994 led to a higher level of organization and stronger sense of lesbian and gay networks across the province including in smaller centres where there had been little lesbian/gay organizing previously.⁶⁴

Class, Race and Community

The gay and, to a lesser extent, lesbian communities that emerged in the 1970s, 1980s, and into the 1990s created the social conditions for a new stratum of largely white doctors, lawyers, academics, church leaders, and business managers to form as the “expert” spokespeople for our communities.

This shifting class organization also reflects the problems gay and lesbian professionals have faced in advancement within the heterosexual-dominated professions, forcing them to organize to define and defend their own interests. This stratum represents itself as the respectable and legitimate representatives of the gay “community” since only they have the “proper” professional or managerial qualifications and credentials to do so. They stand in an administrative relation to community networks, mediating our concerns to state and professional bodies.

This has been most obvious in the fight against AIDS. In the Canadian gay, lesbian, bisexual, and trans communities, people who do not have medical or professional qualifications have sometimes been excluded from or “organized out” of decision making in community-based AIDS groups.⁶⁵ Only broadly based grass-roots community organizations have been able to cut across this formation of an autonomous gay managerial and professional stratum with its own distinct social interests. In the response to the Toronto bath raids in 1981, for instance, the Right to Privacy Committee was able to draw on the valuable skills of professionals, but in such a way that these professionals were held accountable to a broad-based community organization made up of mostly working-class and street gays.⁶⁶ Unfortunately, when resistance died down, the professional/managerial stratum gained hegemony in many organizations.

In the organizing of the Campaign for Equal Families in Toronto in 1994–95 in support of Bill 167 and then to attempt to keep spousal and family-recognition rights on the agenda, it was often difficult for those without official political connections, legal credentials, media experience, or leading positions in existing lesbian/gay organizations to get involved at the centre of decision making. Some who were able to present themselves as involved in families or spousal relations were able to get involved, but those who were not seen as being in the “family way,” or as raising other lesbian/gay struggles—especially those more directly related to sexuality or that stressed the need to address racism, or as being too “radical”—tended to be excluded or marginalized as well.

Within lesbian and gay communities there are major class divisions, and the growth of a distinct white professional managerial strata is an important part of the class rela-

tions that have developed within our communities since the Stonewall riots. The emergence of this professional/managerial stratum has produced a social basis for a certain strategy of “assimilation” with heterosexual social relations through emphasizing that lesbians and gays are almost the same as heterosexuals—emphasizing sameness rather than difference—an association of lesbian and gay progress with the continuation of capitalist social relations, and for limiting lesbian and gay struggles to relatively narrow terrains. It is this layer within our communities who provide the main social basis for the hegemony of assimilationist and “integrationist” perspectives—who want to achieve social “respectability” in a social order still based on oppression and exploitation.

While the queer nationalist activism of the early 1990s attempted to challenge this strategy of assimilation through emphasizing queers as markedly different from heterosexuals and an “in your face” response to homophobia, this activism was never able to fully locate the class and social basis of this assimilationist strategy. It was therefore unable to fully see the connections between queer struggles against heterosexist violence, homophobia, and social invisibility and other fronts of class struggle.

Queer nationalist activism was a rejection of assimilationist and simple civil rights approaches that had previously defined many organizing efforts within gay communities. This also ties into the need for a critique of “community” politics where the “community” often gets defined by this professional/managerial elite. In this sense, this activism was a response to the perspectives of the new professional/managerial elites that have gained hegemony in our communities, and in this context Queer Nation was a more youthful, less incorporated wave of activism. At the same time, its implicit class politics were not clearly developed and at times could be dismissive of working-class concerns and struggles. This implicit class critique needs to be developed much more clearly in relation to the racialized class struggles within lesbian/gay communities, which are inter-linked with racialized class struggles outside our communities. This would help to clarify the radical basis of activism while at the same time clarifying challenges to the hegemony of the assimilationist professional/managerial strata over our communities. But instead of this, in Queer nationalism there has been an ideological linkage of anti-assimilationist politics with a militant anti-homophobic politics that locates the problems as backward homophobic ideas in the heads of straight people and some “self-oppressed” gays as well. This gets in the way of clarifying the class and social character of this activism.⁶⁷

Oppression and Difference within the “Gay and Lesbian Communities”

Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and trans political organizing has often been hegemonized by a kind of “identity politics.” This constructs a unitary identity for gays and lesbians that obscures the many social differences among and between us to privilege our common “sexual orientation.” It prevents us from seeing some of the links between our various experienced oppressions and other forms of oppression and exploitation. The universal identity that has been constructed tends to be coded as white, adult, middle-class, cis, and often “male.”⁶⁸ This assumption of a common lesbian or gay identity—which

emphasizes the unitary character of this identity—has stood in the way of recognizing and dealing with the many differences and lines of oppression within lesbian and gay community formation.

One of the first challenges to a unitary lesbian, gay, and even queer identity came from the growing self-organization of lesbians and gays of colour that began to occur in the mid- to late 1980s, with earlier historical roots. Black, Indigenous, and racialized lesbians and gays got together to support each other, to address their own needs, and began to challenge racism in the lesbian/gay communities and heterosexism in the Black, Asian, Indigenous and other communities. Black lesbians and gay men, and other lesbians and gays of colour, were generally excluded from gay images and experienced racism within the gay and lesbian communities.⁶⁹ Within the Indigenous communities, Two-Spirit peoples began to organize. These groups produced powerful challenges to the coding of gay, lesbian and queer as “white” and began to challenge and transform white hegemony. This redefines and broadens lesbian and gay to include the experiences of Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans people. In turn, some white lesbians and gay men attempting to develop an anti-racist practice have challenged white hegemony and supremacy within lesbian/gay community formation by deconstructing the associations of lesbian and gay with “whiteness.”⁷⁰ While focusing on oppressive sexual regulation and the transformation of heterosexual hegemony, this emerging lesbian/gay liberation perspective is making racism, colonialism, sexism and class relations central to queer concerns.

Lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth, given age laws (sexual age of consent and liquor laws regarding access to bars), are excluded from gay social and cultural institutions such as bars, and face ageism in broader social relations and lesbian/gay communities.⁷¹ Despite the fact that they were being challenged in the courts, existing laws at the time of writing denied young men the right to legally engage in anal sex with another man until they are eighteen—and then, of course, only with one other person in private.⁷²

In response, lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth support groups have been formed across the country.⁷³ Many young lesbians and gay men face homophobia and heterosexism in the schools, are forced out of their homes by hostile parents, and must confront heterosexist social agencies and the police. As George Smith points out, the ideology of the “fag” is used in the schools to cut some young men out of regular social interaction and to mandate abuse and even violence against them.⁷⁴ I remember in my high school days when I was a socialist activist that simply refusing to laugh at anti-queer jokes was enough to get “commie, pinko, fag” scrawled across my locker and yelled at me in the halls.

Some adolescent boys and men engage in hustling and engage in sex work to survive, and some young women (both cis and trans) are forced onto the streets when expelled by their families. They often receive hostile treatment from the criminal “justice” system as well as social-service and welfare agencies that are supposed to assist them.⁷⁵ The provisions of the youth-pornography law, which will be mentioned in more detail in the next chapter, have been used to criminalize the lives of some young gay men and hustlers in southern Ontario.⁷⁶

Gay ghettoization can lead to the acceptance of social regulations defining a certain “private,” “adult” homosexual space, which cuts us off from the waged work world as well as the nurturing of young people. The removal of the gay men’s scene from child-rearing, often the school system (aside from gay and lesbian teachers), and youth, places gay fathers, gay childcare workers, and gay youth themselves in precarious positions.

Lesbians and gay men find themselves excluded from, on the fringes of, and within family relations.⁷⁷ The specific experiences of gay fathers and lesbian mothers, and their child custody struggles is sometimes neglected in the gay scene, frequently causing gay fathers to feel rather alienated from the ghetto and “community.”⁷⁸ The lesbian and feminist communities have been much more supportive and understanding toward lesbian mothers and lesbians who want to become mothers and of the need to secure adoption rights so that the non-biological lesbian parent also has custody over the lesbian couple’s child.⁷⁹

Lesbians and gays living with disabilities face problems of access to social institutions not only in society at large but also within the lesbian/gay communities.⁸⁰ Particular problems are produced for those living with HIV/AIDS, many of whom are living with disabilities, despite the social supports that exist from community-based AIDS groups.⁸¹

The development of the gay ghetto has favoured gay men over lesbians, and some gay men over others. It has favoured the white and the middle class over the old, the young, the non-white, the disabled, and the working class and the poor. It also encompasses divisions over HIV status and sexual and gender identifications.

The production of queer cultures through the simple assertion of gay or lesbian identities tends to separate this community formation from that of other oppressed groups, and indeed from the many within queer communities who live multiple, shifting, and intersecting forms of oppression.

Cultural Productions: Resistance and Accommodations

Gregg Blachford’s perspective understands the contradictory features of gay men’s cultural production that reproduces, resists, and is limited in its opposition to hegemonic heterosexual cultures.⁸² He examines areas of gay cultural production, such as slang, to discern moments of opposition and concession. “The homosexual subculture has its own slang which reflects the manner in which homosexuals perceive and structure the world in which they live.” Gay men’s language, he says, reflects both “traditional” patriarchal attitudes toward women and a particular stigmatization of effeminate homosexuals, as well as a ridiculing of masculinity, femininity, and heterosexuality. These contradictory moments affirm the place of gay men in the dominant patriarchal order, yet they are also potentially subversive of the institutionalization of hegemonic masculinity. It is this second moment that we need to expand and intensify.

Blachford also examines gay-male cruising and sexual codes. He demonstrates that these contain moments of “sexual objectification” and sexual “promiscuity”—characteristics that have only been acceptable in men in this society; but they also contain

elements for the subversion of “legitimate” sexual norms, a vision of sex as recreation and play.

There is then the possibility of re-reading the practice of casual sex as an example of creative transformation of and opposition to the dominant culture’s view of what constitutes legitimate behaviour.

Blachford describes how the “expressive artifacts and concrete objects” of gay-male cultures in the 1970s, with their shift to a more “masculine” image, borrowed and transformed images from heterosexual masculinities, thus challenging the association of “effeminacy” with homosexuality. Blachford describes this phenomenon:

First of all, the clothes are worn differently in the gay subculture from the way they are worn by “real men.” They are much tighter fitting, especially tailored to be as erotic and sensual as possible. Parts of the body will be purposely left exposed in an attempt to attract others.... These subtle changes and transformations of objects infuse the style with a new meaning of eroticism and overt sexuality—that is, they are used explicitly to make one appear sexy and attractive to other men. This can be seen as distinct from any celebration of masculinity as such. Instead, it may be an attempt to show that masculine or “ordinary” men can be homosexual too.... It forces the wider culture to question its stereotypes and question the legitimacy of linking femininity and homosexuality.

Blachford claims that this cultural production built on earlier gay cultures, but that the “masculinization” of the culture has shifted the context in which such cultural forms as “camp” operate.

Some connections can be made here with the rather different cultural production among lesbians of butch/femme cultures mentioned previously. However, given the different social locations of lesbians as women, their transformation—shifting and playing around with social constructs of masculinities and femininities to create distinct erotic lesbian cultures—does not participate in possibly reinforcing hegemonic forms of masculinity.⁸³ At the same time, these constructs, no matter how transformed, can still limit the erotic and gender possibilities of sex and relationships between women.

Homosexual oppositional styles, Blachford argues, embody cultural assertion and resistance, but are not in themselves a means for ending oppression. Language may mock dominant values and provide a sense of solidarity for gays, but it will not in itself transform the relations that organize our oppression. Only political organizing will do so, although it can be enriched by, and build on, cultural forms of resistance.

Oppositional cultures exist within a context defined by a hegemonic heterosexual culture that channels subordinate cultural production so that it accommodates the dominant culture. Gay cultural production like fashion trends, for example, can come to be dissociated from gay slang, social life, and sex, and is made available for commercialization on a broader scale. This process neutralizes and makes invisible their

previous gay association.⁸⁴ It is possible for some heterosexual-identified men to take up, wear, and perform some of these cultural artifacts and to still hate queers.⁸⁵

In the 1990s, some similar developments took place in relationship to lesbians. Lesbians began to appear more in the mainstream media and popular culture and not always in extremely negative ways. There was the emergence of what some have referred to as “lesbian chic,” which focused on the styles of usually white, middle-class, and classically femininely “attractive” lesbians. Without addressing the actual lives and oppression experienced by lesbians, this coverage and marketing has focused on some of the styles but not the substance of lesbian experience.⁸⁶

While acceptance of aspects of queer-originating cultural forms demonstrates a certain liberal tolerance, this is a very contradictory process. Forms of and moments of transformation can be blunted, and moments of conciliation toward a consumer-oriented patriarchal, racist, capitalism strengthened. Gay and lesbian communities, through our own cultural productions, cannot alleviate the conditions that have led to our oppression. Other forms of dominant cultural production, such as sexism, racism, ageism, and class relations, also enter into shaping the organization of gay and lesbian ghettos and communities.

Sexualities and Genders—Or the Strange Case of the Disappearance of Gender from Gay Men’s Politics

One of the most significant features of contemporary gay men’s imagery is the attempt to separate homosexuality from gender inversion. As we have seen, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries sex-scientific discourse associated homosexuality with effeminacy and gender inversion. However, this association was not only constructed “from above,” the cultural production and resistance of “fairies,” “queers,” and “cross-dressers” also produced aspects of this association “from below.”⁸⁷ In turn lesbianism was associated with “masculine” women. These definitions have served to shape the emergence of gay and lesbian cultures.

The separation of transvestism and transsexualism from homosexuality in the 1950s and 1960s started to remove some of the symptoms of gender inversion from homosexual definitions. The concept of “sexual orientation” now emerged, as distinct from gender inversion. This created part of the basis for a masculine gay image to come to be the hegemonic one in the gay-male ghetto in the late 1970s and 1980s. Cultural production within the gay ghetto has moved in the same direction as the dominant currents of sexological and sociological discourse. Social regulation of sexual deviance no longer focuses on gays as gender nonconformists, even though this remains one of the popular discourses able to be remobilized against lesbians and gay men.

For gay men, this is also related to the new commercialization of “masculine” men’s bodies in advertising and within consumer capitalism. Men’s bodies are now also being used to sell commodities and social images at the same time. Of course, these displays of men’s bodies are most often coded with social power as opposed to women’s

displayed bodies that are not. At the same time, this opening up of new consumer markets for men does open up possibilities for homoerotic viewings of this imagery,⁸⁸ while creating cross-over markets that include both straight and gay men.

In this new context, images of “effeminate” homosexuals, “screaming queens,” and trans women were—and in many ways continue to be—marginalized except as entertainment. While there has recently been more acceptance for “cross-dressing” within sectors of the gay men’s community this does not always carry over into less exclusionary practices for those who live their lives as trans people. The new “masculinized” and most often white gay image has been universalized through social practices as *the* gay identity, and this has hampered the expression of diversity within queer populations. This has produced forms of exclusion and oppression for transsexuals, transvestites, and transgender people within gay and lesbian community formation. Despite a certain focus on drag and gender performances in “queer theory,”⁸⁹ this often looks “at transgender individuals from a perspective containing very little understanding of the everyday lives and realities of trans people.”⁹⁰

The new macho look is merely a new form of “drag,” revealing no more “natural” a gay lifestyle or “essence” than its predecessors. Some gay activists and theorists suggest that this process of cultural production has finally separated the social organization of sexuality from that of gender. Homosexuals have, in this view, through a process of evolution, been freed from the oppression of the past to live a more “natural” gay lifestyle. This shift is unfortunately paralleled in much “queer theory” that argued for a separation of the analysis of sexuality from gender that are viewed as autonomous discourses. This leads to a focus on sexuality abstracted away from gender relations (and often from race as well) separating the intersections of gender and sexuality that we continue to experience in our lives. At times, this suggests that analysis focusing on gender is not relevant for sexual analysis, or for analysis of homophobia. Gender is then no longer seen as crucial for gay men or even for lesbians in some queer theory.⁹¹ It is almost as if gender disappears as a crucial question for gay men in much gay theorizing and analysis by the late 1980s.⁹²

What has actually occurred, however, is that homosexuality as gender inversion has been transformed through a social process that has included the participation of some gay men into a new definition using the concept of sexual orientation, which can include “normal” masculine gender identifications. This new categorization allows for greater visibility for gay men no longer automatically associated with deviant gender categories. But instead of freeing homosexuality from gender, the process has merely transformed one gender association for another. The current reconstruction and reorganization of gender relations does not mean the end of gender but that gender relations take on new forms. “Macho” homosexuality is still part of the spectrum of contemporary gender organization. Says John Marshall:

The emergence of “macho men” within the contemporary gay world illustrates in an ironic way the extent to which definitions of male homosexuality continue to be pervaded by the tyranny of gender divisions.⁹³

Within some currents of lesbian feminism there has been a parallel “naturalization” of lesbianism as *the* female sexuality and a rejection of gender-inversion practices and associations. Lesbianism is seen as the most “natural” sexuality for women based on the early mother/daughter relationship.⁹⁴ This theory represents a de-sexualization of lesbianism from genital sex to simply women loving women, along with a rejection of earlier butch/femme lesbian cultures, and often of trans people.⁹⁵ This view obscures—if not denies—the important resistance of those women who asserted their own erotic lesbian identities and seized lesbian space by wearing men’s dress and affecting “masculine” lesbian practices, and of those women who adopted “femme” identifications in relation to these “butch” women establishing visible lesbian cultures.⁹⁶ This new “universal” lesbian identity does not deal with sexual- and gender-identification diversity among lesbians, nor with class and race differences.⁹⁷ At the same time, within queer nationalist activism and queer theory that suggests it can overcome at least some of these problems, many lesbians find that they are once again subsumed under men’s experiences that also tend to hegemonize queer definitions. Queer also gets coded as white, “male,” and masculine.⁹⁸

There is a tendency within patriarchal capitalism for sexuality to become more autonomous from the social organization of gender relations, particularly for men. The impact of this has been markedly different for women and men, given our different relationships to reproductive and nurturing labour, and the gender division of labour more generally.

Separation of gender and sexuality cannot be complete, however, without overcoming sexism and heterosexism and totally transforming sex/gender relations. Forms of class and state organization, even if they depend less on the heterosexual family form than in the past, still rely on a social organization of gender that keeps women, gays and trans people subordinate, in the sexual realm as well as others.

A Parade of Sexualities!

A feature of gay/lesbian/trans cultural formation in the larger urban centres is the development of diverse business establishments—various bars and baths for people from different racialized class backgrounds and with diverse erotic and gendered preferences. These establishments are often organized around particular sexual practices that can be traced back to the 1940s or earlier.

Various sub-categories of homosexuality and sexuality have resulted from the work of sexologists (the differentiation of pedophilia, transvestism, and transsexuality) and the diverse erotic cultures produced by those engaging in same-gender sex. There have consequently emerged new terrains of definition and resistance. Declares Gayle Rubin:

Recently, a veritable parade out of Krafft-Ebing has begun to lay claim to legitimacy, rights and recognitions. There are now political organizations for prostitutes, pedophiles and sadomasochists.⁹⁹

Individual and social identities are now not only being created around sexual “orientation,” but also around diverse sexual practices. For instance, with gay and lesbian “somasochism” (now most often referred to as Bondage/Discipline, Dominance/Submission, Sadism/Masochism or BDSM), we are not seeing what was defined by Krafft-Ebing and the sexologists; we are seeing instead, as Foucault suggests, the production of new forms of sexuality, new ways of getting pleasure from the body that focus on the eroticization of consensual interpersonal power relations.¹⁰⁰ We are not seeing the liberation of some “natural” BDSM desire, as some of its practitioners would suggest, but the making of a new eroticism expressed through existing sexological categories. While needing to clearly defend consensual BDSM practices from state and right-wing attack, we have to recognize how BDSM practices play around with, subvert, and mimic hegemonic forms of social power. But as erotic practices alone, they can never in themselves fully transcend or subvert these power relations.¹⁰¹

Most significantly, perhaps, this affirmation of BDSM gay or lesbian identities and practices, and other erotically defined differences—along with assertions of lesbian and gay, trans, Black, people of colour, working-class, and other experiences—challenges unitary notions of homosexuality or lesbianism.

The very extension and broadening of the available sexual categories as a result of the women’s and gay movements points to their disintegration as unitary categories...there are homosexualities, and the vast expansion of the gay subcultures in recent years has led to a proliferation of styles, specializations, and a burgeoning of new identities.¹⁰²

Some people begin to identify more with a sexual practice (say, BDSM) than with homosexuality. This represents a breakdown of older forms of sexual definition and regulation, along with a continuing incitement of sexuality as the truth of our beings with more and more complex differentiations.¹⁰³

The emergence of gay communities has developed the new social and erotic needs of communities of queer men existing at least partially outside institutionalized heterosexuality. Lesbian communities, and the lesbian components of the feminist movement, have asserted the needs and desires of many women living outside institutionalized heterosexuality as well. I focus on gay men here, drawing in part on my own experiences.

These new social needs have challenged heterosexuality, masculinities, and oppressive sexual regulation. Yet the gay community both resists and accommodates oppression, including racism and sexism. Gay men can be led to fetishize our sexual identities, assuming the existence of some ahistorical and “natural” gay minority and forgetting the social and historical processes through which our sexualities, genders, and cultures have been made. This leads to a deflection of the profound challenge we can pose to heterosexual hegemony.

This is the context in which current debates over lesbian and gay history and politics are taking place. Some see the social-constructionist thesis, which has been argued for here, as questioning the “naturalness” of gay historical identity and ancestry.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, some do use the work of Foucault and other social constructionists to argue

for the deconstruction of homosexuality, or gay, or lesbian in the immediate present rather than for its transformation as part of a broader social and historical process. In so doing, they confuse social categories and people's experiences. While a category can be deconstructed in discourse, our experiences can only be transformed through practical social and political activity. These people would have us abandon the only actual basis from which to struggle against heterosexual hegemony.

These critical historical perspectives provide us with a sense of our histories and an ability to see the social forces regulating our sexualities. Rather than deconstructing homosexuality, we must recognize the historical and very real social character of lesbian and gay cultures, their potential to transform sexualities, genders, and sexual rule, and what this suggests about the social construction of hegemonic heterosexuality as well. While the most far-reaching currents to emerge out of queer social constructionist work involved questioning the social construction of heterosexuality there seems to have been a short circuiting of these radical tendencies and a collapse of social constructionism into a more narrowly defined focus on gays and lesbians. This led to the emergence of a series of intermediate positions between essentialism and social constructionism¹⁰⁵ and claims by some queer theorists that this debate had now been superseded.¹⁰⁶ While queer theory in some of its best contributions points to the need to contest and destabilize the hetero/homo duality, this is largely done in cultural terms and needs to be extended in more social, historical, and materialist directions.

Of Minorities, Communities, and Ethnic Groups

In transforming homosexuality into a gay identity, we may not be merely resisting oppressive classifications, we may also be locking ourselves into another minority group. This could limit our critique of sex and gender relations and paralyze our struggles over sexual definition and regulation by implicitly assuming the "naturalness" of heterosexuality for the majority. Corresponding to this, a "natural" lesbian or gay community is postulated. According to Dennis Altman, the "ethnic homosexual" has emerged with

the widespread recognition of a distinct cultural category which appears to be pressing for the same sort of "equality" in Western society as do ethnic minorities.¹⁰⁷

The notion of an ethnic or quasi-ethnic community has been taken up by some gays and lesbians for various reasons, chief among which is that it already exists as a model of how communities are formed and their legitimacy established. It therefore provides a basis for gays to appeal for social rights to state agencies and professional groups by claiming we are like these other "legitimate" groups. This is how we can claim to be "respectable."

Some gay sociologists have tried to legitimize homosexuality by stretching existing sociological categories of "minority" group and community to cover our experiences. Some used "institutional completeness" in the 1970s to describe gay community formation in large cities. They contrast this "completeness" with Leznoff and Westley's

account of Montréal homosexual networks in the early 1950s, which were described as having little formal organization and therefore were not “institutionally complete.”¹⁰⁸ These gay sociologists imply that these earlier forms were underdeveloped. The same has been written about same-gender erotic cultures in “Third World” countries and Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans people.

“Institutional completeness” was a term originally applied to the adaptation of ethnic immigrants to urban life.¹⁰⁹ Stephen O. Murray compares the emergence of the Toronto gay community in the 1970s to that of the city’s ethnic communities; according to his criteria, “only in terms of familistic orientation is there a difference between the urban gay community and urban ethnic communities.”¹¹⁰ This is, of course, a significant difference. Murray concludes, however, that “the Toronto gay community fits the criteria of community as an entity at least as well as Toronto ethnic communities.”¹¹¹ Such accounts not only misunderstand the social process of gay and lesbian community organization, but also the social relations through which ethnicity is itself organized, which include state immigration, employment, labour, and multicultural policies.¹¹²

The gay and lesbian communities must be seen differently. Here I use the word “community” in the everyday sense of people in society. The notion of community is internally defined by the resistance of gays and lesbians to oppression, and externally defined by the police, the mass media, and state policies. Community is, then, a social relationship between gay and lesbian resistance and heterosexual hegemony—not something that can be abstracted from this relation. It cannot be seen as a natural “thing” existing on its own outside this social and historical context.

This category of community is yet another instance of the opposition/accommodation combination that is the basis of our interaction with state agencies, as a basis for articulating ourselves with state relations, and for struggling for our civil and human rights as a legitimate group.¹¹³ The notion of the gay community as a legitimate minority is clearly opposed by the forces of moral conservatism, conservative politicians, and until very recently by the police.¹¹⁴ In response we must argue for our legitimacy, but we must also beware of getting trapped by “legitimacy” and “respectability.”

Gays and lesbians are not an ethnic group and are not regulated as such by state agencies, nor are we born into a minority group. We are regulated by a system of sexual and gender relations, not by a system of ethnic regulations and relations. At the same time, for many, their lives are additionally defined by racial and ethnic regulations and this cannot be isolated from their experiences as queers. White gay men and lesbians often occupy positions of socially constructed “privilege” within these relations of racial and ethnic regulation, although this varies in the Canadian context in relation to language and different socially constructed ethnicities.

Lesbians and gays often come to assume their sexual consciousness through a different social and psychological process that requires that they “come out” in order to join gay or lesbian communities. The contradiction between heterosexuality as a “universally” proclaimed sexuality and homosexuality as a “particular” subordinated sexuality cannot be understood by simply equating gay struggles with that of ethnic minorities. At the same time, we must beware of tendencies that attempt to define what

is “universally” queer, thereby ignoring the connections that directly link queers with other bases of oppression; many lesbians and gays are also oppressed on the basis of anti-Black and other forms of racism, anti-Semitism and ethnicity, and their experiences and oppression must be a defining aspect of lesbian and gay liberation.

The minority-community perspective obscures class, gender, and race differences.¹¹⁵ This ignores the very real social differences lived by queers and favours “sexual orientation” over other dimensions of our experience,¹¹⁶ which helps to create the basis for a professional, managerial, white, middle-class gay stratum to speak for our community.

But it is not enough to simply recognize and celebrate differences, although this is far more desirable than denying them outright. As Himani Bannerji suggests, we need to problematize the very concept of “difference” and ask from whose standpoint it is defined.¹¹⁷ This emphasis on “difference” can end up leaving white hegemony undisturbed since it is never defined as “different.” People can be allowed their differences, but white, middle-class hegemony stays in place. This perspective can fail to move beyond a type of liberal pluralism that tolerates differences. Instead, we must also address the underlying social relations of inequality and oppression within our communities. We must recognize and celebrate our differences but also act to challenge racism, sexism, and class relations in our communities and in social relations more generally.

The minority-group perspective, which does not address how people make their way into this community, also tends to neglect the needs of those “coming out,” particularly young people, and generally ignores sexuality. Focusing only on those who are already involved in the ghetto and the community ignores those people who engage in same-gender sex occasionally, and those who have not yet come out. It reinforces the absolute distinction between heterosexuality and homosexuality, denying the flux and fluidity of desires, and does not allow for bisexual concerns and politics. One of the political problems encountered in organizing defence for men accused of homosexual sex in washrooms and parks is that they do not always consider themselves gay and are not necessarily part of the narrowly defined gay community.¹¹⁸ Sexuality must therefore be taken up in a broader context, going beyond self-defined gays to include people who engage in occasional same-gender sex.

Particularly disturbing in this context is the recent trend toward legitimizing this “natural” minority view through biological and sociobiological knowledge. A 1981 Kinsey Institute study opted for a biological explanation for homosexuality because they could find no adequate social explanation, and this perspective has set the framework for a number of other studies.¹¹⁹ Some gay men who are research scientists have also begun to argue this position as have some gay rights activists.¹²⁰ Support for this position is usually stronger among gay men than among lesbians. It is understandable, in the face of right-wing accusations of “conversion” and “seduction,” that some gay/lesbian activists take up naturalistic and biological determinist arguments. Such a position, however, will lock us into a framework, just as it did the early German homosexual-rights movement, that does not challenge heterosexual hegemony.

The new gay-minority approach directs us away from challenging the dominant forms of social life. By accepting the boundaries of an adult-defined community, we are

accepting a strategy of regulation that would let us have a commercial ghetto but would keep us firmly out of areas that involve young people, schooling, and family policies. Attempts to raise the need to address the specific concerns of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans youth in the schools have and continue to be a major focus for moral-conservative and right-wing opposition to lesbian and gay rights.¹²¹

Lesbians and gay men are not only members of minority communities: “It is not so much an oppressed minority that the gay movement is about as an oppressed sexuality.”¹²² In order to understand the dialectic between gay movements and communities, a number of distinctions must be made. The gay ghetto can be seen as commercial and residential concentrations of gays and lesbians. The community, on the other hand, can be seen as comprising those people who have a sense of belonging to such a community—patrons of bars and baths, ghetto residents, those involved in self-help organizations and social networks. This consciousness is the product of the conflict between gay and lesbian resistance and heterosexual hegemony. Our liberation movements are the social and political groups that defend these ghettos and communities, but that also go beyond this to fight for an end to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans oppression.¹²³ It is these movements that need to be nurtured and expanded.

Responsibility/Irresponsibility Distinctions

This minority-community position directs attention away from our sexual practices and lives—precisely the main concerns of the right wing and the police. Gays and lesbians are treated as being not very different from the mainstream except for the genders of their sexual partners. This allows for distinguishing between “good” and “responsible” gays who strive for respectability and “bad” and “irresponsible” gays who are sexually and socially deviant. Vis-à-vis the AIDS crisis, the mass media have attempted to divide us into those who live “respectable” and “responsible” monogamous lifestyles, and those who engage in “irresponsible” and “anonymous, public and/or promiscuous sex.” These terms are themselves defined by state and professional groups. During the AIDS crisis, “perverse” has come to mean “public” or “promiscuous” gay sex rather than homosexuality in general. Gay sexual practices have been “re-medicalized,” and homosexual sex is again associated with sickness. All this has caused divisions within the gay communities and has allowed state agencies to intervene in our social and community life under cover of “public health” measures.¹²⁴ Chapter 10 will look in more detail at the work of the mainstream media and social agencies in the social organizing of a “backlash” against gays.

In the context of AIDS, the spread of HIV, as in the infamous 1988 “AIDS Fiend Strikes Again” headline from Halifax’s *The Chronicle Herald*,¹²⁵ has been blamed on “deviant” and “irresponsible” people living with AIDS/HIV (PLWA/HIVs) often visualized as gay or bisexual men. Conveniently, this framing does not address everyone’s responsibilities for engaging in safer sex and safe practices in the context of AIDS or the responsibility of governments to provide explicit and culturally specific AIDS education to all people and

communities.¹²⁶ At the same time, “responsible” PLWA/HIVs are portrayed as those who follow medical and other forms of professional advice and regulation despite the many problems with these medical and professional guidelines and relations.¹²⁷

The evolution of lesbian and gay rights struggles in the context of the spaces opened up by the Charter has produced a new context for the deployment of responsibility/irresponsibility distinctions in relation to lesbians and gay men. Following the winning of basic human-rights protection in a number of province’s human-rights legislation, struggles began to shift from basic human-rights protection to legal struggles for spousal benefits often backed by the union movement as it was quickly realized that sexual orientation protection on its own would not lead to changes in the statutes that were standing in the way of such benefits. One of the first struggles was that of Karen Andrews, who was at the time a library worker and member of the Canadian Union of Public Employees. The Union supported her fight for family medicare coverage for her lesbian partner and the child the couple was raising, although this legal battle was lost in 1988. Subsequently, the Ontario government abolished health-insurance premiums and moved to individual coverage.¹²⁸

Brian Mossop went to court when he was denied bereavement leave for the father of his partner because his partner was a man. While he won before the human rights tribunal in 1989—where it was recognized that families had changed in character to include homosexual relationships—he lost at the Federal Court of Appeal in 1990, and at the Supreme Court of Canada in 1993.¹²⁹ In the previously mentioned Egan case for same-gender pension benefits under the Old Age Security Act, the Federal Court of Appeal in 1993 decided against a spousal pension for Egan’s partner Jack Nesbitt on the grounds he was not a “spouse.”¹³⁰ In 1995, in a Supreme Court decision that finally recognized that Section 15 of the Charter must be read as including sexual-orientation protection, Nesbitt’s right to a pension was nonetheless rejected. Other important spousal legal battles have been fought and some have been quite successful.¹³¹

The legal struggles involving the equality-rights section of the Charter have largely been defined by the lesbian or gay individuals involved and their lawyers. For a period, they were the ones who developed the lesbian and gay perspectives on these issues.¹³² During the late 1980s, there were no major discussions in gay and lesbian organizations on which perspectives should be adopted in the fight for spousal benefits and for the recognition of queer families. No consensus was reached and a number of quite different approaches were put forward among gay, lesbian, bisexual, and feminist activists, and lawyers and legal theorists.

In 1989, the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario (CLGRO) held a conference to try to develop a common position on the struggle for spousal benefits and relationship recognition, and later established a working group of lawyers to determine the necessary changes in the provincial legislation.¹³³ CLGRO began to call for the provincial government to change provincial legislation that defined the “family” and “spouse” as exclusively heterosexual in character. While reinforcing many aspects of the minority-community perspective this new approach began to break away from

certain aspects of this conceptualization by raising questions regarding lesbian and gay familial relations and lesbian/gay parenting. This further encouraged the rather abstract character of human-rights protection to address the particularities of our actual relationships and lives.

Bill 167: Spousal and Family Normalization Struggles

In this section, I briefly examine the 1994 Ontario struggle over spousal rights and family recognition for lesbian and gay couples and our children. Bill 167, drawn up by the provincial New Democratic Party government of Ontario after years of lobbying, pressure, and activism from lesbian and gay groups—especially CLGRO—would have changed fifty-six pieces of provincial legislation, granting lesbian and gay spousal and family relationships formal equality with common-law heterosexual relationships.¹³⁴ Every Tory voted against it; as did all but three Liberals and twelve NDPers, ensuring its defeat. Its defeat was an important setback for lesbian and gay organizing and for struggles for family recognition rights in particular. Similar legislative initiatives in other provinces and by the federal government will most likely be put on the back burner and will require heightened activism and coalition building to again be placed on the legislative agenda.

While the NDP government was forced to address this question because of pressure from CLGRO, lesbian and gay activists in the NDP, and other party members including union activists, its political strategy could only result in defeat. By deciding on a “free-vote” on this legislation, the government was clearly not committed to ensuring its passage, which means that caucus members were not bound by the party position on this question. The NDP government did not hold a free vote on its very controversial social-contract legislation, and in the case of Bill 167 the free vote was justified by suggesting that this legislation was a “moral issue” that raised “troubling questions” for some people. Rather than defining this as an important human-rights question, the NDP leading bloc instead ceded this terrain of argument to those opposed to the bill.

The NDP government appeared to push this legislation forward for a number of reasons which failed to ensure its passage. First, they wished to embarrass the Liberals who in their vast majority came to oppose this legislation and appeal to the Liberal Party constituency that often supports human rights. Second, they wished to shore up some of their support in the public-sector unions who took on the fight for lesbian and gay spousal benefits as their own struggle. Support for the NDP government had been plummeting in these unions given the social-contract legislation that denied union rights and has led to layoffs and cutbacks in social services. Finally, they would strengthen their support among the lesbian and gay communities. They also knew that big business was not opposed to this kind of legislation and may have been prepared to go up against the moral-conservative right wing on this question. As Lynn Andrews and Sandra Whitworth expressed it:

The hatred of lesbians and gay men is so prevalent and acceptable that it seemed “natural” for the New Democratic Party to put the “troubling” issue of same-sex spousal

benefits to a free vote. Likewise, as opposition mounted, the bill was watered down, with a promise to exclude adoption rights and spousal status, considered the most controversial features of the legislation. In other words, the NDP reaffirmed the hatred of gay men and lesbians even as they sought to alleviate it, and thus the defeat of the legislation was ensured.¹³⁵

Moral-conservative forces across the province mobilized in opposition to Bill 167, which they portrayed as a threat to the family and to children. Roman Catholic priests across the province read letters to their congregations calling on church members to write letters opposing the legislation.

Given this situation, only an active organization of lesbians, gay men, union supporters, feminists, and others, and the building of a broad-ranging coalition in support of Bill 167 could have brought about a victory. This required mobilizing the maximum amount of pressure as quickly as possible through letter writing/faxing, but also through organizing people in the streets and promoting popular grass-roots education—which were the areas in which the right wing and even Liberal opposition made the most headway. The right wing's arguments needed to be confronted and undermined explicitly and publicly. Unfortunately, not enough of this was done.¹³⁶ And it was precisely the rights of adoption by the non-biological partner in relationships where the child was already being raised that were abandoned by the NDP at the last minute. It should be pointed out that support for adoption rights was much stronger among lesbians who supported Bill 167 than among many of the gay men whose main concerns focused on spousal benefits.

Despite unprecedented organization across the province, including many areas where there had never been any lesbian/gay organizing before, there were no major public displays of support for Bill 167 until after the defeat in the legislature when eight thousand gathered in angry protest outside Queen's Park and hundreds gathered in protests across the province. The potential for activity was no doubt there at an earlier point since a demonstration organized by left, feminist, and union groups to support Bill 167 and to oppose the free vote attracted two thousand people on the Friday before the bill was defeated. But the Campaign for Equal Families did not stand behind this action; some leaders of the campaign seemed to have drawn the wrong lesson from the Bill 7 sexual-orientation campaign in 1986. Mobilizations were discouraged while the bill was being debated in the legislature, but it was still passed. However, the balance of power was dramatically different in 1994, when only such mobilizations could have secured a victory.

Following the defeat, organizing across the province by the Campaign for Equal Families and the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario, involving people from close to thirty different cities and towns, continued for a number of months. Unfortunately, by 1995 activities had died down except for a series of public actions in Toronto in May and June of 1995. Following the legislative defeat, organizing on the legal front went forward. A series of Toronto lesbian families pushed for the legal rights of non-biological mothers, and a number of second-parent adoption cases proceeded

through the courts. As a result, that May, Justice James Paul Nevins of the Ontario Provincial Court (Family Division), in a significant legal victory, decided the lesbian partners of four women could adopt their partner's biological children. The adoption orders were final, but Nevins's decision that the provincial Child and Family Services Act is unconstitutional because it restricts "spouse" to someone of the "opposite sex," would be challenged.¹³⁷ Meanwhile, the BC government changed the provincial Adoption Act in 1995 to allow lesbians and gay men to adopt children.¹³⁸

Bill 167 was a significant challenge to heterosexual hegemony, especially to the social institutionalization of the family and spouse as exclusively heterosexual in state and social policy. Some important legal victories have been won through the courts on this front in the context of Canada's Charter of Rights. But there are also very real and potential dangers in struggles for spousal and family recognition and in how they can become institutionalized. This is one of the reasons why a series of debates and controversies have been generated within the lesbian/gay and feminist movements over struggles for spousal and family status.

"Family" and "spousal" get used in these struggles and legal cases not only in the transformative sense of challenging heterosexual hegemony but also as part of "responsibilizing" and "normalizing" strategies. In part this is bound up with the conceptualization that spousal and family recognition brings with it *responsibilities* as well as rights.¹³⁹ This perspective also accepts the individualization of benefits in family/spousal contexts rather than providing social supports in non-familial or non-spousal forms, including social support for children. This is a practice of "normalization" since these spousal, family regulations are part of a web of historically established relations between families, places of employment, state regulations, and insurance corporations. It also develops an investment in ensuring that these familial/spousal defined benefits and conceptualizations continue. This strategy would incorporate some "queers" into familial/spousal relations as sites for regulation. These lesbians and gay men would no longer be constructed as "deviant," but instead would be defined as a variant of the norm. As a result, a new albeit limited social legitimacy would be granted to some lesbians and gay men.

This can be seen as an attempt to extend the Wolfenden approach of the establishment of the self-regulating adult homosexual in the "private" realm.¹⁴⁰ The realm of self-regulation would now be extended through this strategy to include certain spousal and familial associations and benefits in relation to employment and state agencies. It would "empower" lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals but only within these responsibilizing and normalizing relations.

The Wolfenden perspective also called for an intensification of criminalization practices against homosexual activities in the "public" realm and against those involving people under the age of twenty-one as we saw in Chapter 8. In this newer variant, the contrast is between "responsibilizing" those involved in family/spousal relations and "irresponsibilizing" those who are not, and especially those who are defined as engaged in queer sexual activities outside spousal confines and who raise sexual questions involving young people.

There is a complementary trend toward the neoliberal privatization of financial responsibility. For instance, same-gender spouses who obtain state recognition will be liable for each other's support.¹⁴¹ Already in British Columbia a lesbian who applied for social assistance after her unemployment insurance ran out was told that she is not eligible for such assistance since her lover earns too much money. And this is in a province where she cannot receive same-sex benefits through her lover's work place plan.¹⁴² Gay people living with AIDS/HIV could have lost the use of their Ontario drug card (allowing them to freely access some of the treatments they need) under Bill 167, since financial responsibility for them (including expensive AIDS/HIV drugs) would have to be assumed by their gay spouse, if they had such a relationship and their partner had a high enough income.¹⁴³ This again individualizes and privatizes economic responsibility within the spousal relationship, and would make it even harder to qualify for a drug card if you have a spouse, and would further restrict access by PLWA/HLVs to the treatments they need.

But many in the Ontario legislature were not willing to accept this "responsibilizing" strategy. The majority could not accept this claim for family and spousal status since it displaces the "normality" of only the heterosexual family. This tendency toward family/spousal normalization remains, therefore, only one tendency of development in current circumstances.¹⁴⁴ The 1994 defeat of this "responsibilizing" strategy demonstrates the continuing activity and resiliency of moral-conservative strategies of regulation that would deny lesbians and gay men any claim to be "responsible" or "respectable." This tendency toward respectability and responsibility is being produced both through currents within lesbian/gay organizing and also state and professional regulatory responses.

While pushing for the recognition that "we are family!"—if we so choose to define ourselves—and through the formulation of alternative social-support policies, we must avoid the traps of the "responsibilizing" strategy by also challenging the practices that simultaneously "irresponsibilize" some lesbians and gay men through sexual censorship and the continuing criminalization of consensual queer sex. Our proposals for transformation must address sexuality and challenge heterosexist hegemony. The affirmation of gay and lesbian identities and the formation of gay and lesbian communities has altered the terrain of sexual categorization and regulation, but it has not fundamentally disengaged us from this framework. Asserting our identities and communities is partially acceptable in patriarchal racist capitalist society as long as we remain ghettoized in a narrow, clearly demarcated social space, or for some, as long as we stay regulated within normalized spousal and family relations.

Private adult sexuality can be regulated more effectively by medical doctors and psychiatrists than by the coercive apparatus of the state. Although gay liberation has significantly challenged and displaced notions of illness, the AIDS crisis has been used to reconstruct them. As well, the policy of sexual regulation put in place in the 1960s contains internal contradictions that have emerged in the 1980s and 1990s.

State agencies firmly patrol the boundaries of our limited social spaces. Too much public visibility calls the police into action. As the public sphere becomes more heavily

patrolled, social taboos tend to shift from homosexuality and lesbianism in general to “recruitment” of youth,¹⁴⁵ lesbian parents raising children in a manless “horror world,”¹⁴⁶ “pedophilia,” “public sex,” “pornography” especially that relating to young people, “BDSM,” and, AIDS.

Homosexuality...has not been accepted in society at large; rather the target for its control has switched. New techniques of surveillance and/or regulation are developing all the time, and they are a product not simply of a capitalistic mode of production nor of a simple evolution of attitudes, but of the complex interaction of social needs, historical practices and the self-activity of those defined.¹⁴⁷

Danger Signals

Moral Conservatism, the Straight Media, the Sex Police, and AIDS

Accommodation, “responsibilization,” and “normalization,” as outlined in Chapter 9, leading towards what comes to be called homonormativity and homonationalism are only one of the possible lines of development in the present period. There is also a right-wing, moral-conservative response to lesbian and gay liberation, anti-racism, and feminism. The post-war years have seen the undermining of previous relations of social, racial, sexual, and gender regulation, the emergence of new forms of sexual regulation, and the initiation of a profound crisis of the regulation of sexuality and gender. Different groups are offering different solutions to this crisis. The feminist, lesbian, gay, and trans movements, however hesitantly and implicitly, have posed significant challenges to dominant sexual and gender organization and have begun to create new forms of social, gender, and erotic life.

These social changes and struggles are occurring in the context of a profound shift in the organization of official politics and social policy in the 1980s and 1990s toward a focus on deficit reduction and “fiscal responsibility,” and away from Keynesian social interventionism.¹ This leads toward the dismantling of many of the gains working-class and poor people had won—often in a distorted form—within the Welfare State, and has often, but not always, been coupled with a trend toward a more authoritarian strategy of state formation in the face of economic and social troubles in the “advanced” capitalist racist patriarchal countries.² In part this is motivated by a response to the excesses of “liberal” or “permissive” social- and moral-reform legislation identified with the 1960s, and more recently to the affirmative-action and social-equality programs that were won by Black and feminist movements. This context has made the progress of queer-liberation struggles more difficult on a number of fronts. While there is now a more widespread liberal tolerance for lesbians and gay men than before, there is also a vociferous anti-lesbian, anti-gay, anti-trans minority that has connections in very high places.

Moral Conservatism

Moral conservatives combat the gains of feminism and gay liberation by attempting to re-establish what they see as the basic features of previous sex/gender relations,

patriarchal relations, white supremacy, and heterosexual hegemony. In the United States, the moral-conservative new right has had the most success and has focused on opposition to reproductive rights, lesbian and gay rights, and increasingly the rights of immigrants, racialized people, and people on social assistance as well. The new-right "Moral Majority" would make abortion the equivalent of murder and cut off federal funding to any agency prohibiting discrimination against lesbians and gay men and to any group or individual suggesting that homosexuality is an "acceptable lifestyle." The Moral Majority would also cut funding for school programs that "tend to denigrate, diminish, or deny the role differences between the sexes as it has been historically understood."³ In 1986, Reagan-appointed Supreme Court judges upheld the constitutionality of sodomy laws against homosexual acts that continue to exist in many states. In the United States, the right wing is increasingly focusing on opposition to lesbians and gays and is arguing that lesbians and gays are not a legitimate minority group and that they are demanding "special rights."⁴ This new-right organizing achieved some success in influencing the Reagan and Bush regimes and in having some impact on the new Republican majority in the US Congress.

In Britain, the Thatcher government's anti-union and neo-liberal economic policies also provided the context in 1988 for Section 28, which stated that a local authority shall not "promote the teaching...of the acceptability of homosexuality as a pretended family relationship." This provided for the cutting off of state funding for any local government body that "promoted" lesbianism and male homosexuality.⁵

Some among the white middle-class, and even working-class, strata experienced the social changes of the 1960s and 1970s and more recent changes as the breaking down of "social and moral order." Their anxieties were shaped by media portrayals of the "generation gap," the "youth revolt," the "crisis of the family," and common-sense conservative and traditionalist ideologies. Social disturbances were blamed on "permissive" legislation, the liberal bureaucratic state's intrusion into people's "private lives," and social movements such as feminism, gay liberation, and Black power which were portrayed as going beyond legitimate thresholds to question the family, moral order, and white hegemony itself.

This moral-conservative "backlash" was fostered by both the contradictions and inadequacies of the 1960s "liberal" legislation and the social changes of post-war patriarchal racial capitalism. Middle-class white elements are unable to see that it is social transformations within capitalism itself that has undermined the stability of their "family." Some of these members of the "silent majority" have called for an end to permissiveness, a return to law and order, and a return to a mythical security and stability of a white-dominated past that never existed.

This anti-permissiveness, or moral authoritarianism, is shaped and organized by various Christian and secular right-wing groups, conservative parties, elements of the mass media, and state agencies such as the police. These right-wing forces appear to provide real, workable solutions by feeding on the conservative attachment to "law and order," and racist, sexist, and heterosexist "common-sense" ideas that exist in popular culture and are recreated every day through the media and hegemonic social relations.⁶

The way in which people live is often bound up with certain gender and sexual “truths”—“the natural attitude”—for example, that only heterosexuality is natural and normal and that women and men have separate and distinct natural roles. Any challenge to this order is perceived as a threat to their existence. Open lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and trans people challenge these notions of gender and sexual normality, violating social boundaries. The assertion that lesbianism and homosexuality are equally valid ways of life poses a challenge to their sense of security in the world. The resultant fears and anxieties can be organized and hegemonized by moral-conservative politics.

In the moral-conservative view, “sexual liberation,” sex workers on city streets, abortion, pornography, sexuality education in the schools, AIDS education that includes safer sex, and lesbians, gays, and trans people all symbolize the changes that have supposedly undermined the moral order—they are manifestations of “social decay” itself. These groups are upset over the public visibility of sex that, according to them, belongs only in the private realm. They are particularly opposed to “deviant” sexualities.

“Pro-family” ideology has become central to the moral-conservative world view. The family in new-right discourse is an organizing focus for many single-issue campaigns (from “right-to-life” and anti-gay campaigns, to opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment and anti-bussing positions earlier in the United States, and anti-childcare and anti-social welfare positions). It is also a highly emotional symbol. The idea of “proper” family life embodies the racist, sexist, heterosexist, and anti-working-class politics of many moral conservatives. The mage of this “proper” family does not include Indigenous people, Blacks, Asians, Latinx, the poor, single mothers and lesbians, gay men, and trans people.⁷ It is no wonder then that these people respond vehemently when queers affirm: “We are Family, get used to it!”

This new-right family, however, does not exist. It is an abstract idea—a heavenly family, removed from all the contradictions and problems that actual family networks face in the real world. It does not include all family forms and social-support networks but only one particular form of heterosexual, white middle-class family. This ideological universal family has been placed at the centre of new-right discourse, unifying diverse political positions. The symbol appeals to the pro-family sentiments that exist within various classes and social groupings, making it possible to organize a social bloc of different social forces against liberal bureaucrats, moral “degenerates,” and “anti-family” militants to move society and state policy in a moral-conservative direction.

In Canada, this reaction to gay liberation and feminism has been organized through right-wing groups such as Right-to-Life, Campaign Life, Renaissance International, Positive Parents, REAL Women of Canada, Citizen’s United for Responsible Education (CURE), the Coalition for Family Values, and, less directly, through the media and police actions criminalizing queer sex. Many of these right-wing groups are also very racist as well. On the official political front, the Reform Party is very hostile to lesbian and gay rights, as are federal Liberal Party backbenchers like Roseanne Skoke and Tom Wappel. Provincially, the Ralph Klein Conservative government in Alberta, which has been busy slashing social programs, has also been acting to oppose any advance toward

human rights for lesbians and gay men, and has gone so far as to threaten the independent existence of the Alberta Human Rights Commission.⁸ The 1995 election of a right-wing Conservative government in Ontario also makes the progress of lesbian and gay struggles in that province more difficult.

There are, however, many divisions and distinctions between many on the economic and political right wing in Canada and moral conservatives. Some political and economic right-wing groups do not support the moral and sexual agenda of the moral-conservative right, even though in general these currents are far more supportive of these campaigns than are liberal or social-democratic currents. The potential for moral-conservative organizing in Canada is not yet entirely clear, but what is clear is that they have been able to have an impact on the official political terrain in moving it to the right,⁹ on media framing of “social problems,” and even in constitutional legal challenges as intervenors.¹⁰ There have been various attempts to bring together groups such as Campaign Life, Renaissance, and REAL Women of Canada with the right wing of the federal Conservative Party, and also with Liberal Party and Reform Party networks, and some of these efforts at different points have achieved some success. Several “pro-family” conservatives played a key in the successful Dump Joe Clark (as leader of the federal Conservative Party) movement, and later a “Family Caucus” was formed within the Tory caucus. More recently, a “pro-family” grouping has formed in the federal Liberal caucus.

Given the different religious and political-party composition and history in Canada, it is unlikely that the contradictory strands of the economic right wing and the “pro-family” moral right can be brought together into as coherent a political project as they have south of the border.¹¹ The term “moral conservatism” is therefore more appropriate, I suggest, than “new right” in the Canadian context. Moral conservatives had some influence with the Mulroney government and played an important role in the passage of Bill C-49, which criminalizes “communication” for the purposes of prostitution, and in pushing the federal Tories to put forward broad-ranging anti-porn proposals and, in 1993, the new youth-pornography law.¹² At present, the main danger does not come directly from these moral-conservative groups themselves but from how their organizing has helped shift the terms of public debate and influenced state policy. Moral conservatives cannot be ignored and their arguments must be addressed explicitly and undermined in a popular fashion. In the current federal context, the active and mobilized moral-conservative opposition to the inclusion of sexual-orientation protection in the recently passed hate-crimes legislation makes it more difficult to quickly proceed with sexual-orientation protection more generally.

The Straight Media: Organizing the Social Relations of “Backlash”

The mass media have played a key role in organizing the social relations of “backlash”¹³ to lesbian and gay organizing. With the emergence of gay liberation, the gay community, the new conditions of gay life, and the urban gay ghettos, new media framings were produced to deal with gays. Lesbians have been excluded from much of this media

coverage perpetuating lesbian invisibility, and it has been harder for the mainstream media to portray lesbians as a sexual danger. In some media coverage, however, lesbians raising children without men have been portrayed as a social danger.¹⁴ The media are not monolithic and can present contradictory narratives regarding queer and trans people. In relation to gay/lesbian struggles, some coverage adopts more liberal framings while others are more defined by moral conservatism. One of the available media framings that constructs gay men as a sexual danger and came to influence the media coverage of gay men in relation to AIDS is explored below.

This framing has been most clearly presented in the CBS TV network's "Gay Power, Gay Politics,"¹⁵ which articulated a major pre-AIDS image of gay men, although the early AIDS coverage associating gay men with "promiscuous" sex and sexual "excess" and the spread of AIDS built upon this kind of framing. In this program, which was seen in Canada and which has influenced the media in this country, gay men are no longer portrayed as weak, effeminate, or pitiful. They are instead presented as the latest minority group to become politically powerful—a social menace, potentially dangerous and violent. Gay men in San Francisco are presented as using their political weight to push for "absolute sexual freedom,"¹⁶ and the gay movement as going beyond "legitimate" demands. Let us look at how this program is itself part of the social relations of "backlash" against gays and, by association, lesbians.

"Gay Power, Gay Politics" was the subject of sharp protests from the United States gay movement.¹⁷ Unfortunately, these challenges were largely confined to the discourse of professional "objective" journalism itself, which is an important terrain on which to challenge the media. We cannot limit ourselves, however, to this terrain. This program is not simply an unprofessional or biased account of the gay community in San Francisco. We must explore how "Gay Power, Gay Politics" was produced, how its "objective" and "factual" character was established through the routine procedures of mainstream journalism. These typical "objective" news-making procedures take up the standpoints of ruling institutions and are involved in the making of heterosexual hegemony. News making is an ideological practice.¹⁸

First, the various "facts" of a story are given order and meaning through the editing process by a story line,¹⁹ in this case the emergence of the gay movement as a "social menace." The influence of various social institutions and relations are embodied in a story. In this case, these range from the editorial policies of CBS to the reliance on expert sources of information like politicians, coroners, the police, and other journalists. The claim of objectivity serves to obscure how these social relations have entered into the account. "Gay Power, Gay Politics" leaves viewers with the impression they are seeing the real world. The program does not seem to be the product of activity in specific social relations. The work of developing the story line, ordering the segments, and the editing process have all dropped out of view.

Much if not every trace of what has gone into the making of the account is obliterated and what remains is only the text [or program in this case] which aims at being read as "what actually happened."²⁰

“Gay Power, Gay Politics” uses routine methods of establishing its objectivity. These range from the documentary format and the validity inherent in the medium of film,²¹ to the confirmation of statements by “native informants” in the gay community, to the citing of actual historical events like the City Hall riots, the murder of Harvey Milk and Mayor Moscone, a reliance on “expert witnesses” from official agencies,²² and the editing process itself. This makes it appear as though gays are, to an extent, the authors of the program, and obscures how the interviewing and editing process are under the control of the producers.

The gay community is represented as made up of white men and is portrayed from the vantage point of a gay elite of professionals and businessmen. The gay movement is associated with “public sex” through scenes of “open cruising” in Buena Vista Park, and with sadomasochism through a visit to an SM “parlour.” Gays in San Francisco, who have supposedly “achieved full civil rights and economic power,” are going beyond these legitimate demands and moving “provocatively into the political arena.”²³ They are corrupting the political process by pushing for “absolute sexual freedom” (which has been given content by previous associations with “public sex” and SM). If gays can’t get what they want through the established channels, then Cleve Jones, who is worked up as a militant, demagogic character, will lead the gay mob into the streets.

None of this has much to do with the actualities of gay life in San Francisco during these years. Scenes have been ripped from their context in the lives of gay men and placed in a mythical construction provided by the story line and the editing process. We cannot read through the final product—the program—to see the real world of gay men, nor the actual history of gay politics. In real life, San Francisco gays have not gained their full civil and human rights, lesbians do play an important role in the political movement, there are gays and lesbians of colour in community organizing, and the gay movement did not begin with Harvey Milk or the mayoralty elections. Those who have no specific knowledge of the gay community in San Francisco or elsewhere, however, will not be able to deconstruct the factual character of this account. This is why we need to develop critical media-literacy skills among broader groups of people so that the power of these media framings can be contested.

The program is created from a particular standpoint, which is not that of lesbians or gay men but that of a “public,” which is assumed to be heterosexual and to embody traditional family values. The “public” and public opinion are constructed through typical media practices. The anchorperson and reporter stand in for the public, asking the questions that the “public” would wish to have asked. “Gay Power, Gay Politics” embodies these social relations. It is part of organizing a social relation, a concerted course of action leading to a “backlash” against gay liberation.²⁴ The growth of the gay community and its organization as a political constituency poses a threat to sections of the ruling institutions and to right-wing and conservative groups. One of the responses is a negative portrayal of gay men. This is not the result of any simple conspiracy but is “the logical outcome of the present organization of news gathering and processing and the assumptions upon which it rests.”²⁵

It is almost as though the “young toughs”²⁶ referred to in “Gay Power, Gay Politics” are being called upon to keep gays in their proper place, out of public view. As Frank Pearce asks in describing the effect of the print media in England on queerbashers: “What were these boys if they were not agents of the ‘public consensus’ so artfully created by the papers?”²⁷

During the 1980 Toronto municipal election, Art Eggleton, the victorious mayoral candidate, hinted that “San Francisco-style gay-power politics” was entering Toronto’s civic world.²⁸ Renaissance applied the CBS frame to the Toronto elections. They wrote of the need to prevent “Toronto the Good” from becoming “San Francisco North” and spoke of “The Record of ‘Gay Power Politics’ in Toronto.”²⁹ Much of the Toronto mass media used aspects of the CBS frame. They spoke of the spectre of gay-power politics taking over at City Hall. They speculated about the number and concentration of gays. Above all, the gay community began to be portrayed from the perspective of a “gay elite” of white businessmen, religious figures, professionals, and politicians.

We must also look at how this image of gay men affects the gay community, our political movements, and gay definitions. What are the implications of accepting the media’s portrayal of the gay community? What are the implications for those of us in the movement who have been struggling for more democratic politics in the community? What are the implications of excluding Black, Indigenous and other people of colour, and working-class gays and lesbians from public presentations? What are the implications of associating gay political organizing with “public sex” and sadomasochism? Does this not once again open the door to attacks against the minority of “bad” or “irresponsible” gays who are involved in these sexual practices as opposed to “good,” “responsible” gays and lead to an acceptance of state-defined distinctions between public and private? What are the implications of exaggerating our influence in and over established political structures? What does this mean for political organizing and other movement activity? This new image of gay men raises many intensely practical questions, as the right wing, the police, and the media continue to use these types of framings against us. They continue to draw on these types of images and narratives in constructing gay men as a sexual danger, including in the context of AIDS for engaging in “irresponsible” sex. But there also have been more liberal media framings in response to the growth of lesbian/gay communities and AIDS organizing.

We must challenge the mass media’s right and ability to manufacture these stories about our lives. We must transform the media by placing it under greater community and democratic control.³⁰

The Jacques Murder: Anatomy of a “Moral Panic”

The police and other agencies have also played a central part in organizing this “backlash.” A new police policy regarding the Toronto gay community was signalled by the “clean up Yonge Street” campaign in the mid-1970s, and particularly by the “moral panic” organized through the media after the sex-related murder of Emanuel Jacques, a

twelve-year-old boy, by a number of men in a Yonge Street establishment in the summer of 1977. Such groups as Renaissance and Positive Parents have made continual use of the socially constructed images of gays as “child molesters” and “murderers” that were established as part of this moral campaign. A look at the media coverage of the Jacques murder provides us with insight into the anatomy of “moral panic.”

Yvonne Chi-Ying Ng contends that, to fully understand what happened, this murder must be situated in its historical and social context.³¹ A similar murder of a nine-year-old in 1973 had not set off a moral panic. What were the circumstances that prompted such a reaction to the Jacques murder, she asks? The answer lies in the particular alignment of social and political forces at the time of the murder.

It is through the specific social context and historical conjuncture, not the incidents themselves, that we begin to understand why the social control apparatus chose to blame Yonge Street for the death of Jacques.

The key to the response to the Jacques murder is the “clean up Yonge Street” campaign. Proposals to clean up the Yonge Street strip had first been advanced by politicians and “legitimate” business interests in 1972. Initially they received little support, and much opposition. It is important to examine the economic and social process behind these requests. With the large corporate investment in the Eaton Centre development on Yonge in the early 1970s, the Yonge Street strip became ripe for speculation. The price of land shot up, and many small businesses simply could not afford to stay. The sex industry, parts of which were able to afford the higher rents, moved in. The Downtown Business Association (to become the Downtown Business Council in 1973), in an effort to re-establish the conditions for the return of “legitimate” small business to the area, submitted a brief to Mayor Crombie. He took up their cause, but without much success, for a number of years.

This “clean up Yonge Street” campaign was defined by a number of social, moral, class, and political interests. This included the business interests who wanted to re-establish themselves in the area, politicians like Crombie who felt it was best for the moral character of the city,³² and plans for redevelopment, and the police who wanted the chance to clamp down on sex workers and massage parlours. This intersected with a debate over the character of the city, particularly its downtown core. These forces came together in their desire to clear the main street of the sex trade, sex workers, and visible homosexuals.

Then, in 1975, the provincial election campaign of Bill Davis’s ruling Conservative Party focused on “law and order,” which included support for cleaning up Yonge Street, the main street of Ontario’s principal city. This campaign mobilized anti-permissive sentiments, the police having linked the Yonge Street strip to organized crime by associating the sex industry, sex workers, and homosexuality with the criminal world.

A special committee of Toronto City Council was established to prepare a report on the strip in February 1977. This report was released in June of the same year. The media was generally favourable to the proposals for a clean-up but there was still hesitation.

Then, on August 1, 1977, the horrible Jacques murder occurred, and was immediately framed by the media through the interpretive schema already established by the “clean up Yonge Street” campaign. “The press treated the murder as a primary news story, playing up its most extraordinary features. The *Star* and the *Sun* juxtaposed articles on the murder with articles on the clean-up campaign. This particular association was established through statements by Premier Davis, Mayor Crombie, and others. Ng explains that this highlights “the crucial role played by government and state officials in defining what is the significant issue involved in the murder of Jacques.” The *Globe and Mail* associated the murder with the strip and with the “sexual permissiveness” that had begun in the 1960s.

Through its selective representation of reality, the media play a clear ideological role.³³ The mass media rely on accredited sources, and thus the perspective of agencies of social regulation are part of the formulation of “objective” news accounts. Such media practices served to neutralize opposition and to create a public consensus for the clean-up campaign.

The sex industry, sex workers, and homosexuals were presented as “folk devils.”³⁴ Coverage of the “homosexual murder” served to focus hostility against the whole gay community, and also against lesbians since they were often subsumed under the homosexual referent.³⁵ Demonstrations by members of the Portuguese community, of which Jacques had been a member, influenced by the media, called for cleaning up Yonge Street, for granting more power to the police, and for capital punishment for homosexuals. The media portrayed the child molester or child murderer as a homosexual stranger to be found lurking in seedy parts of the city, building on and re-mobilizing earlier framings from the 1950s and 1960s that I investigated earlier. According to Yvonne Chi-Ying Ng, “the relationship between homosexual behaviour, pedophilia, and murderous acts become a cluster of images that cemented in the public mind.”

The “moral panic” thus created would have a lasting effect, defining the political terrain for discussions of the character of the city, Yonge Street, “sexual permissiveness,” sex work, and homosexuality for years to come.

By focusing on an unusually violent crime, the media obscured the common occurrence of sexual harassment and violence against children and young people in the family setting—which points to the application of the public/private distinction in social regulation, with the “public” coming to cover a non-domestic private establishment along Yonge Street. Sexual violence in the domestic private sphere does not attract the same police or media attention (although it may attract the attention of social workers) even though the violence may exceed that of the Jacques case. Sexual danger is constructed as being outside the familial, private realm.³⁶ The provincial government, for instance, prevented the release of a study of fifty-four child-abuse deaths in Ontario during the same year that Jacques was murdered.

The Jacques case and the “clean up Yonge Street” campaign signalled a further shift in the Toronto social climate for gay men and lesbians. The “clean up” campaign provided fertile ground for the growth of sentiments against the visibility of the gay ghetto, particularly in the Yonge Street area serving to mobilize the police with their practices

of criminalization against this target. The Jacques murder has reappeared as ammunition in right-wing propaganda; it has also resurfaced in mass-media coverage of the 1981 bath raids and “male” sex work on Yonge Street.

The Empire Strikes Back!

The mid-1970s were the beginning of more difficult times for many men who have sex with men all over Canada in relation to the sex police. Gay communities were becoming more public and visible. As mentioned before, the Criminal Code mandates the police to criminalize gay sex, although this had been modified in 1969 to direct the police more specifically against gay sex in “public” and that involving young people. The bawdy-house laws allowed the police to go after men in bars and baths for engaging in “indecent” activities.

In 1975, thirty-five men were arrested as “found-ins” in a “common bawdyhouse” (police language for a gay bath) in Montréal. In 1976, as part of the clean-up campaign preceding the Montréal Olympics, police raided the Club baths and the Sauna Neptune, charging more than 144 men. The same year twenty-eight men were charged in a raid on the Ottawa Club baths. In 1977, 146 men were charged as “found-ins” during a raid on the Truxx bar in Montréal, provoking a large demonstration of gay resistance in the downtown.³⁷ The police have been one of the central forces regulating the sexual and community life of gay men and to a different extent that of lesbians.

The Toronto police continued their policy of harassment and entrapment.³⁸ As an extension of the “clean up Yonge Street” campaign, the gay men’s community became a more specific target. *The Body Politic* was raided in December 1977 and charges were laid in January 1978.³⁹ “The next year the Barracks bath was raided, initiating the late 1970s–early 1980s wave of bath raids in the city.

In Montréal, Ottawa, Toronto, and later Edmonton, the police began to use the bawdy-house law more systematically against gay establishments. Resting on earlier raids in Windsor and elsewhere against bathhouses and bars, the pre-Olympic “clean-up” raids in Montréal and the raid on the Truxx bar in Montréal are some of the first uses of this law to mass arrest gay men. The Canadian bawdy-house legislation had originally been drafted to deal with houses of “prostitution” as part of the movement for sexual purity and defense of marriage. In 1917 the law was broadened to include any place existing “for the practice of acts of indecency,” putting massage parlours on the same footing as bawdy houses.⁴⁰ Section 179 of the Criminal Code currently defines a bawdy house as “a place that is kept or occupied or resorted to by one or more persons for the purposes of prostitution or the practices of acts of indecency.” It was used in 1994 to round up 175 men as “found-ins” at the Katacombes bar in Montréal. This law is still in place even though there have been a number of attempts to challenge it in court.

This section mandates the police to label gay baths, bars, and even private residences, as places habitually resorted to for the performance of acts of indecency and, therefore, “common bawdy houses.” “Indecency” is currently defined as what the contemporary

Canadian community is not prepared to tolerate—which, the police and Crown attorneys often argue, includes homosexual acts in private rooms in bath houses. To use the bawdy-house legislation the police must engage in prior surveillance work at a particular site to gather evidence to attempt to demonstrate that it is a place habitually resorted to for “acts of indecency” (gay sex). Once this evidence is accumulated, then the police can move in to arrest everyone in a particular establishment on the grounds that they were “found-ins” in a “common bawdy house.”⁴¹ This offence was finally abolished in June 2019 due to the efforts of the informal gay and lesbian historian’s group.

The assaults on the gay baths in Toronto broke with a policy of “grudging acceptance”⁴² or negotiated deals between the police and the bath owners that had existed for decades with only occasional interruptions like the late-1960s raid on the International Steam Bath. The initial Barracks raid can be seen as the initiation of a new operational policy and, as Thomas Fleming suggests, as a way to gauge community reaction before proceeding with further police activity.⁴³ The police and the media attempted to associate the bath and its patrons with sadomasochistic practices and sexual paraphernalia, conjuring up images of sexual sleaziness, deviance, and violence.⁴⁴ In 1979, the Hot Tub Club was raided by fifty police officers.⁴⁵ Worse was to follow. The association of gay sex with dirt was also made clear in the code name “Operation Soap” given the 1981 police war on the gay community, incorporating an image of dirty gay sex being cleansed from the social body by police action.

The fall 1980 Toronto municipal elections witnessed the defeat of John Sewell, a supporter of gay civil rights and critic of police abuse, and aldermanic candidate George Hislop, a prominent gay figure, and the emergence of a vocal anti-gay right wing that had the tacit backing of the police. Police surveillance of the baths to be raided in 1981 likely preceded the election. The results, however, were interpreted by the police as a green light for attacks on gays.

On February 5, 1981, 150 police officers were deployed against the city’s four major gay baths. 289 men were charged as “found-ins,” and twenty as “keepers” of a common bawdy house. On April 23, 1981, the police laid twenty-two new charges of conspiracy against George Hislop, gay activist Peter Maloney, and four other men. These charges once again associated gay leaders, and the gay community, with criminality.

The police consistently identified gay baths with organized crime. In testimony before the House of Commons Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, Guy Lafrance of the Montréal police stated:

Areas of this country are already blighted by the presence of homosexual bawdy houses, disguised as “bath” establishments, sex clubs, and operating from apartments and private homes...such problems cannot be considered to be of a local or isolated nature; rather, they have international implications and many connections with organized crime.⁴⁶

Donald Banks, then with the Intelligence Bureau of the Metro Toronto police force, and one of the key figures in organizing the 1981 raids, stated before the same committee:

Evidence was brought back to me relating to these premises operating as common bawdy houses with an international flavour—directors and such of international finance—and monies leaving Canada into the United States from the operations of some places.⁴⁷

Canadian money going to the United States. How unusual, and how criminal!

In June 1981 the police raided two of the remaining baths in Toronto, arresting another twenty-one men on bawdy-house charges. And in 1983 the Back Door was raided again, in a smaller, more sanitized operation.

This police offensive was attempted moral regulation, an attempt to regulate gay men, and our sexualities, by applying criminal categories—in this case, the bawdy-house legislation—to cover sex between men. As ideological justification for their crusade, the police made use of the media, political, and moral associations established during the “clean up Yonge Street” campaign. They promised to crack down on “prostitution,” the involvement of minors in “indecent” activity, and the alleged connection with organized crime. Says Thomas S. Fleming, “The charges of prostitution function as a moral key allowing the police entry to the baths.”⁴⁸ No sex work, involvement of minors, or evidence of organized crime, however, was documented by the police or demonstrated in court. Because of the organization of the Right to Privacy Committee (RTPC), nearly ninety percent of the men dragged through the courts were acquitted. Yet the police continued to justify their actions with the few guilty pleas entered and that their internal police complaints’ bureau received no complaints.⁴⁹ The police make use of a schema that divides the population between “the public” and “the scum”; in this situation mandated by the Criminal Code which continued to criminalize gay sex, they construct the “public” as heterosexual and the “scum” as gay.⁵⁰

The reasons for the bath raids and the police campaign against the gay community has been the subject of some debate. A full analysis for this would require a much more detailed historical and sociological study than can be undertaken here; however, a few of the elements which would inform it can be sketched in. Most importantly, police organization must be investigated in order to show how the Criminal Code has directed the police against gays including through the use of bawdy-house legislation. This section of the Criminal Code allows the police to inscribe instances of sex between men into “acts of indecency” in the bawdy-house section and therefore to attempt to produce it as crime.⁵¹

Two contextualizing social processes are also at work. First, Toronto was a city of growing racial, ethnic—and now—sexual minorities. The provincial and municipal establishment foresaw the need for a fairly militarized police force—which is not accountable to these communities—to decrease the public visibility of these groups and to keep them contained. Later struggles by the Black community over police racism and violence,⁵² the gay communities, and others forced some limited modifications in policing organization, but the police still are a dominantly “male,” white, and heterosexual presence in the city.

Second, sectors of ruling agencies feared the visibility and concentration of gays in the downtown core. This is the social context in which the “clean up Yonge Street”

campaign and the bath raids can be located. In the 1970s and early 1980s, the increasing visibility of the gay community and sex workers clashed with plans for the redevelopment of the Yonge Street area and the downtown. Police policy sought to limit the visible and public growth of the gay community as the Criminal Code mandated them to do.

These police campaigns were not successful. The attempt to create a “moral panic” around the 1981 bath raids failed because of the widespread resistance by thousands of gays and our supporters. The police had clearly not expected such unprecedented anger and rebellion. Indeed, the raids served to politicize, radicalize, and further define the gay community. Many lesbians were also involved in this process. Support came from feminists, unions, the Black and South Asian communities, civil liberties and religious groups, and progressive members of city council.⁵³ It was in the context of the resistance to the bath raids that Gay Liberation Against the Right Everywhere, Lesbians Against the Right, and the RTPC organized the first lesbian and gay pride day in Toronto to be held at the end of June, a history that continues with the celebrations organized by Pride Toronto every year.⁵⁴

The White and Sheppard Report documented the brutality of the bath raids,⁵⁵ and even the mainstream media adopted a critical attitude toward the police. City Council voted for a provincial independent inquiry into the bath raids and established the city’s own Bruner investigation into police/gay relations when the province refused to establish such an inquiry.

By documenting police harassment, the Bruner Report reflected the gains won by gay resistance and it made many progressive recommendations, including sexual-orientation protection in human-rights legislation and the recognition of gays as a legitimate minority. Its central recommendation, however, was for the establishment of dialogue between the gay community and the police:

It has been obvious throughout the study, and particularly in the complaints and counter-complaints between the police and the gay community and the attitude that each has toward the other, that the relationship suffers from an almost total lack of effective communication.... It is my view that a regular dialogue is key to improved relations between the police and gay community.⁵⁶

This recommendation presented the main problem as a lack of communication. This assumption is not grounded in the experiences of gays and lesbians, or other communities under attack from the police. The gay movement knew perfectly well what the police were up to, and the police, through their surveillance activities, had a profound understanding of the gay movement. The central problem was not lack of communication. The police still have the power to criminalize gay sex. As well, Bruner’s approach tended to place the gay community and the police on the same level, whereas it is the police who have the power to arrest, raid, and to regulate erotic life.

A dialogue committee would manufacture gay consent for police activity. In a situation wherein no community has control over the police, wherein there is no police

accountability to democratic bodies, and wherein criminalizing laws remain on the books, discussion of “problem areas”⁵⁷ like sexual activity in “public washrooms” or parks would only involve the gay community representatives in a process of policing ourselves. This could cause serious divisions in the community and make campaigns against police harassment very difficult given the apparently consensual relations established with the police. Such a dialogue committee could also provide the police with detailed information which could later be used against us.⁵⁸

Perhaps a bit ahead of its time, the Bruner Report prefigured aspects of “community policing” that—although they had earlier beginnings—would be one policing strategy developed in England in response to Black rebellions of the early 1980s to attempt to do more surveillance work of the Black communities and to try to incorporate layers of the Black community into the policing process.⁵⁹ These practices of “community policing” have been exported to police forces in many other countries, including in Canada. In Canada, some “liberal” forces within police departments and on city councils have taken up “community policing” as a more “democratic” form of policing. In a number of centres, dialogue committees between gay-community representatives and the police, as well as with other communities, have been set up. In Toronto and elsewhere, such committees have been used to not only divide our communities but also gay men and lesbians from others facing police harassment including trans sex workers, Black people, drug users and homeless people. The most success was claimed to have been achieved in Ottawa with new training programs for police officers, but the Ottawa police continue to engage in racist practices against the Black community. These dialogue committees and forms of “community policing” cannot work to the advantage of lesbian, gay, Black, and other communities who have experienced police harassment when there are no changes in basic police organization that originates in racism, settler colonialism, and the regulation of Indigenous and Black bodies; when recommendations for reform are ignored year after year; when there are laws that continue to criminalize consensual sex and sex work; when there is no powerful form of independent community review of police conduct and when militarized police forces receive expanding budgets year after year.⁶⁰

While the Bruner Report contained many recommendations that legitimized our struggles, it also suggested a new means of regulation of the gay community and same-gender sex that had to be resisted. Gay movements can use the progressive demands of such reports to push forward our struggles while at the same time pushing beyond the boundaries of social policing they suggest.

The 1980s battles between gay movements and the police are a manifestation of the social struggles over the distinction between “public” and “private.” The police are trying to establish that sex in gay baths—and sometimes bars—and gay sex in parks and washrooms is “public” sex and therefore subject to their direct intervention. Central institutions and gathering places of gay-community formation would thus be rendered “public.” This debate takes place in the context of the boundaries drawn by the 1969 reform and the contradictory developments to which it has led.

The gay movement, in contrast, has argued that gay institutions are part of the “private” sphere and therefore off-limits to the police. It has used the liberal notion of “right to privacy” not only as a defence in court; it has also turned the public/private distinction against state agencies by redefining and shifting the terms of the debate. This strategy not only includes the gay community and its institutions in the private realm; it also shifts the notion of privacy from the language of state discourse and places it in the social practices of everyday life. This notion of right to privacy builds upon the idea of privacy as a realm of individual choice, consent, and morality. But privacy is no longer only territorially defined: if you have sex in this place it is “public”; in that place “private.” Instead, it focuses on the actual social practices people engage in to construct intimacy for themselves. “Right to privacy” is not used in a narrow, individualist sense, but in a collective sense—which requires that one looks at sex and social life from the standpoint of gays, and which moves beyond the boundaries of state-defined categories. It is quite possible to engage in a private act in a place defined by state agencies as public (for example, a washroom, with no one else present or a deserted or secluded part of a park).

Privacy is something that is socially constructed in this society.... Indeed, in the middle of the night, when it is absolutely pitch black, a park might in fact be a very private place.⁶¹

The Toronto movement used right to privacy in a transformative fashion as a vehicle for defending gay men against the police. The dominant public/private strategies of regulation were thus put into question.

It should be pointed out, though, that there can also be grave dangers in accepting a narrow, state-defined notion of privacy.⁶² Conservative gays in the United States have used the idea of privacy in this limited sense to win the support of anti-gay Republicans. This approach fundamentally accepts state definitions of public and private and the sexual policing that goes with them. It constructs gays who engage in sexual activities in “private” as “responsible,” while others engaging in more “public” activities are “irresponsible” and police action can be justified against them. Claims to “right to privacy” are also no basis for queer claims to full social equality with heterosexuality and for dismantling the heterosexual hegemony at the heart of social, family, and state policies.

The mass response to the bath raids in Toronto at least temporarily closed off options for the police. Their tactics had to change. The police began to regularly lay overcrowding charges against gay bars in 1981–82. Surveillance, entrapment, and the arrest of men allegedly engaged in sexual acts in washrooms and parks increased significantly. From July 1982 to April 1983, 369 men were arrested for “indecent acts” with other men in Toronto; more than 600 “indecent act” arrests took place in Toronto in 1985.⁶³

In 1983–85, police action was extended across southern Ontario, with arrests in Orillia, Welland, Oakville, Oshawa, Peel region, Guelph, Kitchener-Waterloo, and St. Catharines. In most instances, the local police used video-surveillance equipment provided by the Ontario Provincial Police, including fibre-optic technology.⁶⁴ In many

cases, the local media published the arrested men's names; at least one man killed himself as a result.

Washroom arrests are hard to fight, particularly in small towns, because of the social stigma attached to the offence, the difficulty in mounting a legal defence, and that many of these men do not consider themselves to be gay or bisexual. Of the southern Ontario centres, only in Guelph was there a protest against the video-surveillance arrests. A "Stop Policing Sexuality" demonstration was held, support activities for the men charged were organized, and legal challenges were launched.⁶⁵ Legal defence requires that our right to privacy be extended to include private sexual acts that take place in "public" places like washrooms. Two men having sex in a cubicle in a deserted washroom, for instance, having clearly taken measures to ensure their intimacy, are performing a private act.⁶⁶ This is, however, a difficult argument to make in court and in political organizing. There have been continuing washroom busts in the 1990s in St. John's, Newfoundland, and across southern Ontario.

Escalating Sexual Censorship: "Obscenity" and Canada Customs

In Toronto, following the resistance to the bath raids, the police focused their attention more specifically against gay institutions. Obscenity charges were brought against Glad Day Bookshop, and new obscenity charges were laid against *The Body Politic* in May 1982. Obscenity legislation, which censors sexual presentations on the basis of "the undue exploitation of sex," does not treat all sexual images and texts equally. The law applies more harshly to same-gender presentations.⁶⁷

In the Glad Day trial in 1983, presentations of lesbian and gay sexuality were seen as more "indecent" and "offensive" to community standards than similar heterosexual portrayals. In his judgement, Justice Vanek referred to the 1970 case of Regina versus Prairie Schooner in which the Manitoba Court of Appeal found that "lurid scenes of lesbianism" "went beyond what the community was prepared to tolerate." Vanek referred to the 1969 Criminal Code reform which decriminalized only certain homosexual acts between adults in private and which defined a public place as existing when "two or more persons are present or if it is a public place." Vanek stated that in the case of the two magazines, which Glad Day was charged with selling, the photographer must have been present, making the acts "public." Again referring to the 1969 reform, he stated that the acts depicted in the magazines "are made public by representing them graphically in a pictorial magazine, which sometimes depicts a third person."⁶⁸ Vanek was unable to determine any lowering of Canadian community standards since this earlier case had been heard.⁶⁹

The 1969 reform therefore retained the idea that same-gender sex is more "indecent" and "obscene" than similar heterosexual acts. Obscenity legislation works to keep lesbian and gay sexuality in a subordinate position while buttressing heterosexual hegemony. This legislation lets the police regulate lesbian and gay communities and images of same-gender sex more generally. It helps establish "proper" images of sex, seriously

limiting what lesbians and gays can view, read, discuss, and produce. It also limits what is available to heterosexuals about our lives. It is not only a denial of lesbian and gay freedom of speech and expression but also an important aspect of heterosexual hegemony and oppressive sexual regulation.

In the mid-1980s, Canada Customs escalated its seizure of lesbian and gay materials. Using a new internal memorandum that labelled depictions of “buggery/sodomy” as “obscene,”⁷⁰ they routinely seized and refused entry to Canada to numerous materials destined for lesbian and gay bookstores across the country, especially Little Sister’s in Vancouver and Glad Day in Toronto. Books and magazines seized at various times included hundreds of titles ranging from *The Joy of Gay Sex*, *Lesbian Sex*, *Macho Sluts*, *Prick Up Your Ears*, Jean Genet’s *Querelle*, to bell hook’s *Black Looks*⁷¹ (as suspected “hate literature”), to the *Tom of Finland Retrospective*, to gay-male erotic writings and the lesbian sex magazines *Bad Attitude* and *On Our Backs*.⁷² A number of sex videos (including safer-sex videos) made for lesbians and gay men have also been seized.

Federal anti-porn “obscenity” proposals announced in June 1986 would have banned all depictions of “anal intercourse” and many other sex acts as prohibited forms of “pornography” thereby further institutionalizing sanctions against presentations of lesbian and gay sex. I use “pornography” here to refer to sexually explicit materials that are usually, but not always, commercially produced; there are a number of different pornographies with different social characteristics. Fortunately, this bill died on the order paper. The main features of this legislation were continued in Bill C-54, which generated widespread opposition for its wide-ranging censorship proposals from librarians, civil libertarians, artists, and lesbians and gay men. The legislation was scrapped in the fall of 1988.⁷³

In February 1992, the Supreme Court of Canada in the Butler decision both upheld the constitutionality of the obscenity section of the Criminal Code and also modified its interpretation.⁷⁴ The Women’s Legal, Education and Action Fund (LEAF) intervened in this decision to argue for an anti-porn feminist position and to try to have the Supreme Court move from a “moral” definition of obscenity to one focused on “harm” to women and other groups. They hailed the decision as a victory for women.

As mentioned before, the key element of the “obscenity” section of the Criminal Code is “the undue exploitation of sex.” This has usually been interpreted as meaning too much sexual explicitness for “community standards” to tolerate. The focus is on sexual explicitness, not on sexism or sexual violence. The Supreme Court in the Butler decision provided the police and courts with a new set of interpretations or tests of the meaning of this section, which focused on associations between sexuality and violence, “degradation,” and “dehumanization.”

The court said that sex coupled with violence is “obscene.” How will the police and courts define sexual violence given they usually do not take context into account? Could this guideline be used against feminist films that are portraying depictions of sexual violence as part of organizing against such violence. We should remember that *Not a Love Story*, a feminist film against pornography was found unacceptable for public showing

in Ontario by the provincial censor board in the mid-1980s because it used scenes from pornography as part of its critique of the porn industry.

The Supreme Court also found that representations of explicit sex that are “demeaning, degrading, and/or dehumanizing” are also obscene. A major problem comes with the interpretation of these words. These terms have multiple meanings and a great deal of vagueness carrying different meanings for different groups.⁷⁵ For many, gay and lesbian sex is per se “degrading,” and there is a long history of criminalization and censorship lying behind this practice as the courts have found representations of lesbian and gay sexualities to be more obscene than similar heterosexual portrayals. For some, “degrading” refers to any sexual activities outside the confines of heterosexual marriage. “Degrading” is a sufficiently expansive term to cover most acts of which a viewer disapproves. It becomes a collecting category that can include a number of unpopular and unorthodox sexual practices, some of which—like consensual queer sex—present no problems of lack of consent, coercion, or violence. As such, the term lacks any real precision to be able to defend materials such as gay and lesbian erotic materials, which are often treated differentially and unequally in present-day social practices.

How will the police interpret this? Past police practice suggests that the police would use this against depictions of lesbian and gay sex and also against other representations of consensual sex. Does this mean that the police could find a depiction of a man ejaculating onto another man’s body “degrading” even though this is an activity encouraged in safer-sex practices for gay men? That is what the federal government’s Bill C-54 attempted to do in 1987. Ontario Provincial Police Detective Sergeant Bob Matthews stated he would find such a representation of ejaculation “obscene” under the new guidelines. He is with Project P, the joint Metro Toronto and Ontario Provincial Police’s anti-porn squad. He stated on CBC radio (February 27, 1992) that the police will define “degrading” simply as too much explicit sex, suggesting that any implication that the characters participating in sex did not already know each other well would also make it obscene.

This police definition of “degrading” has nothing to do with feminist concerns over sexism and violence against women. This interpretation will strengthen the hand of the police in going after portrayals of consensual sex, especially images of lesbian and gay sexuality.

It was no surprise that one of the first obscenity charges laid following the Butler decision on April 30, 1992 was against Glad Day in Toronto for carrying the lesbian sex magazine *Bad Attitude*. Glad Day was convicted in December 1992 in a decision that relied in part on the Butler decision.⁷⁶ And in July of 1992 Glad Day, whose proprietors had taken Canada Customs to court regarding twelve books and magazines that had been seized, lost its case with the judge, who based his judgement on the Butler decision arguing that depictions of casual gay sex with strangers are “obscene,” and with suggestions that anonymous sex and anal sex are potentially harmful to the community.⁷⁷ Following the Butler decision, there seemed to be an intensification of Customs censorship directed at lesbian materials and books and magazines destined for women’s bookstores across the country.

AIDS: Making Us Sick Once Again

The AIDS crisis has been used to once again re-medicalize gay men and to associate gay and bisexual men with sickness, disease, and death. This has helped to reconstruct relations of medicalization that the gay and lesbian movements had been rather successful in undermining in the 1970s and early 1980s (see Chapter 9). This has occurred even though AIDS is caused by a virus, and not by homosexuality or gay sex. As Dennis Altman put it, AIDS was homosexualized,⁷⁸ and the legacy of this homosexualization is still very much with us today. Out of government and professional neglect, community-based AIDS groups and AIDS activism emerged in the 1980s. AIDS organizing is one of the most profound social movements ever to emerge around health questions. Emerging as a social movement, it included the organization and politicization of People Living With AIDS/HIV (PLWA/HIVs) themselves.

It is worth reviewing the history of AIDS organizing and state and professional responses since this is an important part of the context for queer organizing and sexual politics in the 1990s. In North America, AIDS groups first grew out of the largely—but not exclusively—white gay and lesbian movements of the early 1980s and began to involve progressive health workers; often they were influenced by feminist health movements. Organizations developed in response to state inaction and indifference, major problems with the medical profession, and social discrimination against the communities most affected by AIDS. Community-based support and educational groups were first set up in the period 1982–86 across the Canadian state. It is important to remember this history of activism, which is constantly in danger of being submerged and forgotten in the official texts of the AIDS crisis, such as in the 1990 National AIDS Strategy⁷⁹ documents and in much mainstream-media coverage.

In the early 1980s many state agencies basically ignored AIDS aside from the collection of epidemiological information, some job-creation funding for the first community-based groups, and some limited “public health” initiatives based on defence of the “general population” from those infected. The “general population” was coded as the “respectable” heterosexual population that excluded gays, drug users, sex workers, Haitians, Africans, and other people of colour.

“Public health” is also not simply neutral or objective, despite it providing the basis for important gains in some areas. It is always important to ask which public and whose health is being defended. Historically, public-health practices were directed against the living conditions and ways of life of the racialized, the poor and working class and against infectious diseases. It was part of the extension of social surveillance and regulation and the imposition of white middle-class ways of life onto these groups.

The underpinnings of public-health practices regarding AIDS can be traced back to earlier campaigns against sexually transmitted infections, tuberculosis, and infant mortality.⁸⁰ The campaigns against STIs, as mentioned earlier, were also rooted in sexist double standards that blamed “prostitutes” and/or “loose” women for the spread of infection. These practices focused on contact tracing, partner notification, and quarantine. Public-health officials wanted people’s names and identities in their work, and

this has later on created major difficulties for the establishment of anonymous HIV testing where a person's name is not recorded to prevent possible discrimination. "Public health" is not for those who are already infected. Public-health practices often make PLWA/HIVs into the problem, focusing on the irresponsible "deviants" who supposedly spread it,⁸¹ even though the vast majority of people who spread HIV have no knowledge they are infected.

In the face of this inaction and the limitations of public-health practices, badly needed community-based support and education groups were set up in the larger centres across Canada. It was these groups that provided the first support for people living with AIDS—including support in dealing with discrimination and problems in hospitals and other medical institutions—and that undertook the first educational initiatives. They confronted the social process of AIDS stigmatization. These early community-based initiatives helped to turn back some of the social processes organizing AIDS related discrimination and began to force state agencies and the medical profession to respond in a better fashion.

These community groups confronted the previously mentioned initial medical and social construction of knowledge regarding AIDS which was called Gay Related Immune Deficiency (GRID) in 1981. This was influenced by the medical discourse of immunology that focuses on the breakdown in internal dynamics of the immune system and by early epidemiological work conducted for the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, which focused on the homosexuality and gay lifestyle of some of those who were diagnosed early on.⁸² These were mostly white gay men who had some regular interaction with the medical profession. Injection-drug users, people of colour, and others with less regular contact with the medical profession were coming down with these infections and dying at the same time, but they were not noticed by this early epidemiological gaze. GRID was picked up and amplified in the mass media as the "gay plague." We were informed in 1982, for instance, that the "Gay Plague Has Arrived in Canada" by a headline in the *Toronto Star*.⁸³

Diseases are socially constructed, not simply biological or medical phenomena, and this early homosexualization has had a lasting impact on the social construction of AIDS. This re-medicalization of homosexuality built on pre-existing heterosexist practices, which organized discrimination against gay men and in a different way against lesbians and all people living with AIDS. Others were also designated as "high risk groups"—such as the Haitian communities—and discrimination was organized against them in a social context where they already experienced widespread racism.⁸⁴ While I was working at the AIDS Committee of Toronto in 1983, I received a number of calls from people asking if they should fire their Haitian housekeepers because of fears of AIDS. We can begin to see the kind of work that the concept of "high risk groups" can do. "High risk groups"—a concept used in epidemiology—was taken up in the media and used to organize discrimination against groups that were constructed as "threats." As AIDS activists stressed in response, there are risk activities in which anyone can engage, but no risk groups.

The media distinction between “guilty” and “innocent” people with AIDS built on notions of sexual and drug-use “deviance.” If one were guilty, one was to be blamed. This organized social consciousness regarding AIDS. Through this social construction and the lack of official responses, years were lost in terms of needed social, health-care, and medical action.

In 1983–84, out of these community-based initiatives and especially from some gay men and some people living with AIDS came the practices of safe sex. These were a range of sexual practices people could engage in without fear of transmission of any causative agent—this was developed initially prior to HTLV-III (later called HIV) being identified. Safe-sex organizing among gay men made some very important gains in reducing rates of transmission. It was explicit, erotic, clear, in the language/culture of the community, did not put people down, and it empowered people through practical information and knowledge grounded in lived experiences. Viewed from a social construction of sexuality approach, it showed how sexual practices and sexualities can be socially and collectively transformed.⁸⁵ Unfortunately, these acquisitions have mostly been lost in official AIDS education.

In 1984, the “discovery” of a causative agent was announced—HTLV-III, later called HIV. This was tied to the medical discourse of virology, which became the hegemonic medical discourse regarding AIDS.⁸⁶ The theory assumed was that there was a single, viral, causative agent. This has had a major impact on research and research funding. Success for virology is viewed as an anti-viral agent that extends life leading it not to focus on the harms, side-effects, and impacts on quality of life that such drugs might have.

In the mid-1980s in Canada, the federal and other levels of government began to provide more than job-creation funding and began to systematically fund community-based groups on the federal level through Health Promotions. Under Health Minister Jake Epp (1984–88) there were major problems with the lack of action on treatment delivery for PLWA/HIVs and a lack of cooperation with community-based groups. State policies were almost completely defined by public health and later also by palliative care concerns, defending the “general public” from infection from PLWAs and affected communities and basically assuming all PLWAs were going to die relatively quickly. During these years, federal agencies began to do some educational work on prevention issues—but with major limitations.

Consistent state funding for community-based groups—which was an important victory—led to more state regulation of the work of these groups, and they increasingly became transformed from community groups with a participating and active membership with ties to gay and other communities into hierarchical, professionalized organizations in a similar process to that analyzed regarding other community-based groups.⁸⁷ More and more they came to be defined by state funding agencies and to define themselves as “service” organizations with “clients” and “volunteers.” This is not to devalue the badly needed services these groups continued to provide, but to mark a shift in their social organization. Many of the groups initially set up to empower PLWA/HIVs and the

communities affected by AIDS began to come to stand over these communities as part of a state-regulated process of mediation and management.

During these years, there was a transformation of safe sex into safer sex. Safe sex was shifted and sanitized, often placed in a medical or scientific language, and not in the languages and cultures of people who were being addressed. It became professionalized, medicalized, and also individualized, and was removed from its social and political roots. The focus on the “general population” was taken up in public-health education, and this population was assumed to be heterosexual. This was based on the hegemonic sexual ideology of there being two discrete and essential sexualities, which does not address men who see themselves as heterosexual but who occasionally have sex with other men. These men will also not be addressed by material addressed to gay men. Also, because heterosexism was not challenged in this education, it allows heterosexual men to continue to see gay men as “others” from whom they have nothing to learn in the context of AIDS and in other aspects of their lives.⁸⁸

Profound misinformation was produced by focusing this official education against “promiscuity” and *for* monogamy. It is not the number of partners but the acts that are engaged in that is the problem, and serial monogamy with unsafe sex can be a risk. As Cindy Patton points out, women have largely been addressed in official AIDS discourse as either “vessels” of transmission (as mothers, and therefore a risk to the fetus) or as “vectors” of transmission (as sex workers and “promiscuous” women—and therefore a risk to heterosexual men).⁸⁹ There has been little focus on the importance of women themselves.

There was also the hegemony of AIDS as universally fatal during these years, which led to no major focus on treatment. AZT, an anti-viral drug, began to be first publicized and was then released with great restrictions in 1986–87 by Burroughs Wellcome. Research then being conducted continued to focus on HIV as the sole causative agent, and the search for a “magic bullet” anti-viral drug.

A major contradiction emerged in the later 1980s between the knowledge that there were various treatments that could extend people’s lives and continuing state, professional and corporate practices standing in the way of this access. There was both a possibility of survival but also its denial. Out of this contradiction, a new treatment-based activism burst forth onto the streets (such as AIDS ACTION NOW! in Toronto and the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power—ACT UP—in the United States and around the world). This activism gained widespread support from activists in community-based groups in the Canadian AIDS Society (CAS). This new AIDS activism engaged in actions such as burning an effigy of the Health Minister in Toronto in 1988 at an AIDS protest I helped organize. This meant that older strategies of the regulation of community-based groups and PLWA/HIVs were no longer working. This upsetting of the hegemony of earlier regulatory strategies set the stage for the development of the National AIDS Strategy under the new Minister of Health Perrin Beatty in 1990.

This treatment-based activism won some important—if limited—victories, like the use of the federal Emergency Drug Release Program (EDRP) to release some treatments on compassionate grounds (beginning in January 1989), the release and approval

of aerosolized pentamidine (AP) as a preventative treatment for pneumocystis carinii pneumonia (PCP), the limited release of ddI (another anti-viral drug) and other drugs, and a commitment to a National Treatment Registry in the National AIDS strategy, which unfortunately—because of resistance from the medical elite and professional and academic disputes—was only established in 1995. These victories were very important to some people's survival and quality of life.⁹⁰

For instance, PCP—which was the leading cause of death among PLWAs in North America—could largely have been prevented during these years through the use of various prophylaxis or preventatives. By 1985 some primary care physicians were using septria and other drugs for PCP prophylaxis, but no major study was funded to determine the effectiveness of these drugs. Aerosolized pentamidine (AP) showed major promise with less toxic affects but given that septria was an already-established inexpensive drug, there was little profit motive in studies of AP. Contrast this with the millions spent investigating AZT and the millions of dollars it made for Burroughs Wellcome. In the case of AP in Canada, they only undertook a placebo controlled trial of this promising preventative. It was only through the efforts of PLWA/HIVs, AIDS activists, and some primary-care physicians that these preventative treatments became a standard of care in much of North America where there is access to health and medical care. This means that PCP is no longer the major cause of death among PLWAs in North America.

This also led AIDS activists to challenge how clinical trials are organized, including the Canadian double-blind trial of AP I just mentioned. Double-blind placebo-controlled trials are those in which only some of those enrolled in the trial actually receive the drug that might be of use to them. AIDS activists also raised ethical problems with the use of the “clinical endpoints” of death or opportunistic infection in the placebo arms of these trials as ways of determining whether a drug works. This had been put forward as good “clean” science, but the impact on people enrolled was quite devastating, including leading to some deaths. These trials have been set up to provide product testing not to provide treatment and AIDS activists have pushed for open arms and the expansion of treatment delivery.⁹¹

Given the medical hegemony surrounding AIDS, it has been difficult for AIDS groups and PLWA/HIVs to claim and establish “expert” status while at the same time some gains have been made on this front. Some groups of PLWA/HIVs (usually gay, white, and middle class but not entirely) who were tied into PLWA networks in the United States and later Canada and other countries began to become more educated than their doctors about treatments, which led to a challenge to some of the powers of the medical profession. This also exposed major problems regarding treatment delivery in Canada. There is no state mandate to actually deliver treatments to the people who need it. This is a major problem with the health-care system for PLWA/HIVs and many others. Federal and provincial regulations focus on public health and, at the provincial level, on provincial health insurance and what is covered under it.

The Health Protection Branch on the federal level does not have a mandate for treatment delivery. Its public health mandate largely excludes and silences concerns regarding treatments. It only regulates product testing and approves products for release. The

EDRP only relaxes these regulations on compassionate grounds in some situations, and it clearly recognizes the property rights of the drug companies. The EDRP allows the pharmaceutical companies to decide if and under what conditions a drug will be released. Treatment delivery is largely left up to medical professionals and the pharmaceutical corporations and is almost a private contractual relationship entered into between doctor and patient. It is thus left up to the corporations and the profit motive and medical professionals to test drugs and provide people with treatments.

The major pharmaceutical corporations dominate applied research and they only develop drugs that are profitable for them. In the context of AIDS and many other conditions, this just does not work for treatment delivery. It creates major difficulties for PLWA/HIVs, and led AIDS activists to argue for catastrophic rights—the right of PLWAs and others in catastrophic life-threatening situations to have an unrestricted social right to access treatments they and their physicians believe to be beneficial.⁹² AIDS activists also began to point to the possibility of AIDS/HIV becoming a “chronic manageable condition” through the use of treatments against the infections that actually kill people, treatments that slow down the progress of HIV replication, and through adequate social and financial support.

Treatment activism has also challenged priorities for research and the very social construction of medical knowledge. Although for too long treatment activists accepted the hegemony of anti-viral research that has produced the family of drugs—AZT, ddI, and ddC—which are highly toxic and of limited usefulness—they did begin to challenge the research agenda regarding the lack of priority given to treatments for the infections that kill people and to support research into alternative therapies. ACT UP produced research agendas, and Community Research Initiatives were set up by primary-care physicians and PLWA/HIVs in a number of centres, including Toronto, and these groups have done some ground-breaking research. Also, some AIDS activists began to challenge the theory that HIV was the sole cause of AIDS, supporting research into possible co-factors, and also into immune-system stimulation and rebuilding. Regarding the drug corporations and research-scientists’ agendas, AIDS activists have faced a number of problems in confronting the power of drug corporations in the capitalist “medical-industrial” complex.⁹³

There are also problems created by the lack of funding for treatments, which means that some PLWA/HIVs are forced to make treatment decisions based on cost, and often there is no funding available for alternative therapies outside the Western medical model. Treatment is located largely in the sphere of personal consumption, which creates major problems for people who need access to treatments.

This treatment-based activism set the stage for a new federal strategy of regulation⁹⁴ of community-based AIDS groups defined by concepts of “consultation” and “partnership.” In developing this strategy, the consultants for the federal government took up the term partnership from community-based groups (members of the Canadian AIDS Society) who used it to argue for state recognition of AIDS groups as leaders in the fight against AIDS and as equal and defining partners. They then shifted and uprooted

this through the entry of discourses developed in business administration and labour management that deploy “partnership” from an administrative standpoint as a mechanism for integrating other groups under the hegemony of ruling agencies.

In this conceptualization of partnership, the community-based groups become just one of many partners with no special defining powers. “Partnership” then became a conceptual framework for hegemonic regulation. While there were some limited gains—like the commitment to a Treatment Registry and some recognition of the need on the part of PLWA/HIVs and doctors for treatment information—this AIDS strategy was still fundamentally defined by public health and palliative care. While some major tensions have developed over funding, this strategy has been more effective in regulating AIDS groups than in meeting the needs of PLWA/HIVs or the communities most affected by AIDS.

There is a major dilemma facing AIDS organizing and other forms of progressive organizing around health concerns. These groups both need state funding and resources and medical knowledge but must also avoid being regulated and defined by it. This requires organizing within, against, and beyond State regulation and the medical profession.⁹⁵

Finally, since 1990 there has been a new focus on the relations of impoverishment and poverty that many PLWA/HIVs confront and are often thrown into after an AIDS/HIV diagnosis. Daily survival becomes an active process of unpaid work for PLWA/HIVs. There is a lack of access to and institutional problems with “hooking up” to social services and social supports, as Eric Mykhalovskiy and George Smith document,⁹⁶ and major inadequacies in these supports—in terms of funding for transportation needs, vitamins, adequate nutrition, adequate housing, along with the lack of funding for all needed treatments. This focus raises these social supports as necessary preconditions for health and raises class questions as a central aspect of the social response to AIDS.

Initial organizing around AIDS was done mostly by white people—often white gay men—and this left its mark on AIDS organizations making it more difficult for questions of racism and sexism to be significantly addressed within AIDS organizing. Relations of exclusion and alienation in community organizing and AIDS activism have meant that there were needs that were not being addressed.⁹⁷ Over the last period, there has been a growing self-organization of people of colour regarding AIDS concerns, including the Black Outreach Project in Nova Scotia and BLACKCAP in Toronto, South Asian, various Indigenous groups, and groups focusing on the needs of women, like Voices of Positive Women in Toronto. These efforts have challenged racism and sexism in AIDS organizing and also in the broader social response to AIDS. This organizing points us in the direction of realizing that to deal with AIDS we must also deal with how it is tied up with class, gender, and race oppression, which has allowed some activists who came out of organizing in the lesbian and gay communities to extend their political perspectives and to learn from the experiences of people also oppressed and marginalized on bases other than sexuality. Finally, in this context, there is now an official state focus especially through the Krever Commission on problems with infections through the blood

supply, which is partly because of intensified organizing by those who acquired HIV infection as hemophiliacs requiring blood products and also among those who received it from transfusions.

These efforts have broadened out AIDS organizing confronting other bases of oppression. The social organization of the AIDS crisis, which is a condensation of many social relations, means that AIDS activism must confront questions of sexuality, race, gender, class, ability, hemophilia, health care, the medical profession, research, the drug corporations, and many other questions. At the same time, gay and lesbian activists have been able to bring their important experiences to the development of a grass-roots response to AIDS, including the central necessity of challenging heterosexism in any effective response to AIDS. It has also meant that there have been struggles over the importance of recognizing the significance of gays in the social response to AIDS against those who wish to deny it, and important struggles against heterosexism in state, professional, and community practices. This poses profound and radical questions of social transformation that I return to in the conclusion.⁹⁸

The AIDS crisis has forced gay activists to rely on former adversaries—the medical profession and state agencies—for badly needed information and resources. This reliance has at times hindered or contained our political responses to AIDS as we have been wary of antagonizing government or medical bureaucrats. The dilemma is how to fight AIDS using badly needed medical and government resources while at the same time avoiding racism, sexism and heterosexism, and their strategies of containment of the gay community and other affected groups.

Re-mobilizing Homosexuality as a Danger to Young People

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the narrative and imagery of male homosexuals as a special sexual danger to youth was re-mobilized in mass-media framing and in official government-commission-work processes building on the associations put in place in the 1950s and 1960s. Even though this conceptualization had its social roots in the past, it was still alive and possessed a certain resiliency in this new social context. In Newfoundland in 1989 and the early 1990s, the Hughes Royal Commission into why the police did not prosecute Christian Brothers for physical and sexual assaults on boys at the Mount Cashel Orphanage in the 1970s—along with associated media coverage—once again associated “child sexual abuse” with “deviant” homosexual sex. One of the central pieces of police evidence relied on in the commission work process was the 1975 police report *Child Abuse and Homosexual Acts at Mount Cashel Orphanage*, which was suppressed by authorities. This text embodied police attempts to criminalize homosexual activity and brought this perspective with it into the commission work in 1989–90. Rather than exploring the social and institutional power relations that led to the violence and harassment against these boys and young men, the commission often focused on homosexuality as the problem. This also served to obscure the actual gender character of the problem of sexual harassment and assaults against young people that often takes place in the private, familial realm against girls and young women as we have

seen. It also shifts attention away from the pervasive physical assaults and corporal punishment that was part of the disciplinarian regime at Mount Cashel, and in the process “sexualizes” the abuse the boys and young men faced.⁹⁹ This framing was made available through media coverage to cover problems at other institutions across the country. In this framing, “child sexual abuse” becomes a problem that boys and young men faced in institutional contexts often from homosexual identified men.

The major federal-government investigations of sexual-related problems in the 1980s—the Badgley Committee on Sexual Offences against Children and Youth and the Fraser Committee Report on Pornography and Prostitution—both focused on the need to re-deploy adult/youth distinctions in sexual regulation.¹⁰⁰ Even in the deliberations leading up to the 1988 legal change when the age of consent for anal intercourse was finally lowered to eighteen for acts in “private,” the special vulnerability of young men to homosexual advances along with the supposed higher risk of HIV transmission through anal intercourse were cited in committee and by a Justice Department policy coordinator to justify a higher age of consent for this activity than for other sexual activities. Neville Avison, senior criminal-justice-policy coordinator in the Justice Department’s policy program and research branch stated that the prohibition against anal intercourse involving those under eighteen would help stop the spread of AIDS and would curtail acts of anal intercourse that might confirm gayness in someone who was previously a latent homosexual. Part of this argument drew on the perspective embodied in the Wolfenden strategy that defined male homosexuality as a special danger to young men. As he put it:

Homosexuality does not sustain what you would call the traditional Canadian values of family life and it’s clear that the criminal law does have a role to play in maintaining traditional moral values as well as supporting medical ventures and psychological health of the population.¹⁰¹

Rather than calling for more and better safe-sex education—including on the proper usage of condoms for anal sex—they instead fell back on associating at least one central sexual practice they linked with homosexuality (although many heterosexuals engage in this act as we saw in the *Canada Youth and AIDS Study*, which reported that fifteen percent of “sexually active” youths reported engaging in this sexual activity¹⁰²) with a sexual and a health threat. This was based in part on the unfounded assumption that HIV is more easily spread through anal than vaginal intercourse and runs contrary to the advice of AIDS groups who support the proper use of condoms for both vaginal and anal sex. Instead, this higher age of consent makes it more difficult to do safe-sex education by criminalizing these activities. Although there have now been successful lower court legal challenges to the constitutionality of eighteen as the age of consent for anal intercourse this remains the law. When challenged in court, the federal-government lawyers have relied on arguments similar to those that Avison put forward.¹⁰³ This historical, legal legacy continues to associate certain sexual practices with homosexual danger.

The Youth-Porn Law: Re-criminalizing Gay-Male Sex

In 1993, the Conservative government rushed Bill C-128 through the House of Commons and the Senate (it is now Section 163.1 of the Criminal Code). This law was supposed to protect young people by prohibiting “child pornography.” For the first time it criminalized possession of “child pornography,” which was in part defined as pictures depicting anyone who appears to be under eighteen in explicit sexual activities. This is the unfounded assumption that images of sexual acts involving young people incite sexual violence against young people. It also prohibits written materials or visual representations that advocate or counsel sexual activities involving people under the age of eighteen. This law makes it difficult to undertake explicit safe sex education or sexuality education with young people, and many community-based AIDS groups have come out in opposition to it for this reason.

This law was used against Toronto artist Eli Langer for his line drawings that explores questions of adult/youth and youth/youth sexuality and child sexual abuse. Langer later won in court in April 1995 and his work has been returned to him. But this law is not only being used for sexual censorship but also as a way of criminalizing the lives of “male” hustlers and consensual sex between men. It has been used against a number of “male” sex workers in Toronto and London, Ontario, especially those who have made or participated in sex videos as part of their work or who made home movies. Almost all of these charges have been associated with sexual activities between men, and the seizure provision of the law is being used to collect evidence that can be used to criminalize consensual homosexual sex, especially anal sex involving someone under the age of eighteen. Previously the police would have had little means to collect evidence against such consensual sex that occurs in “private.”¹⁰⁴

In London, police operations were launched after some sexually explicit videotapes were fished out of a river. The police created still pictures of the young, local “male” sex workers in the videos and exhibited these pictures around the city to school officials, youth-agency workers, and to other young people. They were thus making these young men’s private and work lives very public. As of April 1994, London police claimed to have interrogated more than two hundred young people and to have identified eighteen “victims.” “Project Guardian” is now a joint project between the London, Ontario, and Toronto police forces.

Of the more than fifty men arrested so far, many are twenty-one years of age or younger. Of those convicted, very few are actually being convicted of youth-pornography offences. Instead, most are convicted for anal sex with someone under the age of eighteen and/or buying (or attempting to buy) the sexual services of someone under the age of eighteen. While no doubt there has been harassment and abuse involved in some of these interactions, the police are not differentiating between unconscious and consensual activities. Most of the younger people who have been charged and those identified as “victims” are “male” sex workers. Most of the young people charged are charged with making “obscene” material or with having anal intercourse with someone under eighteen years of age or both. At the same time, court decisions

questioning the constitutionality of the age of consent of eighteen for anal sex is making it more difficult for the police to use this section of the Criminal Code in this way.

The arrests are often the result of police pressuring the young men to name their sexual contacts. One fifteen-year-old sex worker says police threatened to charge him unless he cooperated by discussing one of his clients (who has since been arrested). "They said they wouldn't tell my parents," the fifteen-year-old says. "That's the only reason why I did it." But he says he later found the police talking to his parents. He is now afraid he will be thrown out of his house. "They think I'm a fag now. [My parents told me,] 'You're a queer, we don't like you any more.'"¹⁰⁵

In April 1994, as part of this police operation, a twenty-seven-year-old man pleaded guilty to anal sex with two men, aged twenty-seven and forty-two, since anal sex is a crime when there are more than two people present. All the participants were consenting but the event was recorded on video and retrieved by police from the bottom of a river. This demonstrated how the new youth-pornography legislation is being used to criminalize consensual homosexual sex the police would otherwise have no evidence to use against. Gay organizations like the Homophile Association of London Ontario and the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario have protested against this targeting of sex between men and "male" sex workers under this law.

In this instance, the very law designed to "protect" young people is actually being used against young people themselves and is being used against consensual gay sex and against "male" sex workers. Needless to say, this legislation and the police action it mandates does nothing to get at the social roots of sexual violence and harassment against young people.

Criminalizing and Censoring the "Irresponsible" and Non-Familial

Last chapter I talked about the construction of the "familial" and "spousal"-identified "responsible" gay, lesbian and bisexual. At the same time, as we can see, other lesbians and gay men who make no claim to be involved in familial or spousal relations are constructed as "irresponsible"; these lesbians and gay men are consistently used by right-wing and moral-conservative groups to undermine the credibility of those constructed as being "responsible." This tendency coincides with continuing sexual policing of same gender sexual practices and of state censorship of lesbian and gay erotic materials mentioned earlier in this chapter.

As Brenda Cossman suggests, for lesbians and gay men "it would seem that sexual, non-family subject positions are not legitimate."¹⁰⁶ "Responsibility" for lesbians and gay men is being constructed in terms of spousal and family relations that can lead to forms of self-regulation and self-management in these contexts. At the same time, for those who are not constructed as "familial" or "spousal," there is continued policing and oppressive regulation in areas regarding sexuality and social life outside spousal/familial contexts. These practices remain "deviant" and possibly "criminal," and are still constructed as some sort of "risk" or "threat" to others, especially to young people. As in the *Wolfenden Report*, those involved in sex with those under twenty-one (in the Canadian

context now, anal sex with someone under eighteen), or engaged in sex-related activities that are too “public” and outside spousal realms, are still to be criminalized. The erotic practices of lesbians and gay men—the main social basis of our differences from institutionalized heterosexuality—remains a terrain of policing and criminalization.

This leads to an intensification of regulation in relation to sexual practices and sexualities which are a major aspect of our social *differences* from heterosexuals. By contrast, some *similarities* of family—and spousal classifications between white middle-class heterosexual familial and some lesbian and gay relationships—are constructed as the route to “respectability.” Some lesbians and gay men come to take up this strategy of “normalization” as their own, to govern their lives and in the process facilitate divisions between themselves and “irresponsible” queers. In organizing for Bill 167 in Toronto in 1994, there was an attempt to avoid dealing with the use of the youth-porn law against gay sex and other lesbian/gay struggles that could not be directly related to the struggle for “We are family!” This is why lesbian and gay organizing needs to avoid the polarities of this “responsible”/“irresponsible” strategy of regulation and to push beyond it, which requires addressing both our claims to spousal and familial status *and* the ending of the practices criminalizing and censoring our sexualities and lives.

The Military, the RCMP, and Equality Rights

The institutions of Canadian state formation that had the most invested in defending the relations of heterosexual masculinity were also the most resistant to recognizing limited human-rights and anti-discrimination policies for lesbians, gay men and bisexuals. Until 1986, the RCMP Security Service regarded homosexuality as a “character weakness” and maintained a strict anti-gay and anti-lesbian hiring policy. They continued to pursue lesbians and gay men as a security risk after the 1969 Criminal Code reform, and strongly supported the federal refusal to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect lesbians and gays from discrimination.¹⁰⁷

In 1985, the RCMP released the document *RCMP Policy in Respect of Homosexual Conduct* amid the debate on the implementation of the equality rights section of the Charter of Rights. The document declared that homosexuality is “a bona fide operational impediment” because it undermines discipline, morale, public acceptance, and the RCMP’s heterosexual “self-image”; because homosexuals are a “security risk”; because it undermines hierarchical rank and structure; because homosexuality is illegal under age twenty-one; because it conflicts with “majority rights”; and because it conflicts with RCMP policy to enforce “a strict compliance to the accepted moral standards.” The document also argued that since communal living spaces like barracks and patrol cabins are “clearly not private places,” “any homosexual acts committed in such places would in fact be criminal offences.”¹⁰⁸ Once again, the limitations of the 1969 Code reform, which only decriminalized buggery and gross indecency in private between two consenting adults, were used to argue against lesbian and gay rights. These policies were retained by the new civilian Canadian Security Intelligence Service which replaced the RCMP Security service in 1984.¹⁰⁹

In response to the federal government's declaration in 1986 that Section 15 of the Charter, dealing with equality rights, would be interpreted to include sexual orientation protection, the RCMP decided that lesbians and gays were free to join the force, but at first only if they were "out." In 1988, under pressure, official discrimination in hiring and promotion was ended.

In the military, the administrative order prohibiting lesbians and gay men from being in the military was modified slightly in 1976 to bring it more into line with contemporary discourse and to take into account the 1969 Criminal Code reform (although this meant very little real change). The new title was *Homosexuality: Sexual Abnormality, Investigation, Medical Examination and Disposal*. Key to this change was the use and definition of the term "homosexuality." The stages outlined for dealing with homosexuals were investigation, discipline, disposal, and release. It was now the Special Investigation Unit (SIU) that investigates cases.¹¹⁰

There have been many documented purges from the military.¹¹¹ Military defence of their anti-gay, anti-lesbian policies ranged from the potential for "blackmail" to concerns over proper military order, morale, and "operational efficiency."¹¹² Again, they argued that since there is no real "private" realm in the military, homosexual sex just cannot be tolerated.

In 1989, a corporal who admitted to being gay had his security clearance revoked. He was then asked to submit a "voluntary release." He refused and took them to the Federal Court of Canada, which forced them to return his security clearance.¹¹³ These policies continued in varying forms in the armed forces until 1992. In 1991, there was an attempt to end the ban on lesbians and gay men in the military, but this was scuttled due to a revolt by the "family caucus" within the Conservative caucus. Michelle Douglas took the government to court challenging the military ban. In October 1992, the case was settled very quickly. Federal lawyers conceded that "sexual orientation" was included in Section 15 of the Charter and that this discrimination could not be justified. The judge signed a consent order and the Department of National Defence announced the end of its discriminatory policy.¹¹⁴ There remain continuing informal practices of discrimination, and gay/lesbian members of the military are not granted the same spousal financial support, as well as travel rights to be with their partners as are common-law heterosexual couples. Military forms of organization were shaped along racist and sexist lines.

The Charter and Sexual Policing: The Contradictory Situation We Are In

The current situation in Canada is marked by two seemingly contradictory developments for lesbians and gay men and on the questions of human rights and sexuality more generally. These impact differently in our lives in relation to class, race, gender, age, ability, and other social differences. On the one hand, the implementation of the equality rights section of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Charter's outlining of at least a partially different pattern of state formation—in concert with our extra-parliamentary and legal struggles—has led to a situation of considerable pressure

for sexual-orientation protection in human-rights legislation at the federal and provincial levels.¹¹⁵ In some jurisdictions this has led to some progress on spousal benefits and even family-recognition fronts of struggle. (This trend was explored in more detail last chapter.) This is, however, only one side of the picture—the more optimistic side, if you will.

At the same time, there also exists an extension and intensification of certain forms of sexual policing and censorship directed against us. This is evident in the video-surveillance arrests in southern Ontario, in the arrest of men on charges of “indecent acts,” in the implementation of Bill C-49 against sex workers passed in late 1985 which has so far withstood a number of constitutional challenges, in the seizure by Canada Customs of lesbian and gay erotic materials, in the opposition mounted to explicit safe-sex education for gay men in the context of AIDS,¹¹⁶ and in the ways the new federal youth-pornography law is being used in southern Ontario against hustlers and consensual gay sex. This escalation of sexual policing affects a number of our sex-related practices, from men who have sex in washrooms and parks, to gay hustlers, to young lesbians, gay men and bisexuals who are denied access to information about queer sexual practices, to community AIDS workers, to lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals who read, view, write, and produce erotic materials.

While on an abstract and formal level, many state and social agencies and the federal government now recognize that we should enjoy equal rights with heterosexuals, they are still not willing to recognize our substantive rights to equality and freedom from oppression. They are unwilling to endorse the actual sexual activities or relationships in which we engage or to challenge the deeply rooted practices of heterosexual hegemony in Canadian state, legal, and social formation. Our rights as “private” individuals are recognized, while our real social and material differences—our erotic pleasures and the gender of those we love, are still not recognized as valid and equal. This situation continues some of the limitations of the 1969 reform. Doug Sanders’s comments on then-Justice Minister Crosbie’s remarks in response to the report of the equality-rights committee in 1986 is useful in clarifying this situation.

Crosbie [the justice minister who introduced the equality rights position] has said that he is not condoning homosexuality in his present statements...it is impressive to me how the current Crosbie attitude is constructed. It is put forward as it is the law anyway. There is no debate about “Oh God! we made a mistake.” “Oops, we should have drafted Section 15 of the Charter more carefully”... The issue can be avoided on the one side by saying, “Well, we are not using a closed list of categories” so you avoid actually saying yes it’s in... This is all legitimated by law and law is beyond debate because it is so sanctified within the political system. So Crosbie can say, “Well, this is the law.” And you don’t come to grips with the issue.¹¹⁷

We therefore face a highly paradoxical situation: on the one hand we are closer than ever to winning sexual-orientation protection and, in many areas, spousal benefits—while,

on the other hand, the police are still able to harass and arrest us for “queer” or “deviant” sex.

The ambiguity is perhaps highlighted in the 1995 decision in the Jim Egan spousal-benefits case mentioned in the introduction (to the second edition). On the one hand, the Supreme Court recognized that sexual orientation is included in the equality rights guaranteed in the Charter. On the other, for somewhat varying reasons, the majority decided that the different-sex definition of “spouse” in the Old Age Security Act did not constitute discrimination against pension benefits for couples or that this was a justified form of discrimination under the Charter.¹¹⁸ While we have abstract rights when it comes to our lives and relationships, these rights in the substantive realm where they have real meaning in our lives don’t really seem to exist. The practices of heterosexual hegemony have only been dislodged on the formal and abstract level of discrimination against “private” individuals on the basis of “sexual orientation” while the social practices of heterosexual hegemony relating to our sexualities and relationships have not been substantially challenged.

As Doug Sanders expressed it in relation to the limitations of recent legal decisions: “Homosexuals can have ‘equality’ so long as their lives are not condoned and their presence is not forced into the consciousness of others.”¹¹⁹ In response we have to act to break through the boundaries of a limited individual formal equality to establish a social acceptance for our sexualities and relationships that must become part of the general social consciousness.

There have been two distinct reactions to the growth of lesbian and gay communities and our liberation movements. Most provincial Tories, the Reform Party, some federal Liberal backbenchers, the police establishment, and the moral conservatives would deny us recognition as legitimate communities, and—within the boundaries of what they can continue to get away with under the Charter—to continue to deny our civil and human rights in as many areas as they can. They want to retain, and indeed broaden, the definition of “public” and to extend public forms of regulation into the private realm. The boundary between public and private can be quite fuzzy indeed. Public/private categories, when they are found not to be working quite right, can be re-deployed and the boundaries between them shifted. These public/private categories are ones of rule, of social administration. These efforts may bring aspects of same-gender sex more directly under the jurisdiction of the police or other state agencies, re-criminalizing aspects of gay sex. When resistance to police practices like the bath raids is too strong, the sex police attack more vulnerable targets like the men who engage in washroom sex. They focus on those queers who can be portrayed as “irresponsible.” This is part of a strategy of those groups who wish to see our visibility reduced. While the target is gay and lesbian visibility and defence of the relations of heterosexual hegemony, they focus on the supposed queer and now trans threat to young people, on washroom or “public” sex, lesbian or gay porn, queer BDSM, or that we supposedly “spread” HIV and AIDS.

As we saw in the Bill 167 debate in Ontario, they are adamantly opposed to family-recognition rights for lesbians and gays. These forces now have new ideological ammunition

in a political and social climate defined by a neoliberal fixation on deficit reduction and fiscal restraint, with attempts to construct and to discredit social justice movements as “special interest” groups, and with the right-wing campaign against “political correctness,” which is being used against a number of equality-seeking movements. The term “politically correct” originated in the feminist, gay, and left movements in the late 1970s and early 1980s as part of a critique of an overly moralistic and rigid form of politics. It was not intended as a weapon to be used against struggles against racism, sexism, and heterosexism. The term has now been taken over and colonized by the right wing and has become a term used to mobilize opposition to anti-racist, feminist, and lesbian and gay movements.¹²⁰

More liberal elements have adopted a different attitude, basically defending, modifying, and expanding the Wolfenden perspective of the 1969 reform and the right of two adults to practise homosexual acts in private. Most now believe, abstractly or generally, in civil and human rights for lesbians and gay men. This position, including interpretations of the Charter itself, is the result of years of campaigning by activists, who have won the support of other groups such as the federal, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan Human Rights Commissions, the trade unions, the United Church, the feminist movement, and many other groups. Basic sexual-orientation protection has now been established in Québec, Ontario, Manitoba, Yukon, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan.¹²¹ The Alberta government is very hostile to human-rights protection for lesbians and gay men and the Liberal government in Newfoundland also remains adamantly opposed.¹²² Following passage of the inclusion of sexual orientation as grounds for sentencing for hate crimes in June 1995—which was opposed by some Liberal backbenchers—the Chrétien government seems prepared to postpone the introduction of such protection in human-rights legislation. While they state their general commitment to this goal, it seems to be placed on the back burner and only activist campaigns can alter this.

Sexual-orientation protection, while it is an important victory, is still a very limited tool for bringing about lesbian and gay liberation. It recognizes our right not to be discriminated against in a series of areas on the basis of our “orientation,” but still permits our arrest under the Criminal Code if we engage in prohibited sexual acts, or if we engage in these acts in the wrong place. Sexual-orientation protection does nothing in and of itself to dislodge institutionalized heterosexuality in social, family, and other state policies nor to stop oppressive sexual policing. It does not stop criminalization of our sexualities or guarantee our spousal and family recognition rights.

In response to these limitations of basic human-rights reform, we have gone on to argue for recognition of our spousal benefits and recognition of our familial relationships as outlined in the last chapter. This has forced some liberal and social-democratic sectors to support these struggles and in response to develop a strategy supportive of normalizing and responsabilizing some lesbian and gay relationships. This exists simultaneously with others of us being constructed as “irresponsible” through the strategy mobilized by criminalization and censorship practices.

These two basic trends are responding to a situation brought about by the contradictions of the 1969 reform legislation—and the ensuing social struggles—and the implementation of the equality-rights section of the Charter. While some homosexual acts were de-criminalized in the private realm, they have never been legalized or accepted as socially approved or equal activities. Major aspects of our oppression continue. Gay and lesbian sex remains fundamentally “indecent” and “obscene” under the law.

There is a great measure of ambiguity inherent in a Criminal Code which legalizes sex between consenting adult males in private, while at the same time allowing their arrest on the grounds that such behaviour is indecent.¹²³

Moral conservatives and the police have adopted a strategy of using the limitations and ambiguities of the practices coming out of the 1969 reform to criminalize and in some cases to re-criminalize aspects of gay sexual practice thereby decreasing its visibility. The strategy of more liberal sectors, while it reflects our gains, also includes re-deployment of the public/private and adult/youth categories of regulation in order to manage us as a social problem. In general, there has been a shift toward a greater focus on adult/youth distinctions which go far beyond the regulation of gay and lesbian sex. While sexual-orientation protection is supported by liberal sectors, it may only prevent discrimination on the basis of general “orientation” or on the basis of acts in private between two consenting adults, and not sex in other contexts. It may not be extended to cover our relationships and families. In response to a presentation I made to an Ontario hearing on human-rights legislation in 1981, James Renwick of the NDP stated:

I have great difficulty in the relationship between adult homosexuals and young people, particularly in the school system, but elsewhere who have a trust responsibility in my view; the dominant cultural mores of the society, which is a heterosexual one, and the relationship of course to the parents in that system as well as the elected school boards in that system. We are talking about an anxiety related to a cultural mores which is heterosexual. The problem is the question of advocacy or as the Board of Education for the City of Toronto said, proselytization.¹²⁴

If these liberals and social democrats had their way, the public sphere would continue to be highly policed. Questions of family life, young people, and the school system would continue to be off-limits for lesbian and gay liberation. Attempts would be made to incorporate our movement into forms of self-policing and regulation. This strategy—while it could help legitimize adult gay ghettos and communities, providing the conditions for more people to come out and for continuing liberation struggles—would not centrally address heterosexual hegemony. Some who advocate this approach are willing to accept lesbian/gay spousal/family relationship rights if they are incorporated into a strategy of “responsibilization” and “normalization.”¹²⁵ This constructs major divisions in our communities.

Some of us—those who are not too “queer”—would be accepted into respectable white middle-class straight society, but not on our own terms. Heterosexual hegemony would be retained, regulating our communities, our sexualities, and our cultures, and preventing any basic challenge to heterosexual hegemony and dominant sex/gender relations.

Our movements must form limited alliances at times with more liberal sectors against the forces of conservatism—in support of equality rights and sexual-orientation protection, for instance—while still keeping our own autonomy and avoiding neoliberal entanglements.¹²⁶ We must continue to: demand repeal of all anti-gay and anti-lesbian laws; defend gays against entrapment in washrooms and parks; defend our community institutions; build alliances against police repression; push for the transformation of the laws continuing to criminalize queer sex; push for better human-rights protection and better human-rights commissions; push for a transformation of our portrayal in the mass media; demand health services for lesbians and gay men; demand adequate AIDS/HIV treatment and social supports; and demand fundamental changes in schooling and family and social policy including our spousal and family rights. All this means that we must go beyond the boundaries of the 1969 reform and the present strategy of sexual rule. A crucial part of this is opposing the polarization of “responsible”/“irresponsible” lines of regulation by bringing together our struggles against criminalization and censorship, and for our spousal and family rights as part of a socially transformative challenge to heterosexual hegemony. This also needs to be part of building broader coalitions with other oppressed groups, that are also often part of our communities, as part of building a revitalized anti-capitalist movement centrally defined by feminism, anti-racism, struggles for lesbian and gay liberation, and which clearly takes the side of working-class and poor people.

The Emergence of the Neoliberal Queer: 1996–2023

Where to Start? What to Cover?

It has been a *long* time since 1996. It is hard to know where to start in covering what has taken place in the twenty-seven years since the second edition. There is not space to cover everything, and I have had to be rather selective and idiosyncratic in drawing on my experiences, writings, and other sources. Given that I am often drawing on my own experiences of activism and what is most familiar to me, this chapter, like the Introductions, has a rather Toronto-centric character. This is less so for my experiences in Nova Scotia (mostly, but not entirely, before the second edition) and Sudbury (1994–2014). The central focus here is the emergence of the neoliberal queer, while the next chapter focuses more on the resistance to and unmaking of the neoliberal queer. However, aspects of the resistance are also mentioned here, since they cannot be disentangled from this emergence.

Ideas for how I put this chapter together are prefigured in the Introduction and I build on them here, focusing on questions of social organization and social struggle. Some areas, like the impact of the mobilizations around 9/11 and the “war on terror” will only be briefly addressed. I do not go into them in detail as they have been explored elsewhere. At the same time, they crucially influence what takes place from before 2001 and still continuing.¹ For space reasons, I am not able to cover the many transformations in popular cultures—or the pop culture wars—as well as the growth in organizing, communicating, and networking of new forms of social media and dating apps (including Facebook, Twitter (now “X”), Instagram, Tumblr, TikTok, Grindr) which become crucial parts of providing information, networking, and community formation. These social media platforms have affected political organizing and deeply changed community building, and social and sexual relations—and this was long before pandemic times.² These are contested terrains often serving capital and forms of oppression but also are new sources of education, connection, and terrains for organizing.

While avoiding any major exploration of the popular culture wars relating to queer and trans people, a few comments are relevant here. A lot of cultural production shifted during this period in response to queer movements and community formation and the emergence of more distinct forms of trans organizing. While much of this cultural production has been part of the construction of the neoliberal queer as a racialized class

politics, there have also been struggles against the white, middle-class coding of the presentations of most queer and trans people who are accommodated with capitalist and racist relations. This is a contested terrain of struggles over meanings, ways of seeing, and representations.

In general, I find Rosemary Hennessey's analysis of the reception of *The Crying Game*—which came out in 1992 and played around with gender performance, trans experience, racism, and colonialism—to be relevant to grasping what has and is taking place.³ In this film, the Irish Republican Army seizes a Black British soldier. He gets killed in a botched British army rescue mission. But, before he is killed, the Black soldier tells one of the IRA volunteers about his Black girlfriend and asks him to look her up. He does so, and he falls for her, only to discover after she has performed oral sex on him that she has a penis. He throws up in response, starting a whole history of cis straight men throwing up in films and programs when they have been attracted to or had sex with trans women. The plot continues with the ex-IRA volunteer trying to protect the trans woman while not wanting to have a sexual relationship with her, with a mixture of reactionary and progressive responses to gender, sexuality, masculinities, racism, and colonialism. *The Crying Game* simultaneously transgressed gender and sexual boundaries while, at the same time, normalizing raced, classed, and colonizing boundaries and relations. As Hennessey wrote:

In foregrounding the film's mythic absorption of the transvestite and its displacement of neocolonialism, I want to offer an alternative instance of how we might begin to understand some of the historical conditions of possibility on which contemporary cultural representations of sexuality at times depend...in opening up ways of thinking about sexual identity in terms of ambivalence, masquerade, and transvestism in history, and the history of neo-imperialism in particular.... My aim is to raise questions about some of the current thinking on the cultural representation of ambivalent sexual identities and to draw attention to its allegorical (i.e., historical) uses.⁴

This means that we need to view and read cultural productions—which bring together, in a mediated fashion, both the relations of production and the relations of making sense/meaning/consumption of these productions—in relation to neoliberal, racist, capitalist relations.⁵ We need to note how, in neoliberal capitalist relations, while there has been a general loosening up of gender and sexual relations, this is still confined within classed, raced, imperialist, and, to an important extent, gender relations. This moves us far beyond the debates over distinctions between “positive” or “negative” images through complicating our analysis, not only along lines of gender and sexuality, but also race, class, colonialism, imperialism and more.

This chapter also cannot be an attempt to construct a movement history for this time period.⁶ Some of what has taken place since 1996 is still very present for me, while other aspects have faded into the distant past, needing to be recovered from the mistiness and foggy of these pandemic times. In part, this chapter is also about memory work.⁷

Perhaps the best place to start, as already suggested, is with the emergence of the neoliberalism in the 1990s. As noted in the Introduction to this edition, neoliberalism is the capitalist strategy that emerged in response to the global composition of struggle of the 1960s and early 1970s that put capitalist relations into question. It is this vibrant cycle of struggles—which includes the emergence of feminist, gay liberation, lesbian feminist, Black power, Red power, and anti-racist movements, as well as working-class and national liberation insurgencies—that disrupted capitalist profitability and social relations. This challenge is what produced the conditions for the shift towards neoliberalism and its attack on the working class, and poor and oppressed people around the world. Seen in this way, people and our struggles are at the forefront of critical social analysis and we do not attribute power simply to shifts in accumulation regimes (for instance, from Keynesianism to neoliberalism) as the agency in social transformation.⁸

Neoliberalism became the ruling capitalist strategy in the late 1970s/early 1980s and has had devastating consequences. Neoliberalism's response to our struggles is based on tearing apart the social power of the working class and oppressed people around the world through social program cuts, cuts to the social wage, "law and order" (including, crucially, racist policing and the prison industrial complex), and the tightening of borders.⁹ Its impact includes the vast majority of queer and trans people and those engaging in diverse sexual and gender practices. In Canada, these are the queer and trans people who have been left behind in the rights revolution, including Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, disabled people, sex workers, the poor, the homeless, and many working-class queer and trans people.

But there are also different currents of neoliberalism that we contend with. The first form our movements in the global north confronted, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, was the moral-conservative one that is described in Chapter 10. This form persists in the global north and takes different forms across the Global South. When our mobilizations, along with interlinked actions by feminists, anti-racist movements, and others set these forces back, a new, non-moral-conservative form of neoliberalism was given space to emerge more clearly.¹⁰ This is what set the stage for the emergence of the neoliberal queer in the 1990s and 2000s. However, it is also crucial to remember that these moral-conservative (as well as overtly racist) strands of neoliberalism are still very much alive today.¹¹

As Dryden and Lenon, Rao, Drucker, Sears, McCaskell, and others point out, there are tendencies in neoliberal racial capitalism that lead towards the moral deregulation of normalized white and middle-class gay, lesbian, and queer sexualities, in part through the expansion of consumer markets and identifications based upon them.¹² But Drucker also points out that formal legal rights in countries like Canada and the United States emerge as social and racialized class inequality expands, meaning that these rights benefit the white middle class much more than others, facilitating the emergence of what I call the neoliberal queer.

Neoliberal capitalist marketing and the extension of consumer capitalism itself, including the "pink market" mentioned in Chapter 9, undermines moral-conservative,

pro-family positions.¹³ This is an important contradiction, but this very same neoliberal moral conservatism was also a central vehicle for discipline and expanding carceral relations, with a focus on law and order, which is key to *all* forms of neoliberalism. McCaskell argues that, “While at first neoliberalism needed a populist social conservatism to displace the old Keynesian order once in power, a more mature neoliberalism could dispense with such embarrassing bedfellows.”¹⁴ This analysis tends not to see this moral conservatism as a form of neoliberalism but just as a temporary, tactical accommodation of neoliberal forces with conservative and moral-conservative forces.

Neoliberalism, however, was never simply about consolidating liberalism. Some theorists and activists get taken in far too much by the ideology of neoliberalism, which they identify with liberalism, rather than seeing that neoliberalism is a combination of liberal and more conservative capitalist tendencies. It is actually not clear that non-moral-conservative strands of neoliberalism are the more “mature” form, given the resurgence of more moral-conservative and right-wing forms over the last ten to fifteen years in various places around the world, including in what is now called Canada.

Not only do different forms of neoliberalism exist, our struggles also have an impact on their varied characteristics. As mentioned, this includes opening up the space for non-moral-conservative forms to emerge. Feminist, queer, and anti-racist struggles pushed back the initial, moral-conservative form of neoliberalism of the later 1970s and 1980s (see Chapter 10), opening up space for the emergence of forms of neoliberalism that were supportive of limited rights for women (mostly white, cis, and middle class) and white, middle-class queer people, and for further opening up “pink market” relations (referred to in Chapter 9). This is the neoliberalism that allowed for the emergence of the neoliberal queer. At the same time, it is important to be clear that this form of neoliberalism—just as with its more moral-conservative strands—remains firmly committed to maintaining racial capitalist relations, to attacks on poor and working-class people, to cuts to social programs and the social wage, to racist immigration policies, racist policing, and the expansion of prisons and strategies of “law and order.” It is this broader neoliberalism that also informs the emergence of the neoliberal queer, despite opposition to its moral-conservative forms.

But this actually existing form of neoliberalism, just like actually existing capitalism more generally, is always gendered and racialized, despite what some claim.¹⁵ And now we are seeing the global resurgence of more moral/social (and often overtly racist) conservative forms of neoliberalism in many nation-states. McCaskell notes some of this, pointing out that: “As mature neoliberalism exploited sexual choice in the West, its authoritarian Russian version hearkened back to the Reagan strategy, using homosexuality as a scapegoat for broader social problems.”¹⁶ This also has much to do with restoring patriarchal gender relations against the social gains that women acquired in the USSR and Eastern European bureaucratic class societies.¹⁷ And now we have some of these more “mature” forms of neoliberalism reverting to more repressive moral/social conservative forms in North America, Europe, and beyond as well.

This neoliberal queer social stratum has earlier roots,¹⁸ some of which are outlined in Chapters 9 and 10, including acceptance of the strategy of privatization of queer

sexualities. In the second edition, I did not use the term “neoliberal queer.” In fact, I did not start using it until the twenty-first century, although this social layer and its always contested hegemony began to emerge in the later 1980s and more fully developed in the 1990s. This coincides with the growth of a gay, white middle class and a business/professional/managerial class—mostly composed of cis men—that identifies its rights and progress with a non-moral-conservative form of neoliberal capitalism.

It is this neoliberal queer that provides the social, racial, and class basis for the social practices that get called homonormativity and homonationalism.¹⁹ This can be seen in relation to the expansion, commercialization, and gentrification of gay/queer community formation;²⁰ the abandonment of often racialized poor and working-class people within our communities; the commercialization and de-radicalization of Pride marches and celebrations, especially in the larger urban centres; a growing abandonment of sexual need and desire-related struggles in favour of spousal, family-recognition, and especially marriage rights; and the absorption of AIDS organizing and activism into state-managed AIDS Service Organizations (ASOs), which had access to large financial resources, covered in Chapter 10.²¹ All of these reconstruct and strengthen racist class relations within our communities. “Community” politics becomes a racialized class politics taking place under cover of the mirage of a common or unitary “community,” as mentioned in Chapter 9.

As class, poverty, and often racism (except in the most limited, formal-rights ways) fell off the mainstream queer agenda, the further development of neoliberal class relations has led to growing racialized class inequalities in our communities.²² A limited layer of largely white, middle-class cis men, who can now be “out” because of our movements, benefiting from our struggles from below, become an uneasy (but at times important) part of the white middle class. A major shift that takes place, helping to set the stage for the emergence of the neoliberal queer, is that the mass struggles of bar and working-class gays, lesbians, and trans people from the late 1960s through to the early 1990s—largely against police repression and the right-wing—ironically created the social basis for white, middle-class, and professional gay men to now be out and to be accepted as part of the white middle class, to speak for the gay “community” in an administrative fashion, and to develop their own class politics, which get put forward as the politics of the “community.” This shifting class organization within gay and lesbian community formation, related to social struggles, helps produce the basis for the neoliberal queer.

Drucker correctly points out that neoliberal capitalist relations have very different impacts upon queer and trans people’s lives depending on their class, race, gender, and other social locations. While white, middle-class gay men assert their right to privacy, for instance, Drucker insightfully points out that neoliberal policies lead to a growing denial of privacy for those on social assistance, refugees and migrants who are put under greater state and social surveillance, and those imprisoned and in detention.²³ This also points to the racialized class character of private space, often tied to private-property ownership, and how this is often denied to queers and other people living in poverty. Only some are granted access to this “privacy,” in ways that are highly mediated by race and white supremacy.²⁴ As mentioned, there is a simultaneous movement of apparent

“de-criminalization” of queer sex within a limited “private” realm, which actually leads to a heightened policing and regulation of queer sex in the broad public realm, especially as it relates to race and class relations.

At the very same time, the vast majority of queer and trans people become more impoverished and oppressed, with many still facing police brutality, racism, and other forms of social violence. They are left behind or marginalized in the rights revolution. Class, gender, and racialized inequalities within queer community formation grow and this white, middle-class layer comes to speak for and to “represent” our communities even more. There is an undeclared racial class struggle going on within gay/lesbian community formation that reshapes our communities towards white, middle-class interests. At the same time, there are diverse and uneven struggles against this hegemony—mentioned in the Introduction, in this chapter, and especially the next—but in major ways, the other side of this racialized class struggle did not fully join in until the Black Lives Matter protests from 2014 to 2016 and the global uprising against racist capitalism and policing in 2020. Perhaps the best place to restart this narrative is with a return to some of the struggles of the early 1990s mentioned in earlier chapters (Chapter 9 and 10).

The Emergence of the Neoliberal Queer

In addition to mapping the emergence of the neoliberal queer, the rest of the chapter also traces its development. It is in the 1990s, as McCaskell points out, that, “A professional class began to assume leadership,” affecting even activist groups like AIDS ACTION NOW! (AAN!). This was even more the case among more respectable gay men and lesbians in groups like the Campaign for Equal Families, which was mentioned in Chapter 9, and mainstream lobbying groups like Egale. I often focus on examining Egale throughout this chapter since it is an important vehicle for expanding the influence of the neoliberal queer (and the racialized class politics upon which it is based) and has had an impact across the Canadian state. Court decisions and legal cases and strategies, as mentioned earlier, helped to cement this influence.²⁵

At the same time, police raids on queer establishments did not stop in 1996. In Toronto, the police raided The Bijou club in 1999, arresting nineteen men and leading to the formation of the June 13th Committee to protest the raid and defend those arrested in the spirit of the Right to Privacy Committee, which had dissolved in 1991. But, by this point, there were queer neoliberal forces who did not support activist responses to police repression. Gay city councillor Kyle Rae broke with the June 13th Committee, stating, “The world isn’t 1981 anymore, but there’s a bunch of dinosaurs who can only react one way.”²⁶ Brent Hawkes, then of the Metropolitan Community Church (MCC), adopted a similar position. As McCaskell points out, “Rae and Hawkes tended to downplay the seriousness of police actions.”²⁷

In 2000, five male police officers raided the “Pussy Palace” held at the Club Toronto, which was attended by around 350 women (cis and trans) who got together for a sexual and social bath night. The police used the liquor license act to lay charges. This raiding group included the recently appointed new Toronto Police chief, Myron Demkiw, who

has been challenged by an open letter initiated by Chanelle Gallant and J.P. Hornick, who were part of the organizing group for the “Pussy Palace,” and signed by more than 400 people in October 2022.²⁸ A significant demonstration was organized in 2000 against this raid with lots of queer men participating, given their previous experiences with police raids. In response to this raid, Rae was humiliated and furious.²⁹ The women organizing the women’s bath house nights later changed its name to “Pleasure Palace” to include trans women more directly.³⁰

There were also continuing bath house raids, including at Goliath’s in Calgary in 2002, at Taboo in Montreal in 2003, and at the Warehouse Spa in Hamilton in 2004, sparking organizing in each of these communities.³¹ Bath house raids and the bawdy-house laws were problems far beyond Toronto, and sparked resistance in many communities. At the same time, emerging neoliberal queer forces generally neglected police repression in their focus on “rights” and developing a politics of respectability and responsibility.

Respectability/Responsibility Versus Erotic Needs and Desires

In Chapters 9 and 10, I pointed out how the struggles for spousal and family recognition came to be counterposed to those defending sexual rights for queer people, including young people, and the struggles of sex workers. We saw in the struggle against the youth porn law and against the raising of the age of consent for sexual activity that those struggling for “responsible” and “respectable” spousal benefits and family-recognition rights wanted little to do with struggles for sexual needs and rights. They did not want to be seen supporting the struggles against the youth porn law in 1993, or the struggles against the raising of the age of consent law to sixteen in 1996 despite the organization of left queer activists, sex workers, AIDS and sexuality educators and youth activists on these questions.

This intensifies even more with the struggles for “same-sex” marriage, which I engage with later this chapter. Many of those supporting marriage did not want their construction as “responsible” lesbians and gay men to be tainted by associations with queer sex and the eroticism of younger people.

I remember, when organizing with sex workers, anti-censorship artists, and left queer activists in the Repeal the Youth Pornography Law Coalition in the early 1990s, that the vast majority of those involved in supporting Bill 167 for family-recognition rights, and then later for same sex marriage, did not want to have anything to do with us.³²

This construction of a “responsible” and “respectable” queer politics³³ was part of the formation of this new white, middle-class elite (again, mostly cis men) and the emergence of the neoliberal queer. This social layer, which involved a number of lawyers, was able to take advantage of the Charter and its shift in state legal formation to push forward its legal claims and to begin to win gains in ways that incorporated some queers into ruling spousal, familial, and eventually marriage relations. They had the legal expertise for this, as well as access to funding for these legal cases. But as McCaskell insightfully points out, “In the process of transforming laws, we transformed ourselves.”³⁴ This focus on legal challenges and arguments and viewing legal change as central to

any social change, trapped our organizing within the social form of law and increasingly shifted our organizing towards accommodation with capitalist (and racist and patriarchal) institutional, state, and other social relations. What had been a transformative social movement became increasingly entwined with and invested in neoliberal capitalist frameworks.

At the same time, this social layer was also involved in gentrification projects and real-estate class interests. Some of its members began to organize against homeless people, sex workers, and drug users in “their” neighborhoods, who they saw as a threat to the value of their (private) property.³⁵ This also led them into growing alliances with and collaboration with the police to defend their property and its value. Their racial class interests aligned them with the police against homeless/unhoused people, sex workers, drug users, and Black and racialized people (many of whom are also queer and trans).³⁶

Increasingly, this social layer shifted “violence” and “danger” to queer people as coming not from queer bashers and the police but instead from poor, homeless/unhoused, and often racialized people who were defined as not “LGBT,” as LGBT becomes increasingly coded as white and middle class. “Violence” gets relocated in the bodies of the poor and homeless/unhoused and often racialized people and shifted away from actual queer bashers, and the police. For instance, in the development of the 519 Community Centre, which has been a hub for lesbian and gay community formation in Toronto from the mid-1980s on, we see a shift from offering important programs for homeless people in the area to restricting these programs to those willing to identify their sexual orientation, to clearing surrounding bushes to decrease homeless/unhoused people from using Barbara Hall Park, and making it more difficult for homeless people to use the inside of the 519 to meet and seek refuge from the cold and heat. The rationale is that homeless/unhoused people are a danger to queer and trans people, while many of them are of course queer and trans themselves.

The 519 even initiated a public/private partnership with an anonymous private donor, first to develop an LGBT athletic complex in Moss Park, which includes a poor community which uses the park and community centre. With protest from Queer Trans Community Defence which I was involved with and other groups, this plan was modified to a proposal for a “community” hub in an area where poor and homeless people congregate, which would have spurred gentrification.³⁷ In 2019, this project was finally abandoned after it was criticized not only by Queer Trans Community Defence, sex workers, and anti-poverty activists, but also by the neighborhood association, and after receiving major delays in the city bureaucratic deliberation process. This occurred in the context of major gentrification of the area, including the involvement of a layer of white, middle-class, property-owning gay men.

At the same time, there were also significant legal victories that were largely formal in character. This is not to suggest that the legal victories around spousal and family recognition did not have significant impacts in the lives of queer people, especially parents raising children together. But formal rights are often differentiated in their actual life impacts on the basis of someone’s class, gender, and racialized social locations. They

are also affected by relations of ability/disability, age, and health status. While we may all, for instance, have the same formal right to stay at the most expensive hotel in the city, or to apply for refugee status in Canada on the basis of being LGBT, in actuality these rights are substantially differentiated along lines of class, race, gender, disability, age, and more. One can only stay at the most expensive hotel if one has the money to do it, and it is accessible and free of racist barriers, and one can only apply for refugee status if one can get to Canada, get a visa, or is recommended by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) or the Immigration and Refugee Board (IRB).³⁸ So while these formal rights are significant, they tended to benefit more privileged layers within queer (and, later, trans) communities. For most queer and trans people, their situations and abilities to meet their needs and desires did not improve. In major ways, they actually got worse for poor, working-class, Black, and racialized queer, trans, and Two-Spirit people, given the class and racial character of neoliberal capitalism.

This sets up an uneven contradiction between formal equality rights and continuing discrimination, oppression, racism, and even violence in the everyday lives of many queer and trans people. We also begin to see, as suggested earlier, that neoliberal queers join in racial class-based campaigns against poor and homeless/unhoused people, against sex workers, drug users, and against Black people and people of colour more generally. A key aspect of this has been reliance on and collaboration with the police.

Egale Becomes a Cross-Country Vehicle for Neoliberal Transformation and White Hegemony

The emergence and the hegemonic positioning of Egale within mainstream LGBT organizations signals its importance as a vehicle for the emergence and development of the neoliberal queer. Egale, initially called Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere, was founded in 1986. It was different from previous cross-country gay/lesbian groups in its focus on lobbying and its investment in the Charter and court challenges. It therefore came to be focused on law and operating within the social form of law as well as Canadian state formation. Egale involved an important shift from earlier cross-country organizations in the 1970s, which had largely been made up of coalitions of groups from across Canada, with annual decision-making conferences, and with a focus on lesbian and gay public visibility. This commitment to the Charter as the road to rights meant that it was also committed to the existing Canadian state form and the settler colonialism and racism it is based on. We will see how this identification limited the perspective of Egale in the 2016 *Just Society Report* when it came to settler colonialism.

The primary founder of Egale was Les McAfee. McAfee had worked with the Tories in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and worked for Conservative MP David McDonald when he first came to Ottawa in 1979. This was a rather different history from that of previous gay organizers. As McCaskell points out, Egale grew out of a “group of thirty lesbians and gay men who had been involved in letter-writing campaigns to Members of

Parliament... Egale was bilingual, included both women and men, and was unabashedly about lobbying.”³⁹ Egale was centrally involved in the turn to the courts and received funding and support from the Charter Challenges Program, which re-affirmed this Charter-based legal focus.⁴⁰

To give a sense of its early history, Egale made no attempt to intervene in the Butler decision or the Glad Day or Little Sisters cases relating to sexual censorship. There was a major reluctance to address sexuality and sexual censorship issues. Later, they did not challenge the previously mentioned youth porn law. But Egale was very heavily involved in the Nesbit/Jim Egan challenge regarding spousal benefits⁴¹ and, later, in the same-sex marriage struggle.

Egale took up a particular positioning regarding whiteness and struggles over race within queer (and, eventually, trans) communities. This was in response to the growing self-organization of Black, Indigenous, and racialized queers who challenged racist practices within gay/lesbian community formation, which was outlined in Chapter 9 and is detailed in the next chapter. OmiSoore Dryden points out that, in 1991, Egale participated in a Toronto coalition and organized a forum called “Racism, Sexual Orientation, and Sex: Making the Connections” on the International Day Against Racial Discrimination. While there was discussion of double and triple forms of oppression faced by people of colour, the focus was on the discrimination LGBT people of colour faced from within their “ethno-cultural” communities. Here, they used a state-defined term that aided in deflecting attention away from racist practices. As Dryden points out, the gaze regarding discrimination was directed outwards but not inwards towards racism within LGBT community formation. Leadership was seen as providing direction in fighting homophobia/heterosexism within people of colour communities and not racism and white privilege within queer and trans communities.⁴² This participated in shaping, within white LGBT communities, the view that, rather than the problem being racism and white privilege, the problem was instead the portrayal of intense homophobia and heterosexism within racialized communities. This was a building block for coding the queer community as largely white, with a focus on racialized communities as being more “homophobic.” This kind of approach, which existed much more broadly within white LGBT community formation, came to shape how many white queers approached racialized communities, including in the QUAIWA wars (see next chapter) and in response to Black Lives Matter in 2016 and since.

In its 2001 report on *The Intersection of Sexual Orientation and Race*,⁴³ Egale did interviews with some Canadian queer people of colour but relied on examples from the United States of America. They did suggest that challenging oppression on several lines would be more effective, at one point. This seems to be what they mean by “intersectionality” in this report but this did not displace the centrality of whiteness in their organizing. They also include a quote from a Black gay man about how Black Canadians are supposedly more homophobic than the general Canadian population. No broader context for this statement is provided and, again, it seems like the problem is largely located in Black and other racialized communities. At the same time, they make a type of commitment to what they describe as an intersectional approach.

In February 2002, Egale held consultations for the first time with a number of queers of colour in Toronto. Stating that Egale should do something about racism in queer communities, they set up an intersections committee at the Egale Board. At the very same time, same-sex marriage was where most Egale energy was going, leading to a marginalization of concerns over racism.⁴⁴ I return to Egale and the racialized character of the same-sex marriage struggle later this chapter.

Egale Canada, as an organization, had been incorporated as a federal not-for-profit organization in 1995 with a focus on education, advocacy, litigation, and expert consultation. In 2014, with Helen Kennedy as director, Egale was transformed into Egale—Canada Human Rights Trust. As a Foundation, it is better able negotiate fee-for-service programs with state and other institutions, to develop institutional and individual donations, and to develop services. It was no longer a membership-based organization. It was now only able to spend ten percent of its funding on political advocacy in a restriction on its political activities. As Kennedy is quoted by McCaskell, “We have to be very careful what we do, careful politically.”⁴⁵ This both constrained what the group could do and also directed its work in particular ways.

Throughout the rest of this chapter, I continue to elaborate on how Egale was a major vehicle for neoliberal transformation where it becomes relevant.

Human Rights, Spousal Rights, and Family-Recognition Struggles

Here, I trace out the gains in human rights and spousal and family-recognition rights after 1996, and I then explore the dynamics of the same-sex marriage struggle. One aspect of these struggles is how they participated in constructing queer organizing as being overwhelmingly “white” in character and were also articulated in an increasingly neoliberal fashion with the privatization of social provision and support regarding spousal, family, and eventually marriage benefits. This is described later. Sometimes this was accomplished through an emphasis on “diversity” and “multiculturalism,” with some openings within the elite for white, middle-class cis women, some people of colour, and some lesbians, gay men, and trans people (though fewer in number), which have been made possible through feminist, anti-racist, and queer struggles.

Given uneven developments on provincial levels and the hostility of moral conservatives to formal rights in some provinces, along with the uneven capacities of queer organizations to struggle and organize in different locations, some jurisdictions did not even see limited human rights protection on the basis of sexual orientation until after the publication of the second edition of this book. Sexual orientation protection was finally enacted at the federal level in 1996. Newfoundland and Labrador added sexual orientation protection in 1997, and Prince Edward Island in 1998.⁴⁶ In Alberta, sexual orientation protection was only enacted in 1998 because of a Supreme Court decision in the case of Delwin Vriend, an instructor at a private college who was fired because he was gay.⁴⁷

Sexual orientation protection was a major rights victory, but, as mentioned in Chapter 9, it did not, in itself, provide social equality for lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals, and

it consciously did not include protection for trans and gender non-conforming people. When Ontario NDP MPP Evelyn Gigantes moved an amendment to Bill 7 in 1986 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, Trans activist Rupert Raj wrote to her regarding including protection on the basis of “gender identity.” Gigantes declined to support his suggestion for two reasons. She felt that to include trans issues “would hinder the bill’s potential success because trans issues were distinct from those of gays and lesbians” and “that it would already be hard enough to deal with the homophobic backlash to Bill 7 without introducing trans issues to the mix.”⁴⁸ Even lesbian and gay activists were largely not pushing for human rights protection for trans people. This distinction between lesbian, gay, and bisexual human rights and trans rights was built into these battles for sexual orientation protection and was a basic feature and limitation of the human rights strategy itself, separating questions of sexuality from those of gender formation. This built divisions between LGB and trans people and meant that basic human rights protection for trans people was often decades behind where it was for LGB people. It would not be until the twenty-first century that protection for the human rights of trans and non-binary people would get seriously addressed.⁴⁹

Human rights protection is an important but limited protection, and violence and discrimination against lesbians, gay men, bisexuals and trans people continued. Rights activists quickly realized sexual orientation protection was not adequate and pushed on with spousal and family rights recognition struggles, some of which are outlined in Chapter 9.

Legal struggles for spousal benefits and family recognition continued. In spring 1999, the Supreme Court handed down a landmark decision in the *M v. H* spousal support case.⁵⁰ After her relationship with H. ended, M. attempted to seek support under the Ontario *Family Law Act*. She was denied the right to do this given the exclusively heterosexual definition of “spouse” in the Act. The Supreme Court in an 8-1 judgement found that the Ontario *Family Law Act* violated the rights of lesbians and gay men by defining “spouse” as someone only of the “opposite sex.” The decision made it clear that governments could not continue to deny spousal rights to same-gender couples.⁵¹ At the very same time, Suzanne Lenon points out that, in this decision:

the value of same-sex spousal recognition is achieved in large part because of its function in “decreasing government expenditures since fewer people would have to look to social assistance upon the breakdown of their relationship.” (*M v. H*, para. 109). So, a significant “gay rights” case in Canada was achieved *through* the route of neoliberal privatized relations of care.⁵²

It is important to stress that much progress on spousal benefits and family-recognition rights was associated with this neoliberal privatization strategy, making it hard to disentangle some of these legal victories from neoliberal capitalist relations. This decision led to provincial and federal amendments to redefine “common law partners” as inclusive of both same-sex and heterosexual unmarried couples, and to extend the rights and responsibilities of married couples to common law partners. In response,

the Ontario Conservative government reluctantly passed Bill 5 in 1999, which amended Ontario statutes to include same-gender partners, granting them the same rights as common-law heterosexual spouses in a number of areas—but, significantly, without defining same-gender partners as spouses or as members of families. While the changes were an important step forward in the battle for spousal benefits and family-recognition rights, many queer activists were critical of the legislation for establishing lesbian and gay couples as separate from heterosexual spousal and family relations.⁵³

In June 2000, the federal government finally passed legislation ensuring a series of same-gender spousal rights. At the same time, the legislation added a definition of marriage that established marriage as being strictly heterosexual in character: “the union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.” What was supposed to be legislation affirming lesbian and gay rights instead set limits on these very rights.

Steven Maynard critiqued the federal Bill C-23 in February 2000, writing that, by “pursuing benefits for same-sex couples only, our movement misses the unique opportunity to demonstrate the power of nominally queer issues to speak out and embrace many people whose relationships and living relationships do not confirm to dominant models.” He went on that, “There has been too little discussion...about how this will actually limit the freedom of many queer people by propping up punitive distinctions between those who will be deemed legally and socially acceptable and those who will not.”⁵⁴

This raises broader questions of the limitations of mainstream queer rights politics along homonormative lines. This further entrenchment of queers as an essential minority wanting to be “normal” and “respectable” meant we moved further away from a critique of institutionalized heterosexuality, including connections with the experiences and struggles of those people defining themselves as “bisexual” and “heterosexual” and who also wanted to challenge heterosexuality as a social institution. This meant that “our” essential “minority” politics spoke less and less to the experiences of people who were trying to organize their different gender/sex sexualities in different, non-oppressive ways, rupturing our relations with other people searching for sexual and gender alternatives.⁵⁵

While there was support for equality with heterosexuals with regard to marriage and spousal/family-recognition rights, important discussions also took place among queer and feminist activists over how to fight for recognition for queer relationships and how to provide support for relationships outside institutionalized heterosexuality and the gender binary. Existing forms of spousal benefits do little to redistribute income and resources to those who most need them, and they allocate benefits based on what type of relationship one has (and what type of plan a partner has in paid work) rather than on the basis of need. In doing this, they represent privatized, neoliberal solutions to these problems. These benefits were only available to a limited number of people—with no benefits for people living in poverty.

In Chapter 9, I mentioned that The Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario (CLGRO), one of the last surviving liberationist-inflected rights groups from the 1970s, organized a potentially transgressive conference called *On Our Own Terms* in 1989 to

critically discuss struggles for spousal benefits.⁵⁶ As McCaskell describes it, this was an attempt to adopt a middle course in debates over spousal benefits, but this was also superseded by legal and neoliberal responses. There was an influx of lawyers and other professionals into CLGRO who were committed to relationship recognition but not to liberationist politics or sexual liberation.⁵⁷ CLGRO's relationships working group later split off to form the Campaign for Equal Families, in which liberationists were outnumbered. The Campaign rejected CLGRO's "initial demand that people be able to opt out of relationship categories that they rejected."⁵⁸ Instead, these relationship categories, often neoliberal in character, would now be imposed on us.

With the spousal recognition campaigns of the late 1980s and 1990s, as McCaskell points out, in the "scramble for equality the poor were being thrown under the bus." Groups like AIDS ACTION NOW! were concerned that some of these changes "would mean that if two people were deemed to be in a relationship and one was on social assistance in order to get a drug card, that person might lose benefits and as a couple, their joint income had to be considered." This had major class and poverty implications. Patricia Lefebre pointed out that, "for those whose main source of income is social assistance, the recognition of same-sex spouses will represent a reduction in benefits received."⁵⁹ And, as McCaskell also points out, "The extension of benefits meant little to those who had no benefits at all. For very poor queers on social assistance, the ultimate recognition of gay and lesbian relationships was actually economically detrimental."⁶⁰ But "None of this was the concern of the Campaign for Equal Families. The sole focus of the new professional class was to see the legislation passed."⁶¹ This kind of legislation increasingly pulled some largely white and middle-class cis queers into a network of neoliberal capitalist relations.

Many activists also believed that simply affirming "we are family"—just like "respectable" and "responsible" white, middle-class heterosexual families—allows for "responsible" lesbian and gay couples to be "normalized"—to be just like, or almost like, heterosexual families. The tendency divides those "normalized" lesbians and gay men from "irresponsible" queers who make no such claim to spousal or family status.⁶² Rather than trying to invent and develop new, more egalitarian, and liberatory social ways of living, building on chosen families and making alternative lives this strategy led to the incorporation of transformative possibilities into demands for simple integration, often in ways that accommodated queers with oppressive social forms. This took place not only on the legal terrain but also shaped our very attempts to engage in transformative parenting and other social relationships. I now turn to exploring this.

From Queering Parenting Towards "Normalized" Queer Parenting

Struggles for spousal and family-recognition rights were also connected to the growing number of queer people raising children together, especially lesbian mothers and couples, which produced an important part of the basis for demands for spousal and family-recognition struggles.

My partner Patrick and I adopted our son Mike, who was then ten, in 2003. This has been a wonderful life-transforming experience but within major social constraints. In my view, what is most significant is not the experience of “fatherhood,” which is most often worked up through patriarchal notions, but how men can participate in some of the social relations of “mothering” and what can be learned for undoing masculinities and fathering from these social experiences.

The early hopes that such efforts could be transformative—a queering of parenting based on earlier experiences of making chosen families and trying to raise kids in feminist, non-heterosexist, and anti-racist ways⁶³—was unfortunately often held back and contained due to social pressures and the lack of organized alternatives. This led many back into mainstream, institutional relations, leading to the privatization of child rearing, with children once again seen as the “property” of their parents—only now as the “property” of queer parents. The emergence of the neoliberal queer worked against these dreams for parenting differently. In an interview where I reflected on my own experiences of parenting, I noted that this lack of transformative possibilities is shaped by class and racialized relations. I pointed out that: “The standard discourses of motherhood [and parenting] are based on white, middle-class notions. And these are the notions that get privileged within queer communities.” What this means is that

queer people who are trying to raise kids in a context where they don’t have the same access to material privilege...just don’t have those types of benefits. It’s a general problem in the capitalist, racist, patriarchal society we live in.... And someone who is on social assistance who is doing vital, socially necessary labour to support their kids in really materially difficult circumstances is not going to be able to access these resources in the same way.⁶⁴

I went on to say that this is related to how we have bought back into very individualized and privatized ways of doing parenting. So rather than sharing resources around parenting—which might actually begin to address the problems and concerns of queer parents living in poverty, or of working-class or racialized queer parents—the privatization of parenting, by not collectivizing it more, by not seeing it as a more fundamental part of what could become the queer commons, produces major problems. There is an intensification of how parenting gets increasingly defined as middle class, and if you are not white and middle class, you are not living up to broader social expectations, but also even to middle-class queer expectations of what parenting is supposed to be like. This raises many problems for people trying to raise kids in other contexts, in other material circumstances, who could never possibly “live up” to those white, middle-class standards.⁶⁵

In this context, homonationalism and homonormativity present major problems if we are trying to actually queer certain forms of parenting since what they lead to is the reinforcement of white, middle-class “normality” around how kids are supposed to be raised. This actually closes down queer critiques of the institutionalization of

motherhood and parenthood. This prevents alternative, more collective, more communal, more social ways of raising kids. For racialized queer people and Indigenous queer people trying to raise kids, the generation of homonationalism creates major difficulties and creates particular difficulties for interracial couples raising children together. If people identified as Muslim are constructed as the “enemy” in homonationalism then it creates problems for these people. They are not only being read out of being good “citizens,” they are also being read out of being good queer people and good parents.⁶⁶ The politics of raising kids gets even more complicated with the demand for international adoptions including from some queer parents (usually, but not only, white and middle class). These are often tied into relations of racism and colonial/imperialist relations.⁶⁷

For queer men engaged in parenting, this raises vital questions. In Chapter 9, I referred briefly to the organizing of gay fathers’ groups in the 1980s and their isolation and lack of support in gay community formation.⁶⁸ This was well before I had become a parent myself. The social reproduction work and skills of “mothering” that queer men raising kids together engage in can be an important challenge to hegemonic forms of fathering but also raises challenges to gender divisions of labour and institutionalized and hegemonic forms of masculinity, including those among gay men. It is hard to talk about and share these experiences and struggles and to develop support for each other in doing things differently given the disappearance of critical gender and pro-feminist analysis from most gay men’s politics since the 1980s (see Chapter 9), and the construction of “normalized” gay masculinities.⁶⁹ This can lead to an abandonment of both critical gender critiques and support for feminism. But it also moves away from accepting trans experiences in gay men’s community formation (aside from drag as entertainment) as gender became more essentialized. There is a shift that takes place here from a critical gender analysis, with its focus on the social and collective, to a more limited focus on individual rights and desire. The new surge of trans organizing, including by trans men and trans people raising children, has reopened some of these discussions, but they need to become more social and collective in character.

Peter Drucker, unlike many queer men who address these questions, explores the gendered character of work but, at the same time, tends to focus too much on paid labour, neglecting the importance of unpaid reproductive and domestic labour, especially given his emphasis on relationships and intimacy. He focuses on struggles in unions and waged workplaces as “the main location where the working class organizes to identify as a working class,”⁷⁰ tending to neglect other forms of class-based community struggles and struggles against unpaid labour. In this respect, he could expand his analysis by looking at the “social factory” analysis that informed *Wages For Housework* regarding the significance of unpaid domestic, reproductive and caring labour in the production of capitalist social relations and of labour power itself.⁷¹ This analysis of the importance of autonomy for oppressed groups within the working class and challenging power relations within the working class that came out of autonomist Marxist feminism also produces a useful strategic perspective that moves us beyond the limitations of identity politics.

Reproductive Justice

Reproductive justice feminist groups have fought with “right-to-life” groups, the medical profession, and governments over access to abortion services. Abortion reform was the other side of the limited reforms to gross indecency/buggery laws in 1969 and had much the same limitations, allowing for only some abortions, approved by therapeutic abortion committees on “health” grounds, and establishing no social right for women and trans men to control their own bodies. Meanwhile, racist and anti-disability practices of forced sterilization directed at Indigenous women and the “feeble-minded” continued. Reproductive-rights feminists protested the lack of access to abortion services on class, racial, linguistic and regional lines. They developed a strategy of setting up abortion clinics outside the law to dramatize the problems with the law and to begin to meet needs for access to abortions. This led up to the overturning of the abortion law by the Supreme Court of Canada in January 1988, which was an important victory. Despite the defeat of attempts to re-criminalize abortion, there are continuing problems of lack of access to abortion services in many parts of the Canadian state for people who can bear children (including some trans men) because the federal and most provincial governments are taking no responsibility for ensuring that people actually have access to these services. There have been continuing problems with the obstruction of clinics and clinic staff by anti-choice forces, and other forms of harassment in many places across “English Canada.” There have also been problems securing health-insurance coverage for clinic abortions in a number of provinces.⁷² In the fall of 2020, the New Brunswick Conservative government forced Clinic 554 to close, limiting badly needed abortion services and health care for LGBT+ people.⁷³

Pro-choice feminists are also reproductive-justice feminists who support the right to access birth control and abortion for people who can get pregnant as well as access to safe and needed new reproductive technologies for lesbians and trans people.

As I was finishing writing this, the US Supreme Court overturned the *Roe v. Wade* decision, meaning that states can recriminalize abortion. This is a crucial aspect of the right-wing, racist gender/sexual offensive that also focuses its attacks on trans and queer people, including young people. This has highlighted continuing problems of access to reproductive rights in many places across “Canada” while also giving inspiration to right-wing anti-abortion groups in this country, who are escalating their tactics as this becomes a more contested terrain.

Racialized Marriage Struggles: Love versus Sex, or, Is There Sex After Marriage?

Before getting to the passage of same-sex marriage in Canada, it is necessary to clarify the racial politics surrounding this campaign, which I must admit I noticed but did not fully appreciate at the time. The growing coding of gay and lesbian as white and middle class, including in the same-sex spousal and family-recognition struggles, shaped the same-sex marriage battle, including the representation of those fighting for it. The visual campaign for same-sex marriage was largely white and middle class.⁷⁴ There was also

the parallel construction of opposition to same-sex marriage associated with “multicultural” and “people of colour communities” and the racializing of “homophobia” as a property of communities of colour, and also a portrayal of opposition to “homophobia” as “white.” This was constructed from two directions: first, the whiteness of the same-sex marriage campaigns and, second, the associated construction of people of colour as more “homophobic” and therefore as “threats” to white lesbians and gays.⁷⁵ This was never the case, of course. There was always major white, moral-conservative opposition, as well as opposition to same-sex marriage in some people of colour communities and critiques from some queer of colour activists of the moderate and “white” character of the equal marriage campaigns. As Lenon points out, as a result, “racialized communities were exclusively interpellated into debates over same-sex marriage through terms of difference and distance.”⁷⁶ The same-sex marriage struggle became therefore “not simply a politics of sexuality but is also a politics of race.”⁷⁷

After the spousal and family-recognition struggles, Egale turned to marriage as their flagship issue around 1999.⁷⁸ As mentioned, they avoided support for anti-censorship and sex-related struggles, fearing they would undermine struggles for spousal rights, relationship recognition, and marriage. This helped to produce the context for Brenda Cossman’s 1999 *Xtra* column about the limitations of Egale, wonderfully titled “No Sex Please: National Lobby Group Stands Up For Respectable Rights Only.”⁷⁹ Egale participated in the formation of Canadians for Equal Marriage (CEM) (note the identification with the nation-state in the title) and Egale and CEM had interlocking boards and connections.⁸⁰ Egale threw all its resources into the same-sex marriage fight, prompting trans activist Susan Gapka, who had helped establish Egale’s Trans Issues Committee, to resign in 2005.⁸¹ Egale and CEM both put forward liberalism in terms of equality as well as regarding Canadians.⁸² I return to these homonationalist uses of the equal-marriage campaign a bit later.

There were major problems in the racial analogies used in the equal marriage campaigns. Egale, in its organizing for equal marriage, made use of a racial analogy, specifically regarding anti-miscegenation laws. Dryden notes that:

Anti-miscegenation laws dictated that Black people were legally prohibited from marrying white people. Through this use of racial analogy, Egale suggests that same-sex couples being prevented from marrying was “just like” the racism, discrimination, and violence Black people endured in the *United States*.⁸³

Dryden goes on to say that this obscures the histories and current forms of racism in Canada and that

the deployment of this analogy productively constructs sexuality and race as separately occurring conditions, with gay bodies then understood as white and Black bodies understood as heterosexual. To construct a lesbian and gay subject alongside a Black subject is to produce (and declare) a white gay subjectivity. This is the type of process that Allan Bérubé (2001, 246) speaks of in his work as “gay whitening practices.”⁸⁴

In this same-sex marriage campaign, gay people were compared to Black people in the United States of America as “second-class citizens.” There was even the use of “Free at last!” when same-sex marriage was won with all the connotations and associations that conjured up. But Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer, trans, and Two-Spirit people were not free at last. Legal recognition for white queers seemed to be based on Black dispossession, with a normative construction of the rights of white LGBT people based on “common-sense” anti-Black racism.⁸⁵

Similarly, in the United States discussion over same-sex marriage, Mattie Undora Richardson tells us that:

The mainstream white lesbian and gay leadership is extremely arrogant to assume gay marriage as a “last barrier” to full citizenship when many of us will never see full equality or civil rights [as a result]. Lesbian and gay mainstream marriage advocates have proclaimed that their inclusion will complete the United States march towards full equality for all its citizens. This argument is a slap in the face to everyone who continues to experience institutionalized oppression in this country. The fact that they reflexively refer to African-American civil rights struggles as their point of comparison for equality that has been “won” does two things. One, it falsely establishes that Black people and gay people are mutually exclusive population sets. Two, it is a boldface disregard for Black history and an act of disrespect to Black people who continue to face the violence of racism every day.⁸⁶

There was a white racial politics here, but this combined with and was partially made through a shifting from sex and sexuality, which had been an important focus of queer struggles, to an emphasis on “love” in the equal marriage battle. The focus on marriage and becoming part of “normality” also shifts attention away from the vital erotic dimensions of queer liberation struggles.⁸⁷ As Alan Sears perceptively asked, “Is There Sex After Marriage?”⁸⁸ This shift is a significant problem since sexual oppression remains a central material basis of queer social oppression.

Suzanne Lenon makes visible this assertion of love as constructing a “deservedness” for marriage, along with social respectability and responsibility.⁸⁹ The mass wedding at Casa Loma in 2014 as part of World Pride in Toronto, for instance, was billed by Egale as “a free celebration of marriage equality and love.”⁹⁰ As Lenon asks, “What does the language of love do? What are we doing when we do something *in the name of love*? I thus take the cultural and legal ascendance of private and monogamous queer love as a political problematic that needs to be accounted for.” Here, Lenon points out that it operates as a form of neoliberal governance “shaping and cultivating desired norms and outcomes.”⁹¹

Lenon goes on: “or to put it another way, the wedding vow ‘I do’ exceeds its personal address to the other person and finds itself in a wider field of power that is effective precisely in its appearance as freedom of choice” and it also shapes “queer conduct towards and around heteronormative institutions such as marriage and understandings of inclusion and belonging.”⁹² As Ingraham also points out (see below) there is a

whiteness in cultural representations of marriage, weddings, and love, and marriage in legal decisions is seen as a keystone of legal, social, and moral order.⁹³ In this context, kisses come to stand in for marriage representation but certainly not queer sex. Lenon argues that, “I have marked how love operates as a practice of racialized homonormative governmentality within interlocking cultural and legal domains. Love also aligns with capitalism, where it orients lesbian/gay/queer subjects towards capitalism and consumption. Indeed, perhaps the biggest ‘winner’ of love is the market.”⁹⁴ This also links same-sex marriage firmly into a web of neoliberal capitalist relations. This deployment of love was later extended in the organizing of mainstream LGBT groups with the use of the slogan “Love is Love.” As Christopher Samuel puts it:

Many queers—myself included—experience the phrase “love is love” as devaluing a lifetime of resistance to being called sinful, perverted, self-indulgent, and otherwise unworthy of loving or being loved. It is particularly painful because this devaluation of our experience of difference comes from the very community that should be celebrating it.⁹⁵

But, as Lenon also points out, on the better and more radical side, love can also be connected with subversive and transformative possibilities.⁹⁶ I return to this in the conclusion.

As Chrys Ingraham shows in *White Weddings: Romancing Heterosexuality in Popular Culture*, there is a cultural obsession with white weddings in established popular culture, whether in popular films, commercials, magazines, advertising, television sitcoms, and even in children’s toys. This is rooted in what Ingraham refers to as the wedding industrial complex. This also had an impact on same-sex marriage campaigns. There is a pervasive influence of weddings in our cultures and they play an important role in maintaining the romance of heterosexuality (even if now modified and expanded to include same-sex marriages), the myth of white supremacy, and consumer capitalism. As Ingraham points out, religious and moral views of marriage are now intensified by capitalism and the marketing of weddings, which is very big business.⁹⁷

The same-sex marriage battle was also posed in a broader homonationalist context. It was therefore not just a victory for lesbians and gay men but also for Canada and “inclusion” and “diversity.” Later, this same framing would be echoed in the apology statement in 2017 and the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the 1969 Criminal Code Reform. This tied into developmental theories of “progress,” which were linked into the social making of whiteness.

As Lenon points out: “On one hand, the legal-political struggles for ‘equal marriage’ secure formal equality and successfully challenge the exclusive heteronormative borders delimiting access to marriage.” On the other, “They also provide the occasion for a pedagogy of what it means to be Canadian and what Canada stands for in ways that reinstate dominant racial norms and hierarchies.”⁹⁸ In Lenon’s analysis of the same-sex marriage debates in Hansard, she discovers that, while a racist past is noted, this “is a way to signal a fantasized *present* space and *present* time, where Canada’s pernicious racist history has been progressively overcome and where the rights of ‘minorities’ are

now respected.”⁹⁹ In this narrative, same-sex marriage becomes a “national” and even “patriotic” value. This framing informed much of the rhetoric used by those supporting same-sex marriage.

But these struggles in the 1990s were not the first same-sex marriage struggles. As lesbian historian El Chenier points out, there were a number of struggles around marriage in the 1970s. These struggles were positioned very differently than the later marriage-equality movement and make clear the new social and political contexts in which marriage-equality campaigns took place:

Whereas today activists argue that lesbians and gay men are just like everyone else, by which they mean they are no different from the typical white, middle class, monogamous, respectable family, early advocates for same-sex marriage used the demand for marriage recognition as a springboard to challenge the sexist, heterosexist, and sexually restrictive moorings of society.¹⁰⁰

Chenier goes on that these early marriage struggles were not “for the homonormative politics of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century marriage equality movement”¹⁰¹ and raised far more radical questions. Contesting the appropriation of these early struggles by the later marriage equality movement, Chenier points out that:

The marriage equality movement...has surprisingly little in common with the challenges launched in the early 1970s. In the 1990s and 2000s no one would suggest that queer life could transform marriage and liberate heterosexuals from their own oppressive institutions.... In the early 70s, demanding the right to have their relationships recognized on a par with those of heterosexuals was about challenging traditional marriage, oppressive gender roles, heterosexism and homosexual oppression.¹⁰²

In the 2000s, the same-sex marriage struggle presented a major contradiction for me. I had absolutely no personal or political interest in getting married, and Patrick (my partner) and I were getting increasingly irritated by “well-meaning” straight people asking us when we were getting married. At the same time, as long as state legislation and moral conservatives deny lesbians and gay couples the right to marry, that denial represented a social practice of discrimination. Nevertheless, privileging marriage in state policy over and above all the other relationships that people live is also a social practice of discrimination against all the other relationships people are involved in.¹⁰³ In my brief to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Same-Sex Marriage, called “Don’t Get Me to the Church on Time” in 2002, I wrote:

The active exclusion of same-sex couples from the right to marriage in a context where marriage gives people’s relationships greater social recognition and social privilege is a continuing practice of discrimination.... At the very same time marriage is constructed in state and social policy as the most privileged and important type of relationship in terms of social recognition and privileges. Marriage is granted social privileges that are denied

to other types of social relationships. Some types of relationships between people are treated differently than others and this is a social practice of discrimination...the state institutionalization of marriage as a particular type of privileged relationship in comparison to other types of relationships (common-law, lesbian and gay couples, people raising children on their own) is also a practice of social discrimination.”¹⁰⁴

This later point was also emphasized by the Against Equality group in the United States and resonates with Kate Bornstein who wrote that:

Marriage is a privileging institution. It has privileged and continues to privilege people along lines of not only religion, sexuality and gender but also along the oppressive vectors of race, class, age, looks, disability, citizenship, family status and language. Seeking to grab oneself a piece of the marriage rights pie does little if anything at all for the oppression caused by the institution of marriage itself to many more people than sex and gender outlaws.¹⁰⁵

This also points to major limitations involved with formal-equality approaches. On the basis of formal equality, access can be provided to social institutions like marriage (or the military) that themselves are major sites of social discrimination and oppression even for other queer and trans people.

Even more disturbingly, some mainstream lesbian and gay rights supporters came to see winning same-sex marriage as the end point of our struggle, as the way of finally establishing integration and securing “respectability” in society. It was as if, when this right is won, all the other forms of hatred and discrimination we face will somehow magically disappear. Of course, this did not happen. Some argued that winning same-sex marriage rights would lead to dramatic improvements for younger lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and trans people, when this has not at all been the case and when the sources of queer and trans youth oppression have very little to do with the denial of same-sex marriage.

While some have argued that significant legal and social changes have created the basis for more equal marriage relations,¹⁰⁶ more radical queer activists like myself view marriage as a continuing patriarchal institution that has historically and socially contributed to the oppression of women and plays an important part in maintaining patriarchal, capitalist, and racist relations. We argue therefore for the ending of the institutionalization of marriage as a state-sanctioned relationship that sets these relationships between people above other forms of social relationships.¹⁰⁷ More egalitarian and democratic ways of living will necessarily take diverse forms. Asking simply to be included in the heterosexual and patriarchal institution of marriage does not accomplish queer liberation.¹⁰⁸

In response to the campaigns for same-sex marriage that have been central to gay “normalization,” Drucker, in his insightful critical analysis, places emphasis on earlier struggles around chosen families (and how quickly this has been forgotten in mainstream gay circles in the context of same-sex marriage), including non-monogamy/

polyamory, and broader struggles over kinship and familial relations.¹⁰⁹ As some suggestions for moving beyond confinement to “same-sex marriage,” he turns to Rosemary Hennessy’s notion of “outlawed needs” (where labour and desire meet);¹¹⁰ Alexandra Kollontai’s “winged eros,” from the early years of the Russian revolution; and his use of polymorphous perversity,¹¹¹ drawn from Freud and especially Marcuse, as a refusal of genital primacy, demonstrating how an eroticization of more diverse bodily based pleasures can be useful starting places. I return to these questions in the conclusion.

In using the equality-rights section of the Charter, the struggle for same-sex marriage was remarkably successful, building on the gains won in earlier spousal and family-recognition struggles. In 2001, the Supreme Court of BC ruled that excluding same-gender couples from marriage was discrimination. But that this discrimination “was justifiable in a free and democratic society.” But, in the very next year, in July 2002, the Divisional Court of Ontario ruled that same-gender marriage must be allowed in that province before July 2004. In response to this and other legal and social pressures, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights began hearings on same-sex marriage in the fall of 2002. The hearings took place in ten cities across the Canadian state, including in Sudbury, where I gave my previously mentioned deposition,¹¹² and the Committee finally voted in favour of same-sex marriage. On May 1, 2003, the BC Court of Appeal ruled that same-sex marriage must be allowed in the province before July 2004. On June 10, 2003, as a result of the Ontario Court of Appeal’s judgement, marriage was immediately established as a right for same-gender couples in the province.¹¹³

This decision, and subsequent legal decisions in BC and Quebec, provoked a wave of mobilization of largely white, moral-conservative forces against same-sex marriage and our rights more generally, with backing from some of the major churches, especially the Roman Catholic Church. Unfortunately, those groups most pushing same-gender marriage as a legal strategy, like Egale, were often not prepared to undertake the activism and popular education necessary to confront and defeat these moral-conservative forces, leaving it to more radical queer groups to mobilize in response.

I remember a number of queer and social-justice activists had a gathering against the moral-conservative right wing outside the office of Diane Marleau, then Liberal MP for Sudbury, in the mid-2000s. We got there early, before the moral conservatives arrived, and occupied the space they wanted to take up. We were soon surrounded by a far greater number of people yelling at us. There were many Catholics in the crowd. As a result of us getting there first, we were able to capture significant media coverage even though there were far more of them than of us.

In September 2003, by a vote of only 137 to 132, the House of Commons defeated a Canadian Alliance party motion to reaffirm the “traditional” definition of marriage. But rather than proceeding to then introduce legislation supporting same-sex marriage, the Liberal government referred the question to the Supreme Court. This continued the Liberal government’s history, in response to LGBT struggles in the 2000s and into the 2010s, of waiting for the courts to decide. Rather than taking the lead in pushing forward human rights, the Liberals only moved after the courts made a clear decision,

which allowed them to construct lesbian and gay rights as having some sort of troubling “moral” character, in contrast to other human rights struggles. It also meant they could argue that they had no choice but to enact these rights now that the courts had spoken. In major ways, this is the reverse of the legal decision in the 1967 Klippert case. This position does not decisively challenge heterosexism or engage in popular anti-heterosexist education.

On December 9, 2004, the Supreme Court confirmed that same-sex marriage, “far from violating the Charter, flows from it.” On June 28, 2005, the House of Commons, by a vote of 158 to 133, finally passed legislation establishing that same-gender couples can get married.¹¹⁴ This legislation had a pro-monogamy and settler-colonial character and, as River Rossi writes “contrary to its stated commitment to inclusion, diversity and equality, Canada’s Civil Marriage Act perpetuates inequality by failing to extend state recognition to non-monogamous care relationships,” excluding many Indigenous care relationships.¹¹⁵ Alex Munter of Canadians for Equal Marriage (CEM) had a patriotic and homonationalist response to the legalization of same-sex marriage, arguing that, “This is a proud and exciting time to be Canadian.... Today, we affirmed once again our worldwide reputation as a country that is open, inclusive and welcoming.” But, as McCaskell points out, under neoliberal capitalism “in this world of [formal] equality, [social] inequality was deepening.”¹¹⁶ At the same time that the Civil Marriage Act extended marriage to same-sex couples under the guise of equality and human rights, the 2005 amendment legally entrenched compulsory monogamy and, as was pointed out in Chapter 4, remained a key tool of colonization.

Many thought this issue was settled, but in January 2006 the new Conservative Party (the merger of the Canadian Alliance with what remained of the Conservative Party) was elected to a minority government position. Its campaign platform committed it to holding a free vote on the definition of marriage in the House of Commons and to then introduce legislation restoring the “traditional” definition of marriage. By June 2006, it became clear that the Harper government planned to hold a vote in the House in the fall of 2006. In the end, the motion on December 7, 2006 was defeated by a vote of 175 to 123—but it did allow the Tories to shore up their moral-conservative base. This was combined with their successful proposal to raise the basic sexual age of consent to sixteen from fourteen and allowed moral-conservative groups to stir up hatred and bigotry against queers, which I discuss later. Defeating this approach, then and now, requires a grassroots, coalition-building approach based on activism and popular education.¹¹⁷

While some claimed same-sex marriage as a major victory, not much changed in the fabric of the lives of most queer and trans people. Egale had put most of its energy into the same-sex marriage fight and, for many of those focused on marriage, the fight was now over. But for most of us, oppression and discrimination continued not only on the basis of sexuality, but also gender, class, race, ability, age, health status, and more. Once same-sex marriage rights were won, Egale tried to figure out what to focus on next, and there was a shift towards trans and education-related issues. There was also a shift to research and front-line training, including sponsorship from the banks.¹¹⁸ The Tory

Harper government also abruptly cut the Courts Challenges Program, which had provided support for a number of legal cases, bringing to an end a certain era in equality rights legal challenges.¹¹⁹

The Major Impact of the “War on Terror”: Homonationalist Identification with the “West” and the Canadian State

Along with the same-sex marriage struggle, the somewhat simultaneous mobilizations following 9/11 and the “war on terror” had a major impact in reshaping mainstream queer politics. It led to a major surge in orientalist, homonationalist politics defining “white” Northern/Western countries/cultures as being supposedly more advanced and tolerant of women’s and queer rights while countries/cultures in the Global South were defined as more “barbaric,” including being more “homophobic.”¹²⁰ This was a racist politics, defining Arab and Muslim-identified people, along with other people of colour, as a threat to white gays and lesbians. These groups were otherized and defined as being more “backward” and “homophobic,” as they often were in the same-sex marriage battles, as well. Some white queers began to identify Islam as a major obstacle facing gay rights on a global scale, as queer versions of “Islamophobia” were generalized.¹²¹ This is in the context of continuing Islamophobic violence against Muslim and Arab-identified people, including the six men killed at Quebec City’s Islamic Cultural Centre in 2017, the four family members killed (and another wounded) in London, Ontario, on June 6, 2021, and the violence experienced by women wearing hijabs in Edmonton and elsewhere.¹²² This is also in the context of the passage of Bill 21 in Quebec and its impact on Muslim women since 2019. While currents within Islamic fundamentalism can be seen as a threat to LGBT+ people, this was certainly not the case in most “Western” countries. This wave of homonationalism was unmistakably orientalist in “othering” people identified as Arabs and Muslims.¹²³ This also helped to centre the construction of whiteness in LGBT communities. Rather than repeating this analysis here, I refer readers to the concluding chapter in the book *The Canadian War on Queers*, which I co-authored with Patrizia Gentile, and other sources.¹²⁴

As we encountered earlier, homonationalism, developed by Jasbir Puar, is the identification of Western, Global North nation states as being “progressive” when it comes to queer and trans rights—although this can be more complicated when it comes to trans struggles. In contrast, Islam and countries and cultures in the Global South get constructed as “backward” regarding these rights. The Western state therefore becomes the vehicle for achieving queer rights.¹²⁵ In the Canadian context, this takes two forms, as Dryden and Lenon develop with their elaboration of Puar.¹²⁶ The first is with identifying the Charter as the road to rights and liberation and how this mobilizes queer struggles against the struggles of Indigenous (including Two-Spirit) people, given the settler-colonial character of Canadian state relations. The second, built through the social organization of the “war on terror” and, in a different way, through the same-sex marriage struggle, is the more orientalist form that constructs Arab and Muslim-identified

people, along with people of colour, as more generally “homophobic” and “transphobic,” and therefore as a threat to white, middle-class queer and trans people. Both homonationalist forms lead to viewing the Canadian state social form as crucial to queer and trans rights and liberation, thereby positioning its adherents against Indigenous, Palestinian, and Global South-based struggles, generally.¹²⁷

Homonationalism in Canada is far from homogeneous and thus this particular form of homonationalism requires complication and social and historical grounding. McCaskell even raises the question, “If we understand that there are different homonationalisms, under what circumstances might it be useful to unite with some against others?”¹²⁸ This suggests that sometimes we may need to ally with more “liberal” forms of homonationalism against more explicitly racist or “homophobic” forms, or perhaps to ally with more Charter-based forms. But we need to remember that these Charter-based forms are also based on settler colonialism and expanding carceral relations, and we need to actively oppose *both* settler-based and more orientalist forms of homonationalism. The impact of this orientalist form of homonationalism would be directly confronted when *Queers Against Israeli Apartheid* started to organize in relation to Pride Toronto, and was still there when Black Lives Matter-Toronto challenged racism at Pride Toronto in 2016. I come back to these moments in the next chapter.

Unfortunately, rather than challenging these forms of homonationalism, many within mainstream gay and lesbian organizing accepted them or adapted towards them. Liberal and social-democratic forces cultivated this homonationalism and support for the Canadian state social form, as we saw in the cases of same-sex marriage, the apology from above in 2017, and the celebration of the 1969 Criminal Code Reform in 2019.

The “war on terror” also saw an intensification of national-security policing against Indigenous activism and especially against activists opposing the tar sands and pipelines, which were defined as being in the “national interest” and therefore as matters of national security.¹²⁹ Defence of the institutions of global capital became part of Canadian national security, from the pepper-spraying of activists at the APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation) meetings in Vancouver in 1997, the repression of global justice activists at the Free Trade of the Americas meeting in 2001 in Quebec City, where I experienced tear gas and pepper spray for the first time, to the repression at the G-20 in Toronto in 2010, which saw mass arrests and horrible treatment of the queer and trans people who were arrested there.¹³⁰

The Harper government’s Bill C-31 in 2015 led to an intensification of national-security policing, most of which has been kept intact if not intensified by the succeeding Trudeau Liberal government.¹³¹ The “war on terror” and the intensification and extension of national security practices are key to shaping the post-9/11 period of the emergence of the neoliberal queer.

Criminal Code Changes

Queer struggles, as we have seen, have not only been about same-sex marriage. They have also addressed the criminal code, even though homonormative and homonationalist

supporters of “responsibility” and “respectability” ignored (or at least neglected) this front of struggle, since it required addressing sex, eroticism, and age in a more direct fashion than they were willing to.

In June 2006, the new federal Conservative (minority) government tabled a bill, as one of its first Criminal Code initiatives, to raise the basic age of consent for sexual activity from fourteen to sixteen.¹³² But the anal-sex age of consent was to stay at eighteen, to continue to “protect” young men from a sexual practice associated with “homosexuality.”¹³³ The government argued that raising the basic age of consent would “protect” young people from “sexual abuse.” But the new law would make it even more difficult to do safe sex and sexuality education with young people—making it more difficult for young people to get the sexual knowledges they need. It could also lead to the criminalization of young people engaging in consensual sexual activity with other young people despite the inclusion of a “near-age exemption” that allowed fourteen and fifteen-year-olds to engage in sex with a partner who is less than five years older than them.¹³⁴ As mentioned earlier, there are major problems with “protective” legislation and its construction of social incapacities. Raising the age of consent laws does nothing to get at the social roots of sexual violence and harassment against young people, which are located in patriarchal relations and in the social organization of hegemonic masculine sexualities.

While queer youth, safe sex and sexuality educators, and many queer activists were opposed to this legislation, more moderate groups sat out, and the NDP (along with the Liberals) supported raising the age of consent. The popular construction of “sexual abuse” made it more difficult to support the right of young people to not only say no to sex but also to say yes to sex in consensual and empowering ways. While those committed to same-sex marriage and desexualizing queer struggles, especially in relation to younger people, did not want to address this issue, it was also made more difficult given the broader shift in popular consciousness on these questions that has taken place since the 1960s and 1970s.

I often used Marge Piercy’s incredible book *Woman on the Edge of Time*¹³⁵ when I taught Introductory Sociology, but I increasingly found that my students, when reading about consensual sex play between young people, could only read this as “sexual abuse.” The social and reading contexts had shifted. While this makes it more difficult to defend the erotic needs and rights of younger people, it also, in my view, makes it even more crucial to challenge and undermine these social blockages to consensual and empowering forms of eroticism.

In late 2005, a Supreme Court decision regarding heterosexual “swingers” sex clubs modified the interpretation of “obscenity” under the criminal code (referred to in Chapter 10) to focus on the question of “harm,” building on the earlier Supreme Court Butler decision in 1992.¹³⁶ The decision argued that, if these actions were consensual, took place in a “private” club, and were not causing any “harm” to people, then they should not be crimes under the Criminal Code.¹³⁷

There are major problems with constructions of “harm,” especially regarding consensual BDSM (bondage, discipline, sado-masochism) practices, as already mentioned

in relation to the term “degrading” in Chapter 10. BDSM participants, like Andrea Zanic and others, argued that legal regimes not allowing people to engage in “physical harm” aside from some sports (like hockey and boxing) excludes participation in consensual BDSM, which has elaborate cultural practices and codes around consent and safety.¹³⁸ This requires refusal of the conflation of BDSM practices with “harm” and “violence” and opposition to the criminalization of all consensual BDSM practices.

It was not clear whether this “swinger’s” ruling was to be used to cover sex between men in bars and bathhouses, given that the “indecent” constructed legally and socially regarding same-gender erotic acts has been considered greater and more threatening than for similar heterosexual acts. The decision definitely did not cover consensual erotic acts in parks or in “public” washrooms, which remained legally “public” places where “indecent act” provisions applied.

Canada as a “Hotspot” for the Criminalization of HIV

There was also the continuing criminalization of people living with HIV infection during these years. Earlier in Chapter 10, I addressed how public health legislation, including public health orders and quarantine measures, were used against people living with HIV/AIDS and the communities of people most affected by AIDS.¹³⁹ There was a shift towards a growing criminalization of people with HIV/AIDS for supposedly spreading HIV and for not revealing their HIV status to sexual partners. This was a major shift from earlier safe-sex organizing, which was based on everyone’s responsibility to engage in safe practices and not simply the responsibility of the HIV+ person. This neoliberal shifting of sole responsibility onto HIV+ individuals has been a crucial part of undermining earlier community-based efforts that viewed engaging in safer practices as everyone’s responsibility. Earlier legal definitions of “gross indecency” and “indecent” live on in the continuing criminalization of HIV shaped by the persistence of “promiscuity,” “deviance,” and “pathology” applied to some men who have sex with men.¹⁴⁰ This means that, even within queer communities, the politics of “respectability” can be used to stigmatize those who are non-monogamous/polyamorous, those not interested in marriage, and those engaging in particular consensual sex practices. The objective of these earlier safe-sex mobilizations was to ensure that no HIV transmission took place. The neoliberal breaking-down of this social and collective responsibility and consciousness has made it more difficult for people to take on their social responsibilities for safer practices in the current COVID-19 pandemic.

Criminal Code sections ranging from “sexual assault” to “aggravated assault” to “being a common nuisance” and “criminal negligence causing bodily harm” have been used against people living with AIDS/HIV accused of having “spread” HIV.¹⁴¹ Often these charges have been directed against sex workers, “street people,” men of colour, and/or injection drug users. Criminal charges early on were mostly laid in cases of “potential” HIV transmission to women from men but this has changed, with women (especially sex workers) also being targeted.

Often, there has been a particular focus on racialized (and particularly Black) men for supposedly “spreading” HIV, especially to women. June Callwood produced a particular demonization of Charles Ssenyonga, who died in 1993 before any legal judgement was rendered against him. Her book *Trial Without End: A Shocking Story of Women and AIDS* came out in 1995.¹⁴² Callwood’s narrative built on racist mobilizations of “African AIDS” and the erotic “other” as she condemned Ssenyonga on moral grounds. James Miller perceptively referred to this as “African immigrant damnation syndrome.”¹⁴³ In the trial of Johnson Aziga in 2008–2009, a similar racist media mobilization took place. As McCaskell points out, “The story fit the racist tropes about Black men assaulting white women, immigrants as dangerous, guilt and innocence, love and betrayal, death and sex.”¹⁴⁴ Rinaldo Walcott writes in *Queer Returns* that “in the age of HIV/AIDS, the Black dick has emerged as an instrument as dangerous as the gun.”¹⁴⁵

There has been a major increase in the number of people charged for allegedly not disclosing their HIV status before engaging in sexual activities. Canada is now known as a criminalization “hotspot” where “criminal laws are systematically used to prosecute people living with HIV (PLWH), primarily for failing to disclose their serological status to sexual partners.”¹⁴⁶ Since 1989 and picking up after 2004, more than two hundred people have been criminally prosecuted for alleged HIV non-disclosure.¹⁴⁷ Kyle Kirkup points out how the criminalization of queer sex lives on in the criminalization of HIV and must be opposed.¹⁴⁸

In the first HIV transmission case to make it to the Supreme Court, the 1998 *Cuerrier* decision,¹⁴⁹ the Court decided that a person who knows they are HIV+ and has unprotected sexual intercourse with someone who is not HIV+ without disclosing their HIV status can be convicted of “aggravated assault,” which is one of the most serious charges in the criminal code.¹⁵⁰ Since this revolved around notions of “fraud,” if HIV+ status was not disclosed, the charge did not depend on any actual HIV transmission but on the legal notion of “significant risk.”¹⁵¹ This ruling was often understood as imposing a legal duty on PLWA/HIVs to disclose their HIV status before engaging in any sexual activity—which was interpreted by some AIDS Service Organizations (ASOs) as meaning not only that they disclose their HIV status to all sexual partners but also that, if AIDS support workers knew about unsafe sex taking place, they also had to inform the authorities. These types of developments also took place in other countries.¹⁵² This approach began to incorporate ASOs into the practices of regulating and policing the sexual lives of PLWAs/HIV.

Despite what some ASOs believed, legal experts pointed out that these decisions do not impose on AIDS workers and counsellors any legal responsibility to report “unsafe” activities by individual PLWA/HIVs to the police.¹⁵³ Since this time, there have been major therapeutic developments reducing the viral load among those able to access these medications. The major “U = U” or “undetectable equals untransmissible” campaign was built upon this insight, which has been a major argument against criminalization. However, many HIV+ people do not have access to treatment regimens that would make their viral load “undetectable.”

In 1999, the Committee for Accessible AIDS Treatment (CAAT) was formed to improve access to AIDS treatments for people in more “marginalized” communities, including people of colour, and poor and homeless people.¹⁵⁴ In the *Mabior* decision in 2012,¹⁵⁵ the Supreme Court had to decide whether the approach set out in the *Cuerrier* decision still applied to fraud voiding consent in the case of sex with an HIV+ person. The court had to address the vagueness of “serious risk of bodily harm” and the scope of “fraud.” The basic approach of the *Cuerrier* decision was upheld and they tried, in this context, to clarify what specific circumstances pose a “significant risk of bodily harm.” These circumstances were to be where there was “a realistic possibility of transmission of HIV.” The court decision was simultaneously against absolute disclosure in cases where risk is minimal but requiring disclosure in all cases of “non-negligible risk.”¹⁵⁶ While this provided some clarification including that where there was both a low viral load and a condom was used, there should be no charges, for instance. But this decision was correctly seen by activists as being too vague to prevent the criminalization of HIV non-disclosure where there was little to no risk of transmission.

Since this Supreme Court decision there have been cases in which, based on the scientific evidence before them, courts have concluded that a low viral load on its own—sometimes in combination with condom use—negates a realistic possibility of transmission. This recognizes the growing global consensus that a person with a suppressed viral load cannot sexually transmit HIV.

AIDS organizations and activists have pushed both for an end to this HIV non-disclosure criminalization as well as a series of prosecutorial guidelines to provide more clarification when decisions to charge and to proceed with charges are being made.¹⁵⁷ While some progress has been made, major problems remain. Activists have been calling for a moratorium on new charges, a review of past unjust convictions and prosecutions, for the criminal code to be changed so that laws relating to sexual assault can no longer be used in non-disclosure cases and that criminal laws only be used when there is clear intentional and actual transmission of the virus.¹⁵⁸

In an Ontario Court of Appeal decision in August 2020, citing the *Mabior* decision, it was decided that an HIV+ man’s conviction of “aggravated sexual assault” for HIV non-disclosure would stand even though condoms were used in every instance of sexual intercourse and there was no HIV transmission.¹⁵⁹ This struggle continues.

1996–2015: Consolidation of the Neoliberal Queer within Pride Committees and Egale

In the period 1996 to 2015 the neoliberal queer social layer and perspective, with some contestation, consolidated its influence in Pride Day Committees in major urban centres across Canada and in and around groups like Egale. The gay/lesbian professional/managerial elite increasingly developed close connections with powerful state and corporate actors.

I trace the transformation in Pride Committees first with a focus on Pride Toronto. Despite its political roots in Toronto in the resistance to the 1981 bath raids, Pride

Toronto also went through a neoliberal transformation.¹⁶⁰ By the 1990s, community and activist groups that had been at the heart of Pride were priced out of participation in the parade as alliances with businesses were pursued as the solution to financial problems. The Pride Committee worked to construct Pride as based on high-income consumers, bound together by class and whiteness.¹⁶¹

This same pattern was followed in Montreal, Vancouver, Halifax, and other centres. In part, this has been accomplished through state and corporate funding and sponsorship, which has reshaped the character of these organizations, replicating corporate forms of organization with executive directors and boards of directors, and with a generally disempowered membership that is often consulted only once a year. For a while in the 2010s, the Halifax pride parade placed banks and businesses at the front, followed by some of the union groups, and then queer and trans community groups. For those watching the beginning of the parade it could certainly look like it was Bank and Corporate Pride Day.

While there were previous forms of government funding, the first major blocks of government funding for Pride Toronto came in 2003. But as one Pride board member remembers, according to McCaskell, “getting grants meant we started changing the structure to fit the grants...and at the same time staff started making decisions rather than the board.”¹⁶² This led to a significant re-organization of the Toronto Pride Board, work areas, and staff. These pressures led to a shift in the composition of the Pride Toronto Board, as more people were added with management, business, and consulting backgrounds. Similar shifts took place in other Pride Boards in the larger urban centres. The task became “delivering LGBT bodies to corporate branding and advertising and helping the city market itself as a queer-friendly tourist destination.”¹⁶³ From my observations at Pride parades in Toronto and Halifax, Pride became a site for developing Pride and loyalty among gay and trans employees and their supporters at Pride events in the bank or corporation that employed them. This became part of constructing queer and trans workers as “productive” workers for these banks and corporations. This also led to growing Pride Committee support for government policies and presence for Liberal and Conservative politicians (some of whom were openly gay) and political parties as Pride parades increasingly became sites for not only homonormative but also homonationalist performances. Police and, in some locations, military contingents became more and more visible in the parades.

In smaller centres developments often took both different and similar directions. In Sudbury, despite the Pride march there being initiated in 1997—largely by lesbian and gay activists who had been involved in the community/union-based days of action against the neoliberal conservative regime of Mike Harris¹⁶⁴—it also went through a period of conservatization, organized in part through funding relations with banks and alliances with the police. In 2016, just a few weeks after the Black Lives Matter protest against the police in Pride Toronto—mentioned in the Introduction to this edition, and which we come back to later—the flag-raising ceremony for the *Fierté Sudbury Pride* seemed like a love-in for the Sudbury police, with the police very present and being profusely thanked by *Fierté Sudbury Pride members*, as if the police were the most crucial allies of Pride.

In 2014, World Pride was held as part of Pride Toronto. This coincided with a police cleanup as part of TAVIS (Toronto Anti-Violence Intervention Strategy) of poor people, Black people, and racialized people to create “safety” for, among others, white, middle-class queer people. This TAVIS initiative was opposed by the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty and many other movement and community groups. As McCaskell put it, making visible this contradiction, “World Pride is an inclusive project resting on exclusive material foundations.”¹⁶⁵ But there were also signs of resistance, including a revolt by queer and trans youth against the TD Bank sponsorship of their workshop during the World Pride conference.

These developments also influenced those involved in Egale. Douglas Elliot, a lawyer associated with Egale whom we met in the Introduction to this edition, organized a \$100-a-plate soiree in 2007 in honour of retiring chief justice Roy McMurtry, who had overseen both the Toronto bath raids and the censorship charges against *The Body Politic*. In 2003, he was also one of the judges who ruled in *Halpern v. Canada*, the Ontario Court of Appeal decision legalizing same-sex marriage in Ontario. As McCaskell puts it, “But in 2007 all was forgiven, or rather, forgotten.”¹⁶⁶ Elliot stated the event was about “truth and reconciliation,” with the major emphasis on reconciliation. McCaskell quotes former *The Body Politic* collective member Gerald Hannon, who had been one of those charged, as “hoping for a little truth.”¹⁶⁷

James Watt was a key architect of the neoliberal Tory Mike Harris’s first election victory and the attacks on mothers on social assistance and people living in poverty that were central to it. He argued, within Tory circles, that they could not leave same-sex spousal benefits to the activist left and instead they had to make it instead a matter of “Canadian values.”¹⁶⁸ This came to define not only how Conservatives—but also, as we have seen, how Liberal and even social democratic forces—framed spousal, family-recognition, and same-sex marriage struggles. Egale, in its wisdom, decided to give an award to Watt in June 2009. John Baird, a cabinet minister in the Harper government, was also a guest at the gala. But despite Watt’s attacks on our allies and on poor queer people, “for EGALÉ having such a well-connected, wealthy and influential friend was what mattered.”¹⁶⁹

Vertical alliances with those in power were taking over the mainstream movement, if there was anything that could still be called a “movement” at all at that point.¹⁷⁰ Egale’s growing neoliberal-inflected campaigns emphasized the importance of LGBTQ inclusion, “a concept that is packaged and sold by Egale in the form of training programs for corporations and professionals.”¹⁷¹ This area of work and funding tied them increasingly into state and corporate relations.

McCaskell also reports John Baird’s comment, as a Conservative cabinet minister, regarding anti-homosexual legislation in Uganda in 2009: “It offends Canadian values. It offends decency.” McCaskell observes that “neoliberal policies again trumped social conservatism.”¹⁷² Here, McCaskell does not fully grasp how this version of homonationalism can coexist with moral conservatism, as gay rights are supported much more in other countries than within the Canadian state itself. Miriam Smith describes this as the Harper government being able to be simultaneously homonationalist and

“homophobic” and “transphobic”: “The government selectively deployed Canada’s positive LGBTQ rights record in the service of foreign policy goals, beginning with the 2009 condemnation of Uganda’s Anti-Homosexual Act.”¹⁷³ Even socially/morally conservative neoliberalism can be shaped by homonationalism.

Rahul Rao goes into more depth on this in his investigations of homocapitalism, pointing to 2014, when the World Bank aligned itself against the Anti-Homosexuality Act announced by Uganda’s President Museveni. In response to the passage of this Act, the World Bank delayed a loan of ninety million US dollars to Uganda, “on the grounds that the law would adversely affect health programs that the loan was intended to support.”¹⁷⁴ World Bank president Jim Kim’s justification for this delay was that “when societies enact laws that prevent productive people from fully participating in the workforce, economies suffer.”¹⁷⁵ Again, the emphasis is on queer productivity for capital. This move by the World Bank was “perhaps the single most coercive response by an IFI (International Financial Institution) to a member state action perceived to be homophobic.”¹⁷⁶ This would have very detrimental impacts on people in Uganda. The World Bank’s response to the Anti-Homosexuality Act in Uganda articulates an emerging type of global capitalism that incorporates particular queer social relations into neoliberal markets. In it, ending sexual and gender discrimination is promoted through pro-capitalist global human rights discourses and initiatives that link personhood with participation in the market, and full citizenship status as contingent on productivity.¹⁷⁷ Although this version of the Act was withdrawn since it had been passed without a quorum, a stronger version of the Anti-Homosexuality Act was passed in March 2023, provoking Ugandans inside the country and Ugandan Asylum seekers to organize against it. Those organizing on the ground in Uganda made it clear initially that they were opposed to any attempts to cut off aid that would hurt poor and working people in the country.¹⁷⁸ At the time of writing the Act has been approved with devastating consequences for queer and trans Ugandans.

As McCaskell puts it for the Canadian context, “we have struck a Faustian bargain. The state defends [some of—*my addition*] our rights, and the tolerance we experience is deployed as proof that Canada is the liberal country it imagines itself to be. We have become complicit in the nation’s forgetting and the ongoing damage it causes.”¹⁷⁹ We must take this further, asking, who is this “we”? It is not a reference to all queer and trans people but rather to the white neoliberal elites that have emerged out of our communities, movements, and organizing. And, as in other areas, we need to resist this social organization of forgetting through the resistance of remembering.¹⁸⁰

Referring to Liberal ex-cabinet minister George Smitherman and Kathleen Wynne, who became Premier of Ontario in 2013, McCaskell describes how, “Some of ‘our’ people were finally in positions of power.... Now we were becoming those in power.”¹⁸¹ Here we very much need to ask very bluntly, which “our” and “we” is this? There was clearly now a small rich and powerful group of white gay men (and some lesbians) at the top who were tied into ruling class political and social relations. Their racialized class project did not represent the same “we” as those queer and trans people who did not benefit from the rights revolution.

Sex Worker Struggles: Legal Victories but Increasing Oppression

As mentioned earlier, there is much that connects the historical and social experiences of sex workers and queer and trans people, and not only that many sex workers are also queer and trans. For many decades, queers and sex workers often occupied the same social spaces and jointly defended each other. The policing of sex workers and the policing of queer and trans people often took place through the bawdy-house law and other sections of the Criminal Code used against both groups. Sex workers and queer and trans people have also worked together in many coalitions and campaigns, from AIDS to safe sex organizing and harm reduction initiatives,¹⁸² to opposition to the youth porn law in criminal code reform efforts, and regarding “missing persons” cases.¹⁸³ And the police have long refused to protect the lives of sex workers, who are rendered vulnerable and expendable by criminalization, including in the Pickton murders in the Downtown East Side of Vancouver and those of trans women sex workers and of queer men of colour in the McArthur murders in the Toronto Village.¹⁸⁴

The areas of law regulating and criminalizing sex work included the bawdy-house laws; the transportation of sex workers to their work; a series of procuring offences including living of the avails of sex work; and “communicating” for the purposes of selling sex, mentioned in Chapter 10.¹⁸⁵ While police and moral conservatives campaigned for clamping down on sex workers, many socialist and radical feminists and queer liberationists, as well as sex workers themselves, organized for the full decriminalization of sex work.¹⁸⁶ The police and the moral conservatives were disturbed by the visibility of sex workers on city streets, even though the police themselves, through their arrest patterns, had created street sex workers as a “public nuisance” in some urban zones.¹⁸⁷ Rather than deal with police practices and the legal, social, racial, and class realities that created sex work in this form, the forces of the right took advantage of the concerns of residents—about noise and harassment—to call for more police powers to defend the respectability, social status, and real-estate values of these often white and sometimes middle-class neighbourhoods.

While most queer and trans activists have supported the full decriminalization of sex work, the emergence of the neoliberal queer unfortunately led to some mostly white, middle-class cis gay men taking part in campaigns against sex workers in their neighborhoods, including in Vancouver and Toronto.¹⁸⁸ In this sense, the class and social struggles within queer community formation have placed some queer-identified people (mostly white gay men) on the side of gentrification and their real estate values as opposed to the lives of sex workers.

Sex workers launched a series of major legal challenges to the constitutionality of the laws criminalizing sex work—mostly focusing on the laws against prostitution—starting in 2007. This led up to the Supreme Court *Bedford* decision in 2013¹⁸⁹ (actually, it was a challenge brought by Terri-Jean Bedford, Amy Lebovitch and Valerie Scott), which struck down three important sections of the laws criminalizing prostitution, ruling that they violated Charter rights to freedom of expression and security of the person. This included striking down the living on the avails section, the communication provision, and the sex work part of the bawdy-house law. Sex workers and their allies had won an

important legal victory. This victory rested on decades of organizing by sex workers and their allies against criminalization. Unfortunately, the decision gave the government a way out in giving it a year to develop new legislation to address imposing limits on where and how prostitution can be conducted that were “constitutional” in character.¹⁹⁰ As well, the Bedford decision did not adequately address the problems of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and Two-Spirit people which is often related to sex work and is rooted in settler colonialism, racism and genocide.¹⁹¹ As Indigenous lawyer Naomi Sayers points out: “From my perspective *Bedford* is not a progressive decision, and it does not deliver justice for Canada’s most marginalized.”¹⁹²

In June 2014, the Tory government introduced the Protection of Communities and Exploited Person Act (PCEPA) which criminalized the purchasing of sexual services for the first time in the Canadian state. PCEPA also criminalized communication for the purposes of selling sex near daycares, playgrounds, and schools; and included provisions aimed at those receiving material benefit from sexual services and from advertising sexual services. It adopted what is often referred to as the “Nordic” or “Swedish” approach, which assumes that all women working in prostitution are “victims” and “exploited,” and that prostitution is inherently violent. PCEPA defines sex work as always a form of exploitation, trivializing the actual violence that sex workers face. It has produced new forms of hardship for sex workers and new forms of criminalization which sex workers have had to organize against. This both denies the agency of sex workers but also creates major problems for trying to practice sex work, pushing many sex workers underground again and making their work even more vulnerable and dangerous. As the Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform points out:

In particular, Indigenous women and youth, people who are im/migrants (particularly racialized women), and trans people (especially trans women) face targeted violence, stigmatization, and over-policing under the PCEPA. Those interested in committing violence against sex workers are aware that in a criminalized regime, sex workers actively avoid police for fear of detection, apprehension, and in the case of im/migrant women, deportation.¹⁹³

This has also produced new problems for migrant sex workers by intensifying the conflation of all sex workers with being the “victims” of “trafficking.”¹⁹⁴ This “trafficking” focus has caused particular hardship and repression for migrant sex workers.¹⁹⁵ Special problems have also been produced for migrant sex workers in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁹⁶ In Ontario Bill 251 and the strategy it is part of has led to the expansion of funding for “anti-trafficking” police work and for the extension of police work into social work and social agencies.¹⁹⁷ It has also been made more difficult for sex workers (including porn workers) to use sites on the internet to carry on their work. In the context of the pandemic especially, this can have devastating impacts on the lives and incomes of sex workers.¹⁹⁸

The new Liberal government, which committed itself to reviewing the prostitution laws, has done nothing to get rid of even just the worst features of PCEPA. The House of

Commons Justice and Human Rights Committee finally held hearings on the impact of PCEPA in February 2022.¹⁹⁹ It was only in 2021 that there was a significant legal challenge to PCEPA initiated, even though many analysts believe it will eventually also be ruled unconstitutional. But this will take a lot of organizing, time, and fundraising from sex worker advocates. PCEPA reminds us once again how, given the social form of law that is capitalist, racist, and patriarchal, even important legal victories can be turned against oppressed people. By 2022, the legal challenge to PCEPA proceeded and was organized through the Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform.²⁰⁰ In 2023, the federal government finally added the bawdy-house law to the Expungement of Historically Unjust Convictions legislation that had grown out of the apology process explored later this chapter. But at the same time, they made very clear that only “acts of indecency” and not the sex work section of the bawdy-house law will be included. Sex workers are to be actively excluded from this revision and the expungement of convictions.²⁰¹ In 2023, the federal government is also proposing amendments to Bill s-224, the “human trafficking” offence which will intensify the criminalization of sex workers, racialized people, and migrants.²⁰²

GSAs, “Bullying,” and Sexuality Education Struggles

Schools continue to be major sites for the construction of hegemonic heterosexual masculinities and subordinated femininities, as well as for the production and reproduction of patriarchal, racist, and capitalist relations, heterosexism, the gender binary, and the oppression of trans people. Ideologies of “Fag,” “Dyke,” and anti-trans ideologies continue to shape social interaction in schools, mandating abuse, violence and social media harassment against students so designated.²⁰³ While direct physical harassment and violence may be somewhat reduced, harassment online has intensified, and this can be devastating, since it can quickly become public and social in character.²⁰⁴ At the core of this social form of schooling is the high school as a central site for the production of hegemonic heterosexual masculinities. Until this is addressed, schools will often be sites of harassment, stigmatization, and violence for young women, queer people, and trans and non-binary people, as well as sites for the interlocking production of racist and class relations.

In 2002, the Catholic School Board of Durham County, Ontario denied Marc Hall the right to take his boyfriend to the school prom. This decision was widely contested and challenged, including by the Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) union and raised major questions about public funding for the Catholic School system. This decision was ultimately overturned in court.²⁰⁵

In early 2010, the Ontario Ministry of Education had posted a new Health and Physical Education Curriculum. It rested on more than three years of consultation with various organizations, including with queer groups. It had received the support of ministry bureaucrats and cabinet. Although still not adequate regarding feminist, queer, and trans concerns, it was a move forward. But then the moral conservatives moved into action, starting with Charles McVety, an evangelical Christian and moral-conservative

leader, and the president of Canada Christian College,²⁰⁶ calling for the withdrawal of the policy, and the Tories quickly took up this moral-conservative cause, dressing it up as “parental” opposition. Supporters of the bill were caught off guard and, while some groups spoke out in support of the policy, others did not, and Egale was silent. In response to the moral-conservative mobilization, the government quickly withdrew the sections on “sex education,” to be rethought.²⁰⁷ This showed the power that moral-conservative mobilizations still have on state policies. Eventually this same basic policy was passed five years later in 2015 under the Kathleen Wynne government. It was then challenged under the Doug Ford regime with plans for removing gender identity, same-sex relationships, and consent from the province’s elementary curriculum, sparking major high school student opposition. In September 2018, forty thousand high school students walked out of school in protest of these changes.²⁰⁸ Given this widespread revolt, which also included progressive parents, the Ford government was forced to backtrack in 2019.

Anxieties and concerns over young people’s eroticism and gender practices have been central to the opposition to queer and trans-focused sexuality education. This is magnified when it comes to queer and trans experiences. Queer and trans organizers, in response, have tended to try to avoid these questions when it would be much more effective to confront them head-on. While actively opposing sexual harassment and violence and supporting only consensual sexual relations, we do also need to empower young people to say yes to consensual sex.

There was a long struggle to have Gay-Straight Alliances, which can provide important support for queer and trans students, officially recognized and supported in the schools. While this struggle was most profound in Catholic schools, it has not always been easy in public schools, and there were many individual battles in schools and school boards. In 2010, there were a series of publicized instances of gay and trans young people killing themselves because of harassment. The “It Gets Better” campaign was launched in the United States and quickly spilled over into Canada. This campaign, initiated by gay journalist and columnist Dan Savage, was based on diverse videos (many from celebrities) that tried to convince young queer and trans people that, as they get older, things will get better and they should not consider killing themselves. The limitations of this campaign were that it seemed to suggest that young people right now should just grin and bear it (with some suggesting it would make them stronger personalities) and that, if they did, things would get better later. It also raised classed, gendered, and raced questions about exactly whose lives would get better. The problem was that it offered little to these young people right now to address the harassment and repression they were facing and ignored the racial and class relations it was bound up with.²⁰⁹ Rather than changing or improving their circumstances now, improvement sometime in the future was promised. There was no direct challenge to the heterosexist social form of schooling; instead, problems were located in individual bigotry and ignorance.

James Hubley tried to set up a GSA in his high school in the Ottawa area but found the resulting harassment unbearable; he took his own life in 2011. The response by school and state officials presented Hubley’s death as the consequence of “bullying.” There

are a number of problems with this approach. Anti-queer, anti-trans, sexist, and racist forms of harassment all get placed together into this collecting category of “bullying” so that their particular features and social roots are obscured. Problems are then located not in broader social and institutional relations but within the individual who “bullies.” The solution, then, is not to transform social or school relations but to focus on the actions and consciousness of the “bully” as separate from these. In other words, language describing the problem was shifted from harassment to “bullying.” As McCaskell describes, “Harassment allowed us to look at systemic practices, but bullying focused on individual bad behaviour, usually that of students. While harassment usually came with an adjective attached—sexual, racial, homophobic—bullying floated outside of these power relationships.”²¹⁰ This approach was also tied up with neoliberal attempts to intensify discipline in the schools while cutting school funding at the same time, such as with the 2001 Safe Schools Act in Ontario. This had a disproportionate impact on racialized young people and young people with disabilities.²¹¹

The Ontario Liberal government introduced anti-bullying legislation in the Accepting School Act in 2011. The opposition Tories submitted their own private members bill accepting that “bullying” was a major problem in the schools, but they focused more on regulation of the internet, and their bill “saw bullying as bad individual behaviour, unmoored from broader social inequalities. Its focus was not on empowering victims but on punishing wrongdoers.”²¹² The Accepting Schools Act was passed in June 2012 and included support for the GSAs in high schools, including Catholic schools, which now also had to permit GSAs. This step forward rested on the struggles of queer and trans students and their allies/accomplices, along with queer, trans, and progressive educators.

Although there has been considerable emphasis put on queer and trans youth regarding schooling and opposition to conversion therapy, this has been limited by a tendency to see LGBT people as largely an adult community and, with same-sex marriage, as a “privatized” and couple-based community. Young queer and trans people are still often prisoners of their families, prevented from having legal consensual sex, denied access to sexuality and gender education and sexual information, and subject to harassment and violence in school, on the streets and through social media. The spousal, family-recognition, and especially same-sex marriage struggles established some of us as almost like “nuclear” families that can be accommodated with institutionalized heterosexuality, and as just wanting to be let into the white middle class—but queer and trans youth are left out of this picture. Arguing that we are “just like straights,” except for what we do in bed, obscures the more radical aspects of our struggles and works against alliances with others in movement for social justice.

The Canadian Border Regime and Refugee Struggles—Why Do They Need to Know Who Is Really “Queer”?

One area of struggle emerging from the early gay and lesbian movements was the right to cross borders, the right to immigrate (see Chapter 7), and the right to be accepted as

refugees.²¹³ These long struggles began to pay off in the early 1990s when formal rights to be accepted as refugees began to be established, but this formal right was very hard to make substantive. This right could only be made real if the applicant could actually get to Canada, get access to a visa, and was able to be approved for refugee status.²¹⁴ This was especially the case given that formal rights regarding immigration and refugee status were won at the same time as a more general neoliberal tightening up of borders, especially against people of colour from the Global South, was taking place.²¹⁵

There are two ways that refugees can be approved. One is as a sponsored refugee who is approved by the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights (UNHCR), after usually long waits and processing times in refugee camps. The second is through the Immigration and Refugee Board. In a neoliberal twist, most of these sponsored refugees now require private sponsors (churches and community groups) who undertake financial and other forms of support for the refugee. Some LGBT+ and allied groups in Canada providing this support are concerned that those they support and sponsor are “really gay.”²¹⁶ Only a relatively small number of LGBT refugees have entered Canada this way, since few are in a financial position to provide this sponsorship. When it became possible to claim refugee status on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identification, applicants had to not only demonstrate that they fit into the category of “refugee” but also that they had experienced persecution on the basis of their sexuality or gender. They have to do this with UN officials, in the case of sponsored refugees, or they have to do the work to produce themselves as legible to the Immigration and Refugee Boards in Canada as being “really queer” or trans.²¹⁷

Often this means having to fit oneself into essentialist constructions of LGBT that do not fully fit their experiences. In many parts of the world, people’s lives and how they do their sexualities and genders are organized in different ways than in the “West” and the “North,” and one of the aspects of this refugee-determination process is to impose these constructions of homosexuality, queerness, and transness onto the bodies and lives of people coming from locations where eroticism and gender are often done very differently. This becomes part of constructing a heterosexual-versus-homosexual binary (and a two-gender binary) on a global scale. Regarding asylum seekers, although all LGBT people may have the same formal rights to claim asylum, in practice, many are denied this possibility because of their material and social circumstances and because of the built-in barriers within this border regime.²¹⁸

Many queer and trans refugees were also affected in major ways by the racist practices in these determinations and in such legislation as Bill C-31, passed by the Harper government in 2012. This restrictive legislation put in place major barriers for those arriving through “irregular means,” for those arriving from countries designated as “safe,” and through the Safe Third Country Agreement between the Canadian and US governments, established in 2004. In this Agreement, each country declared itself safe for refugees; therefore, Canada could close the door to most refugee claimants at the US border. This affects any refugee claimant coming through the United States. Given the Trump regime’s attacks on refugees from many countries (and this is broader than Trump’s “Muslim ban”), this agreement was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme

Court of Canada in July 2020 and the government was given six months to respond.²¹⁹ The Liberal government appealed this decision and the agreement is currently still in effect. In 2023, the Liberal government signed an expanded Safe Third Country Agreement with the Biden government, tightening up the Canadian/US Border and denying the ability of asylum seekers in the United States to enter Canada and for those in Canada to enter the United States.²²⁰ This means that asylum seekers fleeing new repressive anti-homosexual legislation in Uganda who make it to the US will be denied entry to Canada.

Many of the provisions in Bill C-31 were specifically designed against the resistance to the restrictions in the legal refugee regime and to prevent claimants from getting status.²²¹ The Liberal government only got rid of some of the worst features of this legislation, maintaining most of its provisions and upholding, as mentioned, the Safe Third Country Agreement with the United States. Although there was some relaxation of these rules for Syrian (and now Ukrainian) refugees, major problems remained and, with the pandemic, it has become even more difficult for refugees to get into and to get status in Canada. The current situation, with white Ukrainian-citizen refugees being accepted into Canada while Black and racialized refugee applicants are denied, is beyond the scope of what I can investigate here. Broader migrant and refugee rights struggles with “No One Is Illegal” and “No Borders” perspectives focus on opposing the criminalization of displaced people, opposing deportations, and making it far easier for claimants to get status. In the context of the pandemic, where migrant workers do crucial support and agricultural labour and where many have been made vulnerable to infection, there have been important calls for all of these workers to get status.²²²

Unfortunately, most LGBT groups working on these issues have not adopted a “No One Is Illegal”/“No Borders” position and tend to focus on LGBT concerns as a single issue, separate from all the other struggles over immigrant, refugee, and migrant rights. This also became clear in Egale’s responses to immigration and refugee policies. In 2010, the media revealed that the office of Tory Immigration Minister Jason Kenney (now the former premier of Alberta) had asked in 2009 that references to same-sex marriage be deleted from a study guide for prospective citizens. As Trevenen and DeGagne put it, Egale responded “in a primarily conciliatory manner.” The Egale executive director stated that she was “hopeful and optimistic that we are going to get it fixed.”²²³ Others, like the activist group No One is Illegal (NOII), confronted Kenney and the government on this.²²⁴ In 2011, after many protests the guide was changed to include “Canada’s diversity includes gay and lesbian Canadians, who enjoy the full protection of and equal treatment under the law, including access to civil marriage. Together, these diverse groups, sharing a common Canadian identity, make up today’s multicultural society.”²²⁵ This “correction” was appropriated, through “diversity,” for a “multicultural” Canada.

This depiction of Canadian identity included a photo of Canadian swimmer Mark Tewksbury. As Trevenen and DeGagne ask, what kind of gay subject does he represent? Yes, he is gay but also white, male, able-bodied, and patriotic. Egale said it was pleased with this revision but they did point to the omission of trans people. But Egale

did not critique other troubling aspects of the guide, including on Indigenous people. As Trevenen and DeGagne argue, “In effect, Egale’s response allows Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s government to appear tolerant and flexible, by reinstating gays and lesbians in the guide, the broader Conservative politics of national inclusion and exclusion goes unexamined.”²²⁶ Egale’s neoliberal single-issue approach, despite a supposed commitment to “intersectionality,” led it to minimize problems with citizenship, refugee, and migrant policies. Egale also asked to be included in the Harper government’s “crime-prevention” agenda without seeming to notice who this was most directed at. This “supports the protection of some LGBT citizens from hate crimes at the expense of people who will be targeted by the racist, transphobic, homophobic, and anti-poor ‘tough on crime’ reforms that the government supports.”²²⁷ Support for “law and order” is a common feature of more “liberal” forms of neoliberalism as well as its more “conservative” forms.

The Tory-proposed Bill C-31, passed in 2012, clamped down on refugees, and immigrants generally, from a racist law-and-order perspective. Immigrant and refugee rights groups were adamantly opposed to its measures, which made things more difficult for queer and trans people trying to get into Canada. Egale’s comments on Bill C-31 focused on concerns about how LGBT refugees from those countries designated as “safe” would be affected, since it would make it more difficult for them to get into and to stay in Canada. But as Trevenen and DeGagne write, Egale “does not, however, attend to the myriad ways that the Conservative government is intensifying the divisions between insiders and outsiders at the borders of the Canadian nation.”²²⁸ This was therefore not an adequate response, especially when compared to that of groups like NOII.²²⁹

Instead, we need to be involved in struggles to challenge racism and border restrictions, for status for all, establishing real sanctuary cities, and establishing queer and trans communities as no-go areas for Canadian Border Services.²³⁰

Policing and a Serial Killer

As mentioned in the Introduction to this edition, police campaigns against queer sex in parks continued in the Montreal area, in Marie Curtis Park in western Toronto, and elsewhere.²³¹ The police continued to both harass and entrap men and to not protect queer and trans people from violence and attacks, often acting to make our communities more vulnerable to violence.

The Toronto queer, trans, and sex worker communities were rocked in the early and mid-2010s by a series of “missing person” cases that ended up as murders and deaths, perpetrated by “serial killer” Bruce McArthur and others. Those killed were mostly men who have sex with men who were of South Asian and Middle Eastern backgrounds, but also included trans women and sex workers, like Alloura Wells and Tess Richey. Those murdered by McArthur (a white man) were Skandaraj Navaratnam, Abdulbasir Faizi, Majeed Kayhan, Soroush Mahmudi, Kirushna Kumar Kanagaratnam, Dean Lisowick (a homeless man), Selim Esen, and Andrew Kinsman. The last name Kinsman

(no relation) was a white gay man, and this seemed to be the turning point in getting the police to take these murders seriously.²³² The police were an obstacle in addressing these missing-person situations and they placed people in our communities in danger. The police obstructed and discouraged efforts by friends and organizing within our communities to try to locate these missing people, and to collect information on them.²³³ The police helped to shut down community organizing on these questions which, in my view, was the only solution that could have prevented some of these men from being killed. There was a serious problem with how the police made more people vulnerable to murder, given that they were denying that there even was a serial killer until early 2018. Given that the police were literally leaving people to be murdered, only a grassroots community-safety response, which was starting to happen before it was undermined by the police, could have helped.²³⁴ Police chief Mark Saunders even criticized people in the gay community for not coming forward with information on the serial killer, blaming us for the problems with the police investigation.²³⁵ An investigation into the handling of the case was organized by Toronto Police Services but its mandate largely focused on problems with police procedures and practices regarding “missing persons.”²³⁶

In 2021, the *Missing and Missed* report was released. It was a devastating critique of the police but, at the very same time, it argued for increased police funding for this work, for embedding “civilians” (including social workers) in the police, and even suggested a way for the police to be let back into the Pride Toronto parade. The No Pride in Policing Coalition, Maggies, and Butterfly issued a joint response, demanding “that missing persons funding be taken away from the TPS and the funds given to community-based groups to address these needs in a more effective and community-based fashion.” This demand was issued as part of a broader demand for the “defunding of the police and the transfer of resources instead to community-based groups.”²³⁷

The Apology Moment: From an Apology from Below to an Apology from Above

The first call that I am aware of for something along the lines of an apology for the long campaign (from the 1950s and even earlier to the 1990s) of state surveillance, interrogation, purging, and harassment of thousands of gays and lesbians in Canada—which I and Patrizia Gentile have called the “Canadian War on Queers” (see Chapters 7 and 10)—was when NDP MP Svend Robinson challenged Prime Minister Mulroney in 1992 to recognize and apologize for the purge campaign, following a series of articles by journalist Dean Beeby that were based on the national security documents Beeby got released under the Access to Information Program (ATIP). Even though Mulroney said that, if these findings were true, there should be an investigation, nothing ever came of it.²³⁸

Then, in our 1998 preliminary research report on the Canadian War on Queers, called “In the Interests of the State,” focusing on the 1960s, we called for an official apology and a clear commitment that such campaigns would never happen again. We also called for

a commission of inquiry to investigate the national security campaigns against lesbians and gay men but also other groups. We also asked for compensation and for an investigation of the involvement of universities and university professors in this campaign. Unfortunately, there was no state response to our recommendations.²³⁹

Much later, after the publication of *The Canadian War on Queers* (2010) in 2015, I was involved in the formation of the We Demand an Apology Network (WDAN), composed of people who had been purged, people who had done research and writing on this, like myself, and supporters. WDAN called for an official, broad-ranging state apology, for redress for those who were affected by the purge campaign, and for the records of people who were convicted of consensual homosexual offences to be expunged.²⁴⁰ The apology in 2017 did not simply come from the goodness of Justin Trudeau or the Liberal government, as some have suggested, forgetting the decades of organizing from below that came before. This is instead the story of decades of queer resistance to the purge campaigns, which eventually created the social basis for the official apology, which finally came decades late.

More people began to break the silence by publicly telling their stories of being purged and of surveillance and harassment. This growing self-organization of those affected by the national security campaigns helped to produce the conditions for the official apology in 2017.²⁴¹ Unfortunately, although important lines of rupture with the national security state were opened up, they were largely able to be contained and sealed over. First, WDAN and others gained the support of the NDP, and then among the mainstream media²⁴² and among Liberal Party members. This was followed by Egale's *Just Society Report* in 2016 and by the class-action suits launched in 2016, with more unified statements of claim in 2017.²⁴³

A shift occurred, however, wherein these struggles from below—which grew out of our histories of resistance to the national security state—were worked-over and transformed through the work of Egale, through state and legal relations, and through the mainstream media, to become what I call an apology *from above*. This also had to do with the social form of the apology itself, which suggests that, once an apology is given, what occurred can be forgotten about. This also exposes some of the contradictions in relying on a politics of recognition from state agencies.²⁴⁴

The *Just Society Report*, put together rather quickly by the Just Society Committee of Egale in 2016, was crucial to this shift.²⁴⁵ The report reflected the organizing from below that created the social and political space for an apology while moving the associated demands towards a more state-oriented apology aligned with the interests of Canadian state formation. Here I draw on my own critical analysis of this report and the insightful critique of it developed by Suzanne Lenon.²⁴⁶

The *Just Society Report* argued for a wide-ranging apology, redress, and the expungement of criminal code convictions for consensual same-sex/same-gender sexual activities. But the report also had major limitations, including an important exaggeration of the impact of the 1969 Criminal Code Reform. It suggested that then Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau was pushing for social equality for gays and lesbians, which was far from the case.²⁴⁷ They framed the report with a quote from P.E. Trudeau's "Just

Society” speech, advocating individual rights but opposing the collective movements of self-determination of Indigenous nations and the people of Quebec.²⁴⁸ A central part of this “Just Society” was the attempted termination of Indigenous sovereignty.²⁴⁹

Lenon points out that the *Just Society Report* is committed to an “intersectional” approach, as mentioned earlier for Egale more generally. But intersectionality no longer means what it meant for the early work of the Combahee River Collective, who opened up the space for intersectionality as an analysis that brings together race, class, gender, and sexuality struggles, or for legal theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw, who systematized the term and applied it more specifically to legal contexts.²⁵⁰ The radical and innovative attempt by Black feminists to analyze the interconnections between relations of race, class, gender and sexuality, which has generated considerable practice and theorizing as intersectional analysis,²⁵¹ is now being actively diluted by liberal and state interests into a form of neoliberal governance. In Canada, Liberal government ministers (including the Prime Minister) regularly claim they are adopting an “intersectional” approach, but this is violently abstracted away from relations of class and capitalism, white supremacy, and settler colonialism. In my view, it is necessary to defend the accomplishments of Black feminism and what has become, for many activists, a “struggle concept”²⁵² against both those on the “left,” who attack it as “identity” politics and not real class politics, and those who wish to wield it for neoliberalism. One form of this is Egale reducing intersectionality to more liberal notions of diversity and inclusion, as “intersectionality” becomes “a symbolic declaration that sustains rather than disrupts, the racial and settler colonial project that is Canada.”²⁵³

Lenon points out that, in the *Just Society Report*, “it is primarily the figure of Two-Spirit identity who carries this signifier of pluralism as Two-Spirit is the only (racialized) identity to be named—Black people and other people of colour rarely appear in the report’s pages, an erasure that should have given pause for its evacuation of the very lives and bodies for which intersectionality was originally theorised.”²⁵⁴ This focus frames Two-Spirit only as “identity” and “culture,” but is at the same time violently abstracted away from the colonialism and genocidal practices directed against Indigenous people more generally. In opposition to this approach, see Kim TallBear, Qwo-Li Driskill, Billy-Ray Belcourt, Scott Morgensen and other critiques of white settler perspectives on Two-Spirit people, addressed in the Introduction and in Chapter 4 of this edition.²⁵⁵ After its Introduction section in the *Just Society Report*, Two-Spirit people largely disappear until later in the conclusion or when intersectionality is mentioned again.

Two-Spirit gets positioned in the *Just Society Report* “as part of the spectrum of diversity and pluralism that makes up ‘sexual minority’ communities and, thus, renders invisible settler colonialism as structure and processes that condition all of our lives.” As Lenon goes on to describe, “‘First Nations’ become analogized to ‘queers’ so that Two-Spirit identifications are disappeared or subsumed entirely.”²⁵⁶

The report’s reliance on intersectionality as diversity and inclusion actually “reproduces racial hierarchy,” making “intersectionality...compatible with a politics of liberal inclusion” and pre-empting “a politics of accountability and anti-subordination.”²⁵⁷

This marks a move that jettisons intersectionality's relational analysis of social power and inequality "so that power recedes from view."²⁵⁸

The histories told in the report also generally conform to a liberal trope of progress as it is "sutured into 'Canadianness' as a structure of feeling, where the call to 'make it right' via a state apology (like same-sex marriage before it) can lead a national 'us' to a better place."²⁵⁹ The report actually argues that Canada "still has the benefit of never having had overseas colonies. This fact minimizes the likelihood of neo-colonial claims being raised in objection to its attempts at encouraging legal reform in the Global South."²⁶⁰ But, as Lenon points out, the impact of Canadian mining companies, especially in South America, tells a very different story, as does the influence of Canadian banks in the Caribbean and South America (and the revolts against this influence).²⁶¹ This is an "intersectionality," then, that is aligned firmly with a white Canadian homonationalism and racial capitalist relations.

As Bannerji makes clear, a focus on diversity "simultaneously allows for an emptying out of actual social relations and suggests a concreteness of cultural description."²⁶² The social relations that shape subject positions are missing from the analysis and we are left with an "ornamental intersectionality," which is a superficial deployment of intersectionality where "diversity" comes to uphold whiteness. And, as Lenon stresses, "white gay men remain at the centre of the call for an apology to be intersectional."²⁶³

Despite the use of the language of truth and reconciliation, there is no real comparison made, in the *Just Society Report*, between Canadian settler colonialism and South African settler colonialism/apartheid. There is little mention of recovering the "truth" and no mention of land or of queer settler life on stolen land. This raises crucial questions for the politics of memorialization argued for in the report. We need to ask: *who is being remembered and by whom?* What the report attempts to do is to separate Two-Spirit identity from Indigenous colonization and genocidal practices. It is as if Two-Spirit people are only mentioned when they can be of benefit for white settler queers. As Lenon argues, "The deployment of intersectionality as diversity—neutral, depoliticized, outside of histories of domination"²⁶⁴ precludes us from pointing to Canada being the problem. Rather, we need a refusal of this white queer innocence and an analysis of the complicity and active involvement of many white settler queers in colonialism and racism.²⁶⁵

The report also proposes Egale as an organizational mediator between the federal government and LGBT communities, including in the work of memorialization. This includes not only state recognition and influence, but also funding for Egale. In "imagining a role for itself as mediator, Egale positions itself as the white saviour of a [supposedly] disappeared and forgotten identity. That Egale imagines itself to have such a role produced queer settlers as caring and with moral authority."²⁶⁶ This attempts "to secure for Egale's position of white queer innocence and, hence, of saviour."²⁶⁷ As Lenon suggests, "haunting Egale's self-positioning, and I would argue the whole *Just Society Report* itself, is the question of Indigenous sovereignty, that which cannot be spoken of in this moment of queer redress."²⁶⁸ The *Just Society Report's* address to the

federal government played a part in shifting the organizing around the Canadian War on Queers from a position that was critical of national security and military policies into a more accommodationist and far less critical approach in terms of the apology being asked for.

We also see this same process of shifting in the LGBT Purge Fund, which came out of the class-action settlement of 2017. If you follow its Twitter posts and practices, it has become more of a generally pro-military, mainstream-oriented lobby group. In 2022, the Purge Fund met with the Edmonton police—who have a history of racist violence towards Indigenous people—as well as the military, in Edmonton. They hosted a gala with the official LGBT section of the Toronto police in 2022, and in 2023, their Board members participated in a joint ceremony with military authorities at the Camp Borden military base in Ontario.²⁶⁹

This shifting also included mainstream media coverage. While many important stories of the purge campaigns were able to be told in this new context, they were often presented in the same way as John Ibbitson's feature in the *Globe and Mail* in November 2017. In this article, after a series of significant interview excerpts with people directly affected by the purges and other practices of discrimination, Ibbitson ends in the following homonationalist fashion:

...with this apology Canada will have gone further to secure and advance the rights of sexual minorities than any other country in the world. In that sense, the apology is really a celebration. There has never been a time and place where it was so okay to be queer.²⁷⁰

Instead of a critique of national security practices, this account of the apology installs a Canadian patriotic response. This has been accomplished rather successfully, in various overlapping ways, through Egale's *Just Society Report*; through the exclusion of people who were purged from the government's own Advisory Council, which helped prepare the apology statement and the conditions imposed on Advisory Council members;²⁷¹ through the efforts of lawyers for the class-action suit articulating people's needs to a still-heterosexist and colonialist legal regime; through the work of the Liberal government; and through, as already mentioned, much of the coverage and framing in the mainstream media.

What made my experience of the apology so contradictory was the rupture between the grass roots concerns for an apology developed in *The Canadian War on Queers* and by groups like the We Demand an Apology Network (WDAN), which was based on the experiences of those directly affected by the purge campaign, and the attempt to transform this resistance from below into an apology from above that actively forgets this history of queer resistance.

On November 28, 2017, I arrived on Parliament Hill, passed through two security screenings, and surrendered my cell phone and notebook before I could hear the prime minister's apology. As Justin Trudeau started to read the apology, I had mixed feelings: elation for those who were purged that it was finally happening, sadness for all those

who died in the decades before it took place, and major concerns over the limitations of some of the language used.

On the one hand, it was moving to hear a Prime Minister finally take some responsibility for the Canadian War on Queers. Some of the language he used was clearly shaped by the submission of *WDAN* to the Advisory Council²⁷² and the vital advocacy work of former NDP MP Svend Robinson on that body, who made sure that many of our important concerns were addressed. But, in vital ways, Trudeau's apology didn't go nearly far enough. As Lenon points out, in Trudeau's twenty-minute apology statement he employs the word sorry thirteen times.²⁷³ And, after a while, hearing "we are sorry" over and over again rang hollow and lost any meaning.

But it was also a very white apology. It did not go nearly far enough in addressing the colonization of Indigenous nations. It was only an apology to Canadian citizens in a language defending Canadian borders against Indigenous nations and refugees, migrants, and undocumented people, many of whom are racialized people.

There was a neglect of the widespread RCMP surveillance of gay and lesbian groups in the 1970s, who were defined as a threat to national security for challenging the security practices of the Canadian state. This was tied into the surveillance of the left and other social movements. In its "Points Needed in Official, Public State Apology" (September 14, 2017), *WDAN* wrote:

The RCMP surveillance campaign in the 1970s and early 1980s extended to cover gay and lesbian organizations that challenged state national security policies. This was related to and often part of a broader surveillance campaign directed against the feminist movement, unions, the Quebec sovereignty movement, immigrant and Black activists, Indigenous organizing, the left and others. This included the surveillance of the 1971 "We Demand" demonstration, organizations like the Gay Alliance Towards Equality in Vancouver, a number of cross-country conferences, as well as lesbian dances, lesbians involved in the feminist movement and many others. These organizations themselves were often portrayed as risks to "national security" simply for challenging discriminatory practices towards lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in the public service and military.²⁷⁴

In the only attempt to account for how and why the purge campaign happened, Trudeau stated: "You see, the thinking of the day was that all non-heterosexual Canadians would automatically be at an increased risk of blackmail by our adversaries."²⁷⁵ This attribution of agency to "the thinking of the day" shifts responsibility away from state national security practices. But the purge campaign was not the result of the "thinking of the day," and certainly not that of gay and lesbian activists in the 1960s and 1970s who challenged such views. Instead, it was actively put in place by the Canadian state national security and policing regimes when we were targeted as national security risks for suffering from a "character weakness" (see Chapters 7 and 10). It was these state agencies that threw queer and gender non-conforming people outside the fabric of the "nation," making us into national security risks. This experience puts national security into question when it

is an attempt to otherize any group of people, including currently with Muslim and Arab identified people, Indigenous activists, global justice and climate justice, anti-poverty organizers and others.

There were also many appeals to the nation and to patriotism in the apology statement, including, “You are patriots,” directed to those people impacted by the purge campaign as they attempted to incorporate us back into the mainstream of a still-heterosexist, transphobic, racist, and sexist Canada. We forget at our peril what we learned from being expelled from the fabric of the nation about the character of Canadian state relations. There was also an appeal to the Canadian values of “diversity” and “inclusion,” making this very much about the “progressive” character of Canada.

Right after the statement was read by Trudeau, Egale and the class-action suit lawyers and lead plaintiffs held a joint media conference to praise both the apology and the announcement of agreement to resolve the class-action suit. Not included in this response was *WDAN*, which was increasingly undermined and excluded from any ability to respond. Unfortunately, *WDAN*, which played such an important part in initiating this apology process, did not survive much longer with the internal pressures and contradictions this exclusion produced.

The class-action suit increasingly subordinated the concerns of those who had been purged to legal discourse, privileging the lawyers involved over those purged. The largest numbers of people participating in the class-action suit were purged from the military with a much smaller number from the public service. For a number of people purged from the military, despite the harassment and violence done to them by military security, there is still often a patriotic commitment to the institution of the military, which is not the same for the public servants who have been purged from government employ.

As Miriam Smith points out, “Egale engaged in nationalist and even partisan discourse highlighting the role of past Liberal leaders in instituting gay-friendly laws such as the 1969 Criminal Code revision and the 2005 same-sex marriage law.” They even gave Prime Minister Justin Trudeau a “leadership” award for his role in the apology in 2018.²⁷⁶

Of Redress and Expungement

The apology statement itself was a symbolic gesture, with many nice words but not much substance. The substance is in the other two aspects of the apology process. This is the settlement agreement in the class-action suit initiated in late 2016, which brought about some redress for the people who were purged and who are still alive. This also underlines how people had to go to court to get any justice from the government. In the end by the cut-off date in 2019, only 718 people applied for such redress, of the thousands that were directly affected.²⁷⁷

The broad terms of the class-action settlement extend beyond questions of redress to those of memorialization and the release of documents about the purge campaign.

Regarding the final settlement of the class-action suit, there is a *major* problem regarding remembering the purge campaign, which needs to be based on the release of all the organizing documents used in the security campaigns by Cabinet, the Security Panel and other security bodies, External Affairs, the RCMP, the military, and CSIS. Schedule L of the final settlement left documentation relating to government policies entirely up to a Research Project within Library and Archives Canada. The settlement agreement states that they will search likely sources but the government “does not warrant that the Research Project will identify, access and/or release all of Canada’s documents relating to the LGBT Purge. Beyond the Research project...Canada does not assume any further obligation to conduct research to locate non-personal records relating to the LGBT Purge.”²⁷⁸ They also cite the Access to Information Act so that national security exclusions may also still be in play, meaning that any documents released could be redacted on security grounds. As part of the settlement the government stated that it had eleven thousand pages of information, and, as of February 10, 2022, had provided over nine thousand pages of material as part of the settlement.²⁷⁹ The LGBT Purge Fund hired former MP Svend Robinson as a consultant to review these documents. The government of Canada now claims that they have met their obligations under Schedule L of the Final Settlement Agreement. In response, the Purge Fund states:

we know there are many more relevant documents and we are pressing the federal government to provide them. They have not been as helpful or forthcoming as we believe they should be. We have had to hire lawyers to help us in recovering as many records as possible, and we are seeking the assistance of the Federal Court in resolving our concerns with the scope of documents that have been produced.... If this situation cannot be reasonably resolved, it is possible that the LGBT Purge Fund would need to continue with legal action to obtain the additional records.²⁸⁰

In early 2023, the LGBT Purge Fund announced that it had reached an agreement with the federal government for the release of fifteen thousand more pages of historical documents over two years. This Fourth Supplementary Agreement was approved by the Federal Court of Canada and will involve a third-party research company. Although progress has been made, there are still important limitations in access.²⁸¹

Here there is a major contradiction. The government is apologizing for the purge campaigns but is refusing to release all the organizing documents for this campaign. Without the release of all these documents, the social organization of forgetting continues, and this stands in the way of remembering what took place and how it was organized.

The legal settlement also included educational work regarding LGBT+ inclusion in federal employment, which would receive state funding. This term of settlement required the LGBT Purge Fund to hire a Subject Matter Expert to improve on existing training for LGBTQ “inclusion” within the federal government. The Purge Fund selected Egale as this Subject Matter Expert in partnership with Foundation

Emergence (a Montreal-based non-profit doing work against homophobia and transphobia) and Optimus SBR (Toronto-based Business Management Consultants).²⁸² The multiple connections between Egale and the funded legal settlement are clear.

The class-action suit also includes the funding for memorialization and the construction of a monument in Ottawa. There was a limited process of consultation on the monument idea, in which I participated, and one of its principles was commitment to “Indigeneity.” On March 24, 2022, the winning proposal (“Thunderhead,” by a team based in Winnipeg) was announced.²⁸³ Five teams made proposals for the monument with the construction of the monument to be completed by 2025. A number of the proposals, including “Thunderhead,” drew on Two-Spirit and Indigenous practices and knowledge through this concept of “Indigeneity,” although this was clearly situated as a Canadian monument and with Indigenous/Two-Spirit people as part of Canada. At the media conference announcing the winning team, a series of government officials appropriated Two-Spirit and Indigenous culture for themselves, entirely separating it from the settler colonialism and genocidal practices that these government officials are still responsible for.²⁸⁴ One of these was Minister of Tourism and associate Minister of Finance Randy Boissonnault whose comments resonated with earlier remarks he made in 2019, reported on in the Introduction to this edition. It seems key that what this conceptualization of “Indigeneity” does, in this work of “memorialization” and “reconciliation,” is to abstract Indigenous knowledge and ceremony away from the actual history of genocidal practices and colonization.

Part of this memorialization will also be accomplished through the Canadian Human Rights Museum (CHRM) in Winnipeg, with an exhibit within the Museum as well as a travelling exhibit. The CHRM has been hit with major accusations of heterosexism and homophobia, as well as sexism and racism, and mistreatment of queer and trans historians.²⁸⁵ The class-action suit was warned by a series of queer historians not to partner with the CMHR because of these experiences but did so anyway on the grounds that the government wanted it. In fall 2021 an Advisory Council was established for this project.²⁸⁶

The class-action settlement creates an infrastructure for the Purge Fund and Egale that is state-funded and builds a set of relations tying the Purge Fund and Egale into state relations. This is also an important part of how the long struggle for an apology from below is transformed into an apology from above as new institutional sites for the hegemony of the neoliberal queer are established through these legal and funding agreements. State funding for this infrastructure means these organizations are not accountable to queer and trans communities. State funding for LGBT+ groups, including for Egale and the larger Pride Committees, and the infrastructures built through the apology process and the class-action settlement, are part of socially reorganizing racializing class relations within our communities to favour police participation, the celebration of the mythology of the '69 reform, and, more generally, to support neoliberalism and homonationalism.²⁸⁷ This funding contains forms of more critical politics, accommodating sections of our communities to neoliberalism. The other side of this is to further marginalize Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, sex worker, poor, homeless,

and more radical and activist queer and trans people in our communities, excluding them from the new positions within this infrastructure on the basis of their lack of professional and managerial or artistic/cultural credentials.²⁸⁸

Substance is also in the expungement legislation that was introduced the morning of the apology statement and which also has *major* limitations. These include that, under the list of offences that were included as grounds for expungement, many of the most significant charges against consensual queer sex were not included. The bawdy-house legislation under which hundreds of men in the 1970s and 1980s were charged was not covered; indecent act, another charge used against men having sex with men, was also not included. As well, the age of consent used is sixteen, which is higher than the heterosexual age of consent set at fourteen for most of this time period; and the onus is placed on the individual to take the initiative to apply, including proving it was consensual activity, which can be very difficult to do given the state of records and documents in court cases.²⁸⁹

Unfortunately, despite these major limitations, this legislation was rushed through the House of Commons and, even though submissions were allowed in the Senate and an alliance was constructed between the informal gay and lesbian historians group, AIDS organizations, and sex worker activists, no changes were made and the legislation was passed in 2018.

Tom Hooper and I presented to the Senate Committee in Spring 2018 for the informal gay and lesbian historians' group. Martine Roy presented for the Just Society Committee of Egale and, although she did raise some critiques of the bill, she concluded by breaking ranks with the other queer presenters, arguing that the bill should just be passed as it is. Although this was what we thought would happen, it was still shocking when it occurred.²⁹⁰

This was followed by Bill C-75, a broad-ranging piece of legislation intended to get rid of out-of-date and unconstitutional offences in the criminal code. Any new charges that were abolished could potentially get added to the list included for the expungement legislation. Initially, the only offence they planned to repeal relating to queer sex was anal sex. But the historians group argued for this to be expanded to include abolition of the bawdy-house law, indecent acts, and vagrancy, which has been used against trans and gender non-conforming people, along with the laws criminalizing sex work.²⁹¹ Bill C-75 was discussed by the Justice and Human Rights Committee of the House of Commons in September 2018.

I presented along with Tom Hooper for the gay and lesbian historians group on September 25, 2018 arguing, in particular, for the addition of the repeal of the bawdy-house law, indecent acts, and vagrancy to the offences to be repealed.²⁹² A few minutes before Tom and I presented, Anthony Housefather, then chair of the committee, told us, "There is no way we are going to call for the repeal of the bawdy-house law." Fortunately, with the alliance constructed between queer, AIDS, and sex worker activists and the support of NDP committee member Murray Rankin, and with no opposition this time from Egale, our persistence paid off with the bawdy-house law and vagrancy being added to the list of offences to be repealed. They still refused to call for abolishing

the offence of indecent act, arguing it was still necessary to cover some “offensive” acts. Bill C-75 was passed in June 2019, and the offences of anal sex, the bawdy-house law and vagrancy were finally abolished. But they were not added to the list of offences for expungement. Both the Liberal government and Egale, who told us they would be added if we got them repealed, deceived us.

It was not until March 2023—four years later—that the government finally proposed adding the bawdy-house law and acts of indecency, along with some abortion-related convictions, to the expungement legislation. There were major problems here, as they proposed to only include the acts of indecency section of the bawdy-house law and not the sex worker part. That means this will entirely exclude all sex workers from using this expungement legislation, breaking historical connections between queers and sex workers, but it will also exclude queers associated with sex work, an association the police often made in their investigations and reports using the bawdy-house law. The revisions also argued that only acts of indecency within an institution the police designated as a “bawdy house” could be covered and not indecent act convictions in parks and public washrooms, where the vast majority took place. Sex worker activists and the gay and lesbian historians’ group I am part of criticized the major limitations of the new version of the expungement legislation.²⁹³

As a result of these limitations the number of people applying for expungement and the number accepted have been tiny. There have now been seventy applications for expungement. Sixty have been refused and only nine granted.²⁹⁴ Many of those refused were because their convictions were for offences that were not included initially in the legislation. It is hoped that more will be successful if more offences are included.²⁹⁵ This is a very tiny fraction of the thousands of people charged with these offences. Among these, at least we know that Klippert’s 1960s gross indecency convictions, which allowed him to be sentenced as a “dangerous sexual offender,” were finally posthumously expunged.²⁹⁶ On this front, clearly, the apology process so far has been a major failure.²⁹⁷

Despite the limited gains, funding, and compromises emerging from the apology moment there remained a number of areas of struggle. Two of the main unmet demands of long-time LGBT+ organizing in the twenty-first century related to the blood bans against queer and trans people and to conversion therapy. Progress on these fronts, however, was very slow and contradictory, despite official government commitments. I first explore the blood bans and then conversion therapy.

Blood Bans and Politics: Of Sexuality, Anti-Black Racism, and an Ending of the Blood Ban That Did Not Take Place

In the early years of the AIDS crisis, once it became clear that HIV could be transmitted through blood, there were prohibitions on blood donations from those identified as “high risk groups,” including men who had sex with men and Haitians, regardless of what practices they engaged in. On this see Chapter 10. These prohibitions have been long-lasting. One of their features was the extension to cover the racist construction of African AIDS. Queer and Black blood was therefore defined as a “risk” and a “threat”

even when there was no evidence that it was HIV-infected. This stigmatized and organized social discrimination against these communities.

At the same time, hemophiliacs and those requiring blood transfusions were infected through the blood supply. The Krever Commission of Inquiry into the blood supply released its report in 1997 and, along with associated organizing and media coverage, led to a distinction between “guilty” and “innocent” people living with AIDS/HIV. Those who acquired it through sex and drug use were portrayed as being “guilty” and those who acquired it through the blood supply were instead defined as “innocent,” and this meant state responsibility and possible compensation.²⁹⁸ But, as AIDS activists pointed out, there were no “guilty” people living with AIDS/HIV, and everyone should have received social and financial support.

Dryden locates the blood ban against Haitians and “Africans” in the history of the troubling of Black bodies with the impact of anti-Black racism, and with the “scientific” assertions that associated Black people with “having/possessing bad bodily fluids, in particular blood and semen.”²⁹⁹ This built on earlier histories of racial and gendered exclusion regarding blood donation. “Through these logics, HIV and AIDS has become a ‘natural association’ with Blackness.”³⁰⁰ There was a shift of prohibitions against those donating blood from specific African countries to Africa in general.³⁰¹ But in July 2015, after protests, this was limited to just Togo and Cameroon and, in May 2018, there was an end to the explicit African blood ban—but there has been no apology or self-criticism on the part of the Canadian government.³⁰²

Egale did take up opposition to the blood ban, but only narrowly, in relation to men who had sex with men (which of course includes Black men and other men of colour). As Dryden points out:

In the process of securing marriage rights...Blackness became an analogy necessary to constructing gay subjectivity and gay humanity, in its work on blood, instead of using racial analogies, Egale *refused* to acknowledge the queered Blackness of blood.³⁰³

It was almost as if, in avoiding racism and anti-Blackness, Egale wanted to focus only on the gay aspect, with the argument that wanting to give gay blood was patriotic and life-giving and that this patriotic desire was being denied to presumably white gay men. Although this is no longer the case, question 30 of the blood-intake questionnaire related specifically to African AIDS/HIV—but Blackness was seen by Egale as “much too far afield to be understood as related.” As Dryden writes, “The exclusion of narratives on racialized sexuality from the work on including ‘gay blood’ in the national blood supply demonstrates its homonationalist deployment.”³⁰⁴ Here, we again see the failure of Egale’s supposed “intersectional” approach and its refusal to engage with anti-Black racism as a central concern.

Canadian Blood Services (CBS), which took over management of the blood supply from the Red Cross outside Quebec following the Krever Commission, is a government-funded organization that has been a site of systematic racism and anti-Black homophobia. This escalated into targeted harassment within the CBS against scholar/activist

OmiSoore Dryden, who researches and advocates for an end to anti-Black racism and interlinked heterosexism and transphobia. I gave a deputation to an open board meeting of CBS on the historical background to this on June 18, 2021.³⁰⁵ CBS has yet to apologize for this or to take steps to ensure this could never happen again.

In the summer of 2020, with continuing (although shortened) bans, an “All Blood Is Equal” campaign was initiated that only focuses on how continuing blood bans impact LGBTQ people.³⁰⁶ Those who have “taken money or drugs for sex since 1977” continued to be excluded from donating blood.³⁰⁷ In the fall of 2021, new proposals for relaxing the blood bans were put forward, but these continued to focus on anal sex as a particular “high risk” practice, rather than whether people engaged in safe sex.³⁰⁸

On April 28, 2022, the new policies that will be implemented by CBS as of September 30, 2022 were announced by Health Canada. While dropping a formal ban on men and trans women who have sex with men, the discriminatory policy was simply reconstructed in a new substantive form. Possible donors will now be asked if they have engaged in anal sex with anyone new, or with multiple partners in the last three months. If so, they are refused. It does not matter if the anal sex has been done safely or not. Since anal sex has been “homosexualized” as a queer men’s sexual practice, this continues discrimination against donors who are men who have sex with men. Prospective donors will not be asked about any other sexual activities, as if there are no other routes of sexual transmission of HIV. Others excluded include all those who have used PREP (an HIV transmission preventative) in the last four months, and all those who have sex with HIV+ people, even if they have an undetectable viral load.³⁰⁹ Practices against trans women who get treated by CBS as “men” will continue. And the prohibitions continue against those engaging in sex work and drug use.

Despite these major limitations, mainstream and Liberal-allied groups were quick to claim victory. All Blood is Equal said these changes were “long-overdue” and Egale stated on Twitter that it was “A major step in the right direction toward equality with Health Canada’s announcement of ending its discriminatory blood ban. Everyone should have the ability to donate blood regardless of their gender or sexual orientation.”³¹⁰ Accuracy gets sacrificed to loyalty to the Liberal government. In September 2022, it also became clear that CBS signed an agreement with a private company to provide plasma supply, pointing towards a neoliberal privatization of blood services.³¹¹

None of this mainstream LGBTQ+ response prepares people in our communities for the problems they will encounter with CBS if they try to donate blood and the struggles that are still needed to get rid of discriminatory blood bans and practices. On this front, the struggle also continues.

Campaigning Against Conversion Therapy

Earlier, in Chapter 7, I referred to forms of psychological terrorism known as aversion therapy aimed at deterring individuals from engaging in queer sex. Although important battles were fought to limit these practices, they continued in some psychological

and medical circles. Now known as conversion therapy, these practices are directed at converting queer-inclined people into “heterosexuals,” or at least preventing people from living queer lives, and at preventing trans people from gender transitioning or having gender-affirming surgery. There are also other forms of conversion therapy, including Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA), a controversial but officially sanctioned and funded approach directed at autistic people, including autistic queer and trans people. ABA has enough similarities to gay conversion therapy that many autistics refer to it as “autistic conversion therapy”³¹² and it is based on “the idea that autistic ways of being in the world are unacceptable and must be eradicated.”³¹³ Unfortunately, given the historic connections between the development of conversion therapy against effeminate male-bodied children and ABA for autism in the 1960s and 1970s by psychologists at the University of California, Los Angeles, not addressing these connections means that conversion therapy continues to exist for autistic queer and trans people. Ander Negrazis points out that ABA is intertwined with queer and trans conversion therapies because “[autistic] genders and sexualities are inherently pathologized as abnormal.”³¹⁴ When we overlook these important connections, autistic queer and trans people in anti-conversion therapy organizing are left behind, as trans people were in sexual orientation rights struggles in LGB organizing in the 1980s and 1990s.

While these practices are never very successful, they inflict violence and pain on trans and queer people, usually on young people that have parents opposed to their gender and sexual “deviance.” Rebecca Rose describes the struggle against conversion therapy in Nova Scotia:

In the summer of 2018 the fight against conversion therapy was revisited when a Pictou County Bible camp attempted to bring in speakers from Coming Out Ministries, a group that advocates a “cure” for queerness. (The group did not come to Nova Scotia in the end, due to the immense public pressure). Community outcry prompted the passing of provincial legislation in September 2018 which banned conversion therapy in the province (with some caveats).³¹⁵

The new strategy activists have adopted is to try to get federal, provincial, and municipal governments to prevent these anti-queer/anti-trans practices from taking place in their jurisdictions. Beyond Nova Scotia, Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Ontario, and PEI passed such legislation. In March 2020, the federal government introduced legislation to prohibit conversion therapy in Canada. This died on the order paper when the Liberal government prorogued Parliament in August 2020 and had to be re-introduced.³¹⁶

No Conversion Canada was formed to push the federal government on this issue, but its opposition to conversion therapy was only against queer and trans-related conversion therapy. The legislation to ban conversion therapy was reintroduced on October 1, 2020, died again, and was reintroduced in 2021. It was finally passed on January 7, 2022. The struggle continues to ensure that these conversion practices are actually ended,

since an official ban may not necessarily be enforced, and that this prohibition is extended to ABA conversion therapy for autistic people.

Danger From Right-Wing Neoliberal Regimes and Movements, Neoliberalism More Generally, and the Contradictions We Face

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, moral-conservative and other right-wing mobilizations of neoliberalism, while displaced by non-moral-conservative forms, have recently experienced a resurgence as strategies for implementing neoliberal capitalist relations and opposing Black, Indigenous, anti-policing and other social movements. Neoliberal regimes with major moral-conservative influence have taken office around the world, including Trump in the United States (despite his loss to the more “liberal” neoliberal Biden) and one of the defining features of these regimes has been hostility towards and obstruction of queer (and especially trans) lives and rights as part of broader neoliberal austerity and carceral injustice politics. Globally, this takes many forms, with different features, but it includes the former Johnson (now Rishi Sunak) regime in the United Kingdom, including its major anti-trans positions; the Bolsonaro regime in Brazil (now fortunately defeated by Lula); the Putin regime in Russia (now modified with the imperialist invasion of Ukraine); and the Modi regime in India.³¹⁷ We also saw this earlier in Canada under the Harper federal governments, Alberta Conservative governments,³¹⁸ and more recently under the Ford and Kenney/Danielle Smith provincial governments, with their attacks (sometimes fortunately unsuccessful) on trans and queer rights. The re-elected Conservative government in New Brunswick has opposed support for a clinic in Fredericton dealing with abortions and queer and trans health-care³¹⁹ and, in 2023, Premier Blaine Higgs has attacked drag story hours and trans and queer young people.³²⁰

Unevenly associated with, or operating in the spaces opened up by these regimes, are more overtly right-wing, racist, and even fascist forces, who are mobilizing against refugees and migrants, Muslims, queer and trans people including drag queens, Black liberation activists, government mandates regarding Covid, and against anti-fascist groups. In the United States context, it was as if Trump had white nationalist stormtroopers he could call into action. In the Canadian context, these forces are markedly anti-Indigenous, pro-pipeline and fossil fuel industry, anti-refugee and migrant, and anti-queer and trans. During Pride in Hamilton in 2019, fascists allied with anti-gay fundamentalists attempted to disrupt the event and attacked people. Pride was defended by anti-fascist queer and trans activists and other anti-fascists.³²¹ In the context of the pandemic and the uprising, these right-wing groups have forged alliances with anti-masking/antivaxxing groups and with pro-police groups. As we saw in the Introduction to this edition, the Convoy and related mobilizations have expanded space for continuing right-wing/white-supremacist and fascist mobilizations, giving these forces a limited mass base.³²² In 2022 and 2023, especially in smaller centres across the Canadian state, but also including in Ottawa and in Toronto at the Fort York Public Library and at York Mills Collegiate,³²³ these right-wing and fascist groups have protested and,

in some cases, forced the cancellation of drag story hours at public libraries. Fortunately, in many of these centres, pro-trans and queer counter-protestors and anti-fascists have greatly outnumbered the right-wing and fascist forces.

There is now both a more “liberal” neoliberalism under Liberal and NDP governments and also more moral-conservative neoliberal forms. Both of these forms need to be addressed, even though they have differing features. Until recently, however, there has been little queer and trans presence in mobilizations against these right-wing governments, aside from against the attacks on sexuality education in Ontario and Gay-Straight Alliances in Alberta. There was also opposition to the disbanding of a government working group on banning conversion therapy in Alberta in 2019. Fending off these attacks requires building alliances among and between various working-class and oppressed groups, including queer and trans groups, under attack.

Unfortunately, those I describe as neoliberal queers often support (implicitly or explicitly) many of these attacks on working-class, poor, Indigenous, and racialized people, aside from how the campaigns against queer and trans rights directly impact on white, middle-class queer and trans people. The politics of racialized class are now far more important for many neoliberal queers than is any commitment to more transformative versions of queer and trans liberation. And now this occurs in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the uprisings against anti-Black racism and the police, as well as No Pride in Genocide and Land Back mobilizations, which I return to in the conclusion.

Some have suggested that “we” should ally with the more “liberal” forms of neoliberalism against more moral/social conservative forms. This is the path clearly taken up by the neoliberal queer as a political formation. While we need to use the spaces opened up by the contradictions between these different forms of neoliberalism to push forward our struggles, we also need to remember what the different forms of neoliberalism agree on. They are all based on attacks on working-class and poor people through austerity measures and attacks on the social wage, they are based on privatization and the undermining of the “welfare state,” and they are based on racist forms of law and order, policing and prisons, and the tightening up of borders for immigrants and refugees from the Global South. Because of this, any more general alliance with more “liberal” forms of neoliberalism will lead to attacks on most queer and trans people.

Therefore, I argue, we need to oppose *all* forms of neoliberal capitalism. While we need to take advantage of contradictions and conflicts, we also need autonomy from neoliberalism through opposing *both* its more moral-conservative as well as its more “liberal” forms. If we don’t, we will simply be used to advance the agenda of the more “liberal” neoliberal forces, which is what has often taken place. Recently, we have seen how Egale has allied with the Liberal government around the apology from above to the LGBTQ2S+ communities, going so far as to give Prime Minister Justin Trudeau its 2018 Leadership Award for saying he was sorry decades late.³²⁴ As part of the shifting of the impetus for an apology from below into an apology from above, we have seen how Egale, in its 2016 *Just Society Report*, shifted the radical analysis of intersectionality into a mode of neoliberal governance through translating it into a focus on “inclusion” and “diversity.”³²⁵ This leads to our communities being used to facilitate the power of

Liberal Party homonationalism and the interests of white, middle-class queers, who are largely cis men, which does little to advance the important struggles of those left behind by the rights revolution.

Instead, as noted this chapter, the apology from above process and the terms of the class-action settlement have established a state-funded infrastructure for white, middle-class, neoliberal-oriented queer projects. For instance, with funding through Global Affairs Canada, Egale partnered with Toronto Police Services, which is barred from participation within the Pride Toronto parade and festival for anti-Black racism and violence, in doing “inclusion” training for Ukraine’s police forces in 2021.³²⁶

But it goes far beyond this. I share with Drucker the need to extend the critique of neoliberalism into a more general challenge to capitalist social relations. The problem is not simply one form of capitalism, and the solution is certainly not returning to Keynesian forms of capitalism, as many on the left continue to suggest.³²⁷ Queer and trans liberation requires a far-reaching anti-capitalist and anti-racist perspective.

Contemporary practices of sexual and moral regulation set up a contradictory situation. On the one hand, neoliberalism and capitalist globalization, in combination with feminist, queer, and trans struggles, have generally shifted and weakened the centrality of the heterosexual family in the social organization of capitalist relations in much of the “North” and “West.” This has led to a certain lessening of moral regulation of some sex related and gendered practices, but these “gains” have also involved an expansion of consumer capitalism into new areas, leading to the development of the gay or “pink” market, and a focus on developing “productive” queer and trans workers by some corporations and governments.³²⁸

On the other hand, the decline of the heterosexual nuclear family has prompted a reactionary response from newly ascendant moral-conservative neoliberal forces, including attacks on queer and trans people. Moreover, despite major gains in human rights in countries like Canada, there are still profound forms of heterosexist and transphobic discrimination, bigotry, and violence against queers and trans people, rooted in state and social formation, policing and carceral relations, the Criminal Code, social policy, popular cultures, and moral-conservative organizing. While some queers (especially white, middle-class cis gay men) are tolerated and accepted in certain areas, criminalization and censorship continues, and hatred (including violence) is continuously mobilized against other queer and trans people.³²⁹ Ideologies of “fag,” “dyke,” and “trans” that mobilize social courses of action leading to on-line and physical harassment and even violence continue to be mobilized in high schools, on city streets, and through the internet.³³⁰ Formal equality (which is still not fully established) leaves many behind and those living their queer and trans lives through relations of racializing, classed, gendered, aged and disabling forms of oppression continue to face major obstacles and forms of oppression, including social exclusion and police violence.

Miriam Smith in a different way, recognizes some of this when she notes that there are tensions and contradictions between the recognition of same-sex relationships and the continuing criminal and other forms of regulation of queer sex.³³¹ For her, as she describes it, “homonationalism” exists at the very same time as what she describes as

“homophobic” forms of discrimination. What Smith neglects in this important analysis is how queer and trans oppression is always mediated through relations of class, race, gender, disability, age, and more. And now this all occurs in the conditions of a global pandemic and a global uprising against anti-Black capitalism and policing, which I return to in the conclusion.

I now move onto the concluding chapter for this third edition, which focuses on the unmaking of the neoliberal queer. Here, I bring together major themes and resources for pushing our liberation movements forward in the historical present against the project of the neoliberal queer, raising a series of questions we need to continue to discuss, struggle with, and work through.

Unmaking the Neoliberal Queer

From Resistance to Liberation

As I finalize these words in May 2023, we face a series of mediated and overlapping crises, each shaping the others. We cannot think through questions of sexual and gender liberation without placing these struggles in these interlocking and shifting social contexts.¹ Canadian state formation has been profoundly put into question by the continuing revelations of the genocidal practices enacted against Indigenous people in the residential “death camps” and the mass resistance they have prompted, organized by Indigenous people and allies, along with the ongoing Land Back movement and other struggles.

Beyond this, there is the COVID-19 pandemic which has killed and infected millions of people around the globe, with many suffering from Long Covid.² Vaccine and treatment apartheid—which is also related to the lack of personal protection equipment (masks and more) in parts of the Global South—means that, while there is wider access to vaccinations in wealthier countries, most people in the Global South are denied access. This leads to the continuing emergence of new variants of COVID-19 that are often more infectious and vaccine-resistant. Variants that are able to escape the impact of the existing vaccines—those based on the first identified versions of COVID-19, as well as the new bivalent vaccines—remain a major problem as an intense, and mostly preventable, global wave of infection and death develops around us. This pandemic is itself related to ecological devastation and climate change, including the destruction of habitat and biodiversity.³ As pointed out earlier, to respond to this pandemic, we need to shift the AIDS-activist slogan “Silence=Death!” to “Capitalism=Death!” since capitalist social relations are leading to infection and harm, literally killing people.

There was also the 2020 and 2021 uprisings against anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism, and against police murder and violence, including continuing organizing for defunding the police. Nor can we forget the toxic drug supply crisis and the deaths and devastation it is causing. Furthermore, all of this is occurring within the broader context of a protracted climate crisis that is threatening life on this planet. These events are all part of the generalized crisis of racist, patriarchal capitalist social relations that we face as am I finishing this book.

Each of these crises has impacts on queer and trans people affected differently by relations of class, race, gender, ability, age, health, and more.⁴ Our movements and struggles from below—for health and social justice in the pandemic; against racism,

colonialism, the police, and carceral capitalism; for overdose prevention sites and harm reduction, along with measures against poverty and for housing; and to survive against the fossil fuel industries and extractive capitalism while supporting Indigenous struggles—these all respond to these mediated crises, but also participate in producing crisis for capitalist relations. In this sense, “we” also become the crisis of racist capitalism⁵ through our struggles to have our needs and desires met and with the capacity to make an anti-racist, anti-capitalist, anti-patriarchal society defined by queer and trans liberation and climate justice.

I go through these mediated crises, starting with a focus on the uprising against anti-Black racism and the police and how it can impact the unmaking of the neoliberal queer. The examination of the global uprising is more developed here than the other points since it allows for a clearer discussion of what queer and trans liberation politics *must* look like now. This contrasts with what Egale and the Purge Fund and many Pride Committees are arguing for, which is a return to “normal” mainstream LGBT politics following the pandemic—if it ever ends! Though, according to some powerful state officials, it has “already ended”—as if we learned nothing from surviving the pandemic, from the global uprising against the police and anti-Black racism, and No Pride in Genocide organizing. Now many of these forces are arguing for a return to “normality” while the pandemic still rages. In returning to these “normal” LGBT politics that privilege the concerns of white, middle-class queer (and, in fewer cases, trans) people, this is an attempt to retrench the policies of the neo-liberal queer and support for a “liberal” variant of neoliberalism. Liberal state funding also supports this orientation and imposes on these groups a corporate form of organizing with the hierarchy of an Executive Director, Board of Directors, a staff, and a largely passive membership, along with reliance on state and corporate funding.

The Police—From Defunding to Abolition

In the Introduction to this edition, at entry point two, was the 2020 Toronto Pride Day Abolish All Police Rally/Teach-In of close to three thousand people, initiated by the No Pride in Policing Coalition (NPPC). I return to this queer and trans liberationist-informed event where we launched the Statement to “Defund and Abolish All Police.”⁶ As noted in the Introduction, the very possibility for this was created through the resistance of the global uprising itself, which this mobilization was part of. The statement begins:

We join the international uprising led by Black people against police killings and violence.... Systematic, institutionalized, violent, anti-Black racism and settler colonialism shapes Canadian society and its policing practices. Too many of the people shot and killed by the police are people with disabilities. This cannot continue. The past 10 years have seen increases in routinized killings of Black, racialized, and Indigenous people across the country.

Toronto has a documented record of anti-Black, Anti-Indigenous, racist killings by police. Violent racist police practices are enmeshed with homophobic, misogynist, anti-trans, anti-disability, and anti-poor police violence as well as the deadly neglect of Black, Indigenous and racialized people, sex workers, homeless and poor people.⁷

The statement supports all of the demands of BLM-TO (Black Lives Matter-Toronto) including calling for a minimum fifty percent reduction in the then \$1.1 billion Toronto police budget and calls for defunding jails, prisons, immigration detention centres, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), and the Canada Border Service Agency (CBSA). These funds are to be redirected “towards the communities they [the police] have devastated by investing in secure, long-term housing for street-involved and unhoused communities, food security programs, public transit, public health, public libraries, and community led anti-violence programs.” The BLM-TO demands include decriminalizing poverty, drugs, HIV, and sex work and called for investing in harm reduction and in a “community-based and trauma-informed emergency service for people who have experienced gender-based violence.”⁸

To this, the NPPC added: ending colonialism and defunding and abolishing the RCMP; repealing the criminal code sections allowing the police to use deadly force; no transferring of police funding to “institutional social work, the psychiatric profession, or other agencies involved in racist, sexist, anti-disability, homophobic and or/transphobic practices, criminalization, disciplining, and/or psychiatrizing people.” Also included was an end to anti-trans violence and the two-gender binary: “Police and social institutions are invested in anti-Trans practices and support the two-gender binary.... We call on all levels of government and police to not transfer funding and jurisdiction to other agencies invested in anti-Trans practices, the two-gender system and gender oppression.”⁹

In the context of the global uprising against racism and the police, this was an important statement initiated by Black, Indigenous, and racialized activists with the support of white queer and trans activists. It placed us clearly on the side of those defending Black and Indigenous lives and for defunding and abolishing the police. After decades of report after report and recommendation after recommendation for reforming the police, which have led nowhere in making the police less lethal and dangerous to Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, this statement decisively broke with that path. Struggles *within* policing had clearly been a failure from the vantage point of social justice movements, although they had been a major success *for* policing in containing our movements. We can also see this in the long history of setting up liaison and dialogue committees between members of the queer communities and the police, which the police used to try to get us to police ourselves and to do surveillance on our movements and communities. This is partially documented in Chapter 10.¹⁰ Pride Toronto, despite the membership decision to bar police forces from participation within the parade and the festival, still continues these politics from the past with its 2021 decision, under cover of the need to get permits from the police, for the parade and the festival

to provide police training for new police recruits and collaboration with the police on “harm reduction” work in 2022.¹¹

Instead, we are now focusing *against* the police and developing *alternatives* beyond policing and carceral state relations from an abolitionist perspective. We are no longer asking to be let into repressive institutions but are organizing against them and attempting to build alternatives.¹² Nor are we viewing queer and trans needs and struggles as separate from anti-racist and other social justice organizing. Hopefully this signals an end to a “single-issue” narrow focus only on queer and trans issues in organizing, which has always privileged white, non-disabled, middle-class (and usually cis “male”) concerns.

Clearly “To Defund and Abolish All Police” does not address all of queer and trans liberation politics, and it was further elaborated the next year in opposition to prisons and other forms of carceral injustice as well—and, in 2022 and 2023, put in broader contexts¹³—but it marks a major rupture with the mainstream organizing that the emergence of the neoliberal queer has led to. This neoliberal form of organizing has trapped people *within* ruling institutional relations. The statement above is what queer and trans liberation politics, not separate from but combined with struggles against racist, colonial, capitalist, and patriarchal social relations, begins to look like. This is what I argue queer and trans liberation must be about, informed by what was learned from the global uprising, No Pride in Genocide, and responses to the pandemic. If “leaders” who are white, middle-class gay men see this focus against racism, colonialism, and the police as their erasure—as is mentioned in the Introduction to this edition—perhaps it means that the old mainstream LGBT-rights politics, which were coded as white, middle class, and cisgender, and never saw Black, Indigenous, and other anti-racist struggles as central, is finally being surpassed.

Regarding the pandemic, this means continuing to learn from our experiences of AIDS activism and organizing. Unfortunately, the emergence of the neoliberal queer has led to the social organization of forgetting of these lessons since they raise profound questions challenging the institutional relations of the capitalist medical-industrial complex, public health, imperialism/underdevelopment, and health from above. This has stifled people’s abilities to learn from AIDS activism *for* the current pandemic. Learning from AIDS organizing entails a major critique of mainstream public health practices like the earlier “stay at home,” and a reliance on rules, public health “experts,” and policing.¹⁴ We need to reaffirm that there are no “expendable populations,” whether people in low-income countries, older people, people with disabilities, people with compromised immune systems, Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, precarious and migrant workers, those in detention, or others. We need to oppose the use of “herd immunity” and the “reopening” of “the economy” and the schools, which justify the spreading of infection and death to older and disabled people, to precarious and migrant workers, and to young people, along with the other communities of people most vulnerable to the pandemic.¹⁵ The early opening of the insides of restaurants, bars, and other establishments, the unsafe openings of schools, unsafe conditions in for-profit long-term care facilities, and the continuing unsafe labour for low-paid and

precarious workers (and more) allowed for waves of infection and death to develop and, as I finalize this, for devastating waves of infection. Rather than relying on the health from above of the medical-industrial complex, the pharmaceutical corporations, and the public health establishment, we instead need community-based popular education and organizing and to move towards health from below.¹⁶ Given that viruses constantly mutate, allowing COVID-19 to grow and sustain itself within some bodies has led to the emergence of new “variants of concern” that are now escaping the impact of the vaccines that have so far been developed. We are also facing a situation in which vaccines and treatments are being denied to many people in the Global South because of the profit orientation of the pharmaceutical corporations that have developed vaccines and the positions of most Western governments (including the Canadian government). There is an urgent need for a global response and not just nation-state responses for their “citizens.” Globally, this means we must establish free access for people in the Global South for vaccines, treatments, and protective devices and the transfer of resources from the Global North to the Global South to accomplish this. This also means simultaneously addressing the toxic supply crisis with harm reduction measures, the decriminalizing of drug use, safe supplies, and attending to the urgent needs for accessible and safe housing for the homeless.

The interlocked climate crisis must be at the very centre of our concerns and action. We must end the hegemony of the fossil-fuel industry (including car culture) and resource-extraction capitalism over our lives. Instead, we need to defend the ecological networks we are part of and depend on,¹⁷ including, crucially, the defence of Indigenous nations and struggles against resource extraction capitalism, pipelines, fracking, and other capitalist “development” plans. This means that Indigenous solidarity and Land Back must become central to queer and trans liberation organizing. Indigenous land-based knowledge is vital in developing a different social relation to the land, water, and the ecological networks we are all a part of. This involves taking care of all our relations, human and non-human. This will also make white settler queer and trans support for Two-Spirit people all the more powerful on an anti-colonialist basis, rather than being uprooted from active opposition to settler colonialism, as it is in most white settler-dominated groups like Egale, as we saw last chapter.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to look at some of the resources for transformation that make challenging the neoliberal queer possible and then to turn to questions raised in the new Introduction and in Chapter 11 that were not addressed in this book’s 1996 conclusion. These include the need for an internationalist sexual and gender politics.

I do this, in part, through engaging with the important work of Himani Bannerji, Peter Drucker, OmiSoore H. Dryden, Suzanne Lenon, Joseph Massad, Tim McCaskell, Jasbir Puar, Rahul Rao, and Harsha Walia, among others.¹⁸

In the 2000s and 2010s, organizing emerged from those parts of the queer and trans communities who had been left out of the neoliberal rights revolution. This rights revolution benefitted some queer and trans people far more than others, facilitating the emergence of white, middle-class queer and trans people at the top of community

formation. Victories were won but their impacts were uneven and differentiated along lines of class, race, gender, disability, health and more. For many of us—including myself—while we saw formal and legal victories being won, we began to realize something was wrong. Often, important forms of resistance that emerged were not initially clear on what they were directed at, but this organizing challenged and destabilized the emerging hegemony of the neoliberal queer. At the same time, this organizing was also not always clear on its opposition to queer neoliberalism, and could even get taken up, on unclear terrains of struggle, with compromises with neoliberal currents. Over time, however, opposition to neoliberalism became more explicit. Challenging the whiteness of queerness through the self-organization of Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans people was central to these forms of resistance.

The Self-Organization of Black, Indigenous, and Racialized Queer and Trans People

Those largely excluded from formal rights began to organize themselves to try to ensure their needs were addressed. This was pushed forward by the organizing of Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, which has deep historical roots going back to the 1970s and earlier, some of which were mentioned in Chapter 9. Just in Toronto, this included groups like Zami, Aya (a Black men's group that succeeded Zami), Sister Vision Press, organizing around the Dewson Street collective house, The Black Women's Collective, Gay Asians of Toronto, Lesbians of Colour, and cultural festivals like Desh Pardesh, CeleBrAsian, and within Pride, Blockorama.¹⁹ These groups challenged racism and white supremacy within white-dominated queer community formation while also challenging heterosexism within people of colour communities. With the development of the AIDS crisis, the lack of adequate reckoning with racism prompted the creation of AIDS groups formed to address the specific needs of Black, South Asian, Indigenous and other communities.²⁰ Beverly Bain describes the emergence of Blockorama out of Black queer and trans organizing in Toronto:

Blockorama was a way to create space for Black queers in the city to find ways to connect what often gets disconnected. Our Blackness gets severed from our queerness inside the white queer community, and our queerness gets cut off and deemed an aberration inside the heteronormative Black and Caribbean community.²¹

As part of this movement, there was also a growing self-organization of Two-Spirit people, including in AIDS organizing and regarding harm reduction.²² These forms of organizing challenged white hegemony in queer movements and community formation. In response to these initiatives, white-dominated organizations developed various strategies to manage and handle these challenges, including through notions of “diversity” and “inclusion,” expanding from the state strategy of “multiculturalism” and state and corporate Equality, Diversity, Inclusion (EDI) policies, as we saw last chapter. But

these strategies did not displace whiteness in the centre of queer community politics and formation. Until the emergence of Black Lives Matter in 2014, there was unfortunately little recent white queer organizing in support of struggles against racism and white hegemony within queer and trans communities. After BLM, this broadened out with the formation of white support groups for BLM, the formation of the No Pride in Policing Coalition in 2018, and chapters of Showing Up for Racial Justice (SURJ) in Toronto and other centres. It is important to underline that this only emerged with challenges from Black, Indigenous, and racialized people confronting white people to take responsibility for challenging and disrupting the racist practices that “we,” as white people, help to produce and sustain on a daily basis.

Queer and Trans Organizing in the Union Movement

Starting in the 1970s, queer workers began self-organizing in the union movement, especially in public-sector unions like the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) and the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE). Organizing started in areas that had been more accepting of queer workers, which led to a certain concentration of queer workers in these locations. This brought questions of class exploitation and queer oppression together. In the 1970s, there were early decisions to support sexual-orientation protection in unions like CUPW and CUPE and an early supportive decision in the City of Toronto. In 1975, the Gay Marxist Study Group I was a member of and the Gay Alliance Towards Equality (GATE) supported the strike by CUPE 1230 members (Library workers at the University of Toronto) when they were demanding sexual-orientation protection in their contract.²³ Queer (and, later, trans) self-organization spread throughout the union movement and into more industrial unions like the Canadian Auto Workers (CAW) (which became a major part of UNIFOR), the United Steelworkers of America and other unions.²⁴ Organizing took place in individual unions, where unions began to organize their own Pride conferences.

I was invited to speak at two CAW/UNIFOR Pride conferences at their union education centre at Port Elgin, Ontario. The first CAW conference I presented at in the 2000s was on queer working-class histories, and the second UNIFOR conference in May 2017 was on UNIFOR coming to terms with the challenges presented to the union movement by the Black Lives Matter movement.

There was also organizing across unions. The first Canadian Labour Congress Pride and Solidarity conference took place in 1997 in Ottawa with about three hundred in attendance. Prabha Khosla points out that “This was the first conference of gay and lesbian rights held by any union central anywhere in the world.”²⁵

I was there to help facilitate a workshop on queer working-class and trade-union history. It followed an amazing illustrated lecture the night before by Allan Bérubé titled “No Red-Baiting! No Race-Baiting! No Queen-Baiting!”²⁶ At the time I was involved in the Campaign Against Employment Discrimination in Sudbury, formed to support Mary Ross, a lesbian bookkeeper at a Loeb grocery store, forced out of her job when the employer discovered she was a lesbian. People from the Pride conference participated

in a protest outside a downtown Ottawa Loeb store as we demanded justice for Mary Ross (a simultaneous protest and store invasion took place in Sudbury).²⁷

As the influence of corporate funding on Pride organizing grew, union activists grappled with ways to minimize and control it. In Toronto, the Worker's Organizing Rainbow Coalition proposed a code of conduct for corporate sponsors in 1998 to Pride Toronto. As they put it:

Over the past few years, corporate sponsorship of Pride Day has increased dramatically. We need to take stock of this reality to assess if the sponsorship is actually benefiting the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered communities. As workers, as individuals and as citizens we have developed this Code of Conduct as a starting point to measure corporate responsibility to our community. The Code of Conduct provides standards for sponsorship of Pride Day. Companies that do not live up to this standard should not be included as sponsors of our events!²⁸

In the historical present, a broader, more mediational code of conduct is required, covering those who are responsible for destroying the water and land of Indigenous people (especially the banks) and for climate change.

In this context, there was also the growth of significant trans organizing in the unions, traced out in the work of Dan Irving and Trish Salah.²⁹ This was based on both queer and feminist union organizing and raised questions relating to the gender binary in union organizing. At the same time, despite this wave of organizing and the initial radicalism of raising questions of class and critiques of neoliberalism, this union organizing largely (but not entirely) became absorbed into more mainstream rights, spousal and family-recognition, and then same-sex marriage campaigns. It loses its early edge in bringing in the *class* in class struggle as it also comes to assume that queer and trans communities are classless in character. It was also weak, like the broader union movement, on struggles against racism, imperialism, and colonialism, and in addressing defunding and abolishing the police. In these ways, much of it became accommodated to the politics of the neoliberal queer.

Expansion of Trans Organizing

As noted in the Introduction to this edition, there has been a major expansion of trans organizing since the second edition, with earlier historical roots—and this includes organizing by Black and racialized trans people.³⁰ One way of showing this is how, in relation to Pride Toronto, the trans march moved from being an unauthorized event in which hundreds of people participated to a key part of Pride Toronto involving thousands. This trans presence in Pride festivities has also increased across the country.

In part, this expansion is related to a longer-term but now growing crisis of gender relations, with more people experiencing the gender binary, essentialist gender identifications, and gender divisions of labour as not fitting with their lives. Sometimes people choose to shift their locations within this gender binary, while others choose to define

themselves as non-binary. Challenges to patriarchal relations and hegemonic ways of doing gender have been crucial to this development, as more cracks and fissures have been opened up, further destabilizing the gender binary. This also means that the social organization of capital and state relations are no longer as centered on stable gender identifications and divisions of labour. While a lot of work goes into trying to stabilize the gender binary and to containing people's experiences within it, many people are performing and attributing gender in different ways. At the same time, work by the medical profession and major social institutions continue to try to contain these gender revolts within the two-gender binary. This provides for more allowance for people to change their positioning from one gender to the other but without blowing up the gender binary, one aspect of which is the attempt to produce the trans worker as a "productive" worker for capital.³¹

One early front of trans struggle has been the struggle to change names and genders, given that state and medical regulations and hegemonic ways of doing gender have long been invested in stable gender classification and assignment in state documents, including birth certificates.³² This documentary organization of gender as an administrative and legal practice has been central to gender classifications. The struggle has been to reduce restrictions and to make it easier to transition regarding name and gender, with or without surgery, and also, in some jurisdictions, to include more than two gender categories so one does not have to be male or female, including since 2017 in Canada.

One of the first fronts of struggle was also to achieve state funding for gender-affirming surgery to allow for transitioning and covering the costs of hormones and surgeries. Without social funding support, this was only ever in the reach of trans people with wealth and was out of the reach of most trans people, who often live in poverty or have working-class social positions. Many trans women end up working as sex workers, given this is one way to survive and to pay for what they need. This struggle for funding developed unevenly in different provinces with a patchwork of various funding sources in different jurisdictions depending on governments and the level of struggle.

Two main strategies have been put forward for trans rights and liberation. The first is the human-rights strategy on offer from the mainstream LGB movement, which suggests that the trans movement must fight for the same rights and protections that LGB people fought for in the 1980s and 1990s (but which trans people were excluded from). This has often been associated with the taking-up of a kind of respectable social position previously inaccessible to trans people, but which can be accommodated to neoliberal perspectives from which trans people were previously excluded. This approach has been pursued by more mainstream trans organizations and has established some important formal rights for trans people, though it generally portrays trans issues as separate from those of race, class, and other social struggles.

In Ontario, Toby's Act amending Ontario human rights legislation was first introduced as a private member's bill by NDP MPP Cheri DiNovo in 2007.³³ It was not finally passed until June 2012, when human-rights legislation was amended to include gender identity and expression, providing basic human-rights protection for trans people in the province. Although the NDP pushed for it much earlier, it was not until June 2017, with the

passing of Bill C-16, An Act to Amend the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Criminal Code, that gender identity and gender expression were included in the Human Rights Act as identifiable groups protected from hate propaganda in the Criminal Code. It is clear, however, that this extension of rights to particular trans Canadians contributed to maintaining forms of ongoing systemic discrimination against Black, Indigenous, and racialized, undocumented, poor, elderly, and disabled trans people. As Rossi notes:

the incorporation of trans people into the [Canadian] nation-state as recognized citizens is dependent on reproducing structures of whiteness that benefit the state. Here, particular trans people are categorized as “debilitated” for their failure to conform to the model of the trans(homo)nationalist citizen, whereas trans people who do conform to this model uphold structures of whiteness and are thus marked as capable, productive citizens.... [Thus] the line between inclusion and exclusion, and the citizen and non-citizen, has again shifted. The ideal neoliberal citizen can be queer, trans, and disabled, but only to the extent that white nationalism, settler colonialism, and cis-heterosexism are upheld and reproduced.³⁴

Here, the people who are not deemed productive to capitalism, the people who face ongoing forms of criminalization and police violence, the undocumented people denied citizenship and refugee status—people who are not the idealized neoliberal queer—are the very people who are continually denied necessary social supports and solidarity to survive under racial capitalism. This widespread discrimination against those who are “unproductive” to racial capitalism is committed by the Canadian state and within neoliberal organizations that uphold racialized capitalist relations. While this legislation provided basic human rights protection for particular trans people, it also meant that trans people learned what LGB people already had learned—that although important, this was not nearly enough.

The other major strategy supported by more transformative trans activists has been developed by trans activist and scholar Dean Spade, among others, who points to the limitations of human rights and formal legal approaches and suggests that the fabric of trans oppression is bound up with broader race, class, gender, and other social practices that establish, in everyday administrative practices and laws, that gender is organized in ways that systematically devalue the lives and experiences of trans people. A key aspect of state and capitalist social formation is the daily administrative production of gender and the violence this does in people’s lives. This can mean that struggles against gender classifications in policing and social administration more generally, or to decriminalize sex work, or to raise social assistance rates, can be just as important, if not more so, for trans people than is human rights protection.³⁵ As mentioned earlier, rather than focusing only on trans people being assigned to the gender-appropriate prisons, this raises questions about why trans and other people are being imprisoned at all.³⁶ This kind of perspective leads to the transgressing of gender and political boundaries, as Bobby Noble points out in “Trans-ing the Canadian Passport,” where gender and racialized

relations are addressed in the transgression of state borders.³⁷ This moves far beyond the politics of the neoliberal queer.

There has also been a focus on violence against trans people, especially trans women, and the production of trans misogyny: the particular forms of misogyny generated against trans women. Violence is especially mobilized against Black trans women, as has been increasingly recognized in Black Lives Matter organizing.³⁸

One major front of struggle that has emerged is for trans people to be able to access the washrooms that they wish without legal problems or violence. This was often what the Right and anti-trans forces have focused on in opposition to trans-rights legislation. This brings together a challenge to the everyday administrative construction of gender as well as human rights for trans people. The Right is now broadening its approach in its war against trans people to focus also on trans people in school sports and teams and having any visibility in school curriculums or as speakers in schools, and opposition to gender-affirming surgery and other practices.

Coming from some women who claim to be feminists (and often were feminist) who now only focus against trans women and sex workers, there has been a growing campaign against trans women, and the construction of trans women as some sort of “threat” to cis women (who often are coded as white). These forces are called TERFS (Trans Exclusionary Radical Feminists) by many trans activists but, as I suggested earlier in the Introduction, their subscribing to essentialist definitions of gender suggests they are actually a pre-feminist regression. It is becoming increasingly obvious that, in their campaigns against trans women and sex workers, they are quite willing to ally with very right-wing and moral-conservative forces who are opposed to LGB rights, the rights of women, sex workers, the right to abortion, and who support racism, white supremacy and more.³⁹ More recently, it has become clear that sections of the far right are using these connections with anti-trans activists to colonize anti-trans organizing to build broader alliances as the war against trans people, and especially young trans people, becomes central not only to moral-conservative organizing but the mobilization of the right more generally in the US, the United Kingdom, and, to a growing extent, in Canada.⁴⁰ In an article entitled “TERF to Dissident Right Pipeline” author Kat S. notes, as Doyle puts it:

that TERFS’ insistence on “biological sex” as an immutable binary—all “men” de-praved and violent, all “women” fragile victims—may make it easier to convince them of other biological hierarchies. Their insistence on seeing trans women as “violent men,” in particular, can be weaponized against men of colour and turned into overt white supremacy.⁴¹

This transforms the character of cis women’s anti-trans organizing, making it a reinforcement of moral-conservative and right-wing approaches, opposed not only to trans rights but also queer and women’s rights, in alliance with racist and right-wing social forces. Anti-trans organizing ranges from former feminists who focus on trans

women as a major danger to cis women to more right-wing forces, often working in alliance, that are “recycling” many of the moral-conservative arguments used against LGB people in previous decades as part of their war on trans people. Regarding access to women’s services and women’s washrooms for trans women, there is a mobilization of the argument that trans women are not “real” women and are instead misgendered as being men who are “sexual predators.” This is not at all the case, as trans women experiencing the social oppression of women are women.

The challenge of trans people, especially those who are not “transnormative” and are challenging the gender binary, has provoked a storm of opposition to what the right refers to as “gender ideology,” which challenges biological essentialism.⁴² Here, they explicitly act to defend the gender binary and, with it, the oppression of women who are socially subordinated in this binary. The defence of trans people against oppression and violence, and of trans women and Black trans women, in particular, needs to be at the centre of queer and trans politics.

In this broader context there has also been a revitalization of intersexed organizing that opposes surgeries on intersexed babies to fit them back into the two-gender system.⁴³ These operations have nothing to do with health but are about reinforcing social support for the gender binary through forcing people who “physiologically” don’t conform back into it for *social* reasons, and is a practice of social violence.⁴⁴ Organizing by intersex activists and supporters has limited these operations in some circumstances. In Canada, activists like Morgan Holmes have gained the support of organizations, including Egale, who now advocate for intersex rights.⁴⁵ As Suzanne Kessler points out, learning from the experiences of the intersexed allows us to see how the gender constructs imposed on our lives have little to do with physiology and far more to do with how power relations have socially made a binary way of doing gender that we need to resist.⁴⁶

From Violence Against Women to Me Too

Feminists have demanded that state agencies recognize violence in a realm where patriarchal relations have allowed for relatively unregulated violence against women (both cis and trans): the home. The Wolfenden perspective, discussed in Chapter 8, was built on public/private distinctions, which subordinates women in the “privacy” of the domestic realm. While there has been some limited progress on these fronts, the conceptualizations of “sexual assault” and “family violence,” which mandate police and social-service work in this area, both obscure the gendered character of this problem and also define it as a problem that the police should and can deal with, obscuring the broader social relations of patriarchal power within which men’s violence against women in the home occurs. This once again allows for the problem to be constructed as a carceral one, of individual “deviant” or criminal men, through sexual assault and other criminal code categories, thereby obscuring how “normal” patriarchal and familial relations foster the conditions for this violence. The setting-up of transition houses for women needing to escape men’s violence was an important gain for feminists. As

these houses became institutionalized and more professionalized and state funded, however, they often became transformed into something close to new “poor houses” for some women, as they participate in organizing women and their children into relations of poverty.⁴⁷

There was also the organizing of rape/crisis and sexual assault crisis centres. Many of these, after major debates and struggles, included trans women.⁴⁸ More recent organizing in “Slut Walks,” with all of their problems, challenged the distinction between “good” and “bad” girls, which has been central to dividing women (both cis and trans), refusing the idea that violence was justified against any woman, including “bad” girls.⁴⁹ In the context of COVID-19, the emphasis on staying at “home” as safe has again obscured how homes and families can be very dangerous places for women (both cis and trans) and for queer and trans youth, among others.

Sexual harassment and violence against women (both cis and trans) has not dissipated despite major feminist organizing against it. If anything, it has intensified. This feminist organizing has often shifted from addressing the social relations that lead to sexist harassment and violence—in the social making of masculinities and patriarchal social relations—towards criminalization and carceral approaches that addressed acts but did not usually place them in a social/relational context, or challenge the practices of hegemonic masculinities. Carceral forms of feminism do not get at the social roots of violence against women.

In 2006, Tamara Burke, a Black woman, started the Me Too movement to oppose sexual harassment and violence against women, especially women of colour. In 2017, following the public naming of the major and consistent sexual harassment that film producer Harvey Weinstein had engaged in, the hashtag #MeToo was used to focus on rich and famous men who had engaged in sexual harassment and violence, with stories of harassment often coming from celebrity cis women. This obscured how some of this organizing grew out of the “bad trick” sheets distributed by sex workers, but now in the online context where a culture of “compulsory confession” had emerged. While speaking out can be part of the healing process, there was now a focus on only certain kinds or survivors and certain forms of violence and harassment. While people must be accountable for their actions, linking this movement to a carceral response did not point to the social transformations that are needed. While this was very important in refocusing and reviving attention on sexual harassment and violence against women and opening up space for feminists and men against sexism working on these questions, this campaign often tended to be more social-media-based than based in actual community and grass-roots organizing, and focused more on wealthy, celebrity men than on the patriarchal and sexist social relations organizing these problems in women’s lives.⁵⁰ By default, it usually focused on the criminalization of these acts and a carceral approach and not more popular education and mobilizing campaigns. Problems began to become visible when narratives targeting major “male” politicians were unable to do much damage to politicians from Trump to Biden in the United States.⁵¹

This organizing spread to same-gender relations when men who had been sexually harassed by famous male celebrities started to surface in the spaces opened up by

#MeToo. For instance, stories of non-consensual sexual acts and then charges against Kevin Spacey started in 2017.⁵² While men who have sex with men certainly engage in sexual harassment and violence which must be actively confronted, this cannot always be entirely understood through the analysis developed for men's sexual violence against cis and trans women.⁵³ This can lead to misunderstanding queer dynamics around questions such as age and consent, once again portraying consensual queer sex as "abusive." Drucker notes,

queers cannot simply be folded into a general struggle against sexual abuse. Our struggle against abuse needs to be part of our ongoing fight for queer sexual liberation. For decades now, we have suffered from the reduction of liberation to equality with straights in straight-defined institutions, and from the reduction of real equality to juridical equality. It is time to renew the call that some courageous lesbian feminists made in the early 1980s for a new sexual politics. At least for queers, it is time for a politics that is alert to danger but gives the same priority to pleasure and desire—the desire that can catch fire at a moment's touch.⁵⁴

The QuAIA Wars

The development of homonationalism and its relation to Canadian anti-Palestinian state policy set the stage for the wars waged over the participation of Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QUAIA) in Pride Toronto. As McCaskell points out: "To expose Canada's strategic ally as an apartheid state was unsettling to the power structure in which Pride wanted to be included and on which it depended for financial survival."⁵⁵

I was in a loud, energetic contingent of hundreds of people in Pride Toronto's parade in 2010 in support of Palestinian rights. There was also a large free speech contingent that year in opposition to the attempt to keep Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QUAIA) out of Pride. I was helping with marshalling the QUAIA contingent and I noticed a number of times when members of the Jewish Defence League (a now dissolved right-wing racist group⁵⁶) came into our contingent to try to provoke trouble. I had stopped going to Pride Toronto for a number of years in the 1990s and early 2000s because of its growing commercialization, presence of corporations and banks, mainstream political parties, and large police contingents. I was drawn back when Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QUAIA) started having a presence, since this raised a more progressive and often liberationist approach in solidarity with other oppressed people. I supported QUAIA when it started to be attacked by supporters of Israeli apartheid (separation and subordination) policies⁵⁷ against the Palestinians. These attacks on QUAIA included City politicians and the board and staff of Pride Toronto.⁵⁸

As mentioned earlier, as corporate funding and state agencies became more present at the Pride parade (initially a march), it transformed from a day for celebrating and pushing forward our struggles in combination with the struggles of other oppressed people into a site for homonationalist performances celebrating the Canadian state, including its support for the Israeli state against the Palestinians. Here QUAIA ran right

up against the attempts by the Israeli state to rebrand itself as a “progressive,” pro-gay nation with its pinkwashing campaigns focusing on the “advances” the Israeli state has made, while obscuring the continuing occupation, colonization and subordination of the Palestinians.⁵⁹ When city funders made noises about cutting funding to Pride because of QUAIA’s participation, the Pride executive moved to try to ban QUAIA and the use of the term “Israeli Apartheid.” City councillor Kyle Rae—who earlier was a member of Gay Liberation Against the Right Everywhere, was involved with organizing Pride Toronto for many years, and had been the Executive Director of the 519 Community Centre—now moved to oppose QUAIA. Rae had been initially supportive of QUAIA’s participation but changed his position and came to support a ban on QUAIA’s participation when powerful City politicians threatened Pride funding if QUAIA participated.⁶⁰

In response, I helped to pull together a solidarity letter from many of the people who had organized the first Toronto Pride at the end of June in 1981, aside from Rae. We wrote:

As founding members of the Toronto Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee, and people involved in organizing the first Pride event in Toronto at the end of June in 1981, we stand totally opposed to the decision of the current Toronto Pride Committee to ban the use of “Israeli Apartheid” at Toronto Pride events. This banning of political speech is clearly an attempt to ban the participation of Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QUAIA) and queer Palestine Solidarity supporters from the parade and from participation in a major event in our communities.

The statement went on to say:

We call on the Pride committee to immediately rescind this banning and to instead encourage QUAIA’s participation in the pride parade.... We remind people of the political roots of Pride in the Stonewall rebellion against police repression in 1969 and that the Pride march in 1981 in Toronto grew out of our community resistance to the massive bath raids of that year.... We also remember in the 1980s that lesbian and gay activists around the world, including in Toronto in the Simon Nkoli Anti-Apartheid Committee, took up the struggle not only for lesbian and gay rights in South Africa but linked this to our opposition to the apartheid system of racial segregation and white supremacy.... Solidarity with all struggles against oppression has been a crucial part of the history of Pride. To break this solidarity as the Pride Committee has now done not only refuses to recognize how queer people always live our lives in relation to race, class, gender, ability, and other forms of oppression but also breaks our connections with the struggles of important allies who have assisted us in making the important gains that we have won.⁶¹

There was also widespread resistance to these attempts to ban QUAIA, including large community meetings; a Pride Toronto media conference to announce the ban was disrupted by protestors wearing tape across their mouths; more than twenty former Pride honourees returned the awards they had received previously from Pride Toronto, and

those nominated for international and local grand marshals, like Alan Li and others, refused to accept these positions; there was also a large free-speech contingent that year. In response to the attempts to ban *QUAIA* from Pride, biting political satirical group the Lesbian Billionaires chanted, “Whose Pride? TD [Toronto Dominion Bank] Pride.” They handed out monopoly money, asking, “Can we buy your Pride?”⁶²

The Pride Coalition for Free Speech (PCFS), focused on this ban as a free speech and anti-censorship issue. This unfortunately, diverted focus away from the actual work of building the global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign against the Israeli state until it respects Palestinian rights.⁶³ A few of the people involved in The Pride Coalition for Free Speech became more mainstream organizers in LGBT groups after this. For instance, Douglas Kerr became involved in InterPride, the global network of Pride Committees, and the Dignity Initiative, where he is currently Executive Director, which collaborates with state agencies.⁶⁴ These mobilizations forced a reversal in position from the Pride board of directors.⁶⁵ Continuing attempts to ban *QUAIA* over the next few years were all defeated.⁶⁶

This struggle not only took place in Toronto but in a number of centres across Canada and many places around the world. It became especially heated in Halifax. The Halifax Pride fair had a history of having a pro-Israel tourist booth at the fair after the parade. In the midst of the military onslaught on Gaza in July of 2014,⁶⁷ I encountered and challenged a Tel Aviv tourist booth at the Pride fair. The Halifax Rad Pride Collective had earlier had its ability to distribute flyers for pro-Palestinian actions in the vicinity curtailed by the Halifax Pride Committee. I made a complaint that went nowhere.⁶⁸

But when Queer Arabs of Halifax and the Nova Scotia Rainbow Action Project (NSRAP), the only province-wide LGBT advocacy group, made similar proposals in 2016 to stop the pro-Israel apartheid group from having a booth, the pro-Israel Atlantic Jewish Council brought in many straight members to stack the Halifax Pride Annual General Meeting and vote down these proposals. There were many Jewish groups and activists who, in contrast, spoke out in support of the Queer Arab and NSRAP positions. The result was mostly white, cis, straight people voting down these proposals, forcing the queer and trans Black, Indigenous, and racialized people present to walk out, followed by most of the other queer and trans activists as well.⁶⁹ The decisions of this illegitimate meeting were deemed valid even though those voting ended up being mostly straight white people. Queer Arabs of Halifax called for a boycott of Pride activities for a number of years after this. They eventually did get an apology that never went far enough.

Important discussions were also raised within *QUAIA* and other queer Palestine solidarity groups about what solidarity meant when there was sometimes no clear “Palestinian queer” subject to be in solidarity with. In important ways, it was about developing more textured forms of solidarity with the Palestinian struggle more generally, which also raised specifically queer concerns in opposition to pinkwashing by the Israeli state.⁷⁰

This in-the-end unsuccessful attempt to ban *QUAIA* was based on the mobilization of an orientalist form of homonationalism, which constructed Israel as the “civilized”

state and the Palestinians as “homophobic” and “barbaric.”⁷¹ This orientalist form of homonationalism grew out of the mobilizations surrounding the “war on terror,” addressed in the last chapter, that was not unfortunately challenged by mainstream LGBT groups.

QUAIA dissolved in 2015, but global queer and trans solidarity with Palestinian struggles and support for the BDS campaign continues.⁷² More recently, Palestine solidarity activists have been targeted by governing institutions and pro-Israeli groups for their work. Toronto District School Board employee and queer activist Javier Davila was investigated and put on home assignment for making information about the Palestinian struggle available to parents and students.⁷³ When Black author and activist Desmond Cole was invited to speak to the same Board of Education in 2021, he made a reference to solidarity with Palestine. For this, he faced major challenges from pro-Israel groups.⁷⁴ Pride Toronto, in September 2022, selected a new auditing firm that is associated with anti-Palestinian groups.⁷⁵ This struggle continues!

Black Lives Matter!

Mobilizations against the police were a major site of struggle for the gay and lesbian movements from the 1970s into the 1990s. On this, see Chapter 10. At the time of the Toronto bath raids in 1981, there were important links made with anti-police activism within Black communities over the police murders of Buddy Evans in 1978 and Albert Johnson in August 1979, and also with activists in the South Asian communities against police racism. Later, Michael Wade Lawson was killed by Peel police in 1988, and Lester Donaldson was also killed that year. Black feminist and queer people in the Black Women’s Collective and the Black Action Defence Committee, formed in 1988 (some of whom were not “out,” including BADC founder Sherona Hall, at the beginning⁷⁶), played major roles in this activism.

This history of queer anti-police resistance was largely forgotten with the neoliberal turn to collaboration with the police in white, middle-class gay community formation.⁷⁷ The police became central to the emergence of the racialized class politics of the neoliberal queer through liaison and dialogue committees and the defence of real estate values and private property, and against sex workers, the homeless, and drug users. Despite this, organizing continued against police murder and racism in Black, Indigenous, and other racialized communities.⁷⁸

In the United States, continuing racial capitalism, with its imposed poverty and unemployment, racist policing and incarceration, exploded in the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement following the police murders of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 and Eric Garner in New York City in 2015, among others, which rocked the United States and spread globally.⁷⁹ In Canada, various BLM groups were formed, including in Toronto, where I was able to join in a number of their energetic rallies and actions including shutting down the Allen Expressway after the murder of Andrew Loku by the Toronto police in 2015. When BLM-TO (Black Lives Matter-Toronto) formed, it was in solidarity with BLM south of the border against the murder of Michael

Brown and in outrage that the police officer responsible would not be charged, but also against the police killing of Jermaine Carby by a Peel Regional Police officer. In 2016, BLM-TO organized an action against the Special Investigation Unit's decision not to charge the officers who killed Andrew Loku, which ended up as the occupation, or tent city, outside Police Headquarters that lasted for two weeks.⁸⁰ BLM catalyzed militancy across the city and brought hundreds of white accomplices or "allies" into the streets, sparking many discussions about anti-Black racism. This changed the political context for queer and trans organizing in the city, although some white gay men tried as hard as they could to fight against it.

A symposium organized by Ed Jackson called "Paper Trail: The Legacies of *The Body Politic*" was held on the history of *The Body Politic* magazine in Toronto on May 28, 2016. This commemorated the forty-fifth anniversary of the first publication of *The Body Politic*, which also coincided with a run of a play about the magazine at Buddies in Bad Times theatre.⁸¹ This symposium included a number of sessions with presentations by scholars and activists. Panelists Rinaldo Walcott, Lali Mohamed, and Syrus Marcus Ware (a core member of BLM-TO), informed by the emergence of Black Lives Matter, critiqued *The Body Politic*, on free speech/anti-censorship grounds, publishing a racist ad for a "black house boy," to the outrage of queer of colour activists in 1985.⁸² These panelists also confirmed the white character of *The Body Politic*. Prior to the emergence of the AIDS crisis, and continuing more unevenly after that, the politics of *The Body Politic* were generally informed by a sexual-libertarian approach (more on this later this chapter) which focused only on individual sexual pleasure and displaced raced, gendered, and classed relations. This led to a rather limited focus on freedom of speech and anti-censorship struggles, often coded as white. These talks contested

the [event's] celebratory and nostalgic tone. Both Mohamed's and Ware's talks called the work and organizing of Black activists and ancestors (including that of Black trans women Sumaya Dalmar and Monica Forester⁸³) into the room and into the conversation about what rises to the status of a queer archive. This highlighted how queer archives celebrate white queer subjects as the only historical subjects and erase queer and trans Black, Indigenous and people of colour...thereby treating us as perennial newcomers with little historical agency and oversight of our own.... In the question period following these talks, there was a dramatic backlash from white audience members.... These comments excused the lack of racialized content by imagining queer content as essentially white.⁸⁴

This opened up an explosive but badly needed discussion on racism in the history of white-based gay and queer organizing but also the racialized and gendered silences at the heart of *The Body Politic* and much white-oriented gay organizing and institution-building, including archive and history making.⁸⁵ At the end of the day, a series of challenges and unresolved contradictions remained. These discussions urgently need to continue.

Later, in June 2016, Toronto Police Chief Mark Saunders issued what the mass media described as an "apology" for the 1981 bath raids, but it was nothing more than a

statement of “regret” for what took place. Many white, middle-class neoliberal queers bought this as a real apology, including Brent Hawkes, formerly of MCC, who helped facilitate it, but other activists raised questions, and some rejected it as a PR stunt.⁸⁶ BLM-TO, which, as I noted in the Introduction to this third edition, has many queer and trans members, rejected this statement. As McCaskell notes:

the police held a second press conference to unveil a new mural on Church Street. Congratulations to Black Lives Matter Toronto who disrupted the ceremony. Spokesperson Rodney Diverlus called both the “apology” and the mural “PR tools” used to mask the reality of police relations amongst the queer and trans community: Black people, Indigenous people, sex workers et cetera.⁸⁷

As I also described in the third starting vignette in the Introduction to this edition, BLM-TO was selected by Pride Toronto as the honoured group for the parade, and this set the stage for their actions at the Toronto Pride parade in 2016.⁸⁸ As also mentioned, since then there have been consistent efforts, both internal to and external to Pride Toronto, to invite the police back in, including with the federal government’s grants from Public Safety and Canadian Heritage in 2018.⁸⁹ The No Pride in Policing Coalition, which was formed in 2018 and in which I have been actively involved, has so far been successful in keeping the police, as an organized institutional presence, out of Pride. In 2021, Pride Toronto engaged in training of Toronto police and in 2022 had a goal of working with the police on harm reduction.⁹⁰ Struggles against police within Pride occurred not just in Toronto but also took place in almost every city where Pride committees existed, including, in varying ways, in Hamilton, Winnipeg, Calgary, Sudbury, St. John’s, Edmonton, and Vancouver. But BLM organizing also had a broader political impact.

In February 2017, I was at a Toronto demonstration of about 6,000 people initiated by BLM-TO and other groups against Islamophobia and white supremacy following the murders at the Islamic Cultural Centre in Quebec City. In the context of a broader speech against white supremacy, BLM-TO co-founder Yusra Kogali called Justin Trudeau a hypocrite and “a white-supremacist terrorist” for maintaining racist immigration and refugee policies, the colonization of Indigenous peoples, and a white-supremacist state and society. When she said this most of the crowd was clearly with her, but the mainstream media immediately attacked Khogali’s credibility, dislocating what she said from the contexts in which she spoke. Unfortunately, most movement and left activists did not defend her and the cycle of mobilizations which saw thousands of people taking to the streets against racism and the election of Trump in early 2017 in Toronto began to be undermined.⁹¹

Black Lives Matter-related organizing exploded again in later May/June of 2020, with thousands of people taking to the streets in centres across the Canadian state against anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism and police violence and harassment. New BLM and related groups were formed, including Justice 4 Black Lives Winnipeg and Black Lives Matter Sudbury.⁹²

From the beginning, a number of people involved in Black Lives Matter-TO were very creative artists and were involved at the same time in building their own careers, which was very important to them and Black cultural organizing more generally—but this began to shift the objectives of the group as a whole, especially when large amounts of funding were brought into the picture. In 2019, Yusra Khogali left the group, noting what she described as tendencies towards neoliberalism in the group.⁹³ By 2021, BLM-Toronto began to disappear as a Black liberation activist group in the city as Black Lives Matter-Canada was formed with some of the initial core group as a charitable organization. In 2021, it was announced that BLM-Canada had received major funding and had bought a building for the Wildseed Centre for Art and Activism. This led to major discussions and debates among anti-racist activists and the No Pride in Policing Coalition issued a critical statement.⁹⁴ In early 2022, Sarah Jama and Sahra Suadi resigned from BLM-Toronto for overlapping concerns, including suggestions of unaccountable and unethical behavior on the part of BLM-Canada.⁹⁵ In my view, neoliberal influences, including large-scale funding, transformed the character of the group, shifting it from an activist Black Liberation group to it becoming more the manager and owner of a building that will be largely used for Black and anti-racist arts practice. This shows how neoliberal capitalism can transform what were once liberationist organizations into something quite different.

Remembering '69/Anti-69

As mentioned in the Introduction to this edition, in 2019, the Liberal government attempted to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the 1969 Criminal Code Reform as the “decriminalization” of homosexuality—this can be seen as part of an effort to consolidate Canadian homonationalism, building on the “apology from above” mentioned last chapter, as well as the Canadian Heritage funding for various Pride events across the country.⁹⁶ Luckily, much of the official celebration was questioned, challenged, and disrupted by the Anti-69 Network and other organizing. Tom Hooper and I were joined by Lara Karaian, Suzanne Lenon, Cassandra Lord, Karen Pearlston, and River Rossi in organizing a very successful Anti-69 Forum at Carleton University in Ottawa in March 2019. This included thirty-eight speakers and more than 130 participants.⁹⁷

It was the first opportunity in a number of years for many activists and scholars to get together in a gathering committed to social justice and to queer, trans, reproductive justice and sex worker struggles. We tried to center Black and Indigenous voices (we were much more successful with Black voices) as much as possible. Lots of discussions broke out in sessions and in the hallways as new connections and networks were formed. As one sign of the success of the event many of us (the organizers) were asked at the end when the next conference was being held, since people wanted the discussions and networking to continue.

Following the Carleton forum, an Anti-69 Network continued to organize against the “equality” loonie and local forums were organized in Fredericton, Halifax, Ottawa,

and Toronto. Connections were made with the attempts to annihilate Indigenous sovereignty in 1969 and also in 2019. In 1969, the White Paper on the extinguishing of Indigenous sovereignty was part of the “Just Society” that the ’69 reform was an integral part of. In 2019, there were now “termination tables” for extinguishing Indigenous sovereignty to instead become a sub-municipal governmental authority.⁹⁸

An important basis for solidarity with Indigenous struggles was built, including for the Wet’suwet’en struggle against Coastal GasLink and the RCMP. But, at the same time, there was unfortunately little mainstream LGBT support for this Indigenous solidarity. Egale instead adopted a much more supportive position towards the ’69 reform, reading it through a largely “liberal” neoliberal lens. Egale produced a state funded film called *Sex, Sin and 69*, which had many limitations and seemed haunted by Anti-69 organizing, even though none of us participated in it. It did not get widespread showings in 2019, but in 2020, it was on the film festival circuit.⁹⁹

Brenda Cossman, an important lesbian legal scholar, produced a one-sided critique of the Anti-69 approach based on the false assumption that we opposed the ’69 reform itself and not the mythologies constructed around it.¹⁰⁰ Cossman views the Anti-69 position as an example of “a familiar pattern of opposition and antagonism within LGBT communities,” associating Tom Hooper and Anti-69 with “opposition and antagonism.” She inscribes actual Anti-69 organizing into her own ideological schema of “critical left” versus “reformist” organizing, imposing an either/or perspective onto the Anti-69 Network.¹⁰¹

She basically agrees with the Anti-69 position (“the critics are of course right...”) even though she associates us with “antagonism.” Cossman argues that “the 1969 reforms constitute the discursive terrain of the modern era of gay rights. The reform, I argue, helped constitute the modern Canadian gay activist.”¹⁰² Here she emphasizes the importance of legal discourse but does not address the other practices that led to gay activism which included movement building, gay liberation and lesbian feminist organizing including the impact of the Stonewall rebellions, and the expansion of LGBT community formation. In other words, while she emphasizes legal discourse as constitutive, she minimizes self-organization and movement building in response to oppression. This leads to a kind of legal discourse determinism in her analysis.¹⁰³

Cossman brings in the important experiences of the Right to Privacy Committee resistance to the bath raids in Toronto covered in Chapter 10 of this book.¹⁰⁴ Despite referring to the important work of gay activist George Smith that “The discourse of privacy of the 1969 amendments was being used to resist the narrow conception of privacy contained therein” the transformative use of right to privacy developed in the RTPC following the bath raids is about starting within but quickly moving against and beyond the strategy of sexual policing put in place in the 1969 reform.

Right to privacy can be mobilized in very restricted forms where it basically supports strategies of privatization to more transformative notions like that developed by George Smith and the RTPC where the focus on the social practices of constructing intimacy and privacy leads to defying state defined designations of the “public.” While

this starts within state discourses and practices of privacy it moves against and beyond them. It is these moments that Cossman tends to minimize. As I wrote in a critical commentary on this piece by Cossman:

The RTPC did not, however, simply accept the 69 reform as the terrain of struggle. It struggled within, against, and also beyond the limitations of the '69 reform developing an alternative that included the social practices of people producing social relations of privacy and intimacy in state defined "public" places. This was a transformative approach that refused to be trapped within the limitations of the 69 reform. Cossman unfortunately tends to get trapped within these ruling forms of legal discourse. The actual practice of the RTPC provides a transformative alternative to the limitations of Cossman's briefing document and in a number of major ways subverts her argument.¹⁰⁵

Anti-69 was an important battle over both historical memory and political alignment in the historical present. I was very glad to be involved in it. Anti-69 organizing led to a much more critical approach to the '69 reform, which even government officials had to recognize—for instance, in their response to our holding up signs at the launch of the "equality" loonie in April 2019 at the 519 Community Centre. Some were moved from describing the reform as the "decriminalization of homosexuality" to the "partial decriminalization of homosexuality"—which was still not accurate but was at least a more critical approach. In some very important ways, Anti-69 was a challenge to neoliberal queer history, which has supported the Liberal government's mythologies around this reform.

Beyond the Nation-State: Towards a Critical Internationalist Sexual and Gender Perspective

One of the major limitations of neoliberal queer perspectives is their privileging of Global North and "Western" experience and their identification with various "Western" nation states when an internationalist perspective is required. The discussions in this book—including on Uganda in Chapter 11, and on queer Palestinian solidarity activism, homonationalism, and fighting against the pandemic in this chapter—point out that queer and trans liberation politics can never simply be "national" in character or tied to a particular nation-state like Canada. This is intensified in the context of the current waves of capitalist globalization, where social relations have become even more global in character.¹⁰⁶ As noted, there are also major problems with the pandemic being addressed from a nationalist direction and not as a global problem requiring global solutions.

Mainstream LGBT groups based in the Global North are often complicit in attempts by Western and Northern agencies to impose the heterosexual/homosexual polarity and the two-gender binary around the world. Massad has reminded us that there is no universal "gay," "queer," and, by extension, "trans" experience, and there are cultures where the heterosexual/homosexual and two-gender binaries do not yet exist or have

only been unevenly developed or imposed.¹⁰⁷ To act like these classifications are universal is to do violence to the many other ways that genders and sexualities are organized and lived around the world, constructing false universals of “heteros” and “homos” and “men” and “women” as the only options. As mentioned in the Introduction, such a perspective portrays these other ways of doing gender and sexuality as somehow less “mature” than the hegemonic ways these are done in the Global North, which supposedly disclose the future to these more “backward” groups.

I have addressed how part of the state-regulated refugee determination process in Canada involves imposing Western and Northern identifications onto people with diverse gender and sexual experiences coming from the Global South.¹⁰⁸ In this way, immigration and refugee policies become one way of imposing hetero/homo and two-gender distinctions onto people’s diverse lived experiences. On a global scale, we have to refuse to participate in imposing these binaries on other people’s experiences. We also need to encompass in our perspectives those who identify as homosexual, lesbian, bisexual, queer, or trans as well as those who do not define their experiences through these identifications. Instead, their sexual and gender practices may not be tied into any sexual or gender identification as the “truth” of their beings.¹⁰⁹ For instance, they may not see themselves as “men” or “women” but as part of third or fourth gender groupings, or as non-binary. There are also hybrid and mixed forms in some places, with differential class and social contact from Global North-defined identifications.

As Drucker suggests, this can perhaps best be grasped as the uneven and combined making of sexualities and genders.¹¹⁰ In this sense, I strongly agree with Massad, although his argument is rather one-sided. He is correct to stress that there is no common or universal sexual or gender identification through which all people will articulate their experiences. In adopting a more internationalist and non-Global North-centred politics, we need to see that what we are engaged in is a critical sexual and gender politics and not defence of any essentialized identities. What we need, then, is not simply a queer or trans liberation politics but a broader more critical sexual and gender politics.¹¹¹

In relation to developing an internationalist sexual politics, Drucker points out a major shift in ruling politics towards same-sex/gender eroticism. In the nineteenth century, the accusation of “sexual perversion” in the Global South was an argument *for* imperialism and colonialism against sexual practices in the Global South. While, today, with the mobilization of a narrow sense of gay rights, constructed as an identifier of “modernity” and “civilization” in the imperialist/western countries, the lack of support for gay rights in the Global South is now the signifier of their “backwardness” and lack of “civilization.”¹¹² But even in the Global South (and there is major diversity here), Drucker points out that sexual and gender-diverse people’s struggles are “in part directed against a global homonormativity: an attitude among the emerging global lesbian/gay elite that defines other sexualities as derivative and even inferior.”¹¹³ Refusing to impose these Global North identifications on people around the world is central to what new critical internationalist sexual and gender politics *must* address. This broader critical sexual and gender politics cannot be limited to identifications of homosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, trans, or queer.

The emergence of the neoliberal queer is bound up with the homocapitalism that Rao focuses our attention on. This homocapitalism has a global character and Rao stresses the need for a homocapitalist framework to be contextualized beyond North America and Western Europe, which requires taking “globality” seriously.¹¹⁴ Rao’s work develops an analysis of “global homocapitalism,” which

seeks to reconcile the twin imperatives of efficiency and empowerment, making capitalism friendly to queers but also rendering queers safe for capitalism. Such discursive moves threaten to split queers off from anti-capitalist movements, while also splitting queers themselves into those deemed “productive” and worthy of celebration and others cast out as “unproductive”.... No doubt propelled by the collaborative efforts of transnational capitalist class, global homocapitalism acquires hegemony by repackaging queer normativity in recognizably local idioms with which those outside this class can identify or aspire to inhabit. In its bewildering cultural diversity, homocapitalism perpetuates neoliberal illusions of autonomy and choice.¹¹⁵

Key to the neoliberal queer and to homocapitalism is the generation of the productive and efficient (for capital) queer and trans person. As I have suggested, this struggle against the productive/efficient (for capital) queer is a crucial aspect of the struggle against the neoliberal queer.

This Conclusion is for the entire third edition, including the revised second-edition text. I therefore take up and update themes from the 1996 conclusion for the new historical contexts we find ourselves in. Much is still relevant, but I have also taken out what is no longer cogent in 2023. Following this, I conclude with discussions of two key resources for resisting the neoliberal queer and racial capitalism: radical hope and revolutionary love.

Queer and Trans Liberation: A Transformative Politics

Building on the resources for transformation I have just outlined, the following sections are written largely about organizing in Canada, often starting within, against, and beyond struggles within “Western” and Northern” constructions of sexuality and gender, but also with the importance of Two-Spirit people and migrants, refugees, and immigrants coming from the Global South who can subvert these modes of organizing. Queer and trans liberation—and the challenges to heterosexual hegemony, the two-gender binary, and racial capitalism that it brings with it—must be situated within broader histories of sexual, gender, race, class and other social struggles, which have been traced in this book. This is directly counterposed to the project of the neoliberal queer, which is to systematically abstract queer and trans experiences from these relations of race, class, gender, ability, and other forms of oppression and domination. This approach is to reject the standpoint(s) of the neoliberal queer.

Heterosexual hegemony, what some Indigenous and people of colour activists and scholars describe as heteropatriarchy, is a key feature of oppressive sexual and gender

regulation and is being simultaneously eroded and reconstructed. When liberal tolerance towards queers is challenged, we still all too often see the hatred, bigotry, and even violence that lies just below the surface. While the gender binary is being challenged and eroded, it is also actively being reinforced and reconstructed. To account for this situation, it is necessary to survey the origins of queer and trans resistance. In this book, I have argued that queer and trans histories have been histories of resistance and survival in a hostile society; of oppression, repression and denial, but also—and we can never forget this—of desire, pleasure, community, solidarity, and love.

The historical process in which “we” are engaged is far from over. The social forces organizing our oppressions still predominate, despite the gains we have won. “We” continue to be embattled groups that must continue to fight for liberation and to build alliances with other oppressed groups that we are often connected with and part of. But now the neoliberal queer stands on the other side in many of these struggles, with major racialized class struggles within queer and trans communities. If we do not continue our struggles, and extend and radicalize them, we risk losing the social spaces and limited control over our bodies and our lives that we have established. As mentioned before, as in the making of the working class,¹¹⁶ queer and trans people participate in our own social making.

Our oppressions are rooted in and mediated with the historical organization of class, race, state, gender, colonizing, and sexual relations. A series of class, race, and social struggles beginning with colonization and genocidal practices towards Indigenous peoples led to the repression and marginalization of Indigenous practices of gender and eroticism through the formation of “modern” sexuality and gender, eventually leading to heterosexual hegemony and the two-gender binary as integral features of this racist, capitalist, settler-colonial society’s ruling order. As mentioned, our oppressions are also lived differently on the basis of our participation in relations of class, race, gender, colonialism, disability, health, and age.

We can see a dialectical and reflexive relation between the development of capitalist social relations—the opening up of potential social spaces that this leads to—and the active seizure of these social spaces by those who will become queer and trans people. There is a response by state agencies and the police to these cultures and those who are to become queer and trans people resist these attacks—out of this, our movements emerge (see Chapter 2). At the same time, the victories that we have won, and the shifts we have forced in official sexual and gender regulation through struggle, also provide us with the knowledge that through our own movements we can transform the situations we are in. We also know this through interconnected anti-racist, Black liberation, Indigenous, feminist, working-class, and other struggles.

From the diverse social standpoints of queer and trans people, both heterosexuality and the two-gender binary, which are still largely proclaimed to be “normal” and “natural,” can be seen as recent historical and social creations.¹¹⁷ They were constructed at the expense of other alternatives and possibilities, including through the suppression and colonization of Indigenous third- and fourth-gender groupings, and including against the developing networks of people engaging in same-gender/same-sex desire,

and trans people. There has always been resistance to these socially established norms, some of which I have reported on in this book, and we can learn much from them. Resistance and rebellion is always the better part of the story.

The forms of sexuality and gender considered “natural” have been socially created and can therefore be socially transformed. Racist, capitalist, heteropatriarchal social relations and the regimes of sex and gender-scientific classifications, and our resistances to them, created the potential for same-gender/sex desire-based cultures and trans experiences and resistances to emerge. Naming the “abnormal” and “deviant” sexual and gender practices allowed for the better policing and definition of the emerging heterosexual norm and the two-gender “system,” but we also reclaimed these namings and organized resistance through them.

In Indigenous cultures, many names were used in different nations and cultures to describe members of third- and fourth-gender groupings, or what are now often referred to in Turtle Island as Two-Spirit people.¹¹⁸ Within settler societies, while some who engaged in same-gender/same sex eroticism had other names for themselves, including fairy, queer, tribadist, and dyke, others used homosexual, lesbian, and later LGBT categories as a basis for resistance, redefining them to better express our own social experience and needs. Trans people have used many terms to name and describe themselves, from “cross-dressers,”¹¹⁹ to transvestites, to drag queens, to transsexuals, to transgender, to genderqueer and gender fluid, to non-binary, and more. There has been a long struggle in which we are still very much engaged today over who will define and interpret queer, trans, and Two-Spirit social experiences.

Past resistance opened up social spaces that we now often take for granted. We have built our own queer and trans cultures in the context of shifting sexual and social regulations, which are lived differently in relation to class, gender, race, colonialism, and disability. The contradiction between queer experiences and heterosexual hegemony, and interconnected trans experiences and the two-gender binary, can be seen as part of this historical and social process. This sense of “difference” that we experience is not natural: it has not been around for all time, nor will it last forever. The same can be said about the experiences of “normality” and “naturalness” that many heterosexuals and cisgender people express.¹²⁰ These are historical and social creations that can be socially unmade and transformed. This approach denies the social mythologies the neoliberal queer is based on.

Identity Troubles: Within, Against, and Beyond Identities

At first glance, this approach involves holding two apparently contradictory perspectives together. That is, that we need to celebrate our experiences and our lives, cultures, sexualities and genders through the existing categories of queer and trans, while at the very same time grasping that these categories are socially and historically made. These categories are very socially *real*, however, in the present social and political contexts we face. To borrow again from John Holloway’s work, we need to organize simultaneously

within these categories, *against* their limitations, and *beyond* these sexual and gender classifications.¹²¹

Again, this places us against the politics of the neoliberal queer, which want us to remain trapped within these categories and to only organize *within* them. However, the categories through which we have named our experiences of the world are not essential or natural but are social and historical in character. The process of coming out, which has been so central to gay liberation and the formation of LGBT+ communities in much of the Global North has often been described as the revelation of our “true,” “authentic,” or “natural” sexuality and is therefore trapped in naturalist notions about sex.¹²² For growing numbers of queer and trans people in parts of the Global North, there is a growing contradiction in our lives between the possibilities of ending the negative evaluations of queer sexualities and genders and the continued state and social defence of heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary. But this is also limited to particular social and historical locations and, as noted, cannot be imposed on the diverse sexual and gender experiences around the world.

This means a challenge to the essentialist theories often underlying “coming out,” and notions of being a “minority community” that still underlie much of mainstream LGBT politics in the Global North, including those of the neoliberal queer, which often also get imposed on the rest of the world. For instance, this can assume that, because someone engages in sex with a person of the same sex/gender, that this makes them gay or lesbian, bisexual or queer, when this may not be how it works in these people’s lives. It denies the historical and potentially fluid character of people’s sexualities and genders.

Yet neither can the politics of coming out or the categories “lesbian,” “gay,” queer, or trans be entirely abandoned, as some have suggested. In some social and historical contexts, they have a social reality to them that cannot be dismissed. In these contexts, there can be no liberal (“we’re all just people”), idealist, or easy deconstruction of lesbianism, homosexuality, queerness, or transness. As Esther Newton exclaimed at the 1985 “Sex and the State” lesbian/gay history conference in Toronto, “We will deconstruct when heterosexuals deconstruct.”¹²³ Abandonment of lesbian, gay, queer, trans, or Two-Spirit identifications in these situations could deny the particularity and autonomy of our struggles, preventing us from engaging in the protracted process of transforming and deconstructing heterosexual hegemony and sexual and gender rule. While queer and trans categorizations are limiting, they must often be expanded and transformed as the basis for opposing oppression—we need to organize *within*, *against*, and *beyond* these identifications. And we often have to start from *within*. In these contexts, there is no “pure” revolutionary subject lying somewhere outside these social experiences. There is no other basis from which resistance and transformation can be developed in these social contexts. But we also need to recognize that different social and historical contexts require different modes of organizing.

At the same time, we also have to recognize that, even in these contexts, there can be no prioritization of our queer or trans identifications above gender, class, race or other relations. As Duggan expressed it: “The production of a politics from a fixed identity

position privileges those for whom that position is the primary or only marked identity. The result for lesbian and gay politics is a tendency to center prosperous white men as the representative homosexuals.”¹²⁴

This is the social basis for the construction of false universals of queer and trans as white and middle class and the violence of abstraction, abstracting analysis of queer and trans experiences away from their mutual construction through racialized class and gender relations.¹²⁵ This is also the racialized class basis for homonormativity and homonationalism, and the neoliberal queer in the Global North.

Rather than viewing gender, race, class, sexuality, age, and ability as separate designations, we must view them as combined with and shaping our queer and trans practices and experiences. Instead of prioritizing those who are white, middle-class cis men we need instead to prioritize those whose lives are shaped by class, race, gender and other forms of oppression/exploitation. Those queer and trans experiences must now be at the very centre of our organizing, including those of Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, disabled people, homeless/unhoused and poor people and more.

Some of the criticism of identity classifications in the Global North within variants of queer theory and on the “left”—despite their insights—have attempted to not only deconstruct lesbian/gay categories but, it seems, lesbian and gay social experiences as well.¹²⁶ In practice, however, this critique of “homosexual,” “gay,” and “lesbian” has often ended up constructing new “queer” identifications that also come to be naturalized as “male,” white, and middle class. At the same time, I share with Bannerji, Holloway, Wallcott, and others the importance of critiquing ahistorical notions of identity that affirm identity as fixed and essential and as severed from racialized class struggles.¹²⁷

As noted earlier, this critique of identity has also often been limited in both queer and left discussions by not engaging with ruling and normalized forms of identity. For instance, as mentioned in the Introduction, Canadianness, whiteness, heterosexuality, masculinity, and cis-gender normality, among others, are most in need of disruption and deconstruction. It is these ruling forms of identity that need to be taken apart and not simply normalized and accepted.¹²⁸ Katz’s previously mentioned turning of the critical gaze on heterosexuality is an excellent illustration of this. While there is a major need for the oppressed to be able to name our particular experiences of oppression, we also must turn our critical gaze on the identities in hegemony.

Challenging Essentialism

Building on the analysis in Chapters 1 and 2, I adopt an anti-essentialist position. Being trans or queer is not an essential characteristic rooted in biology. While adopting a historical-materialist, social-constructionist approach to sexuality, Drucker correctly notes that, despite the largely scholarly demolition of essentialist approaches that I and others engage in, there is a more popular essentialism that thrives in the media (including the gay media) and in much community formation and organizing. This is central to homonormative practices¹²⁹ and to what I describe as the making of the neoliberal

queer. This popular essentialism, which becomes a form of “common sense,” assumes that sexuality and gender are biological or innate in character. In my view, by using the anti-ideology critique developed by Marx and extended by Dorothy Smith and Himani Bannerji, this can be seen as an ideological approach which is ungrounded from the social relations that actually produce it, making a particular social/historical form of gender and sexuality into something that is natural, fixed, and non-social in character.¹³⁰

This essentialism is often complicated by trans experiences but not fundamentally dislodged. It draws on those strands of trans organizing sometimes referred to as “trans-normative”¹³¹ that can lead to reintegration back into the two-gender binary and racialized class relations rather than on the experiences of non-binary, genderqueer, gender fluid or gender non-conforming people, which place the gender binary more directly in question.¹³² Essentialist approaches are the hegemonic ways of accounting for gender, sexuality, and race differences in this society, in the mass media, popular culture, and in popularized versions of “science,” and this also shapes the understanding of many queer and trans people.¹³³

A common misunderstanding suggests that the social constructionist/essentialist debate “was a variation on a yet older debate about whether nature or nurture was primarily responsible for human behaviour.”¹³⁴ But to see these debates as simply replays of a nature/nurture clash is, as feminist biologist Anne Fausto-Sterling and others point out, to not see how the physiological is transformed socially and historically. This breaks down the rigid boundaries between “nature” and “nurture,” allowing us to see how the physiological provides a basis for the social and historical and how the social and historical transform the physiological.¹³⁵

One way that this more popular essentialism developed was through the adoption within queer theory and queer organizing of what was described as “strategic essentialism.”¹³⁶ This involves a critique of identity categories and essentialism on the theoretical level, but a practical political deployment of “essentialist categories and identity politics in public debates because it is supposed to be all anyone can understand.”¹³⁷ This meant that campaigns for sexual orientation protection, spousal and family-recognition rights, and same-sex marriage were often explicitly based on essentialized notions of identity and sexuality as immutable and “natural.”

There were a number of instances when I was approached about being an “expert witness” in legal cases when I was rejected since I did not subscribe to an essentialist approach to sexuality. In my view, this perspective severely underestimates how people actually engage with the social and historical character of their sexualities and genders, including when they reflect on their own social, bodily experiences. It also reflects a certain dishonesty in theory and organizing connections. I agree with Duggan when she argued:

I take the concerns that lead to the embrace of strategic essentialism seriously, but I think it is ultimately an unproductive solution. It allows sexual difference and queer desires to continue to be localized in homosexualized bodies. It consigns us, in the public imagination, to the realms of the particular and the parochial, the defence team for a fixed

minority, that most “special” of special interest groups—again, letting everyone else off the hook.¹³⁸

Instead of adapting to essentialism for strategic or any other reasons, I suggest that we need to oppose essentialism in all its forms and always use social and historical analysis in a popular education-based pedagogy. In my view, it is not only entirely possible to organize for queer and trans liberation without any reliance on essentialism, it also facilitates organizing since it emphasizes the importance of *social* practices and agency.

The analysis and narratives developed in this book point towards a grounded historical-materialist analysis of queer and (to a lesser extent) trans oppression and its location within racial-capitalist relations and struggles. This provides a non-essentialist historical basis for the social making of queer and trans experiences and identifications. In this context, the construction of identity categories has to be seen as a social accomplishment. Identities are always *within* history and the *social*. When “identities” are seen as social practices or as sites of work, they have a more contradictory character, providing a basis for subversion and transformation. We need to elaborate an analysis of the relation between our diverse experiences of oppression as queer and trans people and how this gets inscribed into conceptualizations of “identity.” Our multiple, intertwined, and relational social experiences of oppression and these unitary identity classifications are not the same. It is this gap we need to examine more fully to develop a politics that does not rely on essentialist notions of identity but, at the same time, allows for the expression and naming of our different social experiences. In our critique of identity politics, we cannot be dismissive of underlying experiences of oppression and the importance of naming experiences that have been silenced and denied.¹³⁹ This is also why we need a critical gender/sexual politics and not a politics trapped within identity affirmation.

Richard Fung addressed some of these complexities in relation to his social experiences as a gay Asian:

During a conversation about the seventeenth-century invention of racial categories as we know them in the West, a friend of mine stated recently, “there is no race beyond racism.” An antiracist politics, she suggested, could only develop through the negation of race; to celebrate racial identity entails the perpetuation of racism. I disagree. First, I do not experience my Asian identity only as racism; neither is my homosexuality only apparent to me in the face of heterosexism. Our identities are sources of pleasure as well as oppression. Second, “pride” in ourselves as Asian, gay or gay-Asian does not preclude a political awareness. It is often, in fact, an important feature of political development.¹⁴⁰

For the Movement for Black Lives, the basis of resistance is an affirmation of the importance of Black life and creating liveable lives and futures,¹⁴¹ and not simply a rejection of racial identifications—identifications which, of course, are central to racist policing. Blackness is seen not only as a site of oppression and racialization but also as

a vital basis for social resistance. Black people (including Black queer and trans people) can only fight against anti-Black racism by using and transforming “Black,” even though race is socially made. This is the basis from which white supremacy and anti-Black racism can be challenged even though there is no essential character to Black and white identifications, which are both historically made in relations of social power.

Similarly, Indigenous struggles involve an affirmation of various Indigenous nations and Indigenous identifications as the basis on which settler-colonial racism and state formation can be challenged and ruptured. This is the context in which Two-Spirit struggles take place, not violently abstracted away from it, as Egale and others suggest. Two-Spirit identifications and practices are also historically and socially made and there is no need for essentialism here (see Chapter 4). Essentialism gets in the way of our struggles since it is also the basis for arguing that ruling identities like whiteness, cis-genderness, masculinity, and more are essential which makes it more difficult to challenge and deconstruct them.

While rejecting the categories that ruling social agencies have imposed on us, we must maintain our ability to name our worlds.¹⁴² Our definitions of ourselves as minorities or distinct groups of people often need to be built upon and transformed rather than simply abandoned. And we have to ensure that these notions of community and minority are transformed and defined by working-class, poor, Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans people. At the same time, we must also not simply accept these categories as the completion of our destinies, for this would only limit our struggles to the small social spaces we have already won.

Our “queer” and trans identifications, communities, and movements can be important weapons in our battles and also in developing a broader gender/sexual politics¹⁴³ and must include a broader sexual/gender and anti-racist perspective that includes the needs of sex workers, reproductive justice struggles, and those of Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, among others. The affirmation of full social equality for queer and trans people in all its dimensions challenges the institutionalization of heterosexuality and the gender binary. We must move beyond affirmation and pride, however, to challenge the ruling regime of sexual and gender regulation and categorization.

Our liberation cannot be reduced to a struggle for a new gay “ethnicity,” as critiqued in Chapter 9, or for the liberation of some pre-existing gay, lesbian, bisexual or trans desire. There is no need to rely on the notion of a fixed or natural minority to argue for rights and liberation. A historical-materialist perspective, like the one developed here, provides an important social basis for our communities, cultures, and sexualities—a solid basis for fighting for our needs in the historical present. Seeing ourselves as a fixed essential minority, however, acts as a straightjacket, preventing us from grasping the social and historical forces that have organized our oppression. This makes it difficult for us in dealing with questions crucial to countering right-wing attacks and challenging state social, gender, and sexual policies, as well as more “liberal” neoliberal strategies of regulation. To simply accept minority status would be to fundamentally accept the existing hetero/homo polarity and the gender binary, and a subordinate position within it. Unfortunately, this is the political project of the neoliberal queer.¹⁴⁴

In turn, this historical materialist/social constructionist perspective is not only for queers, as it also opens up possibilities for heterosexual-identified feminists, men trying to do different-gender sex outside institutionalized heterosexuality,¹⁴⁵ and others who are willing to learn from queer and trans experiences to also challenge the practices of heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary. But we/they will not see or hear this if we are simply an essentialized minority. Rather, we need a politics that speaks to other people's experiences of trying to live differently in rupture with institutionalized heterosexuality, the two-gender binary, and racist capitalism. The politics of the neoliberal queer have prevented us from communicating what we have learned from our experiences to other people in rebellion against ruling sex, gender, race, and class relations. As one illustration of this, our containment within a privatized, normalized form of parenting, as mentioned in the last chapter, has prevented us from making alliances with and learning from others who are trying to do parenting in a more collective, anti-racist and anti-sexist fashion.¹⁴⁶

This process of social transformation for queer and trans liberation involves defending our communities, sexualities, genders and relationships when they are under attack; a challenge to the racial, class, and gender organization of the gay, lesbian, and trans communities; and a change in lesbian-gay-queer and trans definitions to reflect our diverse social needs. This social-historical dialectic of transformation began in the nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century struggles over the meaning of homosexuality between those engaging in same-gender/sex desire and ruling agencies, and continued with the gay liberation and lesbian-feminist transformations from homosexual to gay and lesbian identities and cultures, and now to queer and trans identifications and movements. These struggles moved the categories of homosexuality, lesbianism, and transsexuality away from their anchorage in hegemonic forms of sex and gender regulation and unevenly brought them closer to our own experiences of oppression and resistance. As the Gay Left Collective once argued: "Freedom for gay people will develop as rigid cultural categories are broken down. It is a paradox that the only way for this to happen is through using these categories, organizing within them, and bursting their bonds."¹⁴⁷

Unfortunately, with the turn towards common-sense and popular essentialism, formal rights based on "immutable" characteristics, and the neoliberal queer, we have largely become trapped within these rigid categories. Getting stuck within essentialized categories as minority communities along the lines of "ethnic" minorities (Chapter 9) cuts us off from other groups experiencing oppression that our communities overlap with and prevents us from addressing the roots of our oppressions in racist and colonial capitalist relations.

For a Radical Social Constructionism

In the long-term historical sense, this kind of radical social-constructionist perspective will lead to a breaking down of existing social categories through which we express our sexualities, genders, and identities—homosexual and lesbian as well as trans, bisexual,

and heterosexual. This undermines the politics of the neoliberal queer. A world without the social classification of people on the basis of their “inner” sexuality and gender is something we can only imagine.¹⁴⁸ We can also catch glimpses of what this might be like in some of our struggles, relationships, and experiences today. This points to the elements of prefiguration or of reaching beyond—holding glimpses of possible, radically different futures in our struggles today—which must be an important part of our struggles. For the present, however, this historical perspective guides us in the fight against sexual and gender rule and for *democratic* control over our erotic and gender lives, defining a strategic vision for the future.

The argument here, as earlier in this book, is for a radical social-constructionist approach based in historical materialism, and not simply in discourse analysis. In my view, this is as much about practice and organizing as it is about theorizing. Many, including important currents within queer theory—and not only those informed by strategic essentialism—argue that the debate between social constructionism and essentialism is no longer relevant or has been surpassed, at least regarding queer sexualities. I beg to differ. I believe a historical-materialist, social-constructionist approach is now more needed than ever. And this is not only in relation to sexualities and genders but also can be seen in the explosion of writing and research on the social making of race and whiteness.¹⁴⁹

In doing this, it is useful to reflect on Jonathan Ned Katz’s 2016 “manifesto,” in which he re-asserts the importance of social-historical constructionism.¹⁵⁰ Remember that Katz’s commitment to a radical social-constructionist approach had already led him to turn his critical gaze on the social making of heterosexuality¹⁵¹ and away from any focus on queer people as a naturalized minority group, which informs his earlier work in *Gay American History*.¹⁵² Katz suggests in this manifesto that:

Clarifying and developing that theory still offers, I suggest, a valuable means of understanding the human-produced world. So, yes, I dare to call for a reconsideration of the allegedly naïve and simpleminded, old-fashioned and over, social construction. Even worse, I stress social construction’s intimate alliance with an even older Marxist mode of production theory. At serious risk of being trashed as stupid, naïve, and over-literal, I suggest that, to better comprehend the world we make, we need a clear, general model of social-historical construction.

Because heterosexuality is still so often conceived in universal, eternal, anti-historical terms it provides a good test case to submit to the model I propose. So, by way of illustrating this model, I sample here the history I began in *The Invention of Heterosexuality*, and research by others. Examples of hetero history are offered here to suggest how this model can work as analytical tool.¹⁵³

Katz suggests that, in analyzing this social-historical making of heterosexuality, and also other social-historical constructions, that we need to investigate the following: who are the constructors, what are their aims, how does this take place in time and space, and how is this based on acts or doing, social relationships, and modes of construction?¹⁵⁴

This is a very useful social-historical perspective that has major value in exploring sexual, gender, racializing, class and other social relations that are often assumed to be simply “natural.”

Queer and trans liberation struggles have challenged many of the practices regulating and defining our sexualities and genders for us. We have refused the ways in which ruling agencies have defined our “differences” as disadvantage or sickness. We have challenged the ruling practices that define and regulate sexual and gender “deviance” from psychiatric and social work¹⁵⁵ to police entrapment. We have struggled for a transformation of ruling categories to attempt to protect our sexual and gender practices and communities from attack. We have challenged state definitions of public and private and taken “privacy” out of the language of the state in the battles against the bath raids, using it as a means of defence of our communities. In 2016, Black Lives Matter challenged the white hegemony and anti-Black racism in much of the LGBT communities, especially the sites of major Pride celebrations. The Anti-69 organizing in 2019 contested the official mythologies of the ’69 criminal code and disrupted attempts to celebrate it as the decriminalization of homosexuality and abortion. In 2020, many of us joined with the global uprising against anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism and the police, ensuring that we are opposed to anti-Black racism and *for* defunding and abolishing the police. No Pride in Genocide and Land Back struggles intensified opposition to settler colonialism. This actively resisted the neoliberal queer forces who now want us to return to their “normal” LGBT rights agenda.

Our communities and movements still exist within the confines of the relations of heterosexual hegemony, the two-gender binary, racism, sexism, and class exploitation, even though we also resist these forms of domination. Our communities are not simply playgrounds of pleasure but are infiltrated with the oppressive social relations of a capitalist, racist, patriarchal, ableist society. Our communities therefore both resist and accommodate oppression but now have a racialized class layer that wants to be part of the white middle class in the neoliberal queer. Class and racialized divisions within community formation mean that queer and trans liberation must address these questions now, as well. Naturalist notions cannot deal with the current emergence of the neoliberal queer, which they instead actively facilitate, nor can they address the ambiguity of being partially accepted as “abstract” people, yet often still open to legal charges for the sex in which we actually engage.¹⁵⁶ These essentialist notions provide no basis for clarifying the complexities raised in our struggles. Yet many of our campaigns continue to be predicated on the idea of a fixed LGBT minority even when more letters get added to this listing.

Instead, queer and trans liberation must participate in the undermining of heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary, along with major currents within feminist, anti-racist, anti-capitalist, and other social movements. We challenge the dominant practices of sexual/gender regulation, allowing people to gain more control over their erotic lives through creating new social contexts for erotic and gender life, desires and pleasures.

AIDS Activism and the Pandemic

The idea of an essential (and white) gay men's sexual desire marked much pre-AIDS gay men's sexual politics and it resurfaced, to an extent, with the loss of the sense of urgency of the AIDS crisis. This works to block challenges to how sexuality is socially organized. Such an individualist perspective, which defines our struggle as one for liberation of some inherent, natural (and usually white) gay men's desire, got in the way of gay men's responses to AIDS, since it prevented us from seeing that sexuality could be a site of danger, that gay sexualities can be transformed through our own social activities, as well as obscuring the racism within white gay men's sexualities.¹⁵⁷ It also worked against noting how much sex between men takes place between men who do not identify as gay, which is why the broader "men who have sex with men" category was developed. In the face of AIDS, many gay men practiced safe sex and had to deal with transforming the sexual practices that have been associated with their gay identities. For some white, middle-class men, it was the first time we had to deal with sexuality as not only a terrain of pleasure but also a more generalized terrain of danger as well. For others who faced police and queer-basher violence, racist attacks, and sexual violence from other men, danger has always intruded into realms of pleasure. But many of us did learn from safe-sex organizing and education that we can socially remake our own sexual practices as we practiced safe sex as the new eroticism.

Unfortunately, this commitment to social and collective forms of safe-practice responsibility were undermined under neoliberalism to focus only on the individual person with HIV's infection responsibility, leading to the criminalization of HIV non-disclosure.¹⁵⁸ The individualist focus of neoliberalism and lack of popular education has also undermined people's engagement in the COVID-19 pandemic, opening up the space for the anti-masker/right-wing convergence. It is unfortunate that the social organization of the forgetting of AIDS activism and organizing has led to these lessons having much less impact than they deserve.¹⁵⁹ Moral-conservative groups and associated neoliberal governments have fought attempts to engage in badly needed popular safe-sex and sexuality education, especially directed at young people.

One unfortunate side effect of the important use of PEP (Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis), and previously the practice of "barebacking" (anal sex without condom use), which has many complexities, is that this has sometimes been portrayed as a return to more "natural" forms of queer men's sex or of sex between men.¹⁶⁰ This can also eclipse what we learned at the height of safe sex organizing in the AIDS crisis about the social making and remaking of our sexualities.

In the context of COVID-19, there have been discussions, mostly underground and some on social media, of how to continue to hook up and have new sexual partners in response to early official public health suggestions to "stay at home." These official guidelines included masturbation, that you only have sex with those you already reside with, that you only engage with others beyond this group in virtual sex, that you wear masks while having sex, which discourages oral sex and kissing, that you physically distance while having sex (mutual masturbation), and of course always use condoms.¹⁶¹

While many of these suggestions are useful and safe, it is unfortunate that queer and AIDS activists have not been pushing very publicly for queer-positive safe-sex guidelines in this pandemic that move far beyond the rhetoric of “stay at home” and that include safe cruising and park sex. Actually, it might be safer in the context of Covid, and especially the new variants, to hook up outside, where some of the dangers of being inside can be avoided. Meanwhile, men having sex with men are still hooking up and creatively engaging in safe sex both in relation to HIV and COVID-19.

In the spring/summer of 2022, we experienced the impact of monkeypox in Europe and North America. While monkeypox was ignored, in a racist, anti-Black fashion, when only affecting people in Africa, when it started to affect people in the North and West, including men having sex with men, it attracted more attention—largely through revival of a heterosexist AIDS trope focussing on “promiscuous” men having sex with men as the problem. This media and public health focus did mean that some lessons from surviving the AIDS crisis were revived among men having sex with men, including popular-education work in bathhouses and other locations, with significant success.¹⁶²

These situations have also set the stage for a series of debates and distinctions in the context of the pandemic of “good” and “bad” sexual health practices and forms of “sexual citizenship,” relating to notions of “bio-sexual citizenship,” where biology and sexuality are combined. While replicating earlier distinctions between responsible/irresponsible sexualities, it has also produced shaming practices directed against those engaging in certain sexual activities, which can be very destructive. Shaming practices have been directed against those involved in party cultures and those using drugs. In my view, moralistic and individualistic shaming practices must be avoided and replaced instead with practices of social and collective erotic-health accountability and responsibility. You can still party and have sexual experiences safely regarding both COVID-19 and HIV.¹⁶³ At the same time, some of these debates have also involved more justified critiques of more privileged white gay men from the United States flying to Mexico for circuit parties with little regard for the possibilities of COVID-19 spread to Mexicans and engaging in practices shaped by racist and imperialist relations.¹⁶⁴

The Mirage of a Unitary Community

Notions of a unitary gay/lesbian/queer/trans “community” also hide the shifting class and racial organization within these communities, as well as other social differences, as mentioned in Chapter 9. The existence of a common “community” is also the basis for the development of a professional/managerial gay stratum as “our” respectable representatives, which is an important source for the emergence of the neoliberal queer. This has led to a one-sided racialized class struggle in our communities that privileges white, non-disabled, middle-class cis men. This, as mentioned previously, provides a social basis for “responsibilization,” “normalization,” and “privatization.” As we saw in Chapter 2, the idea of social respectability and responsibility has played dangerous roles in the past as it does now, in the present. One way this plays out now is the emphasis on protest only being permissible if it is “polite” and maintains “civility,” derived

from a particular construction of “Western civilization” and “Canadianness.”¹⁶⁵ This, of course, means it is a non-effective form of protest.

Respectability and responsibility can be important social symbols, the terms of which are defined by ruling social groups. The creation of respectable/responsible forms of sexuality and gender may even, at times—like at the end of the nineteenth century, or with the rise of neoliberal moral conservatism in the late 1970s and 1980s, and re-emerging again today with trans people as a particular target—be a crucial part of sexual and class rule, of reconstructing social relations, and managing social changes. Racialized class is being organized and reorganized in the 2000s around social, cultural, gender and sexual issues. The discourses of respectability/responsibility still operate to divide LGBT+ communities and to reconcile some of us with relations of racism and other forms of oppression. The classifications of respectability and responsibility, along with racial capitalist constructions of class based on gentrification and real estate interests, have been used (as outlined last chapter) to pit white, middle-class gay men against sex workers and homeless/unhoused people, drug users, and Black, Indigenous and racialized people.¹⁶⁶ The same-sex marriage racialized politics discussed last chapter had everything to do with constructing queer and LGBT as white as well as being “respectable.”

This has aligned the elites in our communities with strategies of sexual, gender, race, and class regulation, harming our abilities to organize broader networks for transformative change. An important aspect of this has been collaboration with the police. This can also be used against particular queer sexual practices such as washroom or park sex, or BDSM, or consensual sex between young people, or against those using drugs.¹⁶⁷ It was used during the AIDS crisis to criticize those who are not involved in monogamous and “respectable” sex and to define other practices as “irresponsible,” even if they involve safe practices. This allows for state intervention and division within our communities. These regulatory practices act to subvert the transformative potential of our challenges to heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary in family, social, and state policies. These movements of accommodation—demands to be admitted as respectable, responsible law-abiding “citizens” on a heterosexist, racist, and class-based society’s terms—lock us into major features of the present relations of sexual, class, race and gender organization. Yet neither must our politics be confined to a simple libertarian knee-jerk anti-respectability or “irresponsibility.” Instead, we must challenge this whole way of organizing society and dividing up sexualities/genders.

A strategy toward the transformation of sexual, gender, race, and class rule depends not on some essential “difference” we share, but the common state and professional oppressions and regulations we confront, on our political and social choices, and the embodied connections we make with others.

Communities and Movements: Transformation Versus Containment

The contradictory development of patriarchal, racist capitalist societies, in combination with our struggles, both facilitates and constrains social spaces for both same-

gender erotic/sexual cultures and trans cultures. The categorizations of homosexuality and lesbianism are inscribed within the field established by the current regime of sexual rule. Movements organized around queer and trans experiences, however, can move beyond the confines of this sexual and gender regime transgressing boundaries and barriers.¹⁶⁸

Let me illustrate this point. The very early slogan that “gay/lesbian is just as good as straight” was, in the late 1960s and 1970s (and later), an important starting point for our struggles in a number of locations, just as “Black is Beautiful” was in inspiring some of the struggles against anti-Black racism. It was still within the framework of sexual classification, separating gay or lesbian from straight, assigning value to sexuality, and perpetuating naturalist notions of sex. Yet by asserting equal value for “deviant” sexualities, it turned the ruling process of categorization on its head. “Gay is just as good as straight” provided the beginning for a transformative social struggle, which would have to involve protracted revolutionary¹⁶⁹ cultural/social transformations on a number of fronts. Moving beyond the initial aim of the simple affirmation of gay/lesbian/queer (and I add trans) identities, it becomes part of a struggle for control over the institutions and practices regulating sexual and gender life. On the basis of sexual and social needs, pleasures, and experiences developed over the last two centuries, and on the basis of the growth of lesbian/gay, feminist, trans, and Black and anti-racist organizing, heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary are both challenged and transformed. This requires not only the elimination of the heterosexist organization of sexual policing and the establishment of full rights for queer and trans people, but also the abolition of policies that have placed heterosexuality and the gender binary at the centre of state and social policies.

However, there is also the danger that “gay is just as good as straight” gets frozen and stuck within the moment of organizing *within* oppressive relations, therefore abandoning the needed moments of *against* and *beyond*. For instance, in contrast to the same-sex marriage struggle, which incorporates queer people within an oppressive set of relations, queer and trans liberation requires getting rid of state-institutionalized marriage, which privileges marriage over other social relationships and is therefore, as mentioned last chapter, a social practice of discrimination. Instead, we need social support for a range of different relationships and ways of raising/supporting children, including those among Indigenous nations and cultures and Black communities. And to be able to mobilize *against* and *beyond*, we need to oppose homonationalism and the neoliberal queer.

Our liberation politics needs to move beyond its ghetto and community dimensions, which take on a different character in smaller centres than in larger urban ones, and in different places around the globe. A struggle that starts in our communities needs to be directed at the various institutions of oppressive sexual and gender regulation, challenging the power of state and ruling relations on a number of fronts. The Criminal Code and the continuing criminalization of queer sex must be challenged,¹⁷⁰ as must the heterosexist and two-gender assumptions upon which state policy in most areas is still based.

We must distinguish between queer and trans liberation as political and social movements and the various settings in which they operate, and not simply reduce them to their “community” dimensions. The emergence of gay ghettos and gay, lesbian, and women’s communities, and various lesbian and gay Black, Asian, Indigenous, and other social networks and communities, as well as trans networks, has led to increasing confusion between community and movement. This has the advantage of cutting across dismissals of queer cultures by early gay liberation and lesbian feminism and of establishing queer movements in community-based politics. On the other hand, it has tended to reduce our horizons to the politics of the community, obscuring links with the broader social settings in which our lives and communities are situated.

The large Pride Day events and parades in Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver, involving hundreds of thousands of people, have been transformed through the processes mentioned last chapter into a day for the community to “come out,” in partnership with corporations, banks, and governments, and not as a day to push forward our struggles to transform state and social policies, despite Pride Day’s political beginnings in resistance to police repression at Stonewall and the Toronto bath raids in 1981, as well as police repression in Montreal. As we saw last chapter, in Pride Toronto this led to attempts to censor *QUAIA*, and *BLM-TO* had to stop the parade to get anti-Black racism and police violence addressed.

Two intimately interrelated fronts for the struggle for queer and trans liberation can be distinguished. First, the defence, and transformation (including against racism and for more spaces for Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans people, addressing the needs of disabled people, and childcare for queer and trans parents) of our networks and communities, and second, struggles for the transformation of social norms and state regulations and making broader social alternatives. In Toronto, the resistance to the bath raids in 1981, which began as a defence of those arrested and the gay ghetto, quickly grew into a broader challenge to the legal and state policies that organized the police operation. Struggles for our family and spousal benefits began to grow over into challenges to state family and social policies, even though the deployment of strategies of normalization and responsibilization limited this challenge. Our struggles against continuing violence against us often begin with the defence or support of individuals who have been attacked by queer-bashers but grow into a challenge to policing practices that do not protect us, as well as the social construction of heterosexual masculinities that leads some young heterosexual men (and others) to attack us. Those within our communities who construct poor and homeless/unhoused people as the source of “danger” and “violence” entirely shift this struggle to be in the interests of gentrification, real estate class interests, and the neoliberal queer.

The struggle for same-sex marriage, although rooted, in important ways, in struggles for spousal and family rights and benefits, similarly linked individual with broader social/political struggles, although this time with a politics of respectability and responsibility and a racialized white politics. This organized relations within our communities much more in the direction of neoliberal queer politics and the marginalization of trans politics. The organizing of *BLM* around Pride Toronto in 2016 brought together the needs

and concerns of Black, Indigenous, and racialized people within Pride and queer communities, challenging anti-Black racism in white queer community formation, while linking this to major challenges to racist forms of policing and anti-Black racism more generally. The campaigns leading up to the apology were often based on individual experiences of being purged from the public service or the military but became part of a more general challenge to the Canadian war on queers. But the apology from below based on this resistance was transformed into an apology from above, as covered in the last chapter. Finally, in the context of the COVID-19 crisis, which has had a major impact on many queer and trans people, the forgetting of what we learned from AIDS activism has meant that queer and trans organizing has had much less of a critical impact on public health practices in arguing for popular education and community organizing for safe practices, for global access to treatments and vaccines, and that there are no “disposable” groups.

This involves both struggling inside or within ruling relations but also *against* and *beyond* them. There is no absolute counter position of “insider” versus “outsider” strategies, and we need to move beyond this binary, since we must often hold them both together in our organizing. Our struggles start inside oppressive social relations, which is the only way they can have a mass character and mobilize social power to transform social relations. If we only ever see ourselves as “outsiders,” refusing to be contaminated by social relations of oppression and domination, we cut ourselves off from any actual basis for social transformation. At the very same time, getting trapped within only “insider” or “within” strategies severely limits our struggles, as it does for Egale and other organizations hegemonized by neoliberal queer perspectives or for those involved in limited police reform.¹⁷¹

Community transformations must be based on grassroots democracy and the direct participation of people in our communities and movements to prevent the emergence of professional/managerial elites and the neoliberal queer. In building and defending our communities we must also uproot the social power of those at the centre, including challenging whiteness, middle-classness, cisgenderness, and masculine hegemonies. This involves challenging features of the social organization of queer and trans communities and the social power relations that run through our communities. Those of us in positions of relative social privilege must act to assist in opening up spaces for people from previously subordinated cultures within queer and trans community formation to empower themselves, including Black and racialized queer and trans people, Two-Spirit people, youth, older queer and trans people, the disabled, those with HIV, COVID-19 and other illnesses, and those oppressed on the basis of the particular sexual or gender practices they engage in. It means making our community spaces no-go areas for the police and for Canada Border Services Agency personnel. This transforms queer and trans communities through the incorporation of new needs, desires, and experiences. This requires not only recognizing and celebrating our differences but also challenging and transforming relations of inequality, oppression, and social relations of power. This involves challenging gay-business definition and control over queer communities and establishing more services and social spaces with democratic community

control. Mutual aid networks formed to provide support and care for people in the AIDS, and now in the COVID-19 crisis, give us some sense of this practice and how this can be expanded.¹⁷² Communities that are more democratic, diverse, and that recognize the centrality of caring and reproductive labour would be the result.

The second main front is the struggle outside the queer and trans communities, narrowly defined: from the police and the legal system to the media and popular cultures, the schools, the medical profession and health care, and to social and family policies. A key aspect of this struggle is challenging state policies: legislation that organizes sexual policing, particularly Criminal Code offences like indecent act and obscenity laws, and the criminalization of HIV+ people; laws criminalizing sex workers; and state policies that institutionalize heterosexuality and the gender binary as the social norm in social and family regulations. Some successful struggles, like struggles for spousal benefits and anti-discrimination measures, have been located just as much in unions and waged workplaces as they have been in distinct queer communities.¹⁷³ This begins to uproot the historical process whereby heterosexuality was, and continues to be, institutionalized as the social norm. Central to all these struggles is the affirmation of the full social equality of queer and trans life, including our sex lives and relationships. All these struggles point to the need for popular and direct democratic control over social institutions, and the need for coalitions with other oppressed peoples that we are also connected with to fundamentally transform society. Abolitionist politics lead us to dismantle and abolish carceral state institutions and relations while transferring resources to community-based groups to care for people and meet their needs.

The settings in which queer and trans liberation operate are also those of a more general sexual, gender, racial, and capitalist crisis. We are part of complex and shifting historical battlefields over sexual and gender relations bound up with racialized class relations. It is to this that I now turn.

The Battlefields of Sex and Gender

Various defined and lived as pleasure and danger, sexuality remains a contested terrain at the centre of many social struggles.¹⁷⁴ Major social and political struggles centre on who will define and control desire and pleasure. Feminism, queer and trans liberation, and anti-racist struggles have transformed sexual and gender regulation into arenas of social and political struggle as we pushed for major shifts in the ways in which erotic and gender life is organized. In response to these same social changes and struggles, the forces of the right and many state agencies are battling to reassert and reconstruct heterosexual, patriarchal, and two-gender binary hegemonies. The stakes are high. We could move in the direction of more control over erotic life for queers and trans people, for women, and for Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, or we could be forced to give in to pressure from moral-conservative mobilizations and move in a direction that closes off these possibilities. But limitations are also imposed on us by non-moral-conservative forms of neoliberalism. Past forms of sexual and gender regulation are in crisis, in part because of our struggles, and new regulations are being

articulated by state and official agencies, in part through the extension of police power and social surveillance through social agencies and services.¹⁷⁵ Nothing is assured in these sex and gender wars, as different groups attempt to develop their own solutions to the sexual crisis, and as major differences over sexual, gender and racializing relations have emerged within and between the feminist, queer, trans, anti-racist and anti-capitalist movements. Added to this is the social positioning of the neoliberal queer, largely in the context of marriage, “respectability,” and privatization which shifts the focus away from queer sex and desire, although there are still some currents supporting individual sexual desire.

In Canada, major social struggles have focused on queer sex; sex work; reproductive rights; trans rights; HIV criminalization; same-sex marriage; youth sexualities including sexuality education, Gay Straight Alliances, and age of consent laws; sexual representation and pornography; AIDS and safe practices; the treatment and social support needs for PLWA/HIVs; and sexual violence against women, children, trans people, and Two-Spirit people. To this, we need to add missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and Two-Spirit people, and No Pride in Genocide; and the continuing struggles against the blood ban, conversion therapy and against unneeded and coercive alterations of the bodies of intersexed young people. And this is all mediated by relations of race, colonialism, and class. One alternative to colonial sexualities and genders is found in Driskill’s notion of the “sovereign erotic”—that is, the exercise of Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination through the expression of sexualities and genders that challenge the silencing effects of colonial heteropatriarchy and gender binaries.¹⁷⁶

Queers and cops fought in the streets and in the courts over the distinction between public and private as the cops raided baths, bars, and even our homes to arrest men for having sex. When our mobilizations forced the police to give up on these kinds of raids, they continued to arrest men having sex with men in washrooms and parks, and this continued, using prohibited-activity provincial offences and municipal bylaw infractions, in Marie Curtis Park in 2016, in parks in and around Montreal,¹⁷⁷ and in many other locations. The youth-porn law was used to criminalize the lives of some younger men who have sex with other men and to intend the re-criminalization of consensual gay anal sex. The raising of the age of consent law to sixteen while keeping the age of consent for anal sex at eighteen led to the criminalization of queer sex for young men having sex with other men. And the police have long refused to protect the lives of sex workers, who are rendered vulnerable and expendable by criminalization, as in the Pickton murders in the Downtown East Side of Vancouver and those of queer men of colour in the McArthur murders in the Toronto Village.¹⁷⁸ As noted last chapter, it was only in 2019 that the long struggle to get rid of the anal sex, bawdy-house, and vagrancy laws finally succeeded. And in 2023 it is now abundantly clear that the police cannot be reformed, and they must be defunded and abolished.

Right-wing moral conservatives, state agencies, and many feminists, meanwhile, have questioned and challenged pornography—although for different reasons. While feminists have objected to the sexism and violence against women in some heterosexual pornography,¹⁷⁹ and in the media and culture more generally, for the right wing the

problem is not only the public visibility of sexual representations, but their sexually explicit character, particularly those dealing with “deviant” sex. Unfortunately, state agencies were able to use anti-porn feminism to create tighter state censorship of sexually explicit material, including queer images and texts.¹⁸⁰ Most feminist agitation against porn made little distinction between different social forms of pornography, so most often gay men’s porn, which often has a different social character, has been dealt with as if it had the same social meaning as straight men’s porn. Some anti-porn feminists have therefore participated in efforts leading to a clampdown on gay men’s porn and erotic materials for lesbians. Anti-porn feminists have not only had their intentions transformed as their proposals have entered into state frameworks, they have also been active in producing some of these problems, as in the Women’s Legal, Education and Action Fund’s intervention in the Supreme Court Butler decision that I wrote about in Chapter 10. The Butler decision’s refocus of “obscenity” and “indecency” on questions of “harm” have created new complexities for presentations of BDSM sexualities.¹⁸¹ The federal state also extended forms of sexual censorship in relation to young people with its youth-pornography law.

These struggles have challenged and renegotiated the previous public/private strategy of sexual regulation, undermining the central strategies of sexual and gender regulation put in place in the postwar period in Canada. This strategy has coordinated and organized the social relations and courses of action of various state and professional agencies in relation to sexual and gender “problems.” While opening up certain possibilities, based on our struggles, for queer community formation and for people who can get pregnant to have limited legal access to abortions, it has also constrained and policed the lives of gay men, lesbians, sex workers, women (both cis and trans), and trans people, as well as young people. In response to challenges to the public/private regulatory strategy, there was a shift toward adult/youth lines of regulation, especially in relation to the youth-pornography legislation, the raising of the age of sexual consent to sixteen, the attempt to maintain the age of consent for anal sex at eighteen, in the controversies over and restrictions placed on sexuality and AIDS education for young people, and the PCEPA prohibition on sex work near schools, and more.¹⁸² There has been the criminalization of instances of HIV non-disclosure, and the shifting of “indecency” applied to men with HIV continuing to engage in sexual activity, including using charges of sexual assault.¹⁸³ But there has also been a shift towards “obscenity” and “indecency” having to do with “harm” and the definition of women sex workers *per se* as having been “victims” and “trafficked.” Once again, grassroots feminist concerns about sexual violence against women and children and representations of violence and sexism in pornography, have been transformed into a professional, state administrative and policing language.¹⁸⁴

A key task is to challenge and displace these public/private and adult/youth-derived regulatory strategies and the sexual policing and social policies they have mandated. The social basis is there for broad coalitions of various and interlocking transformative movements that can develop and fight for alternate sexual and gender policies and practices, always thought through on an anti-racist, anti-carceral, and anti-capitalist basis.

The Limitations of Sexual Pessimism and Sexual Libertarianism

There still exist many differences, however—gender, sexuality, class, race, language, nationality, age, and ability—within and among the many groups that have been contained by these strategies of regulation. A number of debates and conflicts must be worked through before we can build broader coalitions for the wide-ranging social and sexual transformations that we need.

When it comes to questions of sexual regulation, there are still two main positions that can be identified in the sex debates within feminist, queer, and trans, and more generally, in left and movement circles. Sometimes there is an amalgam of these different perspectives depending on which question is being addressed. And, as a result of the same-sex marriage campaign, there has unfortunately also been the relegation of concerns over sexual pleasure and desire to the margins of queer politics in many neoliberal circles. I will focus on the varying positions adopted on pornography to clarify some of the differences between these perspectives, but they also exist in relation to other sex and gender-related struggles.

The first approach is what Mariana Valverde once called “sexual pessimism,” which is most identified with white anti-porn feminism but also informs the perspectives of other groups, including those organizing against trans women and sex workers. This approach focuses on sex as a danger for women and for young people (especially girls) and has tended to produce a naturalist notion of “men” as sexually violent and predatory and women and young people as sexually passive and inactive. This is currently deployed to help create the image of the “sexually predatory” trans woman and is rooted in essentialist assumptions about sex and gender. Cis women and young people are focused on only as “victims” and not as active agents in the construction of their social and sexual worlds. Cis women are often seen as completely defined by patriarchal power.¹⁸⁵

This sexual pessimism is constructed on racist lines. Black men are often racialized as the hyper-sexual predators of white women, while Black women are sexualized in ways that white women and girls are not.¹⁸⁶ Indigenous women’s bodies are also constructed in highly racialized and colonized ways, becoming sites of men’s and colonial violence.¹⁸⁷

Anti-porn feminism, as we have seen, has been used by state agencies to increase their repressive and regulatory apparatus in order to “protect” women. The activities of some anti-porn feminists have also been incorporated into various strategies for cleaning up urban areas against sex workers, strengthening the policing of consensual sexual practices, and stigmatizing “deviant” sex. Many proponents of this approach also see the need to “protect” young people from sexual activity and erotic materials. This led them to not oppose the youth-porn law, Canada Custom’s seizures of lesbian and gay materials, or the raising of the age of consent to sixteen.

The second position, the more sexual-libertarian perspective,¹⁸⁸ variously modified to address some questions of sexual violence and harassment, tends to view sex as a “natural” good in itself and often views pornography as a form of sexual liberation. This approach has roots in some of the writings of earlier sex radicals like Wilhelm Reich¹⁸⁹ and some of the libertarian currents that came out of the “male”-dominated and largely

hetero “sexual revolution” of the 1960s and its interactions with sections of the “male” left. This kind of position, which gained a significant following among white gay men in the late 1970s and early 1980s, generalized from white, middle-class cis gay men’s relatively positive experiences of sex and gay porn. This was the position informing *The Body Politic*’s publishing of the racist classified ad for a “black house boy.”¹⁹⁰ This position, while it opposes state censorship, also obscures the serious social problems of sexism, violence against women, racism, and the oppression of young people in this society. Since this approach does not centrally address race and class, it has rightfully faced major criticism from Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans activists.¹⁹¹

This position was used to align sections of our movements with the white, heterosexual mainstream porn industry itself and the white mainstream media and cultural industries around abstract notions of “free speech.” While defence of free speech has been absolutely necessary in battles against the state censorship of queer sexual materials, and the defence of *QUAIA* when they tried to ban it from Pride Toronto, it has now been generally colonized by more right-wing forces to defend the “free speech” of anti-trans spokespeople like Meghan Murphy and to defend people like Jordan Peterson, right-wing former professor of psychiatry at the University of Toronto.

Beginning in the early 1990s, as mentioned in Chapter 10, the ideological code of “political correctness” was mobilized against social transformation movements and became part of the repertoire able to be used by moral conservatism and neoliberalism more generally against “threats” from social movements. These movements were separated from their actual roots in fighting social oppression and inequality and it was implied that they had gone too far in imposing “political correctness.” Using “political correctness,” they supposedly became vehicles for censorship and attacks on “free speech.” This argument against “political correctness” served to undermine and invalidate social transformation movements, including, feminist, anti-racist, anti-disability, queer, and (later) trans movements.¹⁹²

Now, “political correctness” has often been replaced by the ideological code of “cancel culture,” which accomplishes much of the same invalidation of social justice movements, and is often mobilized by the right wing and politicians on social media.¹⁹³ While starting off with a certain focus on celebrities being cancelled because of sexist violence or racism, it is now also used to oppose attempts to challenge racist historical figures and monuments, including the mobilization against racist and colonizing monuments that grew out of the global uprising against the police in 2020, and the revolts against settler colonialism and genocidal practices in 2021.

Jordan Peterson rose to fame/infamy in 2016 with his attacks on “political correctness,” which started off with his protests against gender-identity protection in human rights legislation and mandatory anti-bias training. This was expanded to a critique of “Cultural Marxism” and “identity politics” as themselves attacks on “free speech” as his interventions were mobilized by right-wing forces on campuses and in society more generally.¹⁹⁴ This “free speech” right-wing alignment has been used not only against feminism, anti-racism, and trans rights, but also to justify right-wing, racist, and even fascist hate speech and organizing.

Combined with the resurgence of more right-wing forms of neoliberalism—for instance, with the Trump regime in the United States, and the anti-masker/antivaxxer/right-wing convergence in Canada—there has been the emergence of more overtly racist, white-supremacist, and fascist forces who often use “free speech” arguments to defend their racist organizing. There has also been the appropriation of terms like “freedom” from Black Liberation and other anti-racist struggles by right-wing mobilizations such as the “Freedom Convoy.”

As we saw in Chapter 11, in June 2019, alliances of right-wing groups and some right-wing Christians attempted to disrupt Pride celebrations in Hamilton and Toronto, but queer and other anti-fascists defended Pride events.¹⁹⁵ The “Freedom Convoy” in Ottawa made very clear the anti-trans character of this white-supremacist organizing. There is now a small mass base for these white-supremacist groups and the fascists who often facilitate them.

As fascist organizing again becomes more visible, including against drag queens and trans people, we need to start talking about the need for sustained, community-based anti-fascist organizing. The anti-fascist position, which I fully support, is that there must be no platform for fascists. This is not about opposing free speech but is about opposing the active organizing of fascist groups and the violence and hate they lead to.¹⁹⁶

Against Moral Conservatism and the Limitations of Liberalism

Contemporary sexual rule has defined two main polarities for discussions of sexuality and gender. These are united in viewing sexuality and gender as natural. The first is the moral-conservative position, which sanctions only certain forms of sexuality and only two genders, and which would remove individual and collective and ethical choices and transitioning from the field of sexual and gender possibilities. This is still strong in more moral-conservative neoliberal circles. The second polarity ranges from the liberal position to the libertarian and it asserts the right to do whatever one wants as long as it does not interfere with anyone else, or, sometimes (like in the Wolfenden strategy), as long as it is done in “private” and does not involve a young person. The liberal version of this approach is now modified by the Butler decision, with an emphasis on opposing “harm.” An expanded version of this approach is what is generally supported by those identifying with the neoliberal queer but with an emphasis on more “respectable,” “responsible,” and privatized practices. This approach usually assumes an individualist perspective and can lead to abandoning most political, ethical, or cultural criteria for evaluating sexual practices, once again obscuring the social dimensions of the organization and regulation of eroticism and gender.

These polarities continue to confine the political direction of sexual and gender movements so that they can be hegemonized by various strategies of sexual rule—transforming movements of resistance into forms of accommodation with the existing order. This can perhaps be most clearly seen in some of the battles over sexual presentations and pornography, but has ramifications far beyond it. In the polarities established by the

mass media and ruling discourse, the struggle is portrayed as one between censorship and free speech, or between puritanism and sexual liberation, reflecting the interests of the police and the moral conservatives on one side and the pornography industry, the mass media, and civil libertarians on the other.

A liberal approach and one variant of “radical feminist”¹⁹⁷ concerns have been entered into the official debate, with the state censorship position now often being argued on the basis of the “protection” of women from “harm.” These same agencies do nothing to actually bring about social equality for women or to transform the social relations behind violence against women (both cis and trans). The images of violence and sexism in some straight porn reflects and helps naturalize sexism and violence against women and, as such, this porn is part of a broader network of sexist relations that need to be challenged and transformed. To focus, however, on porn as a single issue, or as a main cause of women’s oppression, is to focus on the sexually explicit as the problem and to feed into state censorship strategies that regulate on the basis of sexual explicitness and always hit “deviant” sex the hardest.

Feminist and queer struggles on this terrain can be subsumed under one or the other of these dominant polarities. Anti-porn feminism has been used by the mass media and state agencies to justify attempts to control queer sexual and other depictions. Anti-porn feminist rhetoric as well as anti-trans and anti-sex worker organizing by cis women has been taken up by moral-conservative forces. Anti-porn feminism, through this process, was shifted in the direction of state-protectionist strategies and away from building grassroots movements for liberation.

On the other side, abstract free-speech arguments in defence of gay or lesbian porn can be used to align us with defence of the mainstream heterosexual porn industry and the corporations that control this “free speech” in the mass media and the cultural industries. It leads to underestimating problems of racism, sexism, and the oppression of young people. This “free speech” (which requires money to buy) has little to do with the *actual* free speech desperately needed by queer and trans people, disabled people, feminists, working-class people, Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, and other oppressed people. At the same time as we have fought moves toward state censorship in the practices of Canada Customs, or the “obscenity” section of the Criminal Code, or in the youth-porn law and for the defence and expansion of *our* freedom of speech, we need to do it on our own terms and not those defined for us by others who are defending different social interests.

Related to debates over pornography, different uses of the right to privacy also make visible these differences. The liberal use of the right to privacy, while sometimes necessary as a response to repression, generally leads to a privatization of our experiences and a limiting of our more public claims to the world and social space.¹⁹⁸ This view of “privacy” remains based on notions of the ownership of private property and the right to do what one wants with one’s property in their own private realm. This can be mobilized to defend people’s rights to consume porn or sexually explicit material in the limited “private” realm, but generally it serves to confine our needs and demands to a privatized realm—a tendency that has been intensified by the neoliberal contexts in

which spousal benefits and same-sex marriage have been won. It is also reflected in the privatized forms of parenting taken up by many queer and trans parents. This has been part of the weakening or closing of the queer commons.¹⁹⁹

As outlined in Chapter 10, a more expansive and transformative use of the right to privacy that focuses on social organization was developed in the 1980s by the Right to Privacy Committee in resistance to the bath raids. It challenged state-defined public/private divisions focusing on the social practices people use to establish “privacy” in state-defined public places. It was part of expanding the social spaces we can occupy and extending our queer rights to the world. This rejects any restrictions of our movement and organizing to a narrow “private” realm.

A third position, with which I identify, is an anti-carceral and anti-capitalist approach that builds on the transformative approach developed by the RTPC and is further transformed by abolitionist politics—one that begins to address our different experiences of sexuality, gender, race, age, and class and that understands that gender and racializing relations still organize sexualities differently for men and for women, for cis and for trans people, and for white and Black, Indigenous, and racialized people. This position opposes state censorship of sexual materials, but also deals with both the pleasures and dangers of sex and opens up real sexual alternatives rather than merely defending what already exists.²⁰⁰ It calls for the abolition of policing and all carceral relations and for resources to be transferred to community-based groups to meet people’s social needs. This is a more *optimistic* perspective that tries to minimize sexual danger, expanding the possibilities for erotic pleasure while at the same time refusing to empower police and prisons. Sex is addressed as neither “good” or “bad”—instead, its social context needs to be explored, and the sexualities of oppressed groups defended. This perspective first emerged in the early and mid-1980s in some of the feminist discussions coming out of the “sex wars,” and in attempts to develop a feminist and anti-racist basis for anti-censorship practice. Since then, many of these gains have been forgotten, or eclipsed by the same-sex marriage fight, as many of us have once again been forced into defensive anti-censorship struggles and these lessons have to be re-learned in the context of our current struggles, especially in the context of movements against anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism and colonialism.

Regarding pornography and censorship, this perspective moves us beyond the ideological distinctions of porn as a thing that is either “good” or “bad” and toward an investigation of how sexual presentation has developed historically, and of different types of pornographies, some of which—such as gay, lesbian, trans, or feminist alternative porn—can have a positive and empowering effect on people’s lives and sexualities. Moving beyond naturalist notions, this perspective investigates the historical roots of current sexual controversies in changing social relations and policies of sexual and gender, race, and class regulation. We must oppose all forms of state censorship of sexually explicit materials, which is a key part of sexual regulation—part of state strategies to define for us what “proper” and “normal” images of sex are—which we know from historical experience are used much more vigorously against lesbian, gay, feminist, and

oppositional sexual materials.²⁰¹ But we must also address the very real concerns about sexism and sexist violence, racism, class, and age that are raised regarding pornography and sexuality more generally, and struggle to challenge and transform these along with cultural production more broadly. Our approach to sexual censorship must be broadened to address social and marketplace forms of censorship and to begin to define what a *real* free speech for women, queer and trans people, Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, disabled people, young people, and working-class people might look like.²⁰²

In the context, for instance, of the struggle against the youth-porn law, or for lowering the sexual age of consent for consensual sexual practices (which never really took place), this would involve avoiding the problems of both state protectionist carceral approaches and sexual-libertarian responses. While calling for repeal of the legislation, this would entail prioritizing how these laws are being used against young people themselves, including making it more difficult for young people to get the sexual knowledge and information they need in the context of AIDS and sexual health concerns, as well as to attempt to re-criminalize consensual queer sex. It would require putting forward clear alternate proposals for addressing the social roots of sexual harassment and violence against young people in relation to social inequalities between adults and younger people in this society, in the social-power imbalances in families and many social institutions in relation to young people, in the advertising and cultural practices “eroticizing” young people, and in the social construction of hegemonic forms of masculinities that associate masculinity with aggression and sexual power over others. This requires addressing problems of sexual harassment and violence against young people as a very real problem, but rather than accepting a state protectionist and carceral response that only makes things worse for young people, this approach develops a perspective that facilitates the empowering of young people themselves through giving them the resources and skills to be able to address both their right to say no to unwanted sex but also their right to say yes to the investigation and exploration of their own sexualities.²⁰³ This requires an abolitionist transfer of funds and resources from the police, prisons, and criminal injustice to community-based groups and programs. This cannot be tied up with any reproduction of carceral relations. This develops a much more optimistic/socially transformative approach than either sexually pessimist perspectives that lean toward support for state-protectionist responses or sexual-libertarian responses that neglect the very real problems of sexual and racist harassment and violence that young people face. The question of youth eroticism cannot be avoided and must be directly addressed by younger queer people themselves. A similar approach must be adopted towards the needs raised by young trans people who are the focus of attack by moral-conservative neoliberals and the right-wing.

The hegemonic strategies of sexual and gender rule put in place last century and further defined and shifted with public/private, adult/youth regulatory strategies, and then with a focus on questions of “harm” and “victimization,” have been undermined, in part through our own struggles. There is no longer any clear consensus about what is “normal” or “proper” sex or gender. The gender binary has been increasingly disrupted

and undermined. Struggles have opened up against dominant state approaches to sex and gender regulation from both liberationist and right-wing directions.

The limitations of the Charter and formal equality have been made visible by those left out of the rights revolution and disadvantaged by both moral-conservative and also more “liberal” forms of neoliberalism. Regimes of state and corporate funding that reconstruct relations within our communities in support of neoliberal capitalism have also had major impacts. This also leads to the transformation of social movements into state and professional-managed groups—like many Pride committees, Egale, and the Purge Fund—that came out of the class-action settlement. As mentioned, this provides the social basis for homonormativity and homonationalism, but these tendencies have also been challenged by *QUAIA*, *Anti-69*, *BLM*, the No Pride in Policing Coalition, anti-fascist drag, trans, and queer community-defence organizing, and movements to defund and abolish the police and carceral injustice.

At the same time, however, this is not a general period of “liberal” sexual and social reform. Despite the expenditure of funds earlier in the Covid crisis, the official political agenda is dominated by a neoliberal focus on cutting social programs and austerity while simultaneously expanding and extending policing, prisons, and carceral relations. There is a vociferous moral-conservative and right-wing minority that is opposed to our rights and that has major influence in Conservative provincial governments and within the Conservative opposition at the federal level. This moral-conservative organizing is also used by more liberal and social-democratic forces to restrict how far they can go in relation to queer and trans rights. This is why it is vital to avoid the limitations of not only sexually libertarian and sexually pessimistic positions, but also neoliberal “normalization,” “responsibilization,” and privatization strategies.

There exists, as I have demonstrated throughout this book, a vast difference between how sexuality and gender in all their complexities and contradictions are experienced in everyday life and the categories officially developed to police and manage our erotic lives. Alternate sexual and gender approaches must deal not with sexual rule but with sexual and gender experiences of oppression and repression and movements for liberation. This requires shifts in social standpoints from ruling agencies to the movements for social liberation of oppressed peoples.

This takes us back to some of the stories recounted in the preceding pages: Axel Otto Olson confronting the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths in the 1950s, for instance, bringing into view the blackmail and harassment that gays faced as he was ruled to be outside the terms of reference of the committee. Or we can look at the 1969 reform, when the state took the homosexual issue away from homophile activists and redefined it in narrow legal terms; or to the clash following the bath raids in Toronto when gays disputed the ruling classification of our sexual lives by the police. In the Bill 167 struggle in Ontario, we challenged state definitions of the family as only heterosexual in character. We were defeated when the majority in the legislature defended the heterosexual character of “proper” and “normal” family relationships. More recently, there have been the revolts of those left out of the rights revolution, including trans struggles, Black Lives Matter, and calls for defunding and abolishing the police.

An alternative approach must develop subversive social policies from the standpoints of oppressed peoples. In these areas, alternate sexual approaches should embody and be defined by the experiences of queer and trans as well as other oppressed groups. These experiences are crucial resources to build on in challenging sexual and gender rule.

Toward Erotic and Social Alternatives

The affirmation of diverse consensual sexual practices displaces sexuality and gender as the truths of our beings, moving away from the idea that particular sexual activities express an inner personal essence. There is no “true” sexuality or gender, no correct, moral sexuality or gender. This means moving against the reification and fetishization of sexuality and gender to make the social practices involved in their making as clear as possible. This moves away from the sexual and gender classification of “types,” which the neoliberal queer is quite invested in, leading instead to the celebration and exploration of our bodies, pleasures, and relationships.

In contrast to the moral-conservative position that focuses on a morality of acts and naturalist notions of a single “natural” or “normal” sexuality, a “radical pluralist” perspective, advocated by Jeffrey Weeks, dwells on relations rather than acts and emphasizes meaning and context rather than rules.²⁰⁴ There are no absolutes; consent and actual choice are stressed. Crucial to this perspective are the notions that sexual and gender differences in and of themselves are not social problems and that there can be numerous consensual and ethical choices. This is one of the approaches that emerged out of the sex debates within and between progressive social movements and gained influence in queer and trans movements.

Despite its insights, however, Weeks’s approach does not transcend liberalism. I was much more sympathetic to this approach at the time of writing the second edition and it has become far less radical in these racist neoliberal capitalist times. While it tolerates and celebrates “differences,” it does not adequately address transforming the underlying relations of social power organizing oppression, and this is key.²⁰⁵ Without meaningfully addressing relations of power, it becomes another way of not challenging the social relations of racism, gender, and class. In homonationalist and neoliberal times, it leads to new ways of marginalizing, ghettoizing, and containing oppressed sexualities, genders, and racialized and colonized peoples, since the social relations organizing inequality and oppression are not transformed.

For instance, we have seen how, in neoliberal discourse, “intersectionality” becomes, as with Egale in their *Just Society Report* addressed last chapter, reduced to “diversity” and “inclusion.” Racism, colonialism, and social power relations are disappeared. Pluralism, while it may be a necessary defence against moral conservatives, in and of itself does not get at the need to transform social relations and uproot oppression. It can allow whiteness, masculinity, middle-classness, and cisgenderness to remain in the centre even while allowing groups to express their “differences.”

As suggested already in Chapter 9, Bannerji offers a major critique of the focus on “difference” in some currents within white feminism:

Difference needs to be problematized. Where does such “difference” reside? Who are we “different” from? Upon reflection it becomes clear that the “difference” which is politically significant is not a benign cultural form. The “difference” which is making us “different” is not something inherent or intrinsic to us but is constructed on our basis of divergence from the norm. Since non-white women vary enormously from each other, as do different groups of whites from each other and from us, it remains a question as to why white middle-class heterosexual feminists do not need to use the “difference” argument for their own theory and politics. When questioned thus, “difference” becomes a matter of our *similarity* to each other as non-white women in a racist social organization which “otherizes” us, ascribing a self-ness/sovereignty to white women.... Our “difference” is not simply a matter of “diversities,” which are being suppressed arbitrarily, but a way of noting and muting at the same time fundamental social contradictions and antagonisms. The concept of “difference”...prevents us from seeing that racism is not solely a “cultural/ideological” problem and that the ground of our racist oppression is the same as the ground of white privilege.²⁰⁶

It is not so much a question of difference, which has been able to be absorbed into the languages of neoliberalism, as it is of common social relations based in social power, which empower some groups along racial, gendered, sexual, and classed lines while “otherizing” and disempowering others. Projects of social liberation must be linked to the transformation of social relations from the standpoints of those who are oppressed by current sexual and gender regulations and how they interlock with relations of racialized class.

Instead of pluralism, radical or otherwise, we need an alternative that moves far beyond liberalism. It must address relations of white supremacy and class relations of exploitation. We need to critique and transform the insights of a critical “radical pluralism” with anti-racist, feminist, and anti-capitalist perspectives. This requires giving the insights of radical pluralism a different social and political basis, requiring a much more profound social transformation of the law, state formation, and other social regulations. Abolitionist approaches provide for much of this social basis.²⁰⁷

By shifting social standpoints to start from the experiences of the oppressed, the problem becomes oppressive strategies of sexual, gender, racializing, and other social regulations. This directly engages us in the struggle to transform sexual and gender regulation in liberationist directions. Beginning outside official discourse (in which queers, trans people, sex workers, Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, homeless people, drug users, and others are still largely pre-packaged as social problems), we start instead with the experiences of queer and trans people, sex workers, and others to see instead how sexual policing and oppressive sexual, gender, racializing, and classed regulations are *the* problems.

More generally, this opens up possibilities for the development of a radically different basis for sexual and gender regulation based on social liberation. This would not be based on administrative and carceral categories standing over and against people’s lives, but on the transformation of social relations, including abolishing policing and

carceral relations, which would empower queer and trans people, sex workers, Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, and other oppressed people. This requires a different kind of oppositional discourse organizing very different relations between movements of sexual and gender resistance and other movements for liberationist social transformation. This engages us in moving beyond liberal strategies of sexual regulation, including pluralism, and engaging in anti-capitalist, feminist, and anti-racist social transformation.

One clear direction that comes out of these experiences is the need to focus on ending actual violence and transforming social-power relations and not on regulating “deviant” or oppressed sexualities and genders. There is no need to code difference as disadvantage or deviance. We need to focus instead on social transformation and ending violence and *social* power, not on dividing consensual sexualities and genders into “deviant/normal” forms. Abolition and transferring police/prison resources to community-based groups is crucial here as we deconstruct the powers of racial-capitalist disciplinary power. The aim of this would be to radically democratize relations of sexuality and gender by expanding the possibilities for non-exploitative and anti-racist sexual and gender choices. This approach transforms the agenda toward collectively clarifying the criteria on which to build our sexual and gender communities and lives. An emphasis on anti-racism, anti-sexism, anti-capitalism, choice, relationships, context, social equality, pleasure, and consent—taken together—provides us with the initial basis for alternative sexual and gender practices. One aim of such a perspective would be to expand the possibilities of choice and consent in people’s erotic and gender lives and to ensure that these words have a very real social meaning. These could become part of a broader transformation of social relations as against the present carceral public/private, responsible/irresponsible, adult/youth, normal/deviant, monogamous/promiscuous, good girl/bad girl, male/female, racializing and colonizing dichotomies, and act-specific categories that presently dominate and organize sexual and often gender rule. These alternate policies would focus not on regulating acts themselves, or on location (whether it was in “public” or “private”), or on whether it was “deviant” sex or not, but on questions of the character of the social relations involved.

Sexuality in the context of other social transformations could become—as many of us have already begun to experience—a terrain for communication, connection, play, desire, and pleasure. This would move us away from sexuality and gender as terrains of danger and violence. This would have to be part of a broader series of social transformations that would create the social conditions for full social equality and liberation for women, queer and trans people, young people, Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, and working-class people.

For instance, two or more men engaging in oral sex with each other would not be defined as “deviant” or “abnormal”; if one engaged in violence or harassment of the others—whether this occurred in a sexual context or not—then that would be grounds for social action by community-based groups but not by the police or criminal justice system. If a consensual sexual activity took place in a park where it disturbed no one, it would not be considered a problem. If we are addressing a different-gender relationship

in which coercive sex was forced on the woman (cis or trans) this would not be categorized as more “normal” sex merely because it was heterosexual in character. Instead, the violence and coercion would be seen as the problem and various efforts would be mobilized to deal with this, including forms of transformative justice²⁰⁸ and re-education, all without the police and carceral state. To accomplish this requires a major transfer of resources to community-based groups and away from the police and prisons. These alternate and abolitionist approaches become an important basis for social and sexual transformation.

In moving toward queer and trans liberation, we challenge the dominant polarities of sex and gender regulation and develop alternative positions that are not hegemonized by other social groups, positions that are profoundly erotic, sex-positive, anti-sexist, and anti-racist, and that address our different experiences of sex as pleasure and danger. This could develop an erotic-positive queer and trans liberation perspective that can defend all consensual same-sex/gender sexual practices, providing space for their affirmation and redefinition and for bursting the boundaries of ruling sexual and gender regimes. Community-based discussion of sexual and gender issues would be crucial, as would the development of new ways of settling sexual disputes that would not allow for openings for state intervention and the police into these vital community and movement debates.²⁰⁹ Rather than stifling sexual discussions through forms of state and social censorship, we instead need more sex-related discussions and debates and more sexual knowledge, literacy, and exploration.

This process of sexual and gender transformation involves a critical tension between the sexual and gender practices and identities we live and love in the still-capitalist, patriarchal, and racist present, and the social transformation towards very different contexts for erotic pleasure and gender formation. This cannot be based on any waiting for the “revolution” for change to take place but must be based on challenging oppression and making alternatives now. We are not totally defined or determined by the social contexts we find ourselves in, since we participate collectively and individually in making them. Ken Popert was absolutely wrong when he wrote, defending racist preferences in queer men’s sexualities in the pages of *The Body Politic*, that, “Racism will go out of our sexuality when racism goes out of society, and not before.”²¹⁰ Racism needs to be challenged and transformed right now, including within our own social and sexual practices. This is the only way for it to go out of society.

A “transitional” sexual politics could link the transformation of our present desires and pleasures to a vision of transformed sexual, gendered, and anti-racist futures.²¹¹ This form of transitional politics would be a “pluralist” perspective encompassing numerous forms of consensual sexualities; we would focus on opening up possibilities for more choice, consent, caring, democracy, and pleasure in sexual relationships. This involves developing sexual and gender practices that rupture with racist, sexist, and other practices of oppression. However, sexual practice itself would be only one of many sources of pleasure and identification and would no longer be a main source of identity formation. We would focus not on the freeing of some inherent sexuality or gender but on struggles over sexual and gender norms and regulations, and people gaining more

control over their bodies and lives. This moves beyond queer and trans liberation to a broader sexual/gender politics.²¹²

One of the key aspects of this liberation strategy would be the building of coalitions against institutionalized heterosexuality and the gender binary, which would bring together not only queer and trans but also feminist, antiracist, and anti-capitalist movements, and other groups as well. One site for the oppression and regulation of queer and trans people has been in the construction and regulation of family relations through state social and family policies. This is also an important area where coalitions with other groups that also face oppressive regulation in relation to their family and social support relations can be forged. One of the major weaknesses of the struggle for spousal benefits and family-recognition rights, and even more with same-sex marriage, is that it did not pose these questions. Instead, the main axis has been to argue that lesbian and gay couples and families should have the same rights that heterosexual couples and families currently have. This did not lead to any major challenge to the social form in which spousal benefits, marriage, or families are legally and socially recognized beyond critiquing their exclusively heterosexual character and demanding to be let into these existing social forms. As noted in Chapter 11, there was a white racial politics to these campaigns. Along with remembering that many family formations are rather anti-social in prioritizing the needs of family members against those of other people in society,²¹³ we also must recognize racial/ethnic differences in social experiences, where for some, family networks can be networks of support against, or refuges from, racism. There is also the racism of the widespread constructions of “dysfunctional” Black and Indigenous families that must be challenged.²¹⁴

The lack of challenge to the normalized heterosexual family and marriage has been one of the reasons why these struggles have been very susceptible to incorporation into strategies for the “normalization” and “responsibilization” of our relationships and the making of the neoliberal queer. While there has been considerable attention focused on opposition to conversion therapy for queer and trans youth (and this should include autistic queer and trans people), and support for queer and trans youth in schools, there has been little overt challenge to gender practices and the gender binary existing *within* families themselves.

Questions have rarely been raised as to whether it is really the best social policy to allocate social benefits to people on the basis of where they work for wages and on the basis of the type of benefit package that their partners have at waged work. While some of these benefits have been gained as part of a social wage won by waged and unwaged workers through union and community struggles, it is currently only a minority of the population in some unionized workplaces and professional, corporate, and administrative personnel who have access to these benefits. These benefit packages do nothing to help people living in poverty or the many who have no access to them. Of course, as long as heterosexuals are allocated benefits on this basis, we must argue for them for same-gender couples as well. But we also must extend our struggles beyond formal equality claims to challenge the form these benefits take in a more transformative fashion. In moving beyond formal rights, important questions of the redistribution of social wealth

and the benefits people deserve on the basis of their social needs become clearer. It would also become clearer that claims to social resources are justified for people involved in doing the socially necessary and important work of rearing children, whether they are the biological parents of the child or not. There must be recognition of the importance of social reproductive and caring labour, including when unpaid, and support for new networks of people raising children together.²¹⁵

Seen in this light, discussions of alternate social support and family policies could create broader coalitions—including with anti-poverty groups—that queer and trans activists could participate in, along with feminists and others. These alternate social support and family policies would not only challenge heterosexism and the gender binary, they would also challenge relations of poverty, racism and class exploitation. This poses important social-justice questions and begins to raise the need for a new anti-racist, anti-capitalist society in which taking care of people's needs is at the centre.

These coalitions would oppose dominant state family approaches that group together policies encompassing questions of social support, domestic/reproductive and caring labour, childrearing, sexuality, gender, and divisions of labour. Developing alternative social support policies involves redefining social and community support to reflect how people actually live, which is now not often within the “traditional” heterosexual family unit.²¹⁶ This would undermine ruling-class and state organization of gender and familial relations and expand possibilities for people to live in socially supported settings outside institutionalized heterosexuality and the gender binary. This would include the experiences of “heterosexuals” trying to do it differently, or more queerly.

The “family” is also a key area in which to contest the influence of moral conservatism, including its neoliberal form, as pointed out in Chapter 10. The ideological “heavenly” family of moral conservatism must be brought down to earth so that its very painful contradictions can be addressed. Until recently, moral conservatives have been able to hegemonize much of the discussion around family policy, beyond certain early liberal-feminist initiatives regarding the division of property following divorce and questions of child support and sometimes childcare, while feminism and queer and trans liberation—because we have often been immersed in our own defensive struggles and now with the emergence of the neoliberal queer—have not been able to respond adequately to people's needs, fears, hopes, and desires. There has been progress here but often far too much simply within existing family relations and not enough *against and beyond*.

We must therefore communicate the experiences and lessons of alternative support, family, and community networks that challenge the state policies that still establish the nuclear heterosexual family as normative and which often still label all other relationships as “deviant.” We must defend those family and support networks that are most under attack—lesbian mothers, gay couples, trans families, single parents, polyamorous relationships, multiple parents raising kids together, mothers on social assistance, immigrant and migrant families torn apart by discriminatory immigration laws, and battered women and children. We must expand people's possibilities to make choices

about how they live their lives and create the conditions for these choices to have real social support and meaning.

One of the reasons why questions of family relations can get quite heated is that they raise questions involving children and young people. We need to affirm that queer and trans people are just as capable of raising children as are heterosexuals and cisgendered people, and to specifically demolish all the right-wing arguments constructing us as “bad” parents and threats to young people, and as “groomers” in schools and other contexts. We need to see more queer and trans parents speaking out about their experiences, as well as more children of queer parents, sometimes called “queer spawn,” speaking out as well.²¹⁷ This also requires addressing eroticism among younger people. This cannot be avoided.

These alternative social-support proposals must be based on the experiences of those of us surviving and loving outside of, or in rupture with, institutionalized heterosexuality and the gender binary. This includes drawing on the experiences of making chosen families. This would involve gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, trans people, feminists, anti-sexist heterosexual men, and others willing to openly communicate their experiences,²¹⁸ and could be one of the best ways to undermine the influence of right-wing “pro-family” and anti-trans politics. We could demonstrate that people can and are living very fulfilling and pleasure-filled lives in radically different contexts. To be socially equal, however, this requires that these forms of support and family networks receive social support, including as long as we are in a money-based society, financial support. This also means the subversion of state marriage, the validation of polyamorous relations, and also resisting the “normalization” and “privatization” of relationships. Some of Drucker’s suggestions for queer anti-capitalist organizing are very relevant here, including the need for a pro-trans critical gender politics; the undermining of the gay/straight binary; and the re-affirmation of the importance of the personal-is-political method through queering relationships, domesticity, and intimacy.²¹⁹ I return to these questions at the end of this conclusion.

One of the major struggles queer activists have been involved in since the early 1980s and continuing to this day has been AIDS organizing. As mentioned in Chapter 10, AIDS activism confronts a condensation of many social relations, including racism, sexism, heterosexism, the capitalist organization of health care and more, as is also confronted in the current COVID-19 pandemic. All of these relations have to be addressed regarding AIDS, and now the current pandemic. There can be no expendable populations or groups. This includes the need for popular education and organizing around safer practices. It also includes problems with the social organization of treatment delivery and research and the problems created by pharmaceutical corporations and the medical profession for people living with AIDS/HIV, and now those affected by Covid, including Long Covid. This means opposing vaccine and now treatment apartheid. This includes, today, the question of free access to vaccines and treatments especially in the Global South.²²⁰ AIDS activists confronted the problems PLWA/HIVs face in accessing the social supports and services that they badly need. This has again broached questions

of poverty and class relations, along with imperialism and underdevelopment, and the need in responding to AIDS, and now Covid, to put people's lives and health first. AIDS activism was forced to confront the problems created by the professional and capitalist social organization of health care, medicine, treatment, research, and social support in Canadian society.²²¹ Much the same can be said, with all of its specific differences, for COVID-19. We need to make as visible as we can what was learned from the AIDS crisis for addressing the current pandemic and not simply focus on how the pandemic is affecting queer and trans people, important as this is.²²²

As part of the relations of ruling, the practices of the state and professionals are largely oriented around notions of "health from above." One of the important outcomes of the AIDS crisis was the development of community-based AIDS groups, and later AIDS activism, and a new way of addressing health concerns, especially during the early period when governments and public health left us to die. We began to develop, however hesitantly and inconsistently, an approach based on the empowerment of people living with AIDS/HIV and the communities most affected by AIDS. This has been referred to as "health from below."²²³ It entails a counter-hegemonic, transformative politics. But these groups were transformed through funding and policy regulations into more managed AIDS Service Organizations (ASOs). Given the social organization of forgetting of much of this early organizing and activism, and neoliberal queer support for health from above and the medical-industrial complex, this has led to too much reliance on public health, policing, and the pharma corporations in response to COVID-19.²²⁴

We need to begin to define AIDS and COVID-19 health policies much more on our own terms. This is tied into a broader social transformation in health care, sexuality, the medical profession, research, the power of drug corporations, and in other areas—transformations that must put the needs and concerns of the people most affected by the health crisis at the centre—and not capitalist profit rates or professional careers. These health crises can only be seriously addressed by dealing with fundamental features of the racial-capitalist society we exist within. This must be a politics of social transformation, including building coalitions with other oppressed groups around health care and other concerns. This holds out the possibility of fundamentally transforming the relations of health, allowing people to gain more control over their own health as groups and individuals. There are especially important needs for coalitions and solidarity between groups, given cutbacks on healthcare funding. We must not allow them to divide us, but instead we must argue, as in the campaign for catastrophic drug funding in Ontario and Quebec in the 1990s, for funding for the best possible health care for everyone.²²⁵ On the international front, as the Montreal Manifesto by AIDS Action Now (AAN)! and ACT-UP (New York) called for, this requires a massive transfer of resources from the "overdeveloped" Global North to those countries "underdeveloped" by colonialism and imperialism.²²⁶ This is also badly needed in the current pandemic, where vaccine and treatment apartheid and the privileging of the pharma corporations and profit rates literally means that CAPITALISM=DEATH!

In contesting sexual and social policies, queer and trans liberation confronts state and ruling relations. In the area of legal and social policies, state institutions become

a contested terrain between different class and social groups. We can open up social spaces and gain more access to social resources through these struggles, while opposing police, prisons, and carceral relations. In general, however, even in these contested terrains, ruling racialized class relations and their institutions hold more social power than oppressed and subordinated groups. As pointed out in the Introduction to this edition, state forms of organization attend to rule and administration over people's lives, which does not make them vehicles for liberation.²²⁷ This does not mean that we should not fight for reforms within state relations that will defend and extend the social spaces and resources we have been able to seize for ourselves.²²⁸ In adopting a police and prison-abolitionist approach this means that we only support reforms or measures that weaken and limit the powers of policing and carceral state relations as part of a longer-term struggle for abolition and social transformation.²²⁹

While we must organize *within* state relations, including school boards and city councils, and while we must work with left politicians willing to actually take action where we find them at all levels, our main focus must remain outside these institutions in grassroots campaigns, coalitions with other oppressed people, and in building liberatory and transformative political movements.²³⁰ We need autonomy from political parties like the NDP or the Green Party, autonomy from capital, and autonomy from union leaderships.²³¹ It is these movements and their struggles that can begin to transform state relations and build alternatives, in opposition to the neoliberal queer reinforcement of state relations, including policing. It is our movements that can reshape the ground on which official parliamentary and legal politics stand. For instance, without the existence of extra-parliamentary queer movements, the legal victories we have won would not have been possible.

Queer and Trans Liberation and Anti-Capitalist, Feminist, Anti-Racist Futures

Queer and trans liberation challenges the sexual and gender policies of racial capitalist "civilization" and state formation. In so doing, it intersects with the historical process that has organized class, gender, colonizing, and race relations. Queer and trans liberation meets up with anti-capitalist, feminist, disability justice, and anti-racist projects of human liberation, and with movements for Black liberation, Indigenous solidarity, climate justice, anti-poverty, anti-eviction, and migrant and no borders/no one is illegal organizing. This includes not only those involved in queer and trans organizations but also queer and trans activists who would never be part of mainstream LGBT groups but who are actively involved in militant anti-racist, anti-colonial, anti-poverty, union, no one is illegal and climate-justice organizing. Queer and trans liberation has challenged heterosexism within the socialist and other left traditions and has brought new terrains of social transformation into view.

Yet a fundamental tension exists between autonomous sexual and gender political movements like queer and trans liberation, and Black and Indigenous organizing, and the left traditions still often hegemonized by forms of sexism, heterosexism, and often

racism, whether of the formerly social-democratic New Democratic Party variety,²³² the Leninist “revolutionary left,” or the broader party-building left. While left movements in general are in crisis, there has been, as mentioned, a rebirth of dynamic popular and social movements as well as continuing grassroots struggles based in waged workplaces. It is in the debates and struggles of these grassroots movements for change, including within queer and trans organizing, that the resources for new, transformative anti-capitalist movements are being created.

As mentioned in the Introduction to this edition, there is also the white left critique of “identity politics” that puts forward a narrow, “class-first” argument that does not address the mediated and mutually made character of class, race, gender, sexual, and other social relations and struggles. While queer and trans struggles are central and not peripheral to challenging oppressive social relations and to the process of social transformation, this also means that these struggles need to be seen as moving far beyond liberalism and democratic rights to raise profound questions regarding sexual and gender liberation.

For those organizing for LGBT rights in a more limited sense, there has been a process of containment, institutionalization, and infrastructure-building that we saw developing in Egale and through the class-action settlement in the Purge Fund last chapter, in part accomplished through a reliance on state and corporate funding and regulation. This has further transformed what was a social movement into more of a series of largely professionalized and tamed liberal organizations. This is also integrally tied up with the emergence of the neoliberal queer, where there is no longer any perceived need for community-based movement organizing. Instead, an infrastructure is being built that facilitates integration into the white middle class.

It is no accident that, historically, queer and often trans struggles achieved much of their political support from currents on the left, and that many queer and trans activists were/are anti-capitalist activists. In contrast, we have received most of our opposition (but not all of it!) from the forces of the right that support racial capitalism. However, much of this history has been actively forgotten in the time of the neoliberal queer and needs to be rediscovered and actively remembered. Queer and trans activists are playing a major part in rebuilding vital anti-racist, anti-capitalist movements. We need such movements that can support us in our struggles and can more clearly develop alternatives to heterosexual, anti-trans, racist, colonizing and capitalist social relations.

In this light, queer and trans liberation can be part of a broader social coalition for sex-positive, anti-sexist, anti-racist, and anti-capitalist social transformation. This coalitional politics, in turn, would be an important part of a larger movement struggling for popular democratic control and the transformation of the social relations organizing various forms of oppression. This poses important questions of autonomy and alliance for queer and trans liberation; we need an autonomous power base to challenge the particular features and character of our oppressions and to organize against the practices of heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary. *No one else will do this for us.* But if we are to succeed in our goal of fundamentally transforming social relations, we must

build coalitions with other groups, who are also interconnected with us. We also need to see how queer and trans liberation brings a great deal to these mediated and mutually constructed struggles for liberation and against racism, class exploitation, gender, age and ability oppression that actively go on within our communities.

Queer and trans liberation enriches other struggles with our perspective of democratic control over the practices regulating sexualities, genders, and desires—and with our critique of heterosexism and the gender binary. Through this same process, transformative struggles within queer and trans communities over sexist, racist, or class relations are also enriched. Through involvement in transformative movements and coalitions, we learn from people experiencing different forms of oppression, and we begin, in response, to transform ourselves and our movements.

This raises crucial questions of pedagogy—learning and teaching.²³³ As Marx once noted (updated here to address sexism):

The materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and upbringing forgets that circumstances are changed by people and that it is essential to educate the educator themselves.... The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as *revolutionary practice*.²³⁴

In turn, other movements also get transformed by what they learn from us.²³⁵ This would be part of building left movements that could develop a vision of an anti-racist anti-capitalism worth fighting for. One of the many problems with homonormativity, “trans-normativity,” homonationalism, and the neoliberal queer is that they actively produce barriers preventing us from doing this.

Queer and trans liberation, through cultural and political resistance, begins to contest and transform the common-sense acceptance of heterosexuality and the gender binary as normal and natural, organizing in its place a diversity of possible ethical sexualities, erotic practices, and genders. This involves a shift from a state-organized heterosexual hegemony and the gender binary to a taking up of the social standpoints of queers, trans people, women, and oppressed groups. Shifting and transforming sexual and gender definitions and regulations opens social spaces, not only for those of us who presently define ourselves as queer and trans, but also alternatives for everyone. It opens up possibilities for those who would wish to explore the development of different sex/gender desires outside the restrictions of institutionalized heterosexuality and the two-gender binary, for more profound forms of *queering* heterosexualities and genders.

Sexuality and gender are aspects of social life that can be redefined and transformed by people ourselves; they are not “natural” instinctual forces or “things” that control, define, or drive our lives. The politics of transforming sexual and gender identifications and pleasures leads to the subversive conclusion that sexualities and genders are, in the end, matters of social and political choice and not of biology or destiny. Sexualities and genders have no essential meaning other than that which is made of them socially. What

sex and gender “is” we must now decide and shape through our collective struggles. Queer and trans liberation, feminism, anti-racist movements, and more have begun to elaborate a vision and a practice of transformed sex/gender relationships. These movements are characterized by forms of prefigurative²³⁶ change that can give people a sense of empowerment and a sense of the social and erotic pleasures of the future. We can begin to catch glimpses of a transformed world of love and desire in our everyday lives today, thereby beginning to envision an erotic-positive, anti-racist, anti-capitalist society. Queer and trans liberation, in coalition with feminism and anti-racism, and as part of a transformed anti-capitalist movement, can fundamentally transform the ruling regimes of sexuality and gender, even moving beyond gender classifications in the social organization of everyday life.

Queer and trans histories provide some of the perspectives and inspirations for waging this transformative struggle for redefining sexuality and gender. These histories, like the feminist, Black, Indigenous, and working-class histories they are interlocked with, are as much about the future as they are about the past. This provides not only a view of the past from very different places than the history of great white men they tried to teach me in school, but also some of the resources for transforming the present and envisioning future possibilities. But, again, there are major problems with the generalization of neoliberal queer history, which is a history from above, focusing on what great things Pierre Elliot Trudeau, the Charter, the granting of same-sex marriage, and Justin Trudeau have done for us, and marginalizing our movements of dissent, revolt, and rebellion.²³⁷

In the end, sexual and gender liberation can only mean that we gain control over the relations that regulate and confine our sexualities and genders, so that we can remake for ourselves our pleasures, desires, and loves. This vision of the future is based in the struggles we are waging today to take our destinies into our own hands and away from the police, state agencies, the legal system, capitalists, doctors, psychiatrists and psychologists, social workers,²³⁸ and the mass media. The institutions that regulate our erotic and gender lives have not been around for all time—they have developed as part of a historical process. We, too, are part of these histories. These institutions and practices can therefore be transformed. We can then begin to make the pleasures and desires of the future and build a world free of sexual danger and the gender binary. This raises crucial questions of radical hope and revolutionary love which I address before signing off.

Keeping Radical Hope Alive: Preventing a Return to Racial-Capitalist “Normality”

As I finalize these concluding paragraphs in May 2023, there are major struggles all around us against anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism, the police, prisons, and the genocidal projects of residential schools, in support of Indigenous struggles and Land Back struggles against resource extraction capitalism and “development” on Indigenous lands, struggles against climate change, and, in the context of the pandemic, against violent

police evictions of encampments and for safe and accessible housing for the homeless, for the rights of precarious and migrant workers, for vaccines and treatments for poorer countries, for overdose-prevention sites and harm reduction, and against right-wing and fascist forces. All of these are interconnected with queer and trans experiences and with our struggles. At the same time, neoliberal queer forces try to actively sever our connections with these struggles and contain our focus to narrow (largely white and middle-class) legal issues. They try to align us with state agencies, the police, and liberal governments. They want to prepare us for the “return” to a capitalist, colonizing, racist “normality” during and after this pandemic, trying to make us forget about the uprising against anti-Black racism and the police, and genocidal practices that occurred during it, leaving us unprepared to deal with the austerity and other neoliberal attacks that are coming. They simply want us to return to the LGBT agenda of previous demands, without any transformation by abolitionist organizing against anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism and for abolishing police and prisons. This will also be a return to a continuing heterosexist and two-gender-based, patriarchal, racist society, with some of the reforms we have been able to win hopefully maintained against the very real threats of moral-conservative neoliberalism and right-wing/fascist organizing.

In the face of liberal and social-democratic containment strategies, we need to keep the hope for radical social transformation alive.²³⁹ Regarding struggles to abolish and defund the police, they try to undermine those of us putting forward a clear abolitionist perspective which defunds the police by starting to make significant cuts to their armaments and means of repression and through expanding no-go areas, whether they be geographical areas of cities, including areas with a large number of queer and trans people, or parts of neighborhoods or communities, or institutional sites (say a university campus or schools) where the police are no longer able to intervene. This kind of abolitionist approach leads to contesting the relations of racial capitalism. As Mariame Kaba puts it “hope is a discipline” that must inform our perspectives and everyday practice.²⁴⁰

Liberal, and social-democratic forces, are hoping to smother the hopes for radical social transformation that fueled the uprising and Indigenous struggles, in part through growth in police budgets and repression, extending policing into social services and agencies, and through “community policing.” As we have seen in the violent assaults against encampments and their supporters in Hamilton, Ottawa, Halifax, Toronto, and other cities, they wish to intimidate and scare people so we no longer resist and fight back.²⁴¹ One reason for the massive expansion of policing is that ruling state and class forces know they will need them to put down our coming revolts and rebellions.

In so doing, they want to limit any serious defunding or abolishing of the police while continuing to expand police funding and co-ordinating powers and working to restore people’s commitment to racist and capitalist “normality”; to only support “peaceful,” “civil” (and often ineffective) protest; and to facilitate a return to the restrictions of electoral politics as the limit to our political imaginations. In contrast, we need to defy and resist these containment strategies through expanding our radical imaginations²⁴² as we hold open and expand these cracks in anti-Black racism, settler colonialism, and

racial capitalism. This is what can provide the basis for revolutionary hope in our struggles. We know things can be otherwise and we need to continue to fight for liberation. The struggle continues. But hope itself is not enough. We also need revolutionary love.

Revolutionary, Transformative Love

In the last chapter, I referred to Suzanne Lenon's work in the context of same-sex marriage on how queer love in neoliberal times can be claimed by a neoliberal regime of governance and a politics of desexualization in the context of a white racial politics mobilized around same-sex marriage. But Lenon *also* pointed out that:

Queer love can be unmoored from the dictates of the economic interests of neoliberalism, whiteness, and liberal norms of inclusion. This is not queer love's only home.... The Queer Survival Economics Initiative and the Audrey Lorde Project, both based in New York City, offer radical, collective visions of love in the service of progressive social and economic justice. In Canada, Vivek Shraya's (2013) book, *What I Love About Being Queer*, is a visual and textual testimony to the multiplicity of love's meanings.... Queerness, too, is insisting a reimagining of love and its labour.²⁴³

This connection with love and labour in a collective and social context brings us back to the work of materialist feminist Rosemary Hennessy on the making of revolutionary love.²⁴⁴ Here, she points out that, while love can be mobilized, as it was during the same-sex marriage battles, in a privatizing and selfish fashion focused on the desexualized white, middle-class couple and harnessed to the racial and class politics of the neoliberal queer, it can also be used in a more historical, social, and collective sense, and given a very different social and historical basis. Similarly, although differently too, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, in her stories in *Islands of Decolonial Love*, links this transformative, revolutionary love to the everyday struggles for survival and passion against colonialism and the making of alternatives to it.²⁴⁵ Love as an interactive, caring social practice is also emphasized in the transformative work of bell hooks.²⁴⁶

For instance, we can see this more social and collective sense of love, care, and solidarity in the networks for mutual aid that have emerged out of many social movements and revolutionary situations. As trans activist and scholar Dean Spade suggests, mutual aid is the radical act of caring for each other while working to change the world. As a practice, it helps to challenge neoliberal capitalist cultures of individualism and the market, replacing them with the social relations and practices of caring and solidarity, what Sue Ferguson describes as "life-making practices from below."²⁴⁷ This is very much also tied into police and prison abolition and the building of social alternatives. This practice includes not only the mutual aid of the serve-the-people programs of the Black Panther Party—which provided food, education, healthcare and clothing for Black people—and anti-poverty groups providing free food for poor people, but also the buddy systems and support groups set up in the early years of the AIDS crisis,

and the wave of mutual-aid groups dealing with the current pandemic, including those formed to support unhoused people in encampments.

In a more erotic sense this moves far beyond couple-love to become a more social and collective love, meeting unmet needs for social connection, sensation, affect, and solidarity. Many of our needs for eroticism, affection, connection, love, pleasure, and friendship can be seen as often unmet, given heterosexual hegemony, the gender binary, and racist, colonial, capitalist, and patriarchal social relations. Often in queer, trans, and Two-Spirit histories, these needs are also outlawed through policing practices, the law, carceral state relations, and colonial and attempted genocidal practices. A politics of revolutionary love both describes our unmet and outlawed social needs for physical and social connections and the affections and eroticism that we build with others involved in common struggles. Here, Hennessy focuses on needs and not identities and develops a social needs-based politics. Social interaction, sensation, and affect are vital social needs. These needs are historically produced and they in turn produce new social needs.²⁴⁸ Love that begins to meet these unmet and outlawed needs ranges from very erotic and sexual forms of love (whether focused on an individual or a group of erotic partners) to the transformative social love that develops out of our movements and communities. This is love that the early gay liberation movements argued was not only about those already seeing themselves as gay/queer, but also about queer possibilities and potentials in those currently seeing themselves as heterosexual.²⁴⁹ Similarly, trans, non-binary, and Two-Spirit organizing is not only about these diverse groups, it is also very much about possibilities and potentials for those who currently see themselves as cis and binary. It is a message of revolutionary transformation about gender possibilities. In other words, this more radical social love has to be about challenging institutionalized heterosexuality and the gender binary in ways, to borrow an expression from Charlotte Bunch, that are not only for queers, or for trans people.²⁵⁰ It is about a broader social and sexual transformation and not simply for an already existing minority. This is a radical and revolutionary love that spills far beyond sexual identities.

To return, in this context, to the insightful work of Marxist philosopher Herbert Marcuse in a more historically/socially grounded context, this revolutionary love means contesting the de-eroticization of many areas of our bodies and lives that occurs for gendered labouring bodies in alienated, exploitative, and racial capitalist labour.²⁵¹ It is this de-eroticization that makes these bodies “productive” and exploitable for capital, and this is why our project must be for more erotic and far less “productive” bodies, as Rao and others suggest. Rao points to the revolutionary potential “in the very figurations of unproductive, ‘anti-development’ queerness that haunt the imaginaries of homocapitalist discourse.”²⁵² These struggles against productivity for capital are struggles against disciplined work and for “unproductive” pleasures, and can be linked to queer and trans struggles for more time and space for sexuality, desire, and care, for the broader re-eroticization of our bodies. This can be seen as a social struggle for *the expansion of erotic and sexual time*. The struggle against the productive/loyal-to-capital queer and trans worker opens up possibilities for anti-capitalist queer and trans

struggles. This is for a social world of expanded free time for caring, play, and pleasure, based on the death of the social relations of capital.²⁵³

This is a much broader love and eroticism than simply genital hegemony, or primacy, and the subordination of erotic pleasures and zones of the body to genital sex with the de-eroticization of the rest of the body.²⁵⁴ It suggests a different way of living and experiencing eroticism. Instead, this is about the eroticization of everyday life and our bodies in much more generalized ways. At the same time, Marcuse does not at all adequately address race and gender. This approach also needs to be informed by and transformed by the powerful work of Audre Lorde on the uses of the erotic, especially in fighting the patriarchal oppression of Black and racialized women, with the erotic as a crucial part of the struggle to dismantle white, patriarchal relations.²⁵⁵ This needs to be part of our struggles today, in destabilizing the familiar, in not taking the taken-for-granted for granted, and in developing new social practices and needs. It means infusing our organizing for new ways of living with all the excitement and delight of highly erotic touching, connection, desire, and pleasure. This allows us to resituate sexual and gender politics on the basis of our social needs and the historical emergence of new social needs.

Of course, this raises new questions and contradictions that need to be addressed. So hopefully this conclusion, rather than ending the story, is a beginning, sparking more exploration, investigation, writing, and practice. *So, this ending is also a beginning.*

To close I return to the Zapatistas, who continue to provide inspiration for me, and who continue to develop a vision of revolutionary transformation defined by women and queer and trans people. They wrote in a statement issued from Chiapas in Mexico, in the midst of the pandemic:

We do need to get back on the streets, yes, but to struggle. As we've said before, life, and the struggle for life, is not an individual issue, but a collective one. Now we see that it's not a national issue either, but a global one.... We are Zapatistas, carriers of the virus of resistance and rebellion.²⁵⁶

May we all carry this virus *of rebellion and resistance*.

The Struggle Continues: Resisting Neoliberal Queer Historical Narratives

Tom Hooper

I first read *The Regulation of Desire* as an undergraduate student in 2004 and it was responsible for drawing me into the study of the history of sexuality. It changed my understanding of the world. Now, in this updated and expanded third edition of *The Regulation of Desire*, Gary Kinsman has shifted my understanding yet again. Gary has identified the emergence of “the neoliberal queer,” referring to the goal of some queers to become accepted into a white, respectable middle class. Neoliberalism refers to a series of colonial, racist, patriarchal, ableist, and capitalist ideas that place a primary emphasis on the responsibilities of individuals. On the one hand, this means dismantling social programs and the welfare state; on the other hand, it means expanding “law and order,” including police and prisons dedicated to the protection of private property. Since the 1980s, some queers have increasingly become accepted into this ideal. They no longer seek transformation and liberation but, rather, further integration. This neoliberal queer has abandoned those who remain excluded from neoliberal ideas of rights. The neoliberal queer fought hard for the right to same sex marriage, but they do not align with Black, Indigenous, and racialized queers who are calling for an end to policing institutions. Central to the process of creating the neoliberal queer has been the creation of historical narratives in which some events are remembered, but others are forgotten.

For example, in the neoliberal queer historical narrative, the decriminalization of homosexuality in Canada occurred in 1969. According to this myth, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau proclaimed, “there’s no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation,” and then passed a law that decriminalized homosexuality. The problem with the 1969 reform is that it did not produce decriminalization. No laws were repealed, and the limited reform only applied to buggery (anal intercourse) and gross indecency. It did not change any of the other laws that criminalized homosexuality, including indecent acts, vagrancy, obscenity, and the bawdy-house law. As a result, the number of queers criminalized after 1969 dramatically escalated with the expansion of police forces across major urban centres. This is what enabled the bathhouse raids. This history of criminalization in the 1970s and beyond is incompatible with the neoliberal queer’s alignment with policing institutions, and so it had to be erased from the narrative. Gary’s analysis helps explain why and how this has happened.

In my graduate work, *The Regulation of Desire* and Gary's later work with Patrizia Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, were central texts that shaped my efforts to reconstruct the history of the Toronto bathhouse raids. Codenamed "Operation Soap," it remains one of the largest mass arrests in Canadian history, behind the use of the War Measures Act during the 1970 FLQ crisis and the 2010 police action against demonstrators during the G20 meeting in Toronto. On February 5, 1981, 200 police agents stormed four gay bathhouses and arrested 306 men. 286 bathhouse customers were charged with the criminal code offence of being found in a common bawdy house, while twenty bathhouse owners and employees were charged with keeping a common bawdy house. These bawdy-house offences were historically used to criminalize places of sex work but could also be used when there were "acts of indecency" taking place. After the bathhouse raids, the reaction from the maturing queer political community was swift. A group called the Right to Privacy Committee organized a series of major street protests to send a message that queers would fight back against the police. Although this event is often cited in popular histories, the 1981 bathhouse raids are characterized as a mistake, an unusual step backwards in a historical narrative designed to interpret a liberal, progressive view of the queer past. Inspired by the *Regulation of Desire*, I knew that the bathhouse raids were not unusual at all. Instead, the raids were part of a much broader history of marginalization, oppression, and moral regulation. Furthermore, these forms of oppression were not confined to the experience of queers, but included those marginalized based on race, class, disability, age, and health status. The problem is these intersectional connections have been erased and forgotten.

In the present edition of the *Regulation of Desire*, Gary helps explain this erasure and forgetting. Expanding on theories related to homonormativity and homonationalism, Gary identifies the creation of the neoliberal queer as contributing to a "social organization of forgetting." Since the 1990s, a mostly white gay middle class has expanded the formation of a commercialized and gentrified queer community, one that is invested in obtaining certain formal rights from the state. The political priorities of the neoliberal queer differed from those involved in broader struggles against oppression and marginalization. Political platforms that offered a "respectable" queer image, including campaigns for same-sex marriage, were prioritized over struggles that included queer eroticism, decolonization, and anti-racism, as well as confronting the gender binary, or reimagining the world for disabled people. Queer issues became isolated from these broader struggles, leading mainstream queer organizations to abandon racialized, Indigenous, disabled, poor, and working-class movements. This abandonment also requires the construction of respectable, neoliberal queer historical narratives, ones that serve to isolate queer issues by eliminating historic connections to broader struggles.

Very few popular recollections of the bathhouse raids include the important links between queers, racialized queers, and broader racialized communities who were fighting against police violence. On February 6, 1981, the day after the Operation Soap raids, thousands of queers took to the streets expressing their rage against Toronto Police. This was not a "respectable" protest. It was angry. The resounding chant had the crowd screaming, "No more shit!" and "Fuck you, 52!" referring to 52 Division, the police sta-

tion responsible for the raids. Toward the end of the demonstration, the crowd came very close to storming the legislature at Queen's Park. Among those at the forefront of the protest was Cree actor and writer Billy Merasty, who remembers that the doors of the legislature were shaking as the crowd moved forward.¹ Similarly, at another rally on February 20, 1981, only two weeks after the Operation Soap raids, Lemona Johnson was a highlighted speaker. Johnson was the widow of Albert Johnson, a Black man killed by police in the summer of 1979. This was part of a much broader effort by queer activists to develop ties to racialized communities in Toronto. However, historical narratives advanced by the neoliberal queer have constructed queer history as being white in character, erasing the role of Indigenous, Black, and racialized communities in mutual struggle. It also has erased the existence of Indigenous, Black, and racialized queers who were central to the bathhouse raid resistance. The neoliberal queer historical narrative has little room for remembrance of police violence. As Gary has articulated in this third edition, the police have been redefined by the neoliberal queer as allies, and problems with policing are contained, isolated, and relegated to the distant past.

Since the second edition was published in 1996, Gary has experienced additional "entry points," his personal political experiences that have informed and grounded his analysis and understanding, much like my first reading of *The Regulation of Desire*. These deep reflections include the 2016 Black Lives Matter protest of Pride Toronto, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau's apology to queer communities in 2017, the 2019 celebrations of the so-called decriminalization of homosexuality in 1969, the COVID-19 pandemic, the global uprising against anti-Black racism in 2020, and the RCMP invasion of Wet'suwet'en land for pipeline construction in 2021. These and other experiences directly inspired the publication of this book. As a historian and activist, I had the privilege of joining Gary during several of these events and what follows are some reflections on my own entry points in understanding the regulation of desire. These collaborations with Gary and other activists helped me understand the queer apologies, first by Toronto Chief of Police Mark Saunders in 2016, and then the apology by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau in 2017. We then appeared together before parliamentary committees during the study of the expungement bill C-66 and the criminal-law repeal bill C-75. We helped organize the Anti-69 Conference at Carleton University to confront the myths of the 1969 criminal code reform. Finally, we have confronted the corporate structure of Pride Toronto and organized a community alternative with the No Pride in Policing Coalition. During each of these entry points, Gary and I encountered the neoliberal queer.

A first entry point was when I attended the Toronto Police's so-called statement of regret regarding the bathhouse raids, delivered by police chief Mark Saunders during Pride month on June 22, 2016. Saunders's statement was celebrated in the media as an apology, but it was quite limited, and he never actually apologized. Saunders ignored the ongoing police attacks on Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer and trans people, and the statement of regret instead focused on the "lessons from that period," which were labelled a "dark era." While some in the crowd were enthusiastic about this moment, I was intrigued by the lukewarm reception of Saunders's words. This divide was further

shown by the reaction from those who were part of the September 2000 police raid on the Pussy Palace, a women's and trans bathhouse event. They rejected Saunders's statement. This collective of women and trans people has a long history of activism resisting the police. They battled the Pussy Palace raid in the courts, and on January 31, 2002, a judge ruled that the raid was a violation of Charter rights prohibiting unreasonable search. The charges stemming from the raid were all dismissed. The collective also brought a human rights complaint. On March 31, 2005, a judge approved a settlement in the case. Police were forced to pay \$350,000 in legal fees for those charged, with the remaining balance going to charity. They were also forced to implement sensitivity training for officers to be educated about the queer community. The individual officers involved in the raid were forced to apologize to the collective, but this did not equate to an apology from the Toronto Police as an institution, nor did it represent a fundamental shift in the nature of policing. They rejected Saunders's regrets because meaningful, systemic change had not been realized since the Pussy Palace raid.

For the neoliberal queer, the chief's "regrets" were supposed to represent closure and erasure of the past. As Gary has outlined in these chapters, the responses by Black, Indigenous, and racialized queers argued that the so-called apology was nothing more than a publicity stunt designed to deflect from criticism of policing in the present. The direct action by Black Lives Matter during the 2016 Toronto pride parade, merely days after the chief's "regrets," represented an important moment of resistance to the emergence of the neoliberal queer. In the middle of the parade at the corner of Yonge and College Streets, Black Lives Matter stopped the parade and presented Pride Toronto with a list of demands aimed at addressing the queer community's anti-Black racism. Among their demands was a call for police to be removed as participants from the pride festival. The counterreactions by some white neoliberal queers to BLM's direct action and demands represented a significant disjuncture within the community. As Gary has shown, lawyer and spokesperson for Egale's Just Society Committee Douglas Elliott, accused Black Lives Matter of "hijacking" the Toronto Pride parade because of this demand. Elliott also lamented the increasing discussion about anti-racism in Pride Toronto. This neoliberal queer narrative denies the role of Black activism in Pride Toronto's founding history, including Lemona Johnson, who joined in resisting the police violence of the bathhouse raids.

My second entry point was another apology that demonstrated the further entrenchment of the neoliberal queer, this time from the federal government. Around the same time as the police chief's "regrets," there seemed to be some movement within the federal government toward delivering an apology to queer people. This coincided with a then-ongoing legal settlement with queer members of the military and civil service who had been purged or otherwise mistreated due to their gender or sexuality. It was also part of discussions about possibly offering a pardon to those who were previously convicted of criminal offences due to homosexuality. This movement was the result of decades of activism from a group of purge survivors and activists, many of whom formed the We Demand an Apology Network in 2015. Gary was part of this group and invited me to join. We noticed that conversations around a possible pardon were being limited to the

crime of gross indecency, excluding other offences used to criminalize queer people. These conversations excluded the bawdy-house law used in the mass arrest of the 1981 Toronto bathhouse raids. We also noticed the apology process was being placed in the hands of lawyers, bureaucrats, and queer non-profit organizations, including Egale. These professions and organizations can be easily associated with attributes of the respectable neoliberal queer, and they lobbied for what would ultimately be a neoliberal queer apology.

On November 27, 2017, Gary and I met in Ottawa for what would be the first of many interventions against the neoliberal queer. It was the day of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau's apology to queer people in Canada. During the apology speech in the House of Commons, Gary was watching in person with purge survivors, whereas I was sitting in a radio booth at the CBC building. I was scheduled to appear on a dozen radio stations to provide immediate reaction to the apology. That same morning, immediately before the apology, a draft of the bill to issue pardons for past homosexual offences was made available. While waiting for my radio interviews, I realized my previous fears were coming true: the bawdy-house law was left out of the bill and those arrested in the bathhouse raids were excluded. As the Prime Minister delivered his apology, I watched from a small screen in the radio booth. The speech was eloquent and well researched. To my surprise, Trudeau explicitly mentioned the bathhouse raids and the bawdy-house law as examples of the harm for which he was apologizing. As a result of this contradiction, my radio soundbite became: "Why would he apologize for the bawdy-house law but then keep it out of the pardon bill?" The creation of neoliberal queer historical narratives helps explain this discrepancy between the words and actions behind the apology. The offences included in the bill were the same that were reformed in 1969: buggery and gross indecency. If bawdy houses were included in the bill, it would legally acknowledge the limits of the 1969 reform. This exclusion is tied to the neoliberal queer's desire to be included as a respectable citizen—sex was to be monogamous and private. The neoliberal queer is respectable in the bedrooms of the nation, but not in its bathhouses.

As I was leaving the CBC building, Gary was walking in to appear on CBC television. I agreed to wait for him so we could go somewhere to eat and debrief. Later, as we shared a taxi to a restaurant, Gary was somewhat elated. The apology was a major event that represented a long-fought battle by community activists and purge survivors, and it was worth a moment of celebration. That moment was brief, however, as we knew we had to do something about the pardon bill.

Although the initial discussions with the federal government focused on using the existing pardon process to address historically unjust convictions, the bill introduced on the same day as the Prime Minister's apology went further than this. Bill C-66 created a system to expunge these criminal records. In other words, the records would be destroyed. This was viewed as beneficial. A pardon suggests the convicted person did something wrong but had earned the right to be pardoned of that offence. An expungement, on the other hand, suggests that the criminal record should never have been created in the first place because the conviction itself was historically unjust. However, the limitations of the bill were glaring. Gary and I joined with two other activist scholars,

Steven Maynard and Patrizia Gentile, to try to advocate for changes to Bill c-66. The four of us became known as a Gay and Lesbian Historians Group and we prepared a submission to Members of Parliament. We argued that the number of offences covered by the bill—only gross indecency and buggery—were too narrow. The number of expungeable offences should have been broadened to include the same bawdy-house law used in the bath raids and referenced in Trudeau’s apology, as well as indecent acts, vagrancy, and other laws used to criminalize queers. We also called attention to the ongoing use of criminal laws against sex workers and those living with HIV. Finally, while expungement was better than a pardon, the destruction of historical records was concerning. While the privacy of those charged must be protected, scholars, activists, and communities deserve to know the full truth about these oppressive state practices. We deserve to have access to the paper trail that enabled queer criminalization. By destroying documents, this bill threatens to contribute to the process of forgetting that is central to the creation of neoliberal queer historical narratives. Despite our pleas, we were denied the right to make a submission during committee study of the bill. As a result, Bill c-66 was unanimously adopted by MPs at an expedited third reading. During that debate, though, Green Party leader Elizabeth May read the names of the Gay and Lesbian Historians Group into the parliamentary record and repeated many of our concerns.

Once the House of Commons adopted c-66, our only option to demand changes was in the Senate. The Standing Senate Committee on Human Rights studied the bill in April 2018. This gave us a few months to build a community-based coalition that included the Gay and Lesbian Historians Group, sex workers, lawyers, and other activists. Working alongside Gary, my primary task as part of this coalition was to showcase the importance of including the bawdy-house law in the expungement bill. I worked with Ron Rosenes, one of the men convicted in the 1981 Toronto bathhouse raids, to obtain police and court records of his conviction using freedom of information requests. We showed that the bawdy-house law continued to oppress queer people through these criminal records. This grounded our activism in important ways, we knew the exclusion of so many from Bill c-66 had real-world consequences for people in our communities. My second task was to show that bathhouse raids and bawdy-house charges were not isolated to February 5, 1981, they were widespread from the 1960s to 2000s. I worked with Gary and the other historians to produce a chart called “Bathhouse Raids in Canada, 1968–2004,” showing thirty-eight raids of bathhouses or bars involving more than 1,300 charges under the bawdy-house law. This visual representation of the magnitude of the bathhouse raids became an important tool in our coalition’s appearance before the Senate.

Several speakers from our coalition appeared before the Senate’s human rights committee on April 18, 2018. This included Angela Chaisson and Maya Borooh from the Criminal Lawyers Association, Ron Rosenes, Gary, and me. The morning of our appearance, we worked with members of the Canadian Centre for Gender and Sexual Diversity to arrange access to the press briefing room on Parliament Hill. After our press conference, we spoke before the Senate’s human rights committee. Other speak-

ers who appeared before the committee also spoke in favour of our coalition's position, including Ross Higgins and Jacques Prince from the Quebec Gay Archives, as well as lawyer James Lockyer from Innocence Canada. Ultimately the Senate did not make any changes to the bill. The government had one ally amid the community deputations: Egale. Martine Roy, representing Egale's Just Society Committee, quoted Voltaire and urged the Senate to pass Bill C-66 in its original form, passage of which excluded Ron Rosenes and many others from having their records expunged. The third edition of the *Regulation of Desire* helps us understand the limits of the apology but also the role of Egale in the further entrenchment of the neoliberal queer.

Despite this betrayal by Egale, our campaign in the Senate produced a meaningful report by the human rights committee. Although they kept the expungement bill as is, the committee report outlined several offences in the criminal code that should be repealed so that they might one day qualify for expungement. This was a crucial report. One of the reasons the government refused to add bawdy houses to Bill C-66 was due to the bawdy-house law's continued existence in the criminal code. Only offences that had been repealed would qualify. Under this logic, Bill C-66 included gross indecency because it was repealed in 1988, and expungements of records for buggery could be included in Bill C-66 because it was an offence to be repealed in another bill, C-75.

Bill C-75 represented another entry point, but also another opportunity for our coalition. C-75 was introduced only a few weeks before our appearance at the senate on C-66. Having learned many lessons from our C-66 experience, our coalition was better prepared to fight for changes. C-75 was a massive bill that, in part, repealed several outdated provisions of the criminal code. This included the previous buggery offence that was later renamed "anal intercourse." Like C-66, however, C-75 did not include the repeal of other offences historically used against queer people, including indecent acts, vagrancy, and the bawdy-house law. Gary and I worked with the other historians to produce a briefing on C-75, this time aimed at the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. On September 17, 2018, Ron Rosenes was the first to appear on behalf of the coalition. Ron's goal was to amend C-75 so that it includes the repeal of this offence, both because he was convicted of this in the bathhouse raids, and because he stood in solidarity with sex workers who were the primary targets of the law. While there, Ron met with the New Democratic Party's member of the justice committee, Murray Rankin, asking him to make a motion to amend C-75.

Gary and I appeared before the justice committee the following week. Before our appearance we met with Rankin in his parliamentary office, we convinced him of the coalition's demands to amend C-75 to repeal bawdy houses, vagrancy, and indecent acts from the criminal code. Rankin joined our coalition for a press conference in support of our demands. We then walked to the committee meeting room. As Gary outlines in Chapter 11, committee chair Anthony Housefather approached us when we first entered the room. The message from the government was that they would not amend the bill to repeal the bawdy-house law. After Gary and I made our presentation, Rankin informed the committee that he would motion to amend C-75 to repeal the three offences. This placed the government in a precarious position. Rankin's motion forced a committee

vote directly on this issue. Liberal MP Randy Boissonnault was a member of the justice committee and had been appointed as a special advisor to the prime minister on 2SLGBTQ issues. Rankin's move would have forced Boissonnault to directly vote on maintaining a law that was specifically mentioned in the prime minister's apology. The government changed its mind. Housefather and the justice committee wrote amendments that repealed bawdy houses and vagrancy from the criminal code. Indecent acts were left in place because they argued the law still in use today has not been ruled unconstitutional by the courts. Throughout this process, Gary and I met in Toronto's Church and Wellesley village to strategize. During the summer of 2018 we were discussing C-66, C-75, and the focus on the crimes of buggery/anal intercourse and gross indecency. The exclusion of bawdy houses, indecent acts, and other forms of queer criminalization was not an accident. Gary and I sat at Glad Day Bookstore and decided we needed to gather academics and activists to confront the mythology of the 1969 criminal code reform.

Another entry point was Anti-69, which started as a conference. Gary and I joined with River Rossi, Cassandra Lord, Suzanne Lenon, Karen Pearlston, and Lara Karaian to bring together 130 participants at Carleton University in March 2019. This later expanded into the Anti-69 Network that engaged in various counter-celebration events throughout 2019. Anti-69 brought together many critical voices, including Indigenous, Black, racialized, and trans people. On April 23, 2019, various neoliberal queer groups gathered with federal government representatives at The 519 to launch a special-edition coin released by the Canadian Mint in celebration of 1969. Gary and I joined with sex-work activist Valerie Scott, Black community scholars Beverly Bain and Rinaldo Walcott, and Ron Rosenes to host a press conference ahead of the event. We then walked to The 519 and sat in the back rows of the coin launch holding up Anti-69 signs. Another intervention inspired by Anti-69 was using access to information requests to determine what other federal government celebrations of 1969 were being funded beyond the coin. We discovered the federal Department of Canadian Heritage spent more than \$2 million to fund various celebrations of the 1969 criminal code reform, including a \$250,000 grant provided to Pride Toronto.

Pride Toronto betrayed our communities in several ways through these grants. Although Pride festivals pre-date 1981 and were typically held in August, the current version of Pride Toronto as a June event is deeply embedded in the history of the bathhouse raids and criminalization. Despite the mass community resistance in February 1981, the police again raided the baths that June. The protest on June 20, 1981, was called the Battle of Church Street and involved widespread police brutality. Why was Pride Toronto celebrating "decriminalization" in 1969? If homosexuality had actually been decriminalized in 1969, Pride Toronto as we know it would not exist. In their grant application, Pride Toronto promised to focus on police services as part of their celebrations of 1969. This was a betrayal both of history but also of the demands from the 2016 Black Lives Matter protest. Finally, this was a betrayal because Pride Toronto promised the grant funds would go towards Indigenous artists. The \$250,000 from Canadian Heritage was a small portion of a larger project involving three other grants worth a total of \$2,850,000. Instead of going to Indigenous artists, funds were misappropriated

to cover staff salaries and to pay off debt.² Pride Toronto has emerged as a neoliberal queer organization, fully detached from its protest roots in 1981.

For both Pride Toronto and the federal government, the primary objective of these grants was to bring police participation back into pride. Forgetting the continued criminalization of queers after 1969 was central to achieving this objective. Doing so further assists in a larger, ongoing project of erasing and forgetting past and present injustices against queer, Black, Indigenous, and racialized communities. Beginning in 2016, Gary and I have maintained membership in Pride Toronto and have tried to work from within to ensure the demands by Black Lives Matter be honoured. In 2018, when Pride Toronto began securing grants to invite police to participate, Gary and I joined with other activists and scholars to form the No Pride In Policing Coalition (NPPC). This coalition takes its leadership from Black, Indigenous, and racialized queer, trans, and Two-Spirit people. Since 2020, NPPC has held an abolitionist pride rally as an alternative to the corporate Pride parade. Although initially formed to keep police out of Pride, NPPC has become a central voice in the carceral abolition movement in Toronto.

Despite the efforts of groups like NPPC, neoliberal queer histories have continued to be further entrenched, particularly within the federal government. Recent efforts to expand the expungement eligibility have continued to portray a queer past that is separate from other struggles, in particular sex workers. With the success of C-75, Rosenes subsequently applied for an expungement but was refused, in part because the bawdy-house law was not included in Bill C-66. Due to these and other limitations, only nine expungements in total have been granted. In March 2023, the federal government attempted to address this by adding bawdy houses to the list of offenses that would qualify. However, this came with a stipulation that there could be no allegations of sex work in the conviction. The Gay and Lesbian Historians group published a response highlighting the historic connections between the policing of queers and sex workers. Both queers and sex workers were policed under the same offenses, including gross indecency and the bawdy-house law. It was also common for police to include allegations of sex work when raiding gay bathhouses. We noted that men like Rosenes would continue to be ineligible for expungement. During the 1981 Toronto bathhouse raids, police alleged without evidence that sex work was taking place in the baths. These allegations are printed on Rosenes's arrest record.³

These experiences with Gary confronting neoliberal queer history have been foundational to my becoming a queer historian. My life, scholarship, and activism has fundamentally changed because of Gary Kinsman's scholarship, mentorship, and friendship. The third edition of the *Regulation of Desire* is the continuation of a struggle that is grounded in transformative movements. This book is a result of several new "entry points" for Gary, moments of struggle that revealed broader social relations. I have been lucky enough to be beside him through many of these. As Gary often reminds me, quoting a slogan from the spring 1968 rebellions in France, "the struggle continues."

FOREWORD

- 1 “Why Attend International AIDS Conference,” 2022, <https://aids2022.org/about/why-attend/>.
- 2 OmiSoore Dryden and Onye Nnorom, “Time to Dismantle Systemic Anti-Black Racism in Medicine in Canada,” *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 193, no. 2 (2021): E55–E57; Cornel Grey, Ian Liujiu Tian, and Daniel Grace, “Will You Take on the Challenge? Combatting Racism in Our Communities Will Require All Our Efforts,” <https://www.engage-men.ca/will-you-take-on-the-challenge-combatting-racism-in-our-communities-will-require-all-our-efforts/>; Andrew Tompkins, “‘Driving Wedges’ and ‘Hijacking’ Pride: Disrupting Narratives of Black Inclusion in LGBT Politics and the Canadian National Imaginary,” *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 10, no. 6 (2020): 1214–41; OmiSoore Dryden and Suzanne Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion: Canadian Homonationalisms and the Politics of Belonging* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2015).

INTRODUCTION TO THE THIRD EDITION

- 1 On this use of “the personal is political,” see the work of Dorothy E. Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic: Towards a Feminist Sociology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987); and *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory and Investigation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).
- 2 Although I am referring largely to settler history here, this is also called Tkaronto. This land is the territory of many nations including the Mississaugas of the Credit, the Anishnaabeg, the Chippewa, the Haudenosaunee, and the Wendat peoples, and is now home to many diverse First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples. This is Dish With One Spoon Territory. The Dish With One Spoon is a treaty between the Anishinaabe, Mississaugas, and Haudenosaunee that bound them to share the territory and protect the land. Subsequent Indigenous Nations and peoples, Europeans and newcomers, have been invited into this treaty in the spirit of peace, friendship and respect. The “Dish,” sometimes called the “Bowl,” represents what is now southern Ontario. We all eat out of the Dish—all of us that share this territory—with only one spoon. That means we have to share the responsibility of ensuring the dish is never empty, which includes taking care of the land and the creatures we share it with. Importantly, there are no knives at the table, representing that we must keep the peace.
- 3 At the time of writing, thousands of bodies had been identified and recovered and this was only from a small number of these “schools.” The existence of these bodies was widely known among Indigenous people and recognized in the Truth and Reconciliation report: <https://nctr.ca/records/reports/#trc-reportsreference>. These bodies were not being “found” but recovered. Similar problems were also generated in day schools as well. See Kathleen Martens and Brittany Guyot, “200 Students Died at 46 Day Schools in Canada,

- Federal Documents Reveal,” *APTN National News*, October 6, 2021, sec. National News, <https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/federal-day-schools-indigenous-students-deaths-canada/>.
- 4 The term “unhoused” is now often being used by social agencies and advocates and is accurate in the sense that, for many people, encampments in parks and other places are their homes. At the same time, most people still describe and organize around this issue as “homelessness.”
 - 5 At the same time, there are also developments that I been unable to address and integrate. For instance, I have not been able to address the Russian imperialist invasion of Ukraine, and the whiteness of much of the LGBT+ response.
 - 6 See Egale (website), <https://egale.ca/>.
 - 7 See LGBT Purge Fund (website), <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/>.
 - 8 See Gary Kinsman, “No Return to ‘Normal’ LGBT Politics!” *Canadian Dimension*, February 14, 2022, <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/no-return-to-normal-lgbt-politics>.
 - 9 On the social organization of forgetting, see Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 37–38.
 - 10 One front of struggle has been against the monuments to colonial history that litter official sites across “Canada.” In Winnipeg, at the assembly on July 1, 2021, statues of two queens (Victoria and Elizabeth) were brought down, following the bringing down of the statue of Egerton Ryerson on June 6 in Toronto. Ryerson was an architect of the residential school system. This is why many students and faculty started to call the university officially named after him X University, finally leading, at the end of August 2021, to a decision to officially change the name of the university. In late April 2022, the new name, Toronto Metropolitan University, was announced (I prefer X University). On July 14, 2021, a statue of residential “school” and genocide supporter (and the first “Canadian” Prime Minister) John A. Macdonald was brought down in Hamilton.
 - 11 In particular, see the struggle at 1492 Land Back Lane. Six Nations of the Grand River Land Defenders, “1492 Land Back Lane,” Facebook, accessed May 17, 2022, <https://www.facebook.com/1492LandBackLane/>.
 - 12 Gidimt’en Yintah Access (website), <https://www.yintahaccess.com>. At the same time, those who actively spoke out in support of these Indigenous protests faced racist and settler opposition. When Harsha Walia, in solidarity, wrote in a tweet that we needed to “burn it all down,” referring to colonizing and genocidal institutions, she faced a barrage of racist/colonial responses. She was forced to leave her position with the BC Civil Liberties Association as a result of that association’s “liberal” response, separating itself from Walia. This was exactly the wrong approach. Also see Kelly Hayes and Mariame Kaba, *Let This Radicalize You: Organizing and the Revolution of Reciprocal Care* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2023), 141–44.
 - 13 On state formation, see Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985).
 - 14 Pam Palmater, “Combating Racism in Canada: Genocide,” August 1, 2020, YouTube video, 12:31, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BDZHjTXMq3Y>. On social relations to the land, see Mike Gouldhawke, “Land as a Social Relationship,” *Briarpatch*, September 10, 2020, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/land-as-a-social-relationship>.
 - 15 APTN National News, “Canada Guilty of Cultural Genocide against Indigenous Peoples: TRC,” *APTN News*, June 2, 2015, sec. National News, <https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/canada-guilty-cultural-genocide-indigenous-peoples-trc-2/>.

- 16 For third and fourth genders, see Will Roscoe, *Changing Ones: Third and Fourth Genders in Native North America* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1998); Sabine Lang, "Lesbians, Men-Women, and Two-Spirits: Homosexuality and Gender in Native American Cultures," in *Constructing Sexualities: Readings in Sexuality, Gender, and Culture*, ed. Suzanne LaFont (1999; Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003), 202–18. Regarding fifth genders, among the Bugis in South Sulawesi, Indonesia, there are five different genders, including one for what we might now call the "intersexed." See Anne Fausto-Sterling, "The Five Sexes Revisited," *The Sciences* (July/August 2000): 19–32; and Fausto-Sterling, "The Five Sexes: Why Male and Female are Not Enough," in LaFont, *Constructing Sexualities*, 166–71.
- 17 See Yasmini Nasered, "The Struggle Against Canadian Repression at 1492 Land Back Lane," *The Strand* 63, no. 2 (September 15, 2020), <https://thestrاند.ca/the-struggle-against-canadian-repression-at-1492-land-back-lane/>; Pam Palmater, "Mi'kmaw Treaty Rights, Reconciliation, and the 'Rule of Law,'" *Canadian Dimension*, September 22, 2020, <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/mikmaw-treaty-rights-reconciliation-and-the-rule-of-law-and-others>.
- 18 See Himani Bannerji, *Thinking Through* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1995); and also Gary Kinsman, "Solidarity And Responsibility: Developing Anti-Oppression Politics," *New Socialist*, no. 32, accessed May 17, 2022, https://newsocialist.org/old_mag/magazine/32/article04.html.
- 19 "Against and beyond" is a phrase I have taken from John Holloway's *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism: The San Francisco Lectures* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2016).
- 20 Social form is an expression used to emphasize the social and historically made character of what is often normalized and naturalized. It provides a way of opening up institutions and relations for critical social and historical investigation. See Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*; and John Holloway, *How to Change the World Without Taking Power* (London: Pluto Press, 2005).
- 21 See John Holloway, *Crack Capitalism* (London: Pluto Press, 2010); *How to Change the World Without Taking Power*; and *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*. For an illustration of this usage, see Dorothy Smith's comparison of political-economy discussions of class versus that of Marx in *The Communist Manifesto*. Smith reminds us that, in *The Communist Manifesto*, readers "are placed pronominally; the bourgeoisie is directly addressed as Other, in opposition to the 'we' situated on this, our, side of the struggle... 'We' are the communists, whose position is stated by the communist authors; 'we' creates a position for a subject in the text that is home for whoever takes our side; 'we' are placed by this textual act in class struggle.... The text places the reader historically; class struggle is going on, and we are in the middle of it." Dorothy E. Smith, "Feminist Reflections on Political Economy," in *Writing the Social*, 34.
- 22 No Pride in Policing Coalition, "NPPC Pride March and Rally," Facebook, streamed live on June 27, 2021, Facebook Live video, 3:21:24, https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?ref=watch_permalink&v=301870958291252. For Abolitionist Pride in 2022, see Beverly Bain and Gary Kinsman, "Context Notes: Abolitionist Pride, 2022," No Pride in Policing Coalition, <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/statements/abolitionist-pride-2022/>. In 2023, more than 2,000 people joined at No More Shit! Abolitionist and Anti-Fascist Pride March on June 25th. See <https://www.facebook.com/NoPrideInPolicingCoalition>. A series of digital teach-ins were also organized as events leading up to this action. See <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/>.
- 23 I use radical in the sense of "getting to the root of the problem." As Ella Baker wrote in 1969, "I use the term *radical* in its original meaning—getting down to and understanding the root cause." Quoted in Barbara Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement*:

- A Radical Democratic Vision* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 1. On this broader abolitionist approach, see Rinaldo Walcott, *On Property* (Windsor, ON: Biblioasis, 2021); Shiri Pasternak, Abby Stadnyk, and Kevin Walby, eds., *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle: Police Abolition in Canada* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2022); Angela Davis, Gina Dent, Erica Meiners, and Beth Richie, *Abolition. Feminism. Now.* (Chicago: Haymarket, 2022); Hayes and Kaba, *Let This Radicalize You*; Mariame Kaba, *We Do This 'Til We Free Us: Abolitionist Organizing and Transforming Justice* (Chicago: Haymarket, 2021); and Robyn Maynard and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living* (Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2022).
- 24 This was largely drawn from my reading of Marx's early work and his critique of the limited character of rights and equality within capitalist social relations, and the legal and political forms they took. This led, when I was involved in the Revolutionary Marxist Group in the mid- to later 1970s, to a critique of the human-rights strategy then becoming hegemonic within gay and, to some extent, lesbian organizing, not only as moving away from the liberationist roots of gay liberation and lesbian feminism but also as only addressing the oppressions we faced in formal and limited ways. On some of this, see Deborah Brock, "'Workers of the World Caress': An interview with Gary Kinsman on gay and lesbian organizing in the 1970's Toronto Left," *Left History*, http://www.yorku.ca/lefthist/online/brock_kinsman.html. Also see Revolutionary Marxist Group, "Contribution to the Discussion on Perspectives for the Gay Movement," *Left History*, Documentary Collection: Gay and Lesbian Activism in the 1970s, 1975, https://www.yorku.ca/lefthist/online/doc_pages/contribi.html.
- 25 See Eric A. Stanley and Nat Smith, eds., *Captive Genders: Trans Embodiment and the Prison Industrial Complex* (Oakland: AK Press, 2011)..
- 26 Ruth Wilson Gilmore, "Abolition Feminism," in *Revolutionary Feminisms: Conversations on Collective Action and Radical Thought*, ed. Brenna Bhandar and Rafeef Ziadah (New York: Verso Books, 2020), 171. Also see Kaba, *We Do This 'Til We Free Us*; Davis, Dent, Meiners, and Richie, *Abolition. Feminism. Now.*; "Choosing Real Safety: A Historic Declaration To Divest From Policing And Prisons And Build Safer Communities For All," accessed May 18, 2022, Choosing Real Safety, <https://www.choosingrealsafety.com/declaration>. Also see Pasternak, Stadnyk, and Walby, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*; and Scholar Strike Canada, "Defund, Demilitarize and Abolish Police, Prisons and All Forms of Carcerality," March 21–22, 2022, <https://www.scholarstrikecanada.ca/teach-in-summary>. I return in Chapter 12 to abolitionist approaches to social transformation.
- 27 In McCaskell's *Queer Progress*, there is often a suggestion that racism and "homophobia" are not intrinsic and integral to capitalist social relations, but instead matters of separable democratic rights and struggles. This undermines the interlocking character between racism and the organization of capitalist social relations. See Tim McCaskell, *Queer Progress: From Homophobia to Homonationalism* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2016), 137–69.
- 28 See Himani Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 29 Indigenous people cannot really be described as "homeless" in the same way on their own territories. On struggles for housing and in defence of the encampments in Toronto, see A.J. Withers, *Fight to Win: Inside Poor People's Organizing* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2021).
- 30 On Hamilton, see the Hamilton Encampment Support Network (HESN) (website), <https://hesn.ca/>.
- 31 See A.J. Withers and Amie Tsang, "Where There's Smoke, There's No Fire," *Briarpatch*, April 30, 2022, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/where-theres-smoke-theres-no-fire>.

- 32 People later that day were attacked by police at 14 Division of Toronto Police when they went there to try to get a number of those arrested released. Later in September, the police arrested people at a media conference and circulated photos of people they wanted to arrest as police went on a campaign against the Encampment Support Network, enlisting mainstream media support. See Jessica Patton, “3 More Arrested, 8 Still Wanted in Connection with Lamport Stadium Encampment Clearing Protest – Toronto | Globalnews.ca,” *Global News*, September 16, 2021, sec. Crime, <https://globalnews.ca/news/8195990/lamport-stadium-encampment-arrests-toronto-police/>. These arrests included Skyler Williams, an Indigenous activist with 1492 Land Back Lane. See Megan Ross, “Skyler Williams Is a Political Prisoner,” *Canadian Dimension*, October 14, 2021, <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/skyler-williams-is-a-political-prisoner>. Cha-nese Ila, a Black woman, was tackled by police leaving the same media conference. See Cha-nese Ila, “I Went to Protest Toronto’s Violent Encampment Removals. I Was Profiled, Frisked and Wrongfully Arrested,” *Toronto Star*, September 29, 2021, sec. Contributors, Opinion, <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/contributors/2021/09/29/i-went-to-protest-torontos-violent-encampment-removals-i-was-profiled-frisked-and-wrongfully-arrested.html>.
- 33 See Jamie Magnusson and Beverly Bain, “Expanding the Policing and Prison Industrial Complex: Containing Cities and Privatizing Public Space through Surveillance, Criminalization, and Financialized Racial Capitalism,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, January 2022, <https://www.noprizeinpolicing.ca/nppc/jan-2022-discussion-paper/>. Part of the police repression of the Hamilton encampment support organizing was the arrest of a number of young Black activists, and their charges were only dropped after a major campaign. Those charged included Nessa Ezra Amos, who was found dead in Toronto in late March of 2022. On Ezra Amos, see Hamilton Encampment Support Network (@HamOntESN), “This timeline of events leading up to and following Nessa/Ezra Amos’ death created alongside friends & family,” Twitter thread, April 8, 2022, <https://twitter.com/HamOntESN/status/1512456669883772933/photo/1>.
- 34 On knowing otherwise also, see Alexis Shotwell, *Knowing Otherwise: Race, Gender, and Implicit Understanding* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011).
- 35 For my earlier writings on this, see Kinsman, “Some Notes on Learning from AIDS Activism for Our Responses to the Coronavirus/COVID-19 Pandemic” and “SILENCE=DEATH, ACTION=LIFE: New Relevance in COVID Pandemic Times,” *Radical Noise*, April 6, 2021, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2021/04/06/silencedeath-action-life-new-relevance-in-covid-pandemic-times/>; in French, “Quelques leçons du militantisme anti-SIDA pour s’organiser dans le contexte de la pandémie du Coronavirus (COVID-19),” *Ouvrage*, May 11, 2020, <http://www.revue-ouvrage.org/quelques-lecons-du-militantisme-anti-sida-pour-sorganiser-dans-le-contexte-de-la-pandemie-du-coronavirus-covid-19/>.
- 36 See Nora Loreto, *Spin Doctors: How Media and Politicians Misdiagnosed the COVID-19 Pandemic* (Halifax: Fernwood, 2021). Loreto was also the only person who collected the vital stats on infections and deaths in long-term care in 2020 and 2021. For an early critical analysis of the social organization of the pandemic against Black people, see Beverly Bain, OmíSoore H. Dryden and Rinaldo Walcott, “Coronavirus Discriminates against Black Lives through Surveillance, Policing and the Absence of Health Data,” *Dalhousie News*, April 23, 2020, <https://www.dal.ca/news/2020/04/23/coronavirus-discriminates-against-black-lives-through-surveillance.html>. For critiques of the mobilization of herd immunity in the pandemic, see Angela Mitropoulos, “‘Herd Immunity’ Was Originally about Vaccination. Now It Is Neoliberal Violence,” interview by Max Haiven, *Truthout*, October 21, 2020, <https://truthout.org/articles/herd-immunity-was-originally-about-vaccination-now-it-is>

- neoliberal-violence/. For a very useful critique of a “left-wing” defence of herd immunity, see Michael Friedman, “Yih and Kulldorf’s ‘Radical’ Covid Strategy: A Recipe for Disaster,” *Spectre*, September 24, 2020, <https://spectrejournal.com/yih-and-kulldorffs-radical-covid-strategy/>. The dominant public health strategy pursued across the “Canadian” state, until recently, “flatten the curve,” was only intended to prevent the hospitals from being overwhelmed, and therefore allowed death and infection to spread in the most affected communities.
- 37 For a longer discussion, see Chapter 10. Also, see Kinsman, “Some Notes on Learning from AIDS Activism for Our Responses to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic”; Kinsman, “Learning from AIDS Activism for Surviving the COVID-19 Pandemic,” in *Sick of the System: Why the COVID Recovery Must Be Revolutionary*, ed. Between the Lines Editorial Committee (Toronto: Between the Lines, May 2020), 83–92; and *Sick of the System Interview—Gary Kinsman July 23, 2020*, July 30, 2020, YouTube video, 17:25, https://youtu.be/GUSa_6fUo-k.
- 38 On this, see Daniel Sarah Karasik, “Suppress the Virus Now!,” *Briarpatch*, November 8, 2020, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/suppress-the-virus-now>; and Suppress the Virus Now Coalition, “Suppress the Virus Now Coalition Statement,” *Briarpatch*, January 21, 2021, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/suppress-the-virus-now-coalition-statement>. See also, Raia Small, “Why Has the Left De-prioritized COVID?,” *Midnight Sun*, August 14, 2022, <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/why-has-the-left-deprioritized-covid/>.
- 39 See Kinsman, “Some Notes On Learning From AIDS Activism for Our Responses to the Coronavirus/COVID-19 Pandemic”; Alan Sears, “Health From Below in a Global Pandemic,” *New Socialist*, April 24, 2020, <https://newsocialist.org/health-from-below-in-a-global-pandemic/>; Karasik, “Suppress the Virus Now!”; and Suppress the Virus Now Coalition, “Suppress the Virus Now Coalition Statement.”
- 40 See ACT-UP (New York) and AIDS ACTION NOW! (Toronto), “Montréal Manifesto,” AIDS Activist History Project, June 1989, <https://aidsactivisthistory.omeka.net/items/show/67>.
- 41 See Susan Ferguson, “Life-Making or Death-Making?,” *Midnight Sun*, October 17, 2021, <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/life-making-or-death-making/>. An insightful exploration, limited by her commitment to Social Reproduction Theory and the importance of the “economic,” she also creatively uses life making practices from below which I return to in the conclusion. Also see Gary Kinsman, “From Silence=Death! To Capitalism=Death!: Notes on AIDS Activism, the Covid Pandemic and Pandemic Racial Capitalism,” *Radical Noise*, March 27, 2023, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2023/03/27/from-silence-death-to-capitalism-death-notes-on-aids-activism-the-covid-pandemic-and-pandemic-racial-capitalism-by-gary-kinsman-feb-20-2023/>
- 42 See Kinsman, “SILENCE=DEATH, ACTION=LIFE.”
- 43 Policing the Pandemic Report, “We Can’t Police Our Way Out of the Pandemic,” August 2020, <https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:f4a8f4cb-39b3-43ba-8a74-f0d760722cb1#pageNum=1>. Also see the Policing the Pandemic Mapping Project (website), <https://www.policingthepandemic.ca>; and Scholar Strike Canada, “Welcome & Policing the Pandemic Teach-In,” March 22, 2022, YouTube video, 1:29:44, <https://www.youtube.com/live/aCyAJID17qE?feature=share>.
- 44 Kinsman, “SILENCE=DEATH, ACTION=LIFE.”
- 45 Global South vaccine apartheid is complicated when we note class differentiation in access to vaccines in countries like India, where the rich have much better access to vaccines than the poor, based on class and location. Many people encounter barriers and obstacles to access, including in Canada, on the basis of class, race, language, ability, technical access

- and skill and more. See Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC), “OHRC Policy Statement on COVID-19 Vaccine Mandates and Proof of Vaccine Certificates,” September 22, 2021, https://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/news_centre/ohrc-policy-statement-covid-19-vaccine-mandates-and-proof-vaccine-certificates.
- 46 See Nadia A. Sam-Agudu et al., “The Pandemic Is Following a Very Predictable and Depressing Pattern,” *The Atlantic*, March 4, 2022, <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2022/03/pandemic-global-south-disease-health-crisis/624179/>.
- 47 This network has included current and former members of Canada Unity, People’s Party, Yellow Vests-Canada, Maverick Party, Soldiers of Odin, La Meute, and more. Also see Gary Kinsman, “Against Fascism, For Abolition,” *Radical Noise*, June 13, 2023, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2023/06/13/against-fascism-for-abolition-by-gary-kinsman/>.
- 48 For more context about the occupation of Ottawa, see “Organizing Against the Occupation of Ottawa,” *Punch Up Collective* (blog), February 6, 2022, <https://www.punchupcollective.org/2022/02/06/organizing-against-the-occupation-of-ottawa/>.
- 49 See D.G., “The Cops Always Face Towards Us,” *Midnight Sun*, March 3, 2022, <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/the-cops-always-face-towards-us/>; James Hutt, “The Battle of Billings Bridge,” *The Breach*, February 16, 2022, sec. Features, <https://breachmedia.ca/the-battle-of-billings-bridge/>; and Brian McDougall, “Building on the Battle of Billings Bridge,” *Midnight Sun*, February 24, 2022, <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/building-on-the-battle-of-billings-bridge/>.
- 50 See Dimitri Lascaris, “Leftists Must Oppose the Suppression of Dissent—Even When We Disagree with the Dissenters,” *Canadian Dimension*, February 16, 2022, <https://canadian-dimension.com/articles/view/leftists-must-oppose-the-suppression-of-dissent-even-when-we-disagree-with-the-dissenters>.
- 51 Scholar Strike Canada, “This Demands an Abolitionist Reckoning: Racism, Fascism, the Convoy Protest, and the Global Expansion of White Supremacy and White Ethnonationalism,” in “Welcome and Opening Teach-In,” March 21, 2022, YouTube video, 2:27:28, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k7xyp6d9r8E>.
- 52 This is, more accurately, a toxic supply crisis and not an overdose crisis. See Mark Tyndall and Zoë Dodd, “How Structural Violence, Prohibition, and Stigma Have Paralyzed North American Responses to Opioid Overdose,” *AMA Journal of Ethics* 22, no. 8 (August 2020): 723–28.
- 53 Harsha Walia writes, “Walter Rodney theorized development as a relational process, where underdevelopment expresses ‘a particular relationship of exploitation.’ Rodney elucidated: ‘Capitalists of Western Europe were the ones who actively extended their exploitation from inside Europe to cover the whole of Africa, including ongoing investment in land, mines, factories, banks, insurance companies, means of transportation, newspapers, power stations.’” Harsha Walia, *Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and the Rise of Racist Nationalism* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021), 124. Also see, Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (London: Bogle-L’Ouverture, 1972).
- 54 On homonationalism, see Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*, Tenth Anniversary ed. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017); and Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, a second edition of which is forthcoming. Orientalism denotes the particular ways in which the white, “Western” imagination constructs Arabs, Islam, and the “Orient” as “other,” ranging from “decadent” to “barbaric.” See Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979); and Patrizia Gentile and Gary Kinsman, “National Security and Homonationalism: The QUATA Wars and the Making of the Neoliberal Queer,” in Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 133–49.

- 55 See Qwo-Li Driskill, Chris Finley, Joseph Gilley, and Scott Lauria Morgensen, eds., *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011); Laura Hall, “White Settler Homonationalism and the Roots of Heterosexist Patriarchy,” *Anti-69 Forum*, March 23, 2019, YouTube video, 13:43, <https://anti-69.ca/vids/#LauraHall>; and Laura Hall, “Revisiting ’69 Celebrations and Challenging Settler Homonationalism in the (Un)Just Society,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 228–44.
- 56 No Pride in Policing (@noprideinpolicingcoalition), “No Pride in Policing live video,” Facebook, June 28, 2020, Facebook Live video, 3:23:44, <https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=4019892321416437>.
- 57 Speakers and performers for the event (some in person and some virtually) included Beverly Bain, Desmond Cole, Zoë Dodd, OmiSoore Dryden, Monica Forrester, Audrey Huntley, Pam Palmater, Robyn Maynard, Andrea Ritchie, Syrus Marcus Ware, Ravyn Wingz, Carole Monture, Terry Monture, Andrea Vasquez, and a speaker from Not Another Black Life and the Eagle Women Singerz and Jingle Dancers.
- 58 The No Pride in Policing Coalition (NPPC) for Pride Day 2020, “No Pride in Policing Coalition (NPPC) Statement of Demands,” No Pride in Policing Coalition, <https://noprideinpolicing.ca/>.
- 59 Gary Kinsman, “Some Notes on the Uprisings against Anti-Black Racist Capitalism and the Possibilities for Hope: Resisting Both Repression and Liberal Containment,” *Radical Noise*, June 11, 2020, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/06/11/some-notes-on-the-uprisings-against-anti-black-racist-capitalism-and-the-possibilities-for-hope-resisting-both-repression-and-liberal-containment/>. Also see Pasternak, Walby, and Stadnyk, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*.
- 60 Douglas Elliot, “It seems the transformation of Pride Toronto is now complete,” Facebook, June 25, 2020, 6:04 p.m. Italics added.
- 61 On the violence of abstraction and the construction of false universals, see Bannerji, *Thinking Through*; and Derek Sayer, *The Violence of Abstraction: The Analytic Foundations of Historical Materialism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987).
- 62 Kinsman, “Some Notes on the Uprisings.”
- 63 See David McNally and Charles Post, “Beyond Electoralism: Mass Action and the Remaking of the Working Class,” *Spectre* 3 (Spring 2021), <https://spectrejournal.com/beyond-electoralism/>. Much the same can be written about the calling of the federal election in August 2021 in “Canada.” Without going into its specific features, it can be seen how it managed to displace mobilization and the focus on “No Pride in Genocide” back within the framework of mainstream “Canadian” and electoral politics.
- 64 On this also see Loreto, *Spin Doctors*.
- 65 For instance, that have affected precarious and migrant workers in meat plants in Alberta and a bakery in northwest Toronto. See Joel Dryden, “Alberta Meat-Processing Plant Tied to Canada’s Largest COVID-19 Outbreak to Re-Open Within Days,” *CBC News*, April 29, 2020, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/cargill-high-river-jon-nash-meat-packing-plant-covid-19-1.5549774>; Sara Mojtehedzadeh and Jennifer Yang, “More Than 180 Workers At This Toronto Bakery Got COVID-19—But The Public Wasn’t Informed,” *Toronto Star*, August 10, 2020, <https://www.thestar.com/business/2020/08/10/more-than-180-workers-at-this-toronto-bakery-got-covid-19-but-the-public-wasnt-informed-why-arent-we-being-told-about-workplace-outbreaks.html>. Also see Loreto, *Spin Doctors*.
- 66 See Tom Hooper, Gary Kinsman, and Karen Pearlston, “Anti-69 FAQ,” February 14, 2019, <https://anti-69.ca/faq/>; more generally, The Anti-69 Network (website), <https://anti-69.ca/>.

- 67 See The Anti-69 Network, "Funding 1969," <https://anti-69.ca/funding/>, esp. the "Egale Canada Rights Trust" grant application; and Gary Kinsman, "Some Critical Reflections on Watching Sex, Sin and 69, the New Film from Sandbay and EGALÉ," *Radical Noise*, July 2, 2019, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/07/02/some-critical-reflections-on-watching-sex-sin-and-69-the-new-film-from-sandbay-and-egale/>.
- 68 See "Funding 1969"; and Tom Hooper, "Was Homosexuality Really Decriminalized in 1969?," *NOW Toronto*, November 21, 2019, <https://nowtoronto.com/news/homosexuality-canada-pride-1969/>; and Tom Hooper, "Queering '69: Mythologies and Heritage Grants to Egale and Pride Toronto," in the Between Postwar and Present Day Conference, May 7, 2021, YouTube Video, 18:36, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zDRuTGN2-W0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zDRuTGN2-W0;); and Tom Hooper, "\$1,850,000 Misdirection of Funds and Settler Colonialism, Pride Toronto Grants from the Department of Canadian Heritage," January 19, 2022, <https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:ac1c477f-dc98-4469-a69b-10e418e571f#pageNum=1>.
- 69 Tom Hooper, "Canada Is Releasing A Coin Commemorating a Myth That Homosexuality Was Decriminalized in 1969," *CBC News*, April 22, 2019, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/opinion/canada-coin-1.5100177>; also The Anti-69 Network, "LGBT Loonie: No Equality in 1969, Still No Equality in 2019," *Radical Noise*, April 18, 2019, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/04/18/lgbt-loonie-no-equality-in-1969-still-no-equality-in-2019/>.
- 70 See The Anti-69 Network, "Funding 1969," esp. "Pride Toronto" grant application; and Tom Hooper, "Letter of Complaint to the Pride Board regarding \$250,000 from Canadian Heritage for Celebrating the 69 Reform as the 'Decriminalization' of Homosexuality," *Radical Noise*, January 14, 2020, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/01/14/tom-hoopers-complaint-to-the-pride-toronto-board-regarding-250000-from-canadian-heritage-for-celebrating-the-69-reform-as-the-decriminalization-of-homosexuality/>.
- 71 Hooper, "Letter of Complaint to the Pride Board."
- 72 See The Anti-69 Network, "Funding 1969"; and Hooper, "Letter of Complaint to the Pride Board"; Hooper, "Queering '69: Mythologies and Heritage Grants to Egale and Pride Toronto"; and Hooper, "\$1,850,000 Misdirection of Funds and Settler Colonialism, Pride Toronto Grants from the Department of Canadian Heritage."
- 73 Tom Hooper, "Pride Toronto's Planned Theme of '50 Years of Decriminalization of Homosexuality' Perpetuates the Mythology of the 1969 Criminal Code Reform," *Anti-69, News*, January 28, 2019, <https://anti-69.ca/prideto/>.
- 74 Hooper, "Pride Toronto's Planned Theme."
- 75 Although in practice this seemed largely to be reduced to celebrating drag queens. See, Pride Toronto, "50th Anniversary of Stonewall Riots," *Pride Toronto Annual Report 2019*, 2019, https://www.pridetoronto.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Pride-Toronto_Annual-Report-2019.pdf.
- 76 Gary Kinsman, "Wolfenden in Canada: Within and Beyond Official Discourse in Law Reform Struggles," in *Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the Commonwealth: Struggles for Decriminalisation and Change*, ed. Corinne Lennox and Matthew Waites (London: School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2013), 183–205.
- 77 Gary Kinsman, "Not a Gift from Above: The Mythology of Homosexual Law Reform and the Making of Neoliberal Queer Histories," in *No Place for the State: The Origins and Legacies of the 1969 Omnibus Bill*, ed. Christopher Dummit and Christabelle Sethna (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2020), 74–97.
- 78 These interviews are drawn upon in the second edition of this book, as well as in Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*.

- 79 On Arnold Peters, see Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire*, second ed., 238, 242, 273.
- 80 Gary Kinsman, "The Apology from Above and Below, Expanded Version," *Radical Noise*, December 5, 2017, <http://radicalnoise.ca/2017/12/05/the-apology-from-above-and-below-expanded-version/>; and Kinsman, "Forgetting National Security in 'Canada': Towards Pedagogies of Resistance," in *Activists and the Surveillance State: Learning from Repression*, ed. Aziz Choudry (London, Toronto: Pluto/Between the Lines, 2019), 129–52.
- 81 See Tom Hooper, "Queering '69: The Recriminalization of Homosexuality," *Canadian Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (June 2019): 257–73; Hooper, "The State's Key in the Bedroom Door: Queer Perspectives on Pierre Elliot Trudeau's 'Just Society' in the Era of the Bathroom Raids," in Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 101–20.
- 82 See Karen Pearlston, "Avoiding the Vulva: Judicial Interpretations of Lesbian Sex Under the Divorce Act, 1968," *Canadian Journal of Law and Society/La Revue Canadienne Droit et Société* 32, no. 1 (April 2017): 37–53; Pearlston, "Something More': The State's Place in the Bedrooms of Lesbian Nation," in Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 200–22.
- 83 Kinsman, "Not a Gift From Above."
- 84 See Kinsman, "Not a Gift From Above"; Kinsman, "Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s: From Liberation to Rights," in *We Still Demand!: Redefining Resistance in Sex and Gender Struggles*, ed. Patrizia Gentile, Gary Kinsman, and L. Pauline Rankin (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017), 137–62.
- 85 On neoliberalism, see Kinsman, "Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s," 138–41; Peter Drucker, *Warped: Gay Normality and Queer Anti-Capitalism* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016), 220–28; Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2007); David McNally, *Another World Is Possible: Globalization and Anti-Capitalism*, second ed. (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring/Merlin Press, 2006); and Walia, *Border and Rule*.
- 86 See Stephen Dillon, *Fugitive Life: The Queer Politics of the Prison State* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018).
- 87 Drucker, *Warped*, 220, 268.
- 88 See Maurice Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society" (master's thesis, McGill University, 1954); Ross Higgins, "Montréal 1953," *Pink Ink* 1, no. 5 (December/January 1984): 31–32.
- 89 See Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Madeline D. Davis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold: The History of a Lesbian Community* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
- 90 Rahul Rao, "Global Homocapitalism," *Radical Philosophy* 194 (November/December 2015): 47. Also see Rahul Rao, *Out of Time: The Queer Politics of Postcoloniality*, Oxford Studies in Gender and International Relations (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020).
- 91 Rao, "Global Homocapitalism," 47.
- 92 See "Pinkwashing," *Decolonize Palestine*, April 4, 2021, <https://decolonizepalestine.com/rainbow-washing/pinkwashing/>.
- 93 Rao, "Global Homocapitalism," 47.
- 94 Rao, "Global Homocapitalism," 41.
- 95 Rao, "Global Homocapitalism," 48.
- 96 On the Charter, see Chapter 9. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 391–401.
- 97 See Kinsman, "Not a Gift from Above"; and Kinsman "Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s."
- 98 See Hooper, Kinsman, and Pearlston, "Anti-69 FAQ"; and videos of the Anti-69 "Just Society" Plenary conference, March 23–24, 2019, *Anti-69*, <https://anti-69.ca/justsociety/>; and Hall, "Revisiting '69 Celebrations and Challenging Settler Homonationalism in the (Un)Just Society," 228–44.

- 99 See Rinaldo Walcott, "The Black 1960s: Black Life after Sir George Williams & Other Stories of the Nation," in "Anti-69 'Just Society' Plenary," *Anti-69*, <https://anti-69.ca/justsociety/>; also "Protests and Pedagogy," Conference, Concordia University, Montréal, January 29–February 11, 2019, <https://protestsandpedagogy.ca/>; and Nalini Mohabir and Ronald Cummings, eds., "Special Issue: Legacies of the Sir George Williams Student Protests," *Topia, Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies* 44 (March 2022), <https://utpjournals.press/toc/topia/44>; Ronald Cummings and Nalini Mohabir, eds., *The Fire That Time: Transnational Black Radicalism and the Sir George Williams Occupation* (Montréal: Black Rose, 2021). Also see Rinaldo Walcott and Idil Abdillahi, *BlackLife: Post-BLM and the Struggle for Freedom* (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2019).
- 100 See Roxana Ng, "Multiculturalism as Ideology: A Textual Analysis," in *Knowledge, Experience and Ruling Relations: Studies in the Social Organization of Knowledge*, ed. Marie Campbell and Anne Manicom (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 35–48; Rinaldo Walcott, "White Lies: Race, Power, and the Future," in *Gendering Globalization, Globalizing Gender*, ed. Gül Çaliskan (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2020), 61–74; and, more generally, on the roots and limitations of "diversity," see Rinaldo Walcott, "The End of Diversity," *Popular Culture* 31, no. 2 (2019): 393–408.
- 101 Public Safety Canada, "Government of Canada Working with Pride Toronto to Improve Safety of LGBTQ2 Communities," Government of Canada, News Release, November 24, 2018, <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-safety-canada/news/2018/11/government-of-canada-working-with-pride-toronto-to-improve-safety-of-lgbtq2-communities.html>. Also see Tom Hooper, "Tom Hooper's Complaint to the Pride Toronto Board Regarding \$250,000 from Canadian Heritage for Celebrating the 69 Reform as the 'Decriminalization' of Homosexuality," *Radical Noise*, January 14, 2020, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/01/14/tom-hoopers-complaint-to-the-pride-toronto-board-regarding-250000-from-canadian-heritage-for-celebrating-the-69-reform-as-the-decriminalization-of-homosexuality/>; Hooper, "Queering '69: Mythologies and Heritage Grants to Egale and Pride Toronto"; and Hooper, "\$1,850,000 Misdirection of Funds and Settler Colonialism." Just months after the January 2017 Pride Toronto membership vote to keep the police out of the Pride parade and festival, Pride Toronto representatives were attempting to obtain grants and make other arrangements to get the police back in. See document accessed by Tom Hooper, Brian Frois for Mayor John Tory, "Briefing Note, Meeting With Pride Toronto, Recap of 2017 Pride Festival," Tom Hooper (@thomashooper), "Update on @PrideToronto," Twitter post, March 14, 2022, <https://twitter.com/thomashooper/status/1503345284671279104>. Hooper's research also shows that Pride Toronto received one million dollars from Public Safety Canada that was not directed to Indigenous communities. Tom Hooper (@thomashooper), "New Thread: @PrideToronto took \$1 million from Public Safety Canada to 'develop more effective policing practice in LGBTQ2+ Indigenous community,'" Twitter post, September 7, 2022, <https://twitter.com/thomashooper/status/1567488495458852864>.
- 102 One illustration of this is in checking the Twitter site for the LGBTQ Purge Fund (@lgbt_fund), which has become more pro-military and pro-government.
- 103 See Gary Kinsman and Amy Gottlieb, "Black Lives Matter Toronto recaptures Pride's activist roots," *CBC News*, July 7, 2016, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/black-lives-matter-toronto-pride-kinsman-1.3665829>; BLM – Canada, "Demands," <https://blacklivesmatter.ca/demands/>; Walcott and Abdillahi, *BlackLife*; and Rodney Diverlus, Sandy Hudson, and Syrus Marcus Ware, eds., *Until We Are Free: Reflections on Black Lives Matter in Canada* (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2020), esp. Naila Kaleta-Mae, "Black Lives Matter—Toronto Sit-in at Pride," 263–75.

- 104 Kelly Cutrara, “Gay Rights Lawyer Doug Elliot on Pride Parade Disruption—July 4, 2016,” interview with Douglas Elliot, *OMNY Radio*, July 4, 2016, <https://omny.fm/shows/kelly-cutrara/gay-rights-lawyer-doug-elliott-on-pride-parade-dis>. Quoted in Kinsman, “Forgetting National Security in ‘Canada,’” 144.
- 105 Arshy Mann, “Why Black Lives Matter is Toronto’s Most Effective LGBT Movement,” *Daily Xtra*, April 28, 2016, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/why-black-lives-matter-is-torontos-most-effective-lgbt-movement-70830>.
- 106 Eternity Martis, “Pride Toronto Members Vote to Keep the Police Out of the Pride Parade,” *Daily Xtra*, January 18, 2017, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/pride-toronto-members-vote-to-keep-police-out-of-the-pride-parade-72858>.
- 107 “Queer and Trans Activists Call on Pride Board and Executive Director to Step Down,” *NOW Toronto*, December 4, 2018, <https://nowtoronto.com/news/queer-trans-pride-toronto-police-black-lives-matter/>. See Brian Frois for Mayor John Tory, “Briefing Note, Meeting With Pride Toronto, Recap of 2017 Pride Festival.”
- 108 Sherwin Modeste (now Kojo Modeste), current Executive Director of Pride Toronto, was interviewed in *Xtra* and they reported “... regarding police presence at Pride, Modeste maintains respect for the decision to keep uniformed cops out of the festivities. He says that, eventually, he’d like to see that relationship mended.” And he is quoted as stating, “I respect that [decision to keep police out of Pride] and will continue to honour that until such a time that the membership decides to go a different direction.... That being said, yes, I welcome dialogue and conversation with the police because we have to work together.... We look at how we can work with the police to change the way that police treat LGBTQ members of the community.” See Cameron Perrier, “What Does Pride Look like after COVID-19?,” *Xtra*, June 25, 2021, <https://xtramagazine.com/power/future-pride-pandemic-covid-203564>. On police training and collaborating with the police on “harm reduction,” see “Pride Toronto Board Decision to Train Police Recruits, Collaborate with the Police on ‘Harm Reduction’ Violates Decision of Pride Membership,” *NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition*, January 17, 2022, <https://www.noprideinpolicing.ca/nppc/pride-policing/>. Pride Toronto is using their applications for police permits for the Parade and Festival space as ways to expand their collaboration with the police. These collaborations are especially disturbing given the new Toronto police chief, Myron Demkiw, was directly involved in the raid on the Pussy Palace in 2000, and in successfully suing Councilor Kyle Rae, who criticized this police action. In 2023, Pride Toronto and other Pride Committees called for more funds for policing, given the rise in right-wing anti-drag/anti-trans protests. This led to problems at the Pride Trans March, where the increased police presence led to Indigenous drummers leaving the march, a Pride Toronto “head” marshal asking those critical of the police to leave, and the police taking photos and videos of many march participants. On June 25 at the Abolitionist and Anti-Fascist Pride March, the police, on a number of occasions, threatened to arrest the marshals.
- 109 See Kinsman, “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s”; and Kinsman, “‘From Resisting Bath Raids to Charter Rights: Queer and AIDS Organizing in the 1980s,’” in *A World to Win: Contemporary Social Movements and Counter-Hegemony*, ed. William K. Carroll and Kanchan Sarker (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2016), 209–32.
- 110 See Becki L. Ross and R. Sullivan, “Tracing Lines of Horizontal Hostility: How Sex Workers and Gay Activists Battled for Space, Voice, and Belonging in Vancouver, 1975–1985,” *Sexualities* 15, no. 506 (2012): 604–21; and Becki L. Ross, “Whorganizers and Gay Activists, Histories of Convergence, Contemporary Currents of Divergence, and the Promise of Non-Normative Futures,” in *Red Light Labour: Sex Work, Regulation, Agency, and*

Resistance, ed. Chris Buckert, Elya M. Durisin, and Emily van der Meulen (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2018), 256–71.

- 111 Gary Kinsman, “Stop the Crackdown on Consensual Queer Sex: Toronto Police at It Again with Project-Marie,” *Radical Noise*, November 14, 2016, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2016/11/14/stop-the-crackdown-on-consensual-queer-sex-toronto-police-at-it-again-with-project-marie/>.
- 112 “Project Marie,” *Queers Crash the Beat*, <https://queerscrashthebeat.com/project-marie/>. Also see Marcus McCann, *Park Cruising: What Happens When We Wander Off the Path* (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2023).
- 113 Gary Kinsman, “Contested Terrains: Of Terms of Reference, The Police and Missing Persons,” *Radical Noise*, August 22, 2018, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/08/22/contested-terrains-of-terms-of-reference-the-police-and-missing-persons/>. Also see Justin Ling, *Missing from the Village: The Story of Serial Killer Bruce McArthur, The Search for Justice, and the System that Failed Toronto’s Queer Community* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2020); and Independent Civilian Review of Missing Persons Investigations, <https://www.missingpersonsreview.ca/>.
- 114 See Elle Ada Kur and Jenny Duffy, on behalf of Maggie’s Toronto Sex Workers Action Project, “Sex Worker Justice—By Us, For Us, Toronto Sex Workers Resisting Carceral Violence,” in Pasternak, Walby, and Stadnyk, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*, 98–112.
- 115 See, “Indesirables: Police Persecution of Men Who Have Sex with Men in the Greater Montréal Area (2010–present),” *Even the Dust: Anti-Police Publication* (Montréal), 2018.
- 116 In 2023 Black Lives Matter-Sudbury issued a statement, “Pride is a Protest,” which was very critical of Fierté Sudbury Pride for organizing a Pride march involving the police and establishing an unsafe event for Indigenous, Black and racialized people. See the BLM-Sudbury statement at: <https://blmsudbury.ca/resources-2/>. In response to this, Fierté Sudbury Pride admitted its “misstep” and cancelled the march after the city refused to withdraw the police. See <https://www.facebook.com/sudburypride/posts/329178269441037/>.
- 117 See Rhea Rollmann, “Why St. John’s Pride Banned Uniformed Police Officers,” *Independent* (St John’s), June 7, 2021, <https://theindependent.ca/journalism/why-st-johns-pride-banned-uniformed-police/>. Also see Rollmann’s continuing important work on the recovery of St. John’s and Newfoundland queer and trans histories: Rollmann, author, *The Independent*, <https://theindependent.ca/author/rhea-rollmann/>; Rhea Rollmann, contributor, *Xtra*, <https://xtramagazine.com/contributor/rhea-rollman>; and their forthcoming *A Queer History of Newfoundland* (Chapel Arm, NL: Engen Books, 2023).
- 118 Egale, in collaboration with the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) and Toronto Police Services, implemented a national police training program on LGBT+ inclusion in Ukraine. See Egale (website), “Our Partners,” <https://egale.ca/our-partners/>. Along the same lines, the LGBT Purge Fund recently met with the Edmonton Police and co-hosted a Gala with the official LGBT section of the Toronto Police, the TPS LGBTQ-Internal Support Network. LGBT Purge Fund, “Projects,” <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/projects/>.
- 119 See Arvin Joaquin, “Meghan Murphy and the Toronto Public Library: What’s Next,” *Xtra Weekly*, November 1, 2019, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/meghan-murphy-toronto-library-whats-next-164045>.
- 120 See Lisa Duggan, “The New Homonormativity: The Sexual Politics of Neoliberalism,” in *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*, ed. Russ Castronovo and Dana D. Nelson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 175–94; and Duggan, *The Twilight of Equality?: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2003).

- 121 See Kinsman “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s”; and Kinsman, “From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights.”
- 122 Mentioned in Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire*, second ed., 13n2.
- 123 Two-Spirit people who wish to be included in this list have quite rightly called for 2S to be at the beginning of the acronym rather than at the end, so it is not LGBTQ2S+.
- 124 This is a limitation of *Queer Edge: From Gay to Queer Liberation*, dir. Nick Mulé (2019, Dissident Voices Productions).
- 125 Peter Drucker reports, in his analysis of Kevin Floyd’s crucial work, a shift on class in the development of queer theory with more focus later on. See Peter Drucker, “Kevin Floyd’s Foundational Queer Marxism: A Tribute,” *Mediations: Journal of the Marxist Literary Group* 34, no. 1 (Fall 2020), <https://mediationsjournal.org/articles/foundational-queer-marxism>.
- 126 Holly Lewis, *The Politics of Everybody: Feminism, Queer Theory, and Marxism at the Intersection* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016). A revised edition was published in 2022.
- 127 Dorothy E. Smith, “Telling the Truth After Post-Modernism,” in *Writing the Social*, 96–130; and David McNally, *Bodies of Meaning: Studies on Language, Labor, and Liberation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001).
- 128 See Himani Bannerji, “The Passion for Naming,” in *Thinking Through*, 17–40.
- 129 On reification and fetishism, or thingification, see Georg Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics* (London: Merlin Press, 1971); John Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Rosemary Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism* (New York and London: Routledge, 2002); and Kevin Floyd, *The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009). Kevin Floyd died on November 20, 2019. See Historical Materialism, Marxist Feminist Stream, “Kevin Floyd,” *Historical Materialism*, November 2, 2019, <http://www.historicalmaterialism.org/blog/kevin-floyd>. Also see Alan Sears, “Queer Anti-Capitalism: What’s Left of Lesbian and Gay Liberation,” *Science and Society* 69, no. 1 (January 2005): 92–112; and Sears, “Body Politics: The Social Reproduction of Sexualities,” in *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentring Oppression*, ed. Tithi Bhattacharya (London: Pluto Press, 2017), 171–91.
- 130 On the fetishism of money, see John Holloway, “Rage Against the Rule of Money: The Leeds Lectures,” *We Are the Crisis of Capital: A John Holloway Reader* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2019), 238–67; and David McNally, *Blood and Money: War, Slavery, Finance and Empire* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020).
- 131 Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality: Volume 1, An Introduction*, first ed. (New York: Vintage, 1980).
- 132 See Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure*; Floyd, *The Reification of Desire*; and Peter Drucker, “Toward a Queer Marxism?,” *Against the Current* 26, no. 1 (March/April 2011): 36–40.
- 133 For a critique of this kind of liberationist politics, see Simon Watney, “The Ideology of GLF,” in *Homosexuality, Power and Politics*, ed. The Gay Left Collective (London: Allison and Busby, 1980), 64–76.
- 134 On some of the barriers for me in accomplishing this in the actual writing and in limitations in interrogating the social practices of whiteness (including my own), see Alan Bérubé, “How Gay Stays White and What Kind of White It Stays,” in *The Making and UnMaking of Whiteness*, ed. Birgit Brander Rasmussen (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001), 234–65. Newer writing that now informs my knowledge of Indigenous struggles includes: Glen Coulthard, *Red Skins, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014); Linda Tuhiwai Smith,

- Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 2008); Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Dancing on our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence* (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2011); Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017); Robyn Maynard and Leanne Betasamoske Simpson, "Towards Black and Indigenous Futures on Turtle Island: A Conversation," in Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 75–84; Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, "Interview with Leanne Betasamosake Simpson," in *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 139–48; Maynard and Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*; Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*; Audra Simpson, "The State is a Man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the Gender of Settler Sovereignty," *Theory and Event* 19, no. 4 (2016), <https://nycstandswithstandingrock.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/simpson-2016.pdf>; Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014); Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith, eds., *Theorizing Native Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014); Laura Hall, "In Place and Time: Indigenous Women's Re-Weaving and Resistances," in *The Clean Place: Honouring Indigenous Spiritual Roots of Turtle Island*, ed. Mike Hankard (Vernon, BC: J. Charlton Publishing, 2019), 43–55; Hall, "White Settler Homonationalism and the Roots of Heterosexist Patriarchy"; and Hall, "Revisiting '69 Celebrations and Challenging Settler Homonationalism in the (Un)Just Society," 228–44.
- 135 See National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, *Reclaiming Power and Place: The Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls*, June 2019, <https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/final-report/>.
- 136 See Elise Thorburn and Gary Kinsman, "Navigating Contemporary Struggles; Class Composition and Social Reproduction," in *Challenging the Right, Augmenting the Left: Recasting Leftist Imagination*, ed. Robert Latham et al. (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020), 86–97.
- 137 Randy Boissonnault, in Bill Morneau, "Canada's New Equality Coin // La nouvelle pièce de 1 \$ Égalité," April 23, 2019, Facebook, Facebook live Video, <https://www.facebook.com/morneau.bill/videos/1868894649882597/>.
- 138 See Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).
- 139 Gary Kinsman, "Constructing Sexual Problems: 'These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species,'" in *Power and Resistance, Critical Thinking About Canadian Social Issues*, fourth ed., ed. Les Samuelson and Wayne Antony (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2007), 101–102.
- 140 Canadian Heritage, "LGBTQ2+ National Monument / Monument national LGBTQ2+," March 24, 2022, YouTube video, 34:23, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=noD6GqGr8nc>.
- 141 See Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation* (New York: Autonomedia, 2004).
- 142 Driskill, *Asegi Stories*, 30n80, quoted in Suzanne Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White: Race and the Demand for Queer Redress," *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 30, no. 3 (2018): 559.
- 143 Driskill, *Asegi Stories*, 30n80.
- 144 Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*. See "The Land Back Issue," *Briarpatch*, September/October 2020, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/issues/view/september-october-2020>.
- 145 Gouldhawke, "Land as a Social Relationship."
- 146 Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, "Interview with Leanne Betasamosake Simpson"; also see Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*.

- 147 On heteropatriarchal relations, see Driskill et al, *Queer Indigenous Studies*, 8–9, 33–37.
- 148 See Kim TallBear’s work on settler sexualities, including the intensification of marriage relations in response to Indigenous gender and erotic practices. Tallbear, “Making Love and Relations Beyond Settler Sex and Family,” in *Making Kin Not Population*, ed. Adele E. Clarke and Donna Jeanne Haraway (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2018), 145–64.
- 149 Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 31.
- 150 Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 42. On disciplinary power linking of population and “biology” to forms of social power, see Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1*.
- 151 Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 42.
- 152 Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 43.
- 153 Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 42.
- 154 Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 43.
- 155 See Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles”; on ecological networks, see Maria Mies and Vandana Siva, *Ecofeminism* (London: ZED Books, 2014). Maria Mies died in May 2023.
- 156 Nick Estes, *Our History is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (London/New York: Verso, 2019), 257.
- 157 On this see John Holloway, “The State and Everyday Struggle,” in *We Are the Crisis of Capital: A John Holloway Reader* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2019), 1–36; Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Walcott, “The Black 1960s”; and Nandita Sharma, *Home Rule: National Sovereignty and the Separation of Natives and Migrants* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020), although I have some concerns about how Indigenous national self-determination struggles get addressed in this book. On this, see Neal Braganza, “Decolonial Struggle and History: Nandita Sharma’s *Home Rule*,” *Spectre*, June 12, 2021, <https://spectrejournal.com/decolonial-struggle-and-history/>. Also see Leanne Betasamosake Simpson on the refusal of the Western nation-state system and on “how Indigenous nationhoods are not a replication of the nation-state and the violence required to maintain statehood.” Indigenous nations, in this view, have a very different non-nation state character. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, “Interview with Leanne Betasamosake Simpson,” 143. Also see Maynard and Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*.
- 158 Walia, *Border and Rule*; and Gary Kinsman “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities: Queer Refugees In the Years of Canadian Neoliberalism and Homonationalism,” in *Envisioning Global LGBT Human Rights: (Neo)colonialism, Neoliberalism, Resistance and Hope*, ed. Nancy Nicol et al. (London: University of London Institute of Commonwealth Studies, 2018), 97–127.
- 159 See Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism Versus the Climate* (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2014); and Klein, *No Is Not Enough: Resisting the New Shock Politics and Winning the World We Need* (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2017).
- 160 Amnesty International Canada, “Grassy Narrows: The Right to a Healthy Environment,” Amnesty International, Our Work: Issues, <https://www.amnesty.ca/our-work/issues/indigenous-peoples/indigenous-peoples-in-canada/grassy-narrows>.
- 161 A major limitation in the delightful film *Don’t Look Up* is this commitment to “science” and following the “science.” See Adam McKay, dir., *Don’t Look Up* (Hyperobject Industries/Bluegrass Films, 2021).
- 162 James Plested, “How the Rich Plan to Rule a Burning Planet,” *The Bullet*, December 23, 2019, <https://socialistproject.ca/2019/12/how-the-rich-plan-to-rule-a-burning-planet/>.
- 163 Kinsman, “Some Notes on Learning from AIDS Activism.”
- 164 The history of trans organizing goes back many decades before the Compton’s Cafeteria riot in 1966. See Susan Stryker, *Transgender History: The Roots of Today’s Revolution* (New

- York: Seal Press, 2017); and Dan Irving and Rupert Raj, eds., *Trans Activism in Canada: A Reader* (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2014). Trans is used here to describe a broader range of gender variation and to challenge the two-gender system in a more profound way than "trans" has often now come to refer.
- 165 See Jules J. Gleeson and Elle O'Rourke, *Transgender Marxism* (London: Pluto Press, 2021). Also see T.J. Ferguson, "The Transition Problem: A Review of Transgender Marxism," *Spectre* 6 (Fall 2022): 68–77, <https://spectrejournal.com/the-transition-problem/>.
- 166 Dean Spade, *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law* (Brooklyn: South End Press, 2011).
- 167 Suzanne J. Kessler, *Lessons from the Intersexed* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998); Cheryl Chase, "Hermaphrodites with Attitude: Mapping the Emergence of Intersex Political Activism," in LaFont, *Constructing Sexualities*, 172–87; also see Anne Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body, Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).
- 168 Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990); and Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
- 169 Again, see the work of Judith Butler, including *Gender Trouble* and *Bodies That Matter*.
- 170 Gary Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes: Biological Determinism Versus Social Liberation," in *Making Normal: Social Regulation in Canada*, ed. Deborah Brock (Toronto: Nelson Thomson, 2003), 262–84; also see Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body*.
- 171 See Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes."
- 172 See Sara Reardon, "Massive Study Finds No Single Genetic Cause for Same-Sex Sexual Behaviour," *Scientific American*, August 29, 2019, <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/massive-study-finds-no-single-genetic-cause-of-same-sex-sexual-behavior/>.
- 173 While Peter Drucker in *Warped* clearly addresses "homosexuality" and "heterosexuality" as historically specific, he is less clear on transgender. While he mostly addresses trans as historically specific, at times he denies this—for instance, when he claims that transgender people have existed for millennia. Drucker, *Warped*, 271.
- 174 Drucker, *Warped*, 77. Also see the critique of the use of "berdache" in Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 55–87.
- 175 See Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*. On how Two-Spirit is part of "the redefinition of tradition as part of decolonial activism," see Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 87.
- 176 The other side of this is the use of Sex Worker Exclusionary Radical Feminists (SWERFs), which I have the same reservations about.
- 177 Anti-trans women are increasingly working with right-wing social forces. See Samantha Schmidt, "Conservatives Find Unlikely Ally in Fighting Transgender Rights: Radical Feminists," *Washington Post*, February 7, 2020, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2020/02/07/radical-feminists-conservatives-transgender-rights/>.
- 178 See Étienne Quintal, "'OK Groomer': Hate Tropes Fueling Opposition to 2SLGBTQ+ Rights in Canada," Canadian Anti-Hate Network, News, April 20, 2022, https://www.antihate.ca/hate_tropes_fueling_opposition_2s_lgbtq_rights_canada.
- 179 In *Warped*, Peter Drucker uses the expression "same-sex" and here he mostly seems to be drawing on notions of sex as in some ways "biological" in character. But just as with gender, knowledge about sex is also socially made, and I still often prefer using same-gender to emphasize this socially made character. This is no simple linguistic solution to the complexities of gendered sexual life, and we need more work to clarify the character of various regimes of sexual/gender definition, identification, and regulation.

- 180 See Gary Kinsman, "Direct Action as Political Activist Ethnography: Activist Research in the Sudbury Coalition Against Poverty," in *Political Activist Ethnography: Studies in the Social Relations of Struggle*, ed. L. Bisailon, A. Doll, and K. Walby (Edmonton: Athabasca University Press, 2023).
- 181 See Brock, "Workers of the World Caress"; Gary Kinsman, "Within, Against, and Beyond: Urgency and Patience in Queer and Anti-Capitalist Struggles," in *What Moves Us: The Lives and Times of the Radical Imagination*, ed. Alex Khasnabish and Max Haiven (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2017), 131–52; Kinsman, "Interview with Gary Kinsman," in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 19–38.
- 182 Bannerji, *Thinking Through*. On some of the barriers for me in accomplishing this in the actual writing and in interrogating the social practices of whiteness (including my own), see Bérubé, "How Gay Stays White."
- 183 On the violence of abstraction see Bannerji, *Thinking Through*; and Sayer, *The Violence of Abstraction*.
- 184 See Saidiya V. Hartman, *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007); Hartman, *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Social Upheaval* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2019); Rinaldo Walcott, *On Property*; and Walcott, *The Long Emancipation: Moving Toward Black Freedom* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2021).
- 185 See Jin Haritaworn, Ghaida Moussa, and Syrus Marcus Ware, eds., *Queering Urban Justice: Queer of Colour Formations in Toronto* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018); and Jin Haritaworn, Ghaida Moussa, and Syrus Marcus Ware, eds., *Marvellous Grounds: Queer of Colour Histories of Toronto* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2018).
- 186 Drucker theorizes uneven and combined construction of sexualities in *Warped* and in *Different Rainbows*, drawing on Leon Trotsky's notion of uneven and combined development where, in Russia, feudal relations were combined with more "advanced" capitalist relations. See Drucker, *Warped*; Peter Drucker, ed., *Different Rainbows* (London: Millivres/Gay Men's Press, 2000); and Joseph A. Massad, *Desiring Arabs* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007).
- 187 Massad's critique of the "Gay International," while very one-sided, does make visible how this organizing can get implicated within the imposition of the heterosexual/homosexual binary, including in social/cultural contexts where there currently are no heterosexualities or homosexualities. *Desiring Arabs*, 160–90. Also see Rao, "Global Homocapitalism," 38–49; and Rao, *Out of Time*.
- 188 See Kinsman, "Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities," 97–127; David A.B. Murray, *Real Queer?: Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities in the Canadian Refugee Apparatus* (London: Rowan and Littlefield, 2016); and Cynthia Wright, "Nationalism, Sexuality and the Politics of Anti-Citizenship," in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 250–69.
- 189 See Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire*, second ed., 12–13.
- 190 For references on the non-universal character of coming out, see Drucker, *Warped*; and Massad, *Desiring Arabs*. Also see Madiha Didi Khayatt, "Terms of Desire: Are There Lesbians in Egypt?," in *Language and Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies*, ed. Robert Bayley and Sandra Scheuter (Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2003), 213–32. I have learned much from the work of Madiha Didi Khayatt on questions of coming out and namings of experience both in terms of coming out in the classroom, and also the experiences of women in Egypt who have sex with other women.
- 191 The theory of permanent revolution, which had earlier roots, was consolidated by Leon Trotsky as he suggested that it was possible to move from the anti-feudal revolution based

- on the peasantry to a growing-over into a socialist working-class revolution. Shanin examines Marx's later writings about the peasant communes in Russia as the possible basis for anti-capitalist transformation. See Teodor Shanin, ed., *Late Marx and the Russian Road: Marx and the Peripheries of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2018).
- 192 See the theoretical work leading up to *Wages for Housework*: Mariarosa Dalla Costa, *Women and the Subversion of the Community: A Mariarosa Dalla Costa Reader* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2019); Selma James, *Sex, Race and Class—The Perspective of Winning: A Selection of Writings, 1952–2011* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012); Silvia Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012); and Silvia Federici, *Patriarchy of the Wage: Notes on Marx, Gender, and Feminism* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2021).
- 193 See Thorburn and Kinsman, "Navigating Contemporary Struggles," 86–97; Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero*; and Federici, *Patriarchy of the Wage*.
- 194 Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International, 1971).
- 195 Richard Day, *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2005). At the same time, I do not subscribe to all the analysis that Day develops, and I continue to support a revolutionary, socially transformative perspective.
- 196 See Holloway, *How to Change the World; Crack Capitalism*; and *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*.
- 197 On composition of working-class struggle see Harry Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically* (Oakland, CA: AK Press/Anthesis, 2000); Nick Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Marx: Circuits and Cycles of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999); Thorburn and Kinsman, "Navigating Contemporary Struggles," 86–97; and John Huot, "Autonomist Marxism and Workplace Organizing in Canada in the 1970s," *Upping the Anti* 18 (2016): 91–105, <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/18-autonomist-marxism>.
- 198 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 27–31; Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos and the Zapatistas, "Sixth Declaration of the Lacandón Jungle," in *The Other Campaign: the Zapatista Call for Change from Below/La otra compañía* (San Francisco: City Lights, 2006); and Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 199 On Dorothy E. Smith, see Dorothy E. Smith and Alison I. Griffith, *Simply Institutional Ethnography: Creating a Sociology for People* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2022). Also see George Smith, "Political Activist as Ethnographer," in *Social Problems* 37, no. 4 (November 1990): 629–48; reprinted in *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, ed. Caelie Frampton, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, and Kate Tilleczek (Halifax: Fernwood, 2006), 44–70; and Agnieszka Doll, Laura Bisailon, and Kevin Walby, eds., *Political Activist Ethnography: Studies in the Social Relations of Struggle* (Athabasca: Athabasca University Press, 2023).
- 200 Some of these works are: Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016); and Taylor, *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2017); Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015); Collins, *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019); Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," in "Feminism in the Law: Theory, Practice and Criticism," special issue, *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1 (1989): 139–68; Crenshaw,

- “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence Against Women of Color,” *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6 (1991): 1241–99; El Jones, *Abolitionist Intimacies* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2022); Rinaldo Walcott, *On Property*; and Walcott, *The Long Emancipation*; Desmond Cole, *The Skin We’re In: A Year of Black Resistance and Power* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 2020); Robin D.G. Kelley, “Insecure: Policing Under Racial Capitalism, Challenging One of the Core Institutions of Racial Capitalism,” *Spectre* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2020): 12–37; Kelley, *Race Rebels: Culture Politics and the Black Working Class* (New York: Free Press, 1994); Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002); and Roderick Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Towards a Queer of Colour Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004). Here he argues that a queer of colour critique places queers of colour as central subjects in theory and politics. Also see Roderick Ferguson, *One Dimensional Queer* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2018).
- 201 See Raul Field, Robin Bunce, Leila Hassan, and Margaret Peacock, eds., *Here to Stay, Here to Fight: A Race Today Anthology* (London: Pluto Press, 2019). I thank John Huot for bringing the work of *Race Today* and Darcus Howe back to my attention. The Toronto Collective that emerged out of the Struggle Against Work Collective in the 1970s used the particularity of different sections of working-class struggle to “mean: a) the position of different sections in the hierarchy of power; b) the particular way capital organizes the 24-hour working day of each section; and c) the particular strengths and weaknesses of different sections of the class which flow from our position in the hierarchy and division of labour.” Toronto Collective Statement, “Letter to Wages for Students on the Struggle Against Work Collective Split,” Zero Work, Background: From Zerowork #1 to Zerowork #2, Supplemental (Historical Materials), June 1976, <http://www.zerowork.org/>.
- 202 See Gary Kinsman, “The Politics of Revolution: Learning From Autonomist Marxism,” *Upping the Anti* 1 (2005): 41–50, <http://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/01-the-politics-of-revolution/UTA>; and Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97.
- 203 Mario Tronti, “Lenin in England,” Marxists.org, 1964, reprinted, <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/it/tronti.htm>.
- 204 See Gary Kinsman, “Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer Review Essays, #1,” review of *Warped: Gay Normality and Queer Anti-Capitalism* by Peter Drucker, *Radical Noise*, April 22, 2017, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2017/04/22/queered-marxism-and-the-making-of-the-neo-liberal-queer-reviews-1/>; and Kinsman, “Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer Review Essays, #2,” review of *Queer Progress: From Homophobia to Homonationalism* by Tim McCaskell, *Radical Noise*, December 3, 2018, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/12/03/queer-progress-queered-marxism-and-the-making-of-the-neo-liberal-queer-review-essays-2/>.
- 205 The central limitation of Peter Drucker’s analysis is the rather determinist approach that informs his analysis of the periodization of same-sex formations and capitalist accumulation regimes. In *Warped*, Drucker has a tendency to use somewhat determinist formulations like “sexual relations and ideologies can be understood as by-products of the shifting social and cultural formations that result from the combination of different modes” of production and reproduction (43–44) and that “economic long waves are ultimately determinant for the shift from one same-sex formation to another” (60). While I appreciate the impressive analysis Drucker develops, this approach tends to grant agency regarding same-sex formations to shifts in these accumulation regimes and not to the struggles and agency of queers and other people. Also see previous note.
- 206 This expression comes from the work of Darcus Howe and *Race Today*. See, Field, et al, *Here to Stay, Here to Fight*.

- 207 On composition of struggle, see Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically*; and Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Marx*.
- 208 See Gary Kinsman, “The Politics of Revolution,” 41–50; and Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles.”
- 209 Also see Kinsman, “Interview with Gary Kinsman,” in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 129–30.
- 210 See Tithi Bhattacharya, ed., *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression* (London: Pluto, 2017); and Ferguson, *Women and Work*. Also see Sue Ferguson, “Engaging Federici on Marx, Capitalism, and Social Reproduction,” *New Politics*, Winter 2022, <https://newpol.org/review/engaging-federici-on-marx-capitalism-and-social-reproduction/>.
- 211 Dalla Costa, *Women and the Subversion of the Community*; James, *Sex, Race and Class*; and Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero*; Silvia Federici and Arlen Austin, eds., *Wages for Housework: The New York Committee 1972–77: History, Theory, and Documents* (New York: Autonomedia, 2017); and Louise Toupin, *Wages for Housework: The History of the International Feminist Movement, 1972–77* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2018). On the limitations in *Wages for Housework*, see Bhandar and Ziadah, “Introduction,” in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 14–15. Also, for a description of a “miscalculation” that *Wages for Housework* made, see Federici, “Interview with Silvia Federici,” in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 151–52; and Federici, *Patriarchy of the Wage*.
- 212 See Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos and the Zapatistas, “Sixth Declaration of the Lacandón Jungle.”
- 213 See Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*; and Holloway, *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*.
- 214 Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97.
- 215 See Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*; and Holloway, *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*.
- 216 See “Choosing Real Safety.”
- 217 See Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*; and Holloway, *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*.
- 218 Bannerji, *Thinking Through*; and Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*; and Holloway, *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*.
- 219 See Ziya Jones, “Rinaldo Walcott on How to Build a Better Queer Future,” *Xtra*, October 28, 2021, <https://xtramagazine.com/health/rinaldo-walcott-211379>.
- 220 See Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 221 On this, see Philip Corrigan, *Social Forms/Human Capacities: Essays on Authority and Difference* (London: Routledge, 1990); Brock, *Making Normal*; and Deborah Brock, Aryn Martin, Rebecca Raby, and Mark P. Thomas, eds., *Power and Everyday Practices*, second ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019).
- 222 Bannerji, *Thinking Through*, esp. chap. 1, “The Passion of Naming,” 17–40.
- 223 Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos and the Zapatistas, “Sixth Declaration of the Lacandón Jungle”; and Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*; and Holloway, *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*.
- 224 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Writings on the Paris Commune*, ed. Hal Draper (1871; New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971); see Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*, 231–32n17; and see Kristin Ross, *Communal Luxury: The Political Imaginary of the Paris Commune* (London and New York: Verso, 2015).
- 225 Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*, 207.

- 226 Audre Lorde, "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches* (Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press, 2007), 110–14.
- 227 See Simpson, "Interview with Leanne Betasamosake Simpson," in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 143. Also see Maynard and Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*.
- 228 Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*, 207–208.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EDITION

- 1 See Tim McCaskell, "The Bath Raids and Gay Politics," in *Social Movements/Social Change: The Politics and Practice of Organizing*, ed. Frank Cunningham (Toronto: Between the Lines/Socialist Studies, 1988), 169–88; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 137–69. See George Smith, "Policing the Gay Community: An Inquiry into Textually-Mediated Social Relations" in *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 16, no. 2 (May 1988), 163–83. On the bath raids and resistance to them also see, Tom Hooper, "Enough is Enough": The Right to Privacy Committee and Bathroom Raids in Toronto, 1978–1983" (PhD diss., York University, December 2016); Tom Hooper, "More Than Two Is a Crowd: Mononormativity and Gross Indecency in the Criminal Code, 1981–1982," *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes* 48, no. 1 (2014): 53–81; Hooper, "Queering '69," 257–73; and Hooper, "The State's Key to the Bedroom Door," 101–20.
- 2 "Queer" can sound very different when uttered by a queerbasher against lesbians and gay men than when it is used by lesbians and gay men as an affirmation of ourselves in a society that often tries to deny our very existence. I also use queer in this book as a broader term than lesbian or gay to try to include the experiences of people before the emergence of homosexual/lesbian classifications, and to also include people who engaged in same-gender passions who would not identify as lesbian or gay. While I now use it to identify with the new wave of queer activism, I do not use it in the same ways that it is used in "queer nationalism" or in "queer theory" where it is sometimes used to displace class and class struggle. See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 5.
- 3 See Gary Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing: 'Consultation,' 'Partnership,' and 'Responsibility' As Strategies of Regulation," in *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*, ed. William Carrol (Toronto: Garamond, 1997), 213–39; George W. Smith, "Accessing Treatments: Managing the AIDS Epidemic in Ontario," in *Knowledge, Experience, and Ruling Relations: Studies in the Social Organization of Knowledge*, ed. Marie Campbell and Anne Manicom (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 18–34; and Smith, "Political Activist as Ethnographer," 44–70. Also see the AIDS Activist History Project website, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/>; and Gary Kinsman, "AIDS Activism: Remembering Resistance versus Socially Organized Forgetting," in *Seeing Red: HIV/AIDS and Public Policy in Canada*, ed. Suzanne Hindmarch, Michael Orsini, and Mari-lou Gagnon (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018), 311–33.
- 4 On the activism of AIDS ACTION NOW!, see, John Greyson, dir., *The World is Sick (Sic)* (Toronto: John Greyson, 1989), videotape, 38 min; and Greyson, *The Pink Pimpernel* (Toronto: John Greyson, 1989), videotape, 32 min. See commentary on Greyson's work in Brenda Longfellow, Scott Mackenzie, and Thomas Waugh, eds., *The Perils of Pedagogy: The Works of John Greyson* (Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2013). See McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 219–47, 257–72, 279–304, 213–26, 351–52, 404–405; and Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 311–33. AIDS Activist History Project, "Toronto Interviews," <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/toronto-interviews/>; also, on the Impact of the "drug cocktail" in extending people's lives see, AIDS Activist History Project, "Interviews," <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/>.

- 5 On some of the limitations of queer nationalist activism, see Steven Maynard, "When Queer is Not Enough: Identity and Politics (Queer Nation)," *Fuse*, 15, no. 1/2 (1991): 14–18; and Kinsman, "From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights," 229–31.
- 6 On the Lesbian Avengers in the United States, see Sarah Schulman, "Excerpts from The Lesbian Avengers Handbook," in *My American History: Lesbian and Gay life During the Reagan/Bush Years* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 289–319.
- 7 On the Bill 167 struggle, see David M. Rayside, *On the Fringe: Gays and Lesbians in Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 153–65; and Nancy Nicol, dir., *Gay Pride and Prejudice* (Toronto: Intervention Video Inc., 1994), two-channel video, 62 min. Also see, Tom Warner, *Never Going Back: A History of Queer Activism in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 323–24; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 323–26.
- 8 See Philip Hannon, "Reason Prevails: Hate Crimes Bill Passes House of Commons," *Capital Xtra*, June 30, 1995, 13. In November 1995 the federal government did move to provide some same-sex leave benefits for federal employees (bereavement, family-related responsibilities, leave, etc.). This did not cover medical, dental, pension and other benefits. For an update on benefits struggles see, Kinsman, "Constructing Sexual Problems," 107–11. On problems with hate crimes, especially in the US context, where they have been used to criminalize and imprison people of colour, see Ryan Conrad, ed., *Against Equality: Queer Revolution, Not Mere Inclusion* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2014), 165–249.
- 9 Glen Whiffen, "Sex Case Details Outlined for Court," *Evening Telegram* (St. John's, NL), May 21, 1993, 1.
- 10 See Eleanor Brown, "Hot Spots: Arrests for Public Sex Are on the Rise, Warns Lawyer," *Xtra*, July 23, 1993, 15; and later articles in *Xtra*. Also see the chart on charges for consensual sex between men from 1968 to 2004, Tom Hooper, "Bathroom Raids in Canada 1968–2004," graph, *Anti-69*, April 2018, https://anti-69.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Chart_Bathroom_raids_in_Canada_1968-200-3.pdf?189db0&189db0.
- 11 See Clare Barclay and Elaine Carol, "Obscenity Chill: Artists in a Post-Butler Era," *Fuse* 16, no. 5/6 (Summer 1993): 18–28. Also see Janine Fuller and Stuart Blackley, *Restricted Entry: Censorship on Trial*, second ed., ed. Nancy Pollack (Vancouver: Press Gang, 1996); Brenda Cossman et al., *Bad Attitude/s on Trial: Pornography, Feminism, and the Butler Decision* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997); and Brenda Cossman, "Censor, Resist, Repeat: A History of Censorship of Gay and Lesbian Sexual Representation in Canada," *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy* 21, no. 1 (Fall 2014): 45–66.
- 12 See Linda Gordon and Allen Hunter, *Sex, Family and the New Right* (Somerville, MA: New England Free Press, 1978); Rosalind Pollack Petchesky, *Abortion and Woman's Choice: The State, Sexuality, and Reproductive Freedom* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1985); for Canada, see Lorna Erwin, "Neoconservatism and the Canadian Pro-Family Movement," *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 30, no. 3 (August 1993): 401–20; and Didi Herman, *Rights of Passage: Struggles for Lesbian and Gay Legal Equality* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), esp. chap. 5 and 6, 77–127. There has been major "Western" Christian moral-conservative support for anti-gay initiatives in Uganda and other African countries in the Global South. See Adrian Jjuuko and Monica Tabengwa, "Expanded Criminalization of Consensual Same-Sex Relations in Africa: Contextualizing Recent Developments," in *Envisioning Global LGBT Human Rights: (Neo)colonialism, Neoliberalism, Resistance and Hope*, ed. Nancy Nicol et al. (London: University of London Press/Humanities Digital Library, 2018), 63–96.
- 13 See Cindy Patton, *Sex and Germs: The Politics of AIDS* (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1986); Patton, *Inventing AIDS* (London: Routledge, 1991); and Patton, *Fatal Advice: How Safe-Sex*

- Education Went Wrong* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996); Simon Watney, *Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS, and the Media* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1997); and Watney, *Practices of Freedom: Selected Writings on HIV/AIDS* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press); Douglas Crimp, ed., *AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988); and Crimp, *AIDSDEMOGRAPHICS* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1990); Gary Kinsman, "Their Silence, Our Deaths: What Can the Social Sciences Offer to AIDS Research?," in *Talking AIDS: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*, Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) Policy Papers, no. 12, ed. Diane E. Goldstein (St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1991), 39–60; Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39; Smith, "Political Activist as Ethnographer," 44–70; the AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/>; and Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 311–33.
- 14 See Gary Kinsman, "The Hughes Commission: Making Homosexuality the Problem Once Again," *New Maritimes* 11, no. 3 (January/February 1993): 17–19; and Kinsman, "Restoring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System'—The Hughes Commission and Mass Media Coverage: Making Homosexuality A Problem," in *Violence and Social Control in the Home, Workplace, Community and Institutions*, ISER Conference Papers, no. 3 (St. John's: ISER Press, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1992), ed. Branda Thompson et al., 211–69.
- 15 See Patrick Barnholden, "A Different Drummer: Lesbians and Gays in the Region: An Activist's Overview," *New Maritimes* 11, no. 3 (January/February 1993): 7. Also on organizing in Halifax, see Rebecca Rose, *Before the Parade: A History of Halifax's Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Communities, 1972–1984* (Halifax: Nimbus Publishing, 2019).
- 16 See Philip Hannon, "Checkered Victory: No Pension For Spouse Of 47 Years, Court Rules," *Capital Xtra*, June 30, 1995, 11.
- 17 See Jeff Lindstrom, "Limited Adoption Rights Granted," *Xtra*, May 26, 1995, 12. Although this decision is limited in its impact, it is very useful for lesbian couples and their children. Also see Kinsman, "Constructing Sexual Problems," 107–11.
- 18 See Nicol, dir., *Gay Pride and Prejudice*. On Mammoliti, his anti-queer history continues with his opposition to *Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QUAIA)* and funding for Pride Toronto if *QUAIA* was allowed to participate, and his videotaping of the Dyke March at Pride. including of women not wearing tops. See McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 436–37.
- 19 See Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39. Also see Ross Higgins, "La regulation sociale de l'homosexualite: De la répression policière à la normalisation," in *La regulation sociales des minorities sexuelle: L'inquietude de la difference*, ed. Patrice Corriveau and Valerie Daoust (Quebec City: Presses de l'Universite du Quebec, 2011), 67–102; and Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 311–33.
- 20 For instance, Edward Carpenter, a homosexual writer and activist in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had connections with anarchist, socialist and libertarian circles. His writings helped numerous men and women come to terms with their lesbian and homosexual experiences in the English-speaking world. Magnus Hirschfeld, a leader of the early German homosexual rights movement and the international sex-reform movement, was associated with the German Social Democratic Party. The German homosexual movement drew most of its parliamentary support from the Social Democrats and later the Communist Party. The Bolsheviks in the USSR repealed the Czarist anti-homosexual legislation and participated in the World League for Sexual Reform. In the 1930s, with the emergence of a new bureaucratic ruling class in the USSR, the laws against homosexuality were reinstated. On the early Soviet Union, see Dan Healey, *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia: The Regulation of Sexual and Gender Dissent* (Chicago: University of

Chicago Press, 2001); On Carpenter, see Sheila Rowbotham, "Edward Carpenter: Prophet of the New Life," in *Socialism and the New Life: The Personal and Sexual Politics of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis*, ed. Sheila Rowbotham and Jeffrey Weeks (London: Pluto, 1977); and Rowbotham, "In Search of Carpenter," in *Dreams and Dilemmas* (London: Virago, 1983), 239–56; Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love* (London: Verso Books, 2008); and Edward Carpenter, *Edward Carpenter, Selected Writings. Vol. 1, Sex*, introduction by Noël Greig (London: Gay Men's Press, 1984). On the early German movement, see John Lauritsen and David Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement, 1864–1935* (New York: Times Change Press, 1974); and James Steakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany* (New York: Arno Press, 1975). Also references in Lorna Weir, "Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger: Sexual Rule, Sexual Politics 1830–1930" (PhD diss., York University, 1986). Also see Barry D. Adam, *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987), esp. "Early Movements and Aspirations," 17–44. Also see Lucy Robinson, *Gay Men and the Left in Post-War Britain: How the Personal Got Political* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007); and Drucker, *Warped*.

- 21 On some of this, see Nanette Funk and Magda Mueller, eds., *Gender Politics and Post-Communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union* (New York: Routledge, 1993). Sexism and the suppression of human rights in Russia have been satirized and challenged by the feminist group Pussy Riot on several occasions since its formation in 2011.
- 22 Leftists have been active in lesbian and gay resistance from the Mattachine Society in the 1950s in the United States to the Gay Liberation Fronts to more recent queer and AIDS activism. On Mattachine, see John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940–70* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 57–74. On major left influences on lesbian and gay resistance in Argentina, Brazil, and Spain, see Manon Tremblay, David Paternotte, and Carol Johnson, eds., *The Lesbian and Gay Movement and the State: Comparative Insights into a Transformed Relationship* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2011). Also see Max Mejia, "Mexican Pink," in Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 43–55; and James N. Green, "Desire and Militancy: Lesbians, Gays, and the Brazilian Workers Party," in Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 57–70.
- 23 My own experiences in a series of Canadian Trotskyist groups are documented in our resignation letter from the Revolutionary Workers' League: Amy, Natalie, and Gary, "We May Not Be Witches...But We Sure Have Been Burned!," *Left History*, Documentary Collection: Gay and Lesbian Activism in the 1970s, March 8, 1980, http://www.yorku.ca/lefthist/online/doc_pages/witches8.html. For some analysis on this, including RCMP surveillance of left organizations focussing on the League for Socialist Action and the Revolutionary Marxist Group, see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 272–86. Other Canadian experiences are included in the Gay/Lesbian Caucus of In Struggle, "Our Resolution for In Struggle's 4th Congress," *In Struggle!* 9, no. 25 (May 4–18, 1982): 6–7; and Brian Mossop, "Gay and Socialist, or Some Reflections of a Commie Fag," *Canadian Dimension* 14, no. 7 (June 1980): 49–51. For experiences in England, see Bob Cant, "A Grim Tale: The International Socialist Gay Group, 1972–1979," *Gay Left*, Autumn 1976, 7–10, <http://gayleft1970s.org/issues/issue03.asp>; Philip Derbyshire, "Sects and Sexuality: Trotskyism and the Politics of Homosexuality" in *Homosexuality, Power and Politics*, ed. Gay Left Collective (London: Allison and Busby, 1980), 104–15; Jamie Gough and Mike Macnair, *Gay Liberation in the Eighties* (London: Pluto, 1985); and Bill Marshall, "Gays and Marxism," in *Coming on Strong: Gay Politics and Culture*, ed. Simon Shepherd and Mick Wallis

- (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 258–74. For the United States, see Ruth Dubrovsky and Lorna Miles, *Lesbian and Gay Exclusion: The Policy that Dare Not Speak Its Name* (New York: United Labor Press, 1982); A. Rausch, *In Partial Payment: Class Struggle, Sexuality and the Gay Movement* (Winter 1980; repr., Chicago: Sojourner Truth Organization, 1981), <https://www.marxists.org/history/usa/pubs/sojournertruth/ipp.html>; Los Angeles Research Group, “Towards a Scientific Analysis of the Gay Question,” in *Pink Triangles: Radical Perspectives on Gay Liberation*, ed. Pam Mitchell (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1980), 117–35; David Thorstad, ed., *Gay Liberation and Socialism: Documents from the Discussions Inside the Socialist Workers Party (1970–1973)* (New York: David Thorstad, New York, 1976); Steve Forgione, Kurt T. Hill, and David Thorstad, eds., *No Apologies: The Unauthorized Publication of International Discussion Documents of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) Concerning Lesbian/Gay Male Liberation. Part 2, 1975–1979* (New York: self-pub., 1980); and Robin Podolsky, “Sacrificing Queers and Other ‘Proletarian’ Artifacts,” in *Radical America* 25, no. 1 (January–March 1991): 53–60. Also see Robinson, *Gay Men and the Left in Post-War Britain*; and Drucker, *Warped*.
- 24 See Martin B. Duberman, *Stonewall* (New York: Dutton, 1993); David A Carter, *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2004); Marc Stein, ed., *The Stonewall Riots: A Documentary History* (New York: New York University Press, 2019). The film *Stonewall*, directed by Roland Emmerich, was widely criticized for the “whitewashing” of the Stonewall riots, denying its actual history, with a very disrespectful portrayal of Marsha P. Johnson’s character. Emmerich, dir., *Stonewall* (Los Angeles: Centropolis Entertainment/Roadside Attractions, 2015).
- 25 A useful critique of the ideology of early gay liberation groups can be found in Watney, “The Ideology of GLF,” 64–76. On gay liberation politics also see Aubrey Walter, ed., *Come Together: The Years of Gay Liberation (1970–73)* (London: Gay Men’s Press, 1980); Lisa Power, *No Bath But Plenty of Bubbles: An Oral History of the Gay Liberation Front, 1970–73* (London: Cassell, 1995); and Tommi Aviccolli Mecca, ed., *Smash the Church, Smash the State!: The Early Years of Gay Liberation* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2009).
- 26 On “sexual rule,” see Weir, “Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger,” 1–75.
- 27 For a general survey of some of this historical literature, see Joe Interrante, “From Homosexual to Gay to ?: Recent Work in Gay History,” *Radical America* 15, no. 6, (November–December 1981), 79–86; Marsha Vicinus, “Sexuality and Power: A Review of Current Work in the History of Sexuality,” *Feminist Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1982): 133–56; Jeffrey Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800* (London: Longman, 1981); Weeks, *Sexuality and Discontents: Meaning, Myths, and Modern Sexualities* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985); Jonathan Ned Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac* (New York: Harper and Row, 1983), esp. 1–19; and David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York and London: Routledge, 1990). Although, the book as a whole tends to try to straddle the fence between “naturalist” or “essentialist” positions, and social constructionist ones, see Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey Jr., eds., *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (New York: Meridian, 1989). Also see Gary Kinsman, “‘Homosexuality’ Historically Reconsidered Challenges Heterosexual Hegemony,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4, no. 2 (June 1991): 91–111. Also see Jonathan Ned Katz, “Envisioning the World We Make, Social-Historical Construction, a Model, a Manifesto,” *OutHistory*, 2016, <https://www.outhistory.org/exhibits/show/katz-writing-work>, esp. “Introduction,” “The Model,” and “Conclusion.”
- 28 See Jonathan Ned Katz, “The Invention of Heterosexuality,” *Socialist Review* 20, no. 1 (1990): 7–34; and Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (New York: Dutton, 1995).

- 29 For a critique of sexual naturalism, see the above sources and Lorna Weir and Leo Casey, "Subverting Power in Sexuality," *Socialist Review* 14, no. 3/4 (May–August 1984): 139–57.
- 30 This critique of the repression thesis of sexuality, a thesis which suggests that, during the Victorian period, a regime of sexual repression was established from which we are freeing ourselves today and revealing our "natural" sexuality, draws on the work of Michel Foucault; see *History of Sexuality*, Vol. 1.
- 31 Roxana Ng, "Sexism, Racism, and Canadian Nationalism," in *Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics*, ed. Himani Bannerji (Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 1993), 183–84. Unfortunately, Roxana Ng passed away in January 2013.
- 32 Karen Dubinsky, *Improper Advances: Rape and Heterosexual Conflict in Ontario, 1880–1929* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 167.
- 33 On "breaching experiments," see Harold Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967). Ethnomethodology is the study of the methods people use to produce society.
- 34 Charlotte Bunch, "Not for Lesbians Only," *Quest* 2, no. 2 (Fall 1975), 50–56; reprinted in *Materialist Feminism: A Reader in Class, Difference, and Women's Lives*, ed. Rosemary Hennessy and Chrys Ingraham (New York: Routledge, 1997), 54–58.
- 35 Lynne Segal, *Straight Sex: Rethinking the Politics of Pleasure* (New York: Verso, 2015), xiv. For a much later period, see James Joseph Dean, *Straights: Heterosexuality in Post-Closeted Culture* (New York: NYU Press, 2014).
- 36 This borrows from Bunch, "Not for Lesbians Only."
- 37 On the problems with identity politics, see Mary Louise Adams, "There's No Place Like Home: On the Place of Identity in Feminist Politics," *Feminist Review*, no. 31 (Spring 1989): 22–33; Butler, *Gender Trouble*; and Bannerji, *Thinking Through*, esp. chap. 1, "The Passion for Naming." When I use identity in this book (often I prefer identification) I do not use it as a fixed psychological or essential notion but rather as a social practice. Identity always needs to have a social and historical character and to be related to class relations and struggles. It is always within class relations and history and is never essential in character. Also see, Lorna Weir, "Limitations of New Social Movement Analysis," *Studies in Political Economy* 40, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 73–102; and Holloway, *How to Change the World*; and Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*. As covered in the Introduction for the third edition of this book, and the conclusion, any critique of identity politics must begin with that of ruling forms of identity politics like Canadianness, masculinities, whiteness, heterosexualities, and cisgenderedness before any critique of oppressed people's identity politics gets raised.
- 38 Kenneth Plummer, "Going Gay: Identities, Life Cycles and Lifestyles in the Male Gay World," in *The Theory and Practice of Homosexuality*, ed. John Hart and Diane Richardson (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968), 94.
- 39 Robert A. Padgug, "Sexual Matters: On Conceptualizing Sexuality in History," *Radical History Review*, no. 20 (Spring/Summer 1979): 13–14. On Ancient Greece, also see Kenneth James Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, Vintage Books first ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1980); Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*, first American ed. (New York: Pantheon, 1985); and Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*. Also see, Katz, "Envisioning the World We Make."
- 40 Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 17–18.
- 41 See Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.
- 42 Ann Ferguson, "Patriarchy, Sexual Identity, and the Sexual Revolution," *Signs* 7, no. 1 (1981): 166. Also see Ferguson, *Blood at the Root: Motherhood, Sexuality and Male Dominance* (London: Pandora, 1989), 188–208; and Ferguson, *Sexual Democracy: Women, Oppression and Revolution* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991), 133–58.

- 43 See Mariana Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1985), esp. "Bisexuality: Coping with Sexual Boundaries," 109–20; and Clare Hemmings, "Locating Bisexual Identities: Discourses of Bisexuality and Contemporary Feminist Theory," in *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*, ed. David Bell and Gill Valentine (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 41–55. "Pansexual" is sometimes now used to cover what used to be referred to as "bisexual," but with trans people and more than two genders more clearly taken into account.
- 44 This term, along with sodomite, is used to describe lesbians and independent women in Jamaica. See Makeda Silvera, "Man Royals and Sodomites: Some Thoughts on the Invisibility of Afro-Caribbean Lesbians," in *Lesbians in Canada*, ed. Sharon Dale Stone (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1990), 48–60; republished in *Feminist Studies* 18, no. 3 (Autumn 1992): 52–32. Makeda Silvera has published a wide variety of work, ranging from novels to a series of edited collections, incl. Silvera, ed., *Piece of My Heart: A Lesbian of Colour Anthology* (Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 1991); and Silvera, *Silenced: Talks With Working Class West Indian Women About Their Lives and Struggles As Domestic Workers In Canada*, second ed. (Toronto: Williams-Wallace, 1984).
- 45 See Peter Drucker, "In the Tropics There is No Sin': Homosexuality and the Gay/Lesbian Movements in the Third World," *New Left Review* 218, no. 1 (July/August 1996): 75–101; Drucker, *Different Rainbows*; and Drucker, *Warped*; Silvera, "Man Royals and Sodomites"; Madiha Didi Khayatt, "The Place of Desire: The Exclusion of Women in the Third World in Theorizing Sexual Orientation" (presentation, Toronto Queer Sites conference, Toronto, May 13, 1992); T. Dunbar Moodie, with Vivienne Ndatshé and British Sibuyi, "Migrancy and Male Sexuality on the South African Gold Mines," in Duberman, Vicinus, and Chauncey, *Hidden From History*, 41–25; Mark Gevisser and Edwin Cameron, *Defiant Desire: Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Ian Lumsden, *Homosexuality, Society and the State in Mexico* (Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1991); João S. Trevisan, *Perverts In Paradise* (London: GMP, 1986); Tremblay, Paternotte, and Johnson, *The Lesbian and Gay Movement and the State*; and Massad, *Desiring Arabs*.
- 46 See Lisa Gribowski, "Reading Between The Lines: Exposing 'Whiteness' in Lesbian Coming-Out Narratives" (presentation, Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association meeting, Montréal, June 1995); Bérubé, "How Gay Stays White," 234–65; Steven Maynard, "What Color Is Your Underwear?: Class, Whiteness and Advertising," in "Queer Licks Issue," special issue, *Border/Lines*, no. 32 (1994): 4–9; and see Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*.
- 47 This is outlined in some ways in Dennis Altman, *The Homosexualization of America: The Americanization of the Homosexual* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982); also see Altman, *Global Sex* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); and Altman, *The End of the Homosexual?* (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2013).
- 48 For some useful insights on the social construction of "whiteness," see Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* (London: Verso, 1992); Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993); and David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 2002); David Roediger, *Colored White: Transcending the Racial Past* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Les Black and Vron Ware, *Out of Whiteness: Color, Politics and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995); and Rassmussen et al., *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness*. Also see the discussion in Shotwell, *Knowing Otherwise*.

- 49 See Mary McIntosh, "Queer Theory and the War of the Sexes," in *Activating Theory: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Theory*, ed. J. Bristow and A. Wilson (London: Lawrence and Wishart), 30–52. Trans and Two Spirit experiences are often also eclipsed within constructions of queer as largely male- and cis-identified.
- 50 On patriarchal social relations and their relation to capitalist relations, see Dorothy E. Smith, "Women, Class and Family," in *Socialist Register* 20 (1983): 1–44.
- 51 This line is taken from the title of Mike Brake, "I May Be a Queer, But at Least I am a Man: Male Hegemony and Ascribed versus Achieved Gender," in *Sexual Division and Society: Process and Changes*, ed. D.L. Barker and S. Allan (London: Tavistock, 1976), 174–98.
- 52 See Adrienne Rich, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," in *Women: Sex and Sexuality*, ed. Catherine R. Stimpson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 62–91; and Bunch, "Not for Lesbians Only." There are also problems with the limitations of both heteronormativity and homonormativity, developed by Lisa Duggan, which are now used very pervasively in queer theory. This is more than simply normalization, which can suggest an emphasis on consent rather than a focus on force and coercion, as well. On homonormativity, see Duggan, *The Twilight of Equality*.
- 53 See Weir and Zaremba, "Boys and Girls Together," 6–7, 9.
- 54 For work on lesbian history and sociology, see Ferguson, "Patriarchy, Sexual Identity, and the Sexual Revolution," 158–72; Ferguson, *Blood at the Root*; Ferguson, *Sexual Democracy*; Adrienne Rich's illuminating but ahistorical "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," 62–91; Lillian Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love Between Women, from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: William Morrow, 1981); and Faderman, *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Madeline D. Davis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold: The History of a Lesbian Community* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Annabel Faraday, "Liberating Lesbian Research," in *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, ed. Kenneth Plummer (London: Hutchinson, 1981), 12–29; Elizabeth M. Ettore, *Lesbians, Women, and Society* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980); Sharon Dale Stone, ed., *Lesbians In Canada*; Silvera, "Man Royals and Sodomites," 48–60; Madiha Didi Khayatt, "Legalized Invisibility, The Effect of Bill 7 on Lesbian Teachers," *Women's Studies International Forum* 13, no. 3 (1990): 185–93; Khayatt, *Lesbian Teachers: An Invisible Presence* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); Becki L. Ross, "Sex, Lives and Archives: Pleasure/Danger and Debates in 1970s Lesbian Feminism," in *Women Challenging Academe*, ed. Sandray Kirby et al. (Winnipeg: Sororal Publishing, 1991), 74–91; and Ross, *The House That Jill Built: A Lesbian Nation in Formation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995); Kathleen Martindale, "What Makes Lesbianism Thinkable? Theorizing Lesbianism from Adrienne Rich to Queer Theory," in *Feminist Issues: Race, Class and Sexuality*, ed. Nancy Mandell (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1995), 67–94; Martha Vicinus, "Lesbian History: All Theory and No Facts or All Facts and No Theory?" *Radical History Review*, no. 60 (Fall 1994): 57–75; and Biddy Martin, "Sexual Practice and Changing Lesbian Identities," in *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, ed. Michelle Barrett and Anne Phillips (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), 93–119. Also, Mary McIntosh, "Postscript: The Homosexual Role Revisited," in Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 46; and Pearlston, "Avoiding the Vulva"; and Pearlston, "Something More," 200–22; Cameron Duder, *Awfully Devoted Women: Lesbian Lives in Canada, 1900–1965* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010); and Liz Millward, *Making a Scene: Lesbians and Community Across Canada, 1964–1984* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016).

- 55 On “queer theory,” see Michael Warner, ed., *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Rosemary Hennessy, “Queer Theory, Left Politics,” *Rethinking Marxism* 7, no. 3 (1994): 85–111; Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure*; and Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 29–31.
- 56 Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *The Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 1.
- 57 Poststructuralism is a word describing a theoretical approach that no longer believes in a structuralist form of analysis where the social is constituted and determined through social structures. Rather than focusing on structures, poststructuralism tends to focus on fragmentation, diversity and difference. Poststructuralists often combine a number of different perspectives in their work. I view “postmodernism” as a general space or mood that has a number of common themes. On the social and political terrains there is a general assumption that we are in a new period and are moving beyond “modernity.” There is an emphasis on language and discourse and often a certain emphasis on psychoanalysis. In general, the subject—or subject positions—are seen as being constituted through discourse. For an interesting Marxist—but far too “fundamentalist” critique of postmodernism. See Alex Callinicos, *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990). Useful but rather one-sided critiques are also raised in what I characterize as ‘red fundamentalist’ responses to postmodernism and post-structuralism in the work of Teresa Ebert and Donald Morton who re-assert narrow economic and class determinisms in their total rejection of queer theory and postmodernism. See Teresa Ebert, *Ludic Feminism and After* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996); Donald Morton, “Pataphysics of the Closet: Queer Theory as the Art of Imaginary Solutions for Unimaginary Problems,” in *Transformations: Marxist Boundary Work in Theory, Economics, Politics and Culture* (Syracuse, NY: The Red Factory, 2001), 1–70; and see Morton, “Changing the Terms: (Virtual) Desire and (Actual) Reality,” in *The Material Queer: A LesBiGay Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Donald Morton (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 1–33. Also see the useful comments of bell hooks, “Postmodern Blackness,” in *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics* (Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 1990), 23–31; Rosemary Hennessy, *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure*; and Linda J. Nicholson, ed., *Feminism/Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge, 1990). Also see Lewis, *The Politics of Everybody*; and Smith, “Telling the Truth After Post-Modernism.” Smith provides a very different grounding and basis for critical social analysis.
- 58 This insight comes from the work of Dorothy E. Smith, incl. “Telling the Truth After Post-Modernism,” 96–130.
- 59 See Gary Kinsman, “Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation: The Social Organization of the Sexual Policing of Gay Men” (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1989).
- 60 There is a need for more of these movement histories. See Ross, *The House that Jill Built*; Warner, *Never Going Back*; McCaskell, *Queer Progress*; Julia Pyryeskina, “A Remarkably Dense Historical and Political Juncture’: Anita Bryant, *The Body Politic*, and the Canadian Gay and Lesbian Community in January 1978,” *Canadian Journal of History* 53, no. 1 (2018): 58–85; Hooper, “Enough is Enough.” Also see, the movement histories included in Valerie Korinek, *Prairie Fairies: A History of Queer Communities and People in Western Canada, 1930–1985* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018); Irving and Raj, *Trans Activism in Canada*; Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*; Millward, *Making a Scene*; Rose, *After the Parade*; many of the contributions in Stephanie Chamber et al., eds., *Any Other Way: How Toronto Got Queer* (Toronto: Coach House Books, 2017); and Rollmann, *A Queer History of Newfoundland*.
- 61 See references in Chapter 3 and later.

- 1 This can be a danger in “queer” and much discourse-driven theory. For a critique of queer theory, see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 29–31; also see Smith, “Telling the Truth After Post-Modernism,” 96–130.
- 2 See Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic*, 128–35, 223–24. Also see Smith, *Writing the Social*.
- 3 See Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Vol. 1*, 116–27.
- 4 Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 29–31.
- 5 See Dorothy E. Smith, “Feminist Reflections on Political Economy”; and Lorna Weir, “Socialist Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality,” in *Feminism and Political Economy: Women’s Work, Women’s Struggles*, ed. Heather Jon Maroney and Meg Luxton (Toronto: Methuen, 1987), 69–83. For autonomist Marxist critiques of political economy, see Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically*; Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Marx*; and Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97. The recent emergence of social reproduction theory, while useful, does not usually move beyond an expanded political economy framework. See Bhattacharya, *Social Reproduction Theory*; and Ferguson, *Women and Work*.
- 6 Andrew Parker, “Unthinking Sex: Marx, Engels and the Scene of Writing,” in Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet*, 19–41. Unfortunately, Parker does not focus on how queers can use the method of historical materialism, and also seems unable to view sex and sexuality as forms of human social practice/production. On the related inability to view the social roots of women’s oppression and the significance of unpaid labour, see Federici, *Patriarchy of the Wage*; and Sue Ferguson, “Engaging Federici on Marx, Capitalism, and Social Reproduction,” *New Politics* 18, no. 4 (Winter 2022), <https://newpol.org/review/engaging-federici-on-marx-capitalism-and-social-reproduction/>.
- 7 Fetishism, defined by Karl Marx, “is a definite social relation between men (sic) that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relationship between things.” *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy: Volume 1: The Process of Capitalist Production* (New York: International Publishers, 1967), 72. On fetishism and reification (or thingification), see Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness*; Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure*; and Floyd, *The Reification of Desire*. Also see, Sears, “Queer Anti-Capitalism,” 92–112; and Sears, “Body Politics,” 171–91.
- 8 Derek Sayer, *Marx’s Method: Ideology Science, and Critique in Capital*, second ed. (Brighton, Sussex: Harvester, 1983), 8–9.
- 9 Dorothy E. Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 31–57; Dorothy E. Smith, *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling* (London: Routledge, 1990), 86–119; and Holloway, *How to Change the World*.
- 10 See Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power*, 31–57; Himani Bannerji, “Writing ‘India,’ Doing Ideology: William Jones’ Construction of India as an Ideological Category,” *Left History* 2, no. 2 (Fall 1994): 5–17; and Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 11 On this type of approach to Marxist method, see Sayer, *Marx’s Method*; and Sayer, *The Violence of Abstraction*; Roslyn Wallach Bologh, *Dialectical Phenomenology: Marx’s Method* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); for emphasis on social forms and social relations, see I.I. Rubin, *Essays on Marx’s Theory of Value* (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1982); Frigga Haug, *Beyond Female Masochism: Memory-Work and Politics*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (London: Verso, 1992); Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic*; Smith, *Writing the Social*; Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically*; and Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Marx*.

- 12 Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents*, 5–10; and Bologh, *Dialectical Phenomenology*, 241. My use of “historical present” differs from that of Weeks in that my usage is not that of a history of relatively ungrounded discourses of sexuality, but rather a history of official discourses as actively organizing practices and relations that, to some extent, still participate in the organizing of the present. My use of historical data is also non-ideological in character in always being grounded in forms of social life. I use the notion of “historical present” to focus on how sexual regulations were socially put in place and not to deny differences in time, place, and historical context. There is some relation here to Foucault’s history of the present.
- 13 This can be seen as an attempt to use Dorothy E. Smith’s sociological perspective of starting from people’s social experiences to develop a critical and grounded analysis of social organization in a more historical context. See Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic*; Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power*; Smith, *Texts, Facts and Femininity*; Smith, *Writing the Social*, and the other references to her work later in this chapter. Also see Kinsman, “Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation”; and Kinsman, “The Textual Practices of Sexual Rule: Sexual Policing and Gay Men,” in Campbell and Manicom, *Knowledge, Experience and Ruling Relations*, 80–95. Also see, Frampton, Kinsman, and Thompson, *Sociology for Changing the World*; and Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*.
- 14 Smith, “Women, Class and Family,” 7.
- 15 There has been some important progress on these fronts. See Smith, “Policing the Gay Community,” 163–83; and Smith, “Political Activist as Ethnographer,” 44–70; and George W. Smith, “The Ideology of ‘Fag’: The School Experience of Gay Students,” *Sociological Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (1998): 309–35; Khayatt, *Lesbian Teachers*; and Khayatt, “Compulsory Heterosexuality: Schools and Lesbian Students,” in Campbell and Manicom, *Knowledge, Experience and Ruling Relations*, 149–63; Carol-Anne O’Brien and Lorna Weir, “Lesbians and Gay Men Inside and Outside Families,” in *Canadian Families: Diversity, Conflict and Change*, ed. Nancy Mandell and Anne Duffy (Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1995), 111–40; Carol-Anne O’Brien, “The Social Organization of the Treatment of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth in Group Homes and Youth Shelters,” *Canadian Review of Social Policies*, no. 34 (Winter 1994): 37–57; and Carol-Anne O’Brien, Robb Travers, and Laurie Bell, *No Safe Bed: Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth in Residential Services* (Toronto: Central Toronto Youth Services, 1993). Also see Gary Kinsman, “Mapping Social Relations of Struggle,” in Frampton, Kinsman, and Thompson, *Sociology for Changing the World*, 133–59; and Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*.
- 16 Since 1996, I am also far more influenced by the anti-racist feminist work of Himani Bannerji, as well as the significant and growing work on settler colonialism and anti-Black racism mentioned in the Introduction to this third edition.
- 17 Padgug, “Sexual Matters,” 9.
- 18 It is also to be remembered that all biological knowledge, like all other forms of knowledge, is socially constructed. See Suzanne J. Kessler and Wendy McKenna, *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1985), esp. 42–80; Kessler, *Lessons from the Intersexed*; and Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), esp. 7–68. Also see, Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body*; Kinsman, “Queerness Is Not in Our Genes,” 262–84; and Katz, “Envisioning the World We Make,” esp. “Intro,” “Model,” and “Conclusion.”
- 19 Gayle Rubin, “The Traffic in Women,” in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 157–210. This perspective draws some of its insights from Rubin’s notion of a “sex/gender” system. I do not use sex/gender system because it tends to conflate questions of sexuality and gender and also because it suggests

that sex/gender relations are some sort of system separate from other social relations rather than an integral aspect of them. It also suggests that this system has been static throughout history rather than historically transformed. In my view, sex and gender relations vary historically and always exist in articulation with class, race, and other social relations. They are therefore part of class relations in a broad sense. Rubin herself has now rejected her earlier approach. See, Rubin, "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," in *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, ed. Carole S. Vance (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 307–309. She rejects this category, but in a pre-feminist regression asserts that sex and gender are two completely autonomous and separate systems. This later position of Rubin's continued to shape later "queer theory," including the influential work of Sedgwick, *The Epistemology of the Closet*. Sedgwick uses Rubin's later work to argue for the need to separate gender and sexual analysis. Now, intersectionality at least proposes intersections between these different forms of oppression, and other work goes beyond this to outline a mediated/mutually constructed approach. On this, see Ashley J. Bohrer, *Marxism and Intersectionality: Race, Class, Gender and Sexuality Under Contemporary Capitalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019); and Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.

- 20 On "sexual scripts," see the work of symbolic interactionists, such as J.H. Gagnon and William Simon, *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality* (Chicago: Aldine, 1973); and Kenneth Plummer, *Sexual Stigma: An Interactionist Account* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).
- 21 Padgug, "Sexual Matters."
- 22 As Karl Marx states: "all epochs of production have certain common traits, common characteristics. Production in general is an abstraction, but a rational abstraction insofar as it really brings out and fixes the common element.... Still this general category, this common element sifted out by comparison, is itself segmented many times over and splits into different determinations. Some determinations belong to all epochs, some only to a few." *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy* (Hamondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 85.
- 23 For this type of view in relation to production, see Sayer, *Marx's Method*. Also see Bologh, *Dialectical Phenomenology*; and Katz, "Envisioning the World We Make."
- 24 See Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*; Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume 2*; Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*; Clellan S. Ford and Frank A. Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1972), 132; Vern Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 32–34.
- 25 On the Sambia, see sources cited in Joseph Harry, *Gay Children Grown Up: Gender Culture and Gender Deviance* (New York: Praeger, 1982), 3. Also see Gilbert Herdt, ed., *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History* (New York: Zone Books, 1996), esp. Herdt, "Mistaken Sex: Culture, Biology, and the Third Sex in New Guinea," 432–36.
- 26 See Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*. Despite its date of publication, this is still one of the best books on the social making of gender. In many ways, it provides a much better socially grounded account of gender than that which is common in poststructuralist or postmodernist theory, including within queer theory. Also see Kessler, *Lessons from the Intersexed*; and Butler, *Gender Trouble*. Butler is often cited within queer theory regarding gender. Despite Butler's use of the term "performativity," she does not focus on gender as actual social performance or accomplishment, but instead on the performative effects of discourse. I argue

- quite strongly that gender is not simply a discursive effect. On this, see Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body*; and Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes," 262–84.
- 27 For a critique of these biological reductionist approaches, see Nelly Oudshoorn, *Beyond the Natural Body: An Archeology of Sex Hormones* (London: Routledge, 1994); and Gail Vines, *Raging Hormones: Do They Rule Our Lives?* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994). Also see Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body*; and Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes," 262–84.
- 28 On the "natural attitude" toward gender, see Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*; and Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*, *op. cit.*
- 29 On collecting categories and devices that bring together a range of different activities, practices, or groups under common administrative classifications so they can be dealt with by ruling agencies, see Philip Corrigan, "On Moral Regulation: Some Preliminary Remarks," *Sociological Review* 29, no. 2 (May 1981): 313–16; reprinted in Corrigan, *Social Forms/Human Capacities: Essays in Authority and Difference* (London: Routledge, 2016), chap. 3.
- 30 See the very interesting account developed by the Red Collective, who describe the "givenness" of our sexuality and feelings that prevents analysis and change. Red Collective, *The Politics of Sexuality in Capitalism*, Red Collective Pamphlet, no. 1 (London: Red Collective and Publications Distributors Cooperative, 1978).
- 31 Ellen Ross and Rayna Rapp, "Sex and Society: A Research Note from Social History and Anthropology," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23, no. 2 (1981): 71; republished in Anne Snitow, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson, eds., *Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality* (New York: Monthly Review, 1983), 51–73.
- 32 On commodity fetishism, see Marx, *Capital*, 71–83.
- 33 Gagnon and Simon, *Sexual Conduct*, 26.
- 34 Gagnon and Simon, *Sexual Conduct*, 5.
- 35 See Plummer, *Sexual Stigma*. Plummer applies a social interactionist perspective to gay men. However, his perspective is limited because it is based on an isolated individual abstracted from social relations. He thereby neglects the questions of cultural and historical investigation that are necessary to explore these relations. To further clarify these points, a historically grounded social interactionist account that can investigate how sexuality is organized through broader social relations would be necessary. Plummer moves beyond some of these limitations in his later work.
- 36 Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), 4.
- 37 Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols* (New York: Penguin Books, 1973), 93.
- 38 For some similar analysis, see Rubin, "Thinking Sex," 280–83.
- 39 Frank Pearce, "How to Be Immoral and Ill, Pathetic and Dangerous, All at the Same Time: Mass Media and the Homosexual," in *The Manufacture of News: Deviance, Social Problems and the Mass Media*, ed. Stanley Cohen and Jock Young (London: Constable, 1973), 287–88.
- 40 Pearce, "How to Be Immoral and Ill," 287–88.
- 41 Unfortunately, valuable insights in Foucault's work, such as "power/knowledge," are limited by his lack of attention to social standpoint and the deletion of active subjects from his discourse analysis. Foucaultian-derived notions of "power/knowledge" often tend to be relatively ungrounded from the social practices that produce them. Sometimes "power/knowledge" almost seems to be self-generating and not produced through social practices. For some useful critical analysis of this, see Dorothy E. Smith, "The Social Organization of Textual Reality," in *The Conceptual Practices of Power*, 70, 79–80; and Smith, "Telling the Truth After Post-Modernism," 96–130.

- 42 On normalization as a strategy of power, see Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, second Vintage Books ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1995). Also see Brock, *Making Normal*.
- 43 George Lachmann Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1978), 16–17; and Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1985). For more on racism and classification, see Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: Norton, 1980).
- 44 On Eurocentrism, see Samir Amin, *Eurocentrism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1989); and Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979). More specifically in relation to sexuality and “homosexuality,” see Massad, *Desiring Arabs*.
- 45 Jeffrey Weeks, “Discourse, Desire, and Sexual Deviance,” in Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 77.
- 46 This point comes from a lecture by Dorothy E. Smith in the Social Organization of Knowledge course, Sociology Dept., Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Fall 1980.
- 47 Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia: An Ethnographic Account of Courtship, Marriage, and Family Life Among the Natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea*, third ed. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968), 395–402.
- 48 See Randolph Trumbach, “London’s Sodomites: Homosexual Behaviour and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century,” *Journal of Social History* 2, no. 1 (Fall 1977): 26n1.
- 49 Richard von Krafft-Ebing, quoted in Isabel Hull, “The Bourgeoisie and Its Discontents: Reflections on ‘Nationalism and Respectability,’” *Journal of Contemporary History* 17, no. 2 (April 1982): 258. Also see Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, first unexpurgated ed. (1886; repr. New York: Putnam, 1965); and Weir, “Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger.”
- 50 Freud’s psychoanalytical work was simultaneously a recognition of how sexual desire was organized in a particular class, patriarchal, racial and historical setting, and a universalization of this experience, which made it ahistorical, thereby articulating new oppressive regulations of erotic life. Freud’s work has been transformed and integrated into the strategies of heterosexual hegemony and sexual rule. While there is much to be learned from Freud’s work, Freudian psychoanalysis has been incorporated into the present practices that define sex and normalize only a particular form of male-dominated heterosexuality. See Jennifer Terry, “Theorizing Deviant Historiography,” *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 55–74. For one lesbian’s struggle with the psychiatric system, see Persimmon Blackbridge and Sheila Gilhooly, *Still Sane* (Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, 1985). Also see “Mad, Angry, Gay and Proud: A Lesbian and Gay Supplement,” *Phoenix Rising* 8, no. 3/4 (July 1990): s1–s40. There have also been a number of feminist appropriations or transformations of Freud.
- 51 On “cutting out” operations, see Dorothy E. Smith, “K Is Mentally Ill,” in *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling* (London: Routledge, 1990), 12–51. Also see George Smith, “The Ideology of ‘Fag,’” 309–35.
- 52 Lon G. Nungesser, *Homosexual Acts, Actors, and Identities* (New York: Praegar, 1983), 55.
- 53 Magnus Hirschfeld, quoted in Arno Karlen, *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1971), 185.
- 54 Diane Richardson, “Theoretical Perspectives on Homosexuality,” in *The Theory and Practice of Homosexuality*, ed. John Hart and Diane Richardson (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 34. The major exceptions were the Kinsey Studies and the psychological work of Evelyn Hooker, which was directed at uprooting the construct that gay men were mentally ill.

- 55 See George Smith, "Overturning State's Evidence: From Social Constructionism to Historical Materialism" (presentation, "Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives," Lesbian/Gay History Conference, Toronto, July 1985); Smith, "Policing the Gay Community," 163–83; and Smith, "Political Activist as Ethnographer," 44–70.
- 56 "Moral Panics" are defined by Stan Cohen:
 A condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotyped fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, and politicians and other right-thinking people; socially accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions; ways of coping are evolved, or (more often) resorted to; the condition then disappears, submerges or deteriorates... Sometimes the panic is passed over and forgotten, but at other times it has more serious and long-term repercussions and it might produce changes in legal and social policy or even in the way in which societies conceive themselves.
- See Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and the Rockers* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1972), 9. Unfortunately, "moral panic" tends to get so over-used in the literature that it almost seems to be self-generating. I try to specifically locate and ground moral panics in social and institutional relations and practices actively constructed between the media, the police, the courts, "citizen's groups," professional experts, and state agencies. These relations combine in different ways in different "panics." They are an active process of social organization. I do not see "moral panics" as an explanation of a social process, rather as pointing toward an investigation of social relations.
- 57 The theory that stress during pregnancy can lead to homosexuality is put forward in "Brain Sex," which was shown on *Witness*, CBC TV, 1992. Also see Simon LeVay, *The Sexual Brain* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994). For more critical commentary, see Kay Diaz, "Are Gay Men Born That Way?," *Z Magazine* 5, no. 12 (December 1992), 4246; Vines, *Raging Hormones*, 85–123; Sarah Schulman, "Biological Determinism, Uncontrollable Instincts—'He's Gotta Have It,'" *Rouge*, no. 20 (1995): 20–21; and also see Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes," 262–84.
- 58 Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes," 262–84.
- 59 See Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray, *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life* (New York: Free Press, 1994). For the controversies surrounding it, see Steven Fraser, *The Bell Curve Wars: Race, Intelligence, and the Future of America* (New York: Basic Books, 1995).
- 60 See "Brain Sex," *Witness*, CBC TV, 1992.
- 61 George Weinberg, *Society and the Healthy Homosexual* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1973).
- 62 See Kenneth Plummer, "Homosexual Problems: Some Research Problems in the labelling Perspective of Homosexuality," in *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 53–75.
- 63 See Gary Kinsman, "'Inverts,' 'Psychopaths,' and 'Normal' Men: Historical Sociological Perspectives on Gay and Heterosexual Masculinities," in *Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Tony Haddad (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1993), 7–8.
- 64 Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*.
- 65 See Dorothy E. Smith, "No One Commits Suicide: Textual Analysis of Ideological Practices" (unpublished manuscript, February 1980), see esp. the diagram, 14; reprinted "No One Commits Suicide," in *The Conceptual Practices of Power*, 140–73. Also see Smith, "The Social Construction of Documentary Reality," *Sociological Inquiry* 44, no. 4 (October 1974): 257–68; reprinted as "The Social Organization of Textual Reality," in *The Conceptual Practices of Power*, 61–80.

- 66 This is not the same as what is referred to as feminist-standpoint theory, which implies that women have a common standpoint and perspective. Instead, Dorothy E. Smith's work argues for a shift in where we begin our inquiry to take up a particular social standpoint in exploring social relations. Standpoint is, then, a place from which to explore social relations and practice. The standpoints of oppressed groups allow us to see aspects of ruling relations not visible from within ruling institutions. See Frampton, Kinsman, Tilleczek, and Thompson, *Sociology for Changing the World*, 6–8; and Kinsman, "Interview with Gary Kinsman," in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 121–22.
- 67 Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 12.
- 68 Dorothy E. Smith, "A Sociology for Women," in *The Prism of Sex: Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. Julie Ann Sherman and Evelyn Torton Beck (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979), 135–87; reprinted and revised in Smith, *The Everyday World as Problematic*, 49–104.
- 69 Smith, "A Sociology for Women," 51.
- 70 Dorothy E. Smith, "The Experienced World as Problematic: A Feminist Method" (Soroken Lecture, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, January 28, 1981), 23. Revised and reprinted as "The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Methodology," in *The Everyday World as Problematic*, 105–45.
- 71 Karl Marx, *Capital*, 163–77.
- 72 Also see Dorothy E. Smith, "Femininity as Discourse," in *Texts, Facts and Femininity*, 159–208; and Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 144.
- 73 Dorothy E. Smith, "The Experienced World as Problematic," 17; reprinted in *The Everyday World as Problematic*.
- 74 For important contributions, see George Smith, "Policing the Gay Community"; Smith, "Political Activist as Ethnographer"; Smith, "The Ideology of 'Fag,'" 309–35; and Khayatt, *Lesbian Teachers*. Also see Eric Mykhalovskiy and George W. Smith, *Hooking Up to Social Services: A Report on the Barriers People Living With HIV/AIDS Face Assessing Social Services* (Toronto: Community AIDS Treatment Information Exchange, 1994).
- 75 See Mary McIntosh, "The Homosexual Role," *Social Problems* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1968): 182–92; reprinted with postscript in Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 38–43. Also see Alfred Charles Kinsey, Wardell Baxter Pomeroy, and Clyde Eugene Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948).
- 76 John Rechy, *City of Night* (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 40. This expression is also used by Scott Favor, played by Keanu Reeves, in the film *My Own Private Idaho*, dir. Gus Van Sant (New York: Fine Line Features, 1991).
- 77 George Chauncey Jr., "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion? Homosexual Identities and the Construction of Sexual Boundaries in the World War I Era," *Journal of Social History* 19, no. 2 (Winter 1985): 189–212; reprinted in Duberman, Vicinus, and Chauncey, *Hidden from History*, 294–317; also see George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994).
- 78 See Laud Humphreys, *Tea Room Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places* (Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1975).
- 79 On bisexuality, see Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1985), esp. "Bisexuality: Coping with Sexual Boundaries," 109–20; Lani Kaahumanu and Loraine Hutchins, *Bi Any Other Name: Bisexual People Speak Out* (Boston: Alyson, 1991); Clare Hemmings, "Resituating the Bisexual Body: From Identity to Difference," in *Activating Theory: Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Politics*, ed. Joseph Bristow and Angelia R. Wilson (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1993), 118–38; and Hemmings, "Locating Bisexual Identities: Discourses of Bisexuality and Contemporary Feminist Theory," in *Mapping Desire: Geographies of*

- Sexualities, ed. David Bell and Gill Valentine (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 41–55. “Bisexual” has sometimes been replaced more recently by pansexualities which can take trans and gender non-conforming experiences into account.
- 80 See Smith, “A Sociology for Women.”
- 81 Some inkling of this shifting in vantage point from “outsider” to “insider” can be seen in Joseph Styles, “Outside/Insider: Researching Gay Baths,” *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 8, no. 2 (July 1979): 135–52. Styles describes how an insider vantage point let him see things in a way that the outsider perspective obscured. On an insider’s sociology, also see the work of Dorothy E. Smith, esp. *The Everyday World as Problematic*.
- 82 Also offering important insights is the work on governmentality influenced by the work of Michel Foucault. See Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, eds., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991); and Mike Gane and Terry Johnson, eds., *Foucault’s New Domains* (London: Routledge, 1993). The closest I have come to using this kind of perspective is in Gary Kinsman, “‘Responsibility’ as a Strategy of Governance: Regulating People Living with AIDS and Lesbians and Gay Men in Ontario,” *Economy and Society* 25, no. 3 (August 1996): 393–409. Also see Deborah R. Brock, *Governing the Social in Neoliberal Times* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019).
- 83 In particular, see Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*.
- 84 See Philip Corrigan, “Towards a Celebration of Difference(s): Notes for a Sociology of a Possible Everyday Future” in *Rethinking Social Inequality*, ed. David Robbins et al. (London: Gower, 1982), 241–61; reprinted in *Social Forms/Human Capacities: Essays on Authority and Difference*, ed. Philip Corrigan (London: Routledge 1990), 103–53.
- 85 See the work of the late E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968); and Smith, “Women, Class and Family,” 1–44, for an account of women’s activity in the organization of this broader notion of class relations.
- 86 See Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*; Carl Boggs, *Gramsci’s Marxism* (London: Pluto Press, 1976); Perry Anderson, “The Antimonies of Antonio Gramsci,” *New Left Review*, no. 100 (November/December 1976): 5–78; Chantal Mouffe, ed., *Gramsci and Marxist Theory* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); and Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: Verso, 1985). Unfortunately, while Laclau and Mouffe trace some of the genealogy of the concept of hegemony, they treat hegemony as only a discursive concept, separating it from social practices and severing it from its historical, social, and organizational contexts. They also completely sever hegemony from class relations and class struggles in their latest work. There are difficulties with notions of “hegemony,” especially if hegemony is construed as an explanatory category in and of itself. But it points us toward the relational and social character of social regulation in a clearer fashion than do terms like “dominant culture” or notions of domination. Unlike social or ideological reproduction, it suggests that social regulation is actively accomplished by individuals in diverse institutional sites and is always “problematic.” It points us toward the social organization of ruling relations while including within it the activities and resistances of the subordinated. It is never total, never exclusive, and there is always the possibility of subversion and transformation. It is these opportunities we have to seize. I now find that hegemony is often used in too state-centred a fashion. On this, see Day, *Gramsci is Dead*. At the same time, I do not subscribe to all the analysis that Day develops, and I continue to support a revolutionary, socially transformative perspective.
- 87 John Clarke et al., “Subcultures, Cultures and Class: A Theoretical Overview,” in *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*, ed. Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson (London: Hutchinson, 1976), 38.

- 88 Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*, 142.
- 89 See Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39; and Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 311–33.
- 90 Clarke et al., "Subcultures, Cultures, and Class," 12.
- 91 See Mary O'Brien, "The Comatization of Women: Patriarchal Fetishism in the Sociology of Education" (presentation, British Sociological Association Conference, Manchester, 1982); and Mary O'Brien, *The Politics of Reproduction* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981).
- 92 See Adrienne Rich, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," *Signs* 5, no. 4 (Summer 1980): 631–60. Despite the many insights of this article, her suggestion that heterosexuality is simply "compulsory" for women is rather one-sided. It does not adequately take into account that "consent" to heterosexuality is also actively constructed through practices of normalization and naturalization. This is why I prefer heterosexual hegemony and institutionalized heterosexuality to compulsory heterosexuality since it includes these moments of coercion and consent. More recently queer theory inflected notions of heteronormativity and homonormativity place the emphasis often too much on consent and not coercion. These are more than just practices of normalization.
- 93 See O'Brien and Weir, "Lesbians and Gay Men Inside and Outside Families," 11–40. Also see Gary Kinsman and Margaret F. Gibson, "Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood," in *Queering Motherhood: Narrative and Theoretical Perspectives*, ed. Margaret F. Gibson (Bradford, ON: Demeter Press, 2014), 245–63. On queer parenting, see Rachel Epstein, ed., *Who's Your Daddy?: And Other Writings on Queer Parenting* (Toronto: Sumach Press, 2009); and Sadie Epstein-Fine and Makeda Zook, eds., *Spawning Generations: Rants and Reflections on Growing Up with LGBTQ+ Parents* (Bradford, ON: Demeter Press, 2018).
- 94 See Frank Mort, "Sexuality: Regulation and Contestation," in Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality: Power and Politics*, 41–42.
- 95 See Gary Kinsman, "The Textual Practices of Sexual Rule," 80–95.
- 96 Rachel Harrison and Frank Mort, "Patriarchal Aspects of Nineteenth-Century State Formation: Property Relations, Marriage and Divorce and Sexuality," in *Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory*, ed. Philip Corrigan (London: Quartet Books, 1980), 106. At the same time the "deviant" subject is not entirely defined by dominant discourse and is also able to move against and beyond them. We need to avoid discourse determinism. More recently, there is a certain legal discourse determinism in Brenda Cossman, "The 1969 Criminal Amendments: Constituting the Terms of Gay Resistance," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 245–62. For a shorter, slightly modified version, see Brenda Cossman, "Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories: Thoughts on Moving Beside Our Debates," *LGBT Purge Fund*, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Monument-Briefing-Documents-EN-Brenda-Cossman.pdf>. For a critique of Cossman's article, see Gary Kinsman, "Critical Reflections on Brenda Cossman's Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories, Moving Beside Our Debates," *Radical Noise*, January 16, 2020, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/01/16/critical-reflections-on-brenda-cossmans-memorializing-lgbtq2-histories-thoughts-on-moving-beside-our-debates/>.

CHAPTER TWO

- 1 Rachel Harrison and Frank Mort argue that "the structure of specific apparatuses or institutions outside the sphere of economic relations cannot be 'read off' from any general concept of the mode of production or its abstract conditions of existence." Harrison and Mort, "Patriarchal Aspects," 108. For a rather different approach that brings in relations of social

reproduction as central, see Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*; and Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero*; and Federici, *Patriarchy of the Wage*.

- 2 Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*, 189.
- 3 Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*, 140. For a broader autonomist Marxist analysis of class relations and struggles, see Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically*; Dyer-Witford, *Cyber-Marx*; Thorburn and Kinsman, "Navigating Contemporary Struggles," 86–97.
- 4 Paul Crane, *Gays and the Law* (London: Pluto Press, 1982), 11. For a broader historical context during this period, see Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*, 45–46.
- 5 Harrison and Mort, "Patriarchal Aspects," 100.
- 6 See John D'Emilio, "Capitalism and Gay Identity," in Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson, *Powers of Desire*, 100–113; republished in D'Emilio, *Making Trouble: Essays on Gay History, Politics, and the University* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 3–16.
- 7 See Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1*. Foucault's work influenced my use of the term "sexual regime," which differs from his perspective in several major respects. Foucault's perspective, despite its insights, has several major limitations. His introductory volume on sexuality is not about the social organization of sexual life, but about the social construction of sexual categories and discourses. The relation between these discourses and lived historical experience is rarely investigated. As a result, his work can tend toward idealism: he suggests that the reality of "sexuality" lies in official discourses rather than in erotic life and the practices of sexual rule. Clearly, the historical implementation of official discourse in institutional settings has played an important role in shaping sexual identities and practices, but this cannot in and of itself account for historical developments. For example, contrary to Foucault's suggestion, the homosexual did not spring forth fully formed simply from medical, sexological, legal, or psychological discourse. We also have to investigate the formation of cultures and resistance among men engaged in same-gender sex along with the social spaces opened up for these cultures through capitalist social relations and the moral and sexual policies of state regulation. Foucault's perspective is remarkably androcentric—he virtually ignores the social relations of biological reproduction, social reproduction, the gender division of labour, and patriarchal social organization, except as they enter directly into the official discourse about sexuality he examines. As a result, Foucault is unable to name the patriarchal character of the ruling agencies from which this regime of sexuality was, and continues to be, deployed. A similar critique can be made regarding racialization in much of Foucault's work. This disconnection of official discourse from its groundings in historically emerging social relations limits the usefulness of his work. In his rush to avoid any narrow legal or state-centred concept of power, Foucault also fragments any conception of state formation as an articulation of social relations into many diverse micro-centres of power with no social or historical unity. He is therefore unable to analyze how the process of sexual regulation has been integrally tied up with capitalist, patriarchal and racialized state formation. Foucault's critique of the repression thesis, mentioned earlier, while very insightful, also tends to be one-sided. In relation to homosexuality, he focuses on the sexological and medical definitions and does not deal with the important role of the police and criminal justice system in regulating sexual life. He generally views power based in law as simply coercive, ignoring its important role in constructing definitions and norms. Regarding homosexuality, the law operates not simply as a coercive instrument, but legal discourse helps construct a specific homosexual subject as a criminal type. The law and the police, as well as medical, psychological, sexological, and other discourses are all crucial aspects of this sexual regime. For similar critiques of Foucault, see Harrison and Mort, "Patriarchal Aspects," 107–108; Nicos Poulantzas, *State, Power, Socialism* (London: Verso, 1980), 148–51;

Weir, "Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger"; and Smith, "The Social Organization of Textual Reality," 70, 79. Also see Smith, "Telling the Truth After Post-Modernism," 96–130. Some of the limitations of Foucault's relatively ungrounded discourse perspective continue to inform innovative queer historical work. See the insightful essay, Terry, "Theorizing Deviant Historiography," 55–74. Terry only notes in an endnote that the resistance that she was able to detect in medical discourse by women "deviants" was not "entirely dependent on the medical discourse for its enunciation" (72). Throughout most of the essay, it seems that even the resistance detected in these texts is constituted through official discourse. There are problems in some of the latest work by Brenda Cossman, with legal discourse seemingly defining queer subjects. Cossman, "The 1969 Criminal Amendments," 245–62; reprinted, shorter and modified, Cossman, "Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories." Also see my critique, Kinsman, "Critical Reflections on Brenda Cossman's Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories."

- 8 See Heidi Hartmann, "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex," in *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, ed. Zillah R. Eisenstein (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979), 204–47. For a different approach, see Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*; and Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero*.
- 9 Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 2.
- 10 This point is developed in the important work of John D'Emilio. See *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 10–13; and "Capitalism and Gay Identity." D'Emilio can be criticized, at times, for his relatively one-sided emphasis on the seemingly spontaneous effects of the social relations of capitalism, particularly its "free labour" system in bringing about homosexual or gay identity, and his neglect in his general theoretical framework (although, interestingly, enough not in his actual historical work) of the regime of sexual rule and resistance to it in the formation of homosexual and gay cultures.
- 11 The analysis of these different kinds of social space comes from Wally Seccombe's class on family formation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto, 1984. See Wally Seccombe, *A Millennium of Family Change: Feudalism to Capitalism in Western Europe* (London: Verso, 1992); and Seccombe, *Weathering the Storm: Working-Class Families from the Industrial Revolution to the Fertility Decline* (London: Verso, 1993).
- 12 See Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men*; and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations between Women in Nineteenth-Century America," in *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Knopf, 1985). These works largely address the experiences of white middle-class women. On the experiences of Black women see, among others, Angela Y. Davis, *Women, Race and Class* (New York: Vintage, 1981).
- 13 This notion of the transition from family of origin to family of "procreation" also comes from Wally Seccombe.
- 14 Later, there emerged other forms of social regulation of the transition from family of origin to family of adulthood, including compulsory schooling, mass culture, and new ways of legally regulating young people's sex lives.
- 15 Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 11. There was a very different history of slavery and its afterlives on Black women, see Davis, *Women, Race and Class*; Hartman, *Lose Your Mother*; and Hartman, *Wayward Lives*.
- 16 See Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1982), esp. "Molly," 81–114; Trumbach, "London's Sodomites," 1–33; and Weeks, *Coming Out*, 33–44. Bray criticizes Weeks for focusing, in his earlier work (like *Coming Out*), on the psychological, medical, and legal definitions of homosexuality in the late nineteenth century, while

- neglecting earlier cultural developments. Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 134–37, n18. “Molly” seems to have been developed in the Molly culture itself, as a taking over of Molly, a form of the name Mary. Bray, 133n5. Also see Trumbach, “Gender and the Homosexual Role in Modern Western Culture: The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries Compared,” in *Homosexuality, Which Homosexuality?*, ed. Dennis Altman (London: CMP Publishers, 1989), 149–64; and Trumbach, “The Birth of the Queen: Sodomy and the Emergence of Gender Equality in Modern Culture, 1660–1750,” in Duberman, Vicinus, and Chauncey, *Hidden From History*, 129–40.
- 17 Court records are not always reliable sources, and we must be careful not to simply accept them as “factual” accounts; rather, we must use them critically and understand their social context and social construction. See Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 85–86, 138n26. Also see Steven Maynard, “On the Case of the Case: The Emergence of the Homosexual as a Case History in Early Twentieth-Century Ontario,” in *On the Case: Explorations in Social History*, ed. Franca Iacovetta and Wendy Mitchinson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 65–87.
 - 18 According to Makeda Silvera, “Sodomite” and “Man Royal” were used in Jamaica to describe women who had sex with other women, and sometimes just for strong independent women. This use of sodomite seems peculiar to Jamaica and is rooted in interpretations of the Old Testament. See Silvera, “Man Royals and Sodomites,” 49–50; reprinted Silvera, “Man Royals and Sodomites: Some thoughts on the Invisibility of Afro-Caribbean Lesbians,” *Feminist Studies* 18, no. 3 (Autumn 1992): 521–32. Also see, Silvera, ed. *Piece of My Heart*; and Silvera, *Silenced*.
 - 19 Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 97.
 - 20 Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 114.
 - 21 Arthur N. Gilbert, “Buggery and the British Navy, 1700–1861,” *Journal of Social History* 10, no. 1 (Fall 1976): 79.
 - 22 Crane, *Gays and the Law*, 12.
 - 23 See Gilbert, “Buggery and the British Navy,” 72–98; and Weeks, *Coming Out*. Also see David F. Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), esp. “Bureaucracy and Homosexuality,” 434–54; and L.J. Moran, “The Uses of Homosexuality: Homosexuality for National Security,” *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 19 (1991): 150–53.
 - 24 Weeks, *Coming Out*, 13.
 - 25 See Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality*, 434–54. See Gary Kinsman, review, “The Construction of Homosexuality, David F. Greenberg,” *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 15, no. 1 (Winter 1990): 112–15. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 55–86.
 - 26 Marx, *Grundrisse*, 83.
 - 27 Corrigan, “On Moral Regulation,” 329; Sayer and Corrigan, *The Great Arch*; Michel Foucault, introduction to *Herculine Barbin* (New York: Pantheon, 1980), viii; Ian Hacking, “How Should We Do the History of Statistics?,” in Burchell, Gordon, and Miller, *The Foucault Effect*, 181–96; and Gane and Johnson, *Foucault’s New Domains*. This is a very different account than Tim McCaskell’s on individualism and liberalism. *Queer Progress*, 5–6. Also, see my review of McCaskell’s book, Kinsman, “Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer, Review Essays, #2.”
 - 28 And even this is contested, as feminists have asserted women’s rights to control their own bodies. See Rosalind P. Petchesky, “Reproductive Freedom: Beyond a Woman’s Right to Choose,” in Stimpson and Spector, *Women: Sex and Sexuality*, 94–96; and Rosalind

- Pollack Petchesky, *Abortion and Women's Choice: The State, Sexuality, and Reproductive Freedom* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1985), 1–21.
- 29 Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 13.
- 30 See Katz, "Envisioning the World We Make," esp. "The Model," and "Conclusion."
- 31 See Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.
- 32 See Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*. At the same time, as Katz points out, Foucault does not specifically problematize heterosexuality. This is a significant limitation in his theorizing about sexuality. Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*, 170–81.
- 33 On fairies and queers, see Chauncey, *Gay New York*, esp. 47–63. Also see Ann Holder's review, "Fairies, and Normals, and Queers, Oh My!: Gay New York Before the Rise of the Closet," *Radical America* 25, no. 3 (1991): 53–64.
- 34 Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 145. Also see Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.
- 35 The process of the emergence and development of the contemporary heterosexual man needs more investigation and study. For some useful explorations, see Andrew Tolson, *The Limits of Masculinity* (London: Tavistock, 1977); Joseph Interrante, "The History of Masculinity," *Gay Community News* (Boston) 7, no. 39 (April 26, 1980): 4, 6; Raewyn W. Connell, *Which Way is Up?: Essays on Sex, Class, and Culture* (Sydney: G. Allen and Unwin, 1983); Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987); Connell, *Masculinities* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Lynne Segal, *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (London: Virago Press, 1990); Kobena Mercer and Isaac Julien, "Race, Sexual Politics and Black Masculinity. A Dossier," in *Male Order, Unwrapping Masculinity*, ed. Rowena Chapman and Jonathan Rutherford (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1988), 97–164; Rinaldo Walcott, "Blackness, Masculinity and the Work of Queer," in *Queer Returns: Essays on Multiculturalism, Diaspora, and Black Studies* (London, ON: Insomniac Press, 2016), 215–41; David H.J. Morgan, *Discovering Men* (London: Routledge, 1992); Victor J. Seidler, *Recreating Sexual Politics: Men, Feminism and Politics* (London: Routledge, 1991); Steven Maynard, "Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History," *Labour/Le Travail* 23 (Spring 1989): 159–69; Blye Frank, "Hegemonic Heterosexual Masculinity," *Studies in Political Economy* 24, no. 1 (1987): 159–70; Frank, "Hegemonic Heterosexual Masculinity: Sports, Looks and a Woman, That's What Every Guy Needs To Be Masculine," in *Violence and Social Control in the Work Place, Community and Institutions*, ISER Conference Papers, no. 3 (St. John's, NL: Institute for Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1992), 273–303; Frank, "Queer Selves/Queer in Schools: Young Men and Sexualities," in *Sex in Schools: Canadian Education and Sexual Regulation*, ed. Susan Prentice (Toronto: Our Selves, 1994), 44–59; and Kinsman, "'Inverts', 'Psychopaths', and 'Normal' Men," 3–35.
- 36 See Leonore Davidoff, "Class and Gender in Victorian England: The Diaries of Arthur J. Munby and Hannah Cullwick," *Feminist Studies* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 88–91; Nancy F. Cott, "Passionlessness: An Interpretation of Victorian Sexual Ideology, 1750–1850," in *A Heritage of Her Own: Toward a New Social History of American Women*, ed. Nancy F. Cott and Elizabeth H. Pleck (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1979), 162–81; Linda Gordon, *Woman's Body, Woman's Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America* (1976; repr., New York: Penguin Books, 1977); and Ellen Dubois and Linda Gordon "Seeking Ecstasy in the Battlefield: Danger and Pleasure in Nineteenth-Century Feminist Sexual Thought" in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, 31–49. Also see Davis, *Women, Race and Class*.
- 37 See Jeffrey Weeks, "Discourse, Desire and Sexual Deviance," 105; Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 112–13; and Weeks, *Coming Out*, 40–41.

- 38 George Chauncey, "From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: Medicine and the Changing Conceptualization of Female Deviance," *Salmagundi*, no. 58–59 (Fall 1982/Winter 1983): 135.
- 39 Chauncey, "From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality," 135.
- 40 Judith Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); and Weeks, *Coming Out*, 16–17. On social purity and moral reform in Canada, see Mariana Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885–1925* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1991). For more recent work, see Brock, *Making Work, Making Trouble*; Bruckert, Durisin, and van der Meulen, *Red Light Labour*; and Emily van der Meulen, Elya M. Durisin, and Victoria Love, eds., *Selling Sex: Experience, Advocacy, and Research on Sex Work in Canada* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013).
- 41 Martha Vicinus, "Sexuality and Power," 135; Foucault, *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, 117–18; and Weir, "Sex Psychology," in "Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger."
- 42 For a critique of an overly expansive and ungrounded notion of sexology that is not located in specific organizational and institutional settings and practices, see Weir, "Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger," 240–46.
- 43 Jeffrey Weeks, "Foucault for Historians," *History Workshop* 14, no. 1 (Autumn 1982): 114. Also see Weeks, "Uses and Abuses of Michel Foucault," in *Against Nature: Essays on History, Sexuality and Identity* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1991), 157–69.
- 44 See Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents*, 61–95; and Weir, "Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger."
- 45 Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 145.
- 46 See Weir, "Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger," 1–70.
- 47 Hull, "The Bourgeoisie and Its Discontents," 258; Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 148–49; and Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.
- 48 Foucault, *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, 122. On these questions, also see Lynette Finch, *The Classing Gaze: Sexuality, Class and Surveillance* (St. Leonards, New South Wales: Allen and Unwin, 1993).
- 49 Foucault, *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, 25–26, 146.
- 50 See Hartmann, "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex"; and Hartmann, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism," in *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*, ed. Lydia Sargent (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1981), 141. Also see Anne Philips and Barbara Taylor, "Sex and Skill: Notes Toward a Feminist Economics," *Feminist Review* 6, no. 1 (1980): 79–88; Barbara Taylor, *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Virago, 1983); and Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 1–44.
- 51 See Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations Between Women in Nineteenth-Century America," in *Disorderly Conduct*, 53–76; Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men*; Sheila Jeffreys, *The Spinster and Her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality, 1880–1930* (London: Pandora, 1985); and Jeffreys, *Anticlimax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution* (London: The Women's Press, 1990). On problems with her analysis, see Mariana Valverde's review of *The Spinster and Her Enemies*, "Sex Versus Purity: Conflicts in the First Wave of Feminism," *Rites*, June 1986, 10–11; and Margaret Hunt, "The De-Eroticization of Women's Liberation: Social Purity Movements and the Revolutionary Feminism of Sheila Jeffreys," *Feminist Review* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 23–46. Note that *Rites* magazine is accessible online at <https://archive.org/details/ritesmagazine>.
- 52 Bob Gallagher and Alexander Wilson, "Sex, Power and the Politics of Identity," interview with Michel Foucault, *The Advocate*, August 7, 1984, 30. On the context of this interview, see Steven Maynard, "'The Party with God': Michel Foucault, the Gay Left, and the Work

- of Theory,” *Cultural History* 5, no. 2 (2016): 122–52. This question of the transformation of same-gender friendships among men deserves more detailed historical investigation. On some of this, also see Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality*; and Jonathan Ned Katz, *Love Stories: Sex Between Men Before Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- 53 Judith R. Walkowitz, “The Politics of Prostitution,” *Signs* 6, no. 1 (1980): 130. Also see Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*; and Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- 54 Weeks, *Coming Out*, 16–17. Also see Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*.
- 55 On the outcast poor, see Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984).
- 56 See A.M. Givertz, “Considering Race and Class in the Regulation of Sexuality and the Prosecution of Sexual Assault in Hamilton, 1880–1929” (presentation, Canadian Historical Association meetings, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, June 7, 1993).
- 57 On racism in Canadian social purity, see Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*.
- 58 Paul Willis, “Cultural Production is Different from Cultural Reproduction is Different from Social Reproduction is Different from Reproduction,” *Interchange* 12, nos. 2/3 (1981): 48–67. Also see Paul Willis, *Learning to Labour: How Working-Class Kids Get Working-Class Jobs* (Farnborough, UK: Saxon House, 1977).
- 59 Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality,” 122.
- 60 See Chauncey, *Gay New York*.
- 61 See John Marshall, “Pansies, Perverts and Macho Men: Changing Conceptions of Male Homosexuality,” in Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 133–54.
- 62 Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality,” 130.
- 63 Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 16.
- 64 See Lauritsen and Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement*, 6–9; and Steakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*, 10–13.
- 65 For instance, Westphal had “discovered” cases of “contrary sexual feeling,” which he saw as a form of congenital psychopathology, also in 1869. Steakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*, 9.
- 66 On “reverse discourse,” see Foucault: “There is no question that the appearance in nineteenth-century psychiatry, jurisprudence, and literature of a whole series of discourses on the species and subspecies of homosexuality, inversion, pederasty and ‘psychic hermaphroditism’ made possible a strong advance of social controls into this area of ‘perversity’; but it also made possible the formation of a ‘reverse’ discourse: homosexuality began to speak on its own behalf, to demand that its legitimacy or ‘naturalness’ be acknowledged, often in the same vocabulary, using the same categories by which it was medically disqualified.” *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, 101. Unfortunately, Foucault does not specify the extra-discursive social basis for this resistance, some of which I try to paint into the picture in this book and other work. This limitation is continued in much queer-theory influenced work.
- 67 See Weeks, *Coming Out*, 16–22; and Weeks, “Inverts, Perverts, and Mary Annes: Male Prostitution and the Regulation of Homosexuality in England in the 19th and Early 20th Centuries,” in *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*, ed. Salvatore J. Licata and Robert P. Peterson (New York: Haworth Press/Stein and Day, 1981), 124. On Wilde, also see Neil Bartlett, *Who Was That Man?: A Present for Mr. Oscar Wilde* (London: Serpent’s Tail, 1988).
- 68 Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality,” 130.

- 69 Anna Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," *History Workshop* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1978): 49.
- 70 Chris Jones and Tony Novack, "The State and Social Policy," in Corrigan, *Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory*, 147.
- 71 Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," 12.
- 72 See Petchesky, *Abortion and Women's Choice*.
- 73 See Lucy Bland, "Guardians of the Race, or Vampires upon the Nation's Health? Female Sexuality and Its Regulation in Early Twentieth-Century Britain," in *The Changing Experience of Women*, ed. Elizabeth Whitelegg et al. (Oxford: Martin Robertson in association with the Open University, 1982), 373–88; Lucy Bland and Frank Mort, "Look Out for the 'Good Time' Girl: Dangerous Sexualities as a Threat to National Health," in *Formations of Nation and People*, ed. Tony Bennett (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), 131–51; and also the related article by Lucy Bland, "Marriage Laid Bare: Middle Class Women and Marital Sex, 1880s–1940," in *Labour and Love: Women's Experience of Home and Family, 1850–1940*, ed. Jane Lewis (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 123–46. Also see Allen M. Brandt, *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States Since 1880* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); and Frank Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-Moral Politics in England Since 1830* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987).
- 74 Quoted in Angus McLaren, "Birth Control and Abortion in Canada, 1870–1920," *Canadian Historical Review* 59, no. 3 (September 1978): 319. Also see Angus McLaren and Arlene Tigar McLaren, *The Bedroom and the State: The Changing Practices and Politics of Contraception and Abortion in Canada, 1880–1980* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986); and Angus McLaren, *Our Own Master Race: Eugenics in Canada, 1885–1945* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1990).
- 75 See Michael Blanch, "Imperialism, Nationalism and Organized Youth," in *Working-Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory*, ed. John Clarke, Chas Critcher, and Richard Johnson (London: Hutchinson, 1979), 102–20; and Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality*. Also see some of the articles in Andrew Parker, Mary Russ, Doris Sommer and Patricia Yaeger, eds., *Nationalisms and Sexualities* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992).
- 76 This point comes from Philip Corrigan, "On Moral Regulation," 313–37. Also see Jacques Donzelot, *The Policing of Families* (New York: Pantheon, 1979). Donzelot's insightful analysis is unfortunately limited by anti-Marxist and anti-feminist tendencies. See Michèle Barrett and Mary McIntosh, *The Anti-Social Family* (London: Verso, 1982), 95–105, 116–18.
- 77 Ellen Ross and Rayna Rapp, "Sex and Society: A Research Note from Social History and Anthropology," in Snitow et al., *Powers of Desire*, 610.
- 78 Hull, "The Bourgeoisie and Its Discontents," 258.
- 79 Weeks, *Coming Out*, 27. Also see Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution*; Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality*; Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, 123–42; for later developments see Nikolas Rose, "The Psychological Complex: Mental Measurement and Social Administration," *Ideology and Consciousness*, no. 5 (Spring 1979): 5–68; and Rose, *The Psychological Complex: Psychology, Politics and Society in England, 1869–1939* (London: Routledge and Regan Paul, 1985). Degeneration was apparently first formulated as a concept by Benedict Augustin Morel in 1857. The theory of degeneration was popularized by Max Nordau in his book *Degeneration*.
- 80 Stephen Jay Gould, *Ever Since Darwin: Reflections on Natural History* (London: Burnett, 1978), 226.
- 81 Weeks, *Coming Out*, 27, 58–59.
- 82 In reference to same-gender sexuality between men, Marx and Engels were bothered by the then current fears of "degeneracy." In his historical work, Engels makes specific derogatory mention of male same-gender sexuality. Engels wrote about Ancient Greece: "this

degeneration of women was avenged on the men and degraded them also, till they fell into the abominable practice of sodomy and degraded alike their gods and themselves with the myth of Ganymede.” Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, in Light of the Researches of Lewis H. Morgan* (New York: International, 1930s), 128. In their personal correspondence, Marx and Engels were very clear in their attitudes. They were not unaware of the beginnings of “homosexual” emancipation efforts in Germany. In 1868 there was an interchange between Marx and Engels over a book by Dr. Karl Boruttau. Engels is translated as referring to Boruttau as the “cock queer.” In 1869, Marx sent Engels the latest book on “Uranians” by Ulrichs. Uranians for Ulrichs were basically a “third sex” defined by a congenital anomaly, among men a woman’s soul trapped in a man’s body. Engels replied: “This is a very strange ‘Uranian’ that you have sent me. Here are really unnatural disclosures. The pederasts are beginning to count themselves and find that they form a power in the state...it is only by luck that we are personally too old to have to fear that at this victory we will have to pay bodily tribute.” See Hubert Kennedy, “J.B. Schweitzer: The Faggot Marx Loved to Hate,” *FagRag*, no. 19, Spring 1977, 6, which quotes in translation from *Marx Engels Werke*, V. 32, 324–25. Notice that Marx and Engels used such terms as “unnatural disclosures” and “pederasts” (they do not use the category of “homosexual,” which was invented only in 1869). Also see Hubert Kennedy, “Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate,” *Journal of Homosexuality* 29, no. 2/3 (1995): 69–96. On Ulrichs and his concept of Uranian, see Steakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*, 3–9; Hubert C. Kennedy, “The Third Sex Theory of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs,” in Licata and Peterson, *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*, 103–11; and Hubert Kennedy, *Ulrichs: The Life and Works of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: Pioneer of the Modern Gay Movement* (Boston: Alyson, 1988). When J.B. Schweitzer, an early leader of the Lasallean wing of the German Social Democratic movement, was accused of same-gender sex in a park, he was defended by Lasalle, but not by Marx and Engels. Marx and Engels apparently saw the Uranians, the sodomites, and the pederasts as symptoms of degeneration and unnatural behaviour. They evidently felt that “proper,” “normal” sexuality would take the exclusive form of what we now call heterosexual genital intercourse. Also see Parker, “Unthinking Sex,” 19–41.

- 83 Katz, *Gay American History* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976), 135–37, 143–44. Also see Weir, “Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger,” esp. “Sex Psychology,” and “Sex Reform.”
- 84 See Gary Kinsman, “The Metro Toronto Police Department and the Gay Community,” in “Sexuality and the State,” special issue, *Atkinson Review of Canadian Studies* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 28–33.
- 85 This is in contrast to the perspective advanced by Foucault in *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*, in which he basically views the creation of the homosexual as the result of sexual and medical discourses themselves that are not seen as directly linked to sexual policing and forms of sexual resistance.
- 86 Although, as I suggested earlier, this effect of sexual science is overemphasized in a one-sided manner in Foucault, *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*.
- 87 “Men (sic) make their own history but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted by the past.” Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (New York: International, 1972), 15.
- 88 See previously mentioned sources. Also see Adam, *The Rise of a Lesbian and Gay Movement*, 17–25. On Hirschfeld, also see James D. Steakley, ed., *The Writings of Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld: A Biography*, Canadian Gay Archives Publication series, no. 11 (Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1985).

- 89 Quoted in Chauncey, "From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality," 142.
- 90 See Steakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*; and Lauritsen and Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement*.
- 91 On Whitman, see Geoffrey Egan, "These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species: Notes Toward a History of Homosexuality in Canada, 1890–1930" (unpublished paper, Concordia University, April 1980), 26; Michael Lynch, "The Lover of His Fellows and the Hot Little Prophets: Walt Whitman in Ontario," *The Body Politic*, October 1980, 29–31; Lynch, "Walt Whitman in Ontario," in *The Continuing Presence of Walt Whitman: The Life after the Life*, ed. Robert K. Martin (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992), 141–51; and Robert K. Martin, *The Homosexual Tradition in American Poetry* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979). On Carpenter, see previously cited references, and Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 160, 165, 250–54, 364–65, 395–97, 414; Ruth F. Claus, "Confronting Homosexuality: A Letter from Frances Wilder," *Signs* 2, no. 4 (1977): 928–33. John Addington Symonds in England drew upon the writings of Ancient Greece, stating that "...here alone in history do we have the example of a great and highly developed race not only tolerating homosexual passions, but deeming them of spiritual value and attempting to utilize them for the benefit of society." Symonds, "A Problem in Greek Ethics: Being an Inquiry into the Phenomenon of Sexual Inversion Addressed Especially to Medical Psychologists and Jurists," in *Male Love: A Problem in Greek Ethics and Other Writings*, ed. John Lauritsen (New York: Pagan Press, 1983), 1. As Weeks argues, "His aim was to establish, by using the Greek analogy, that homosexuality could be accepted as part of the social mores." *Coming Out*, 52. Using the example of Classical Greece in this way was part of a long Eurocentric tradition that traced the origins of "civilization" back to Ancient Greece, which was then claimed as a European culture. See Katz, *Love Stories*.
- 92 The class, racial, and ethnic dimensions of the formation of homosexual and lesbian identities and cultures need to be explored much more fully. For some exploratory work on sex between men, see Mercer and Julien, "Race, Sexual Politics and Black Masculinity," 97–164; Kobena Mercer, "Skin Head Sex Thing: Racial Differences and the Homoerotic Imaginary," in *How Do I Look? Queer Film and Video*, ed. Bad Object-Choices (Seattle: Bay Press, 1991), 169–210; Walcott, "Blackness, Masculinity and the Work of Queer"; Richard Fung, "Looking for My Penis: The Eroticized Asian in Gay Video Porn," in *Bad Object-Choices, How Do I Look?*, 145–60; Eric Garber, "T'aint Nobody's Business: Homosexuality in Harlem in the 1920s," *Advocate*, May 13, 1982, 35–39; and Garber, "A Spectacle in Color: The Lesbian and Gay Subculture of Jazz Age Harlem," in Duberman, Vicinus, and Chauncey, *Hidden From History*, 318–31; George Chauncey, Jr., "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion? Homosexual Identities and the Construction of Sexual Boundaries in the World War I Era," in Duberman, Vicinus, and Chauncey, *Hidden from History*, 294–317; and Chauncey, *Gay New York*. On working-class men, masculinity, and homosexuality in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ontario, see Steven Maynard, "Rough Work and Rugged Men," 159–69; and Maynard, "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall," 207–42. Analysis of the formation of lesbian cultures had largely remained confined to white and middle-class women until recently. For example, see Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men*; and Faderman, *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers*. Faderman makes a better attempt to deal with class and race differences. However, there has now been some very important work done on the formation of Black and working-class lesbian networks. See the work of the Buffalo Women's Oral History project, Madeline Davis, and Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy, "Oral History and the Study of Sexuality in the Lesbian Community: Buffalo, New York, 1940–1960," *Feminist Studies* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 7–26; and their pathbreaking book, Kennedy and Davis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold*; and see Elise (now El) Chenier, "Rethinking Class in Lesbian

- Bar Culture: Living 'the Gay Life' in Toronto, 1955–1965," *Left History* 9, no. 2 (2004): 85–118. For some of the earlier controversies in lesbian history, see Vicinus, "Sexuality and Power," 147–51; and Vicinus, "They Wonder to Which Sex I Belong": The Historical Roots of the Modern Lesbian Identity," in Altman et al., *Which Homosexuality?*, 171–98. On Black women's experiences, see Audre Lorde, *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name* (Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1982); and Lorde, *Sister Outsider*; Hazel V. Carby, "It Jus Be's Dat Way Sometime: The Sexual Politics of Women's Blues," *Radical America* 20, no. 4 (June/July 1986): 9–24; Ekuia Omosupe, "Black/Lesbian/Bulldagger," in "Queer Theory, Lesbian and Gay Sexualities Issue," special issue, *differences* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 101–11; and Helen (Charles), "'Queer Nigger': Theorizing 'White' Activism," in Bristow and Wilson, *Activating Theory*, 97–106.
- 93 See George Chauncey, Jr., "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion?," 294–317; and his book *Gay New York*. In his book, Chauncey distinguishes between fairies and queers in a much sharper fashion. Fairies were largely working-class men who engaged in some of the practices of "gender inversion," while "queer men" first emerged in middle-class cultures and did not necessarily adopt "effeminate" behaviours. They did, however, identify their primary sexual interest as being in other men. See *Gay New York*, esp. "The Fairy as an Intermediate Sex," 47–63, and "The Forging of Queer Identities and the Emergence of Heterosexuality in Middle Class Culture," 99–127. Also see Holder, "Fairies and Normals and Queers, Oh My!," 53–64.
- 94 Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 11–14.
- 95 Chauncey, "From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality," 135.
- 96 Chauncey, "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion?," 315. He unfortunately tends to use homosexuality in a transhistorical fashion in this quote.
- 97 Chauncey, "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion?," 315–16.
- 98 For some thoughts beginning to move in this direction, see Peter Drucker, "In The Tropics There is No Sin': Homosexuality and Gay/Lesbian Movements in the Third World," *New Left Review* 218 (July/August 1996): 75–101; Drucker, *Warped*; and Drucker, *Different Rainbows*; Massad, *Desiring Arabs*; and Kinsman, "Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities," 97–127.
- 99 See Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 331–61. This also relates to how social spaces were in some ways more open for men having sex with men before the purge campaigns in Ottawa and Victoria in the late 1950s. See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 102.
- 100 Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 99–127. His description moves in this direction.
- 101 We continue to suffer from the lack of historical recovery of working-class men's voices describing their own experiences. However, there are some important leads and new developments. See, for example, Earl Lind's accounts of his contacts with young working-class men in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, *Autobiography of an Androgyne* (1918; repr., New York: Arno, 1975); and Earl Lind, *The Female Impersonators* (1922; repr., New York: Arno, 1975). Also see Steven Maynard's groundbreaking work looking at court records to try to recover working-class men's experiences of same-gender sex and policing. On working-class men's encounters with sexual policing, see Maynard, "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall," 207–42. I examine this article in more detail in Chapter 6. Also see Allan Bérubé, "No Red-Baiting! No Race Baiting! No Queen Baiting! The Story of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union," *OutHistory*, 2016, <http://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/no-baiting/red-race-queen>.
- 102 See previous references to Carpenter in the introduction to the second edition. Also see Noël Greig, "The Dear Love of Comrades," in *Two Gay Sweatshop Plays* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1981), 71–142. Also see Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*.

- 103 See Weeks, "Inverts, Perverts and Mary Annes," 115–30.
- 104 See Dorothy E. Smith and G. Malnairch, "Where Are the Women? A Critique of Communist and Socialist Political Organization" (paper presentation, Marxism: The Next Two Decades Conference, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, 1983). Also see Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 1–44.
- 105 Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 13. Also on social reproduction, see Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*; and Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero*.
- 106 See Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power*; and Smith, *Writing the Social*. Also see the section on bureaucracy in Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 53–62. At the same time, the vast majority of domestic and reproductive labour has continued to be assigned to women (both cis and trans), but middle-class and elite white women increasingly purchase the labour of women of colour (often migrants) to do this work for them.
- 107 Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 66–107. Also see Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.
- 108 For explorations of how the ideologies of naturalism work, see Roland Barthes, *Mythologies* (London: Granada, 1982). He analyzes how relations of social power naturalize and normalize and turn into ideologies what is historically and socially made. While critiquing the determinism often shaping his work, I argue in contrast that people can unearth the social and historical practices that have gone into the making of these mythologies. For the development of US consumer markets and cultures, see Stuart Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1976); and Stuart and Elizabeth Ewen, *Channels of Desire: Mass Images and the Shaping of American Consciousness* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1982).
- 109 Christina Simmons, "Companionate Marriage and the Lesbian Threat," in "Lesbian History Issue," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1979): 54. Also see Jeffreys, *The Spinster and Her Enemies*, although I strongly disagree with her one-sided critique of sex-scientific discourses and the sex-reform movements, which does not recognize their contradictory character. Some feminists like Stella Browne and Dora Russell were able to use aspects of sexual scientific work to push forward their campaigns for greater access by working-class women to birth control and abortion so they could have greater control over their reproductive and (hetero)sexual lives. On this, also see Mariana Valverde's review, "Sex Versus Purity," 10–11; and Hunt, "The De-Eroticization of Women's Liberation," 23–46. On women's resistance to conventional norms, which ironically participated in the construction of the new social norm of companionate marriage, see Ellen Kay Trimberger, "Feminism, Men, and Modern Love: Greenwich Village, 1900–1925" in Snitow et al., *Powers of Desire*, 131–52. Also see Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The New Woman as Androgyne: Social Disorder and Gender Crisis," in *Disorderly Conduct*, 245–29; and Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); and Peiss, "'Charity Girls' and City Pleasures: Historical Notes on Working-Class Sexuality, 1880–1920," in *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, ed. Kathy Lee Peiss, Christina Simmons, and Robert A. Padgug (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 57–69. Also see Christine Stansell, *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789–1869* (New York: Knopf, 1986); and Carolyn Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem: The Perils and Pleasures of the City, 1880–1930* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995).
- 110 Atina Grossmann, "The New Woman and the Rationalization of Sexuality in Weimar Germany," in Snitow et al., *Powers of Desire*, 163–64. Also see Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.
- 111 The reference to "heterosexual counter-revolution" is from Chauncey, "From Sexual Inversion," 144–45. Also see Simmons, "Companionate Marriage and the Lesbian Threat,"

- 54–59; Estelle Freeman, “Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870–1930,” *Feminist Studies* 5, no. 3 (Fall 1979): 512–29. Also Jeffreys, *The Spinster and Her Enemies*.
- 112 Chauncey, “From Sexual Inversion,” 132. Also see Lisa Duggan, “The Trials of Alice Mitchell: Sensationalism, Sexology, and the Lesbian Subject in Turn-of-the-Century America,” *Signs* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1993): 791–814.
- 113 Ferguson, “Patriarchy, Sexual Identity, and the Sexual Revolution,” 167–69; Ferguson, *Blood at the Root*, 188–208; and Ferguson, *Sexual Democracy*, 52–65, 133–58.
- 114 For a critique of passing see Rose, “A History of That Which Was Never Supposed to Happen,” 165–84. See, esp. Rose’s critique of Katz on passing in *Gay American History*, 172–74.
- 115 See the work of Davis and Kennedy, esp. *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold*. For an exploration of some of the diverse literary sources of lesbian identity formation, see Cy Thea Sand, “Lesbian Writing: Adventure Into Autonomy,” *Fireweed*, no. 13 (1982): 24–38; Joan Nestle, “Excerpts from the Oral History of Mabel Hampton,” *Signs* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1993): 92–35; Eric Garber, “A Spectacle in Color,” 318–31; Garber, “Gladys Bentley: The Bulldagger Sang the Blues,” *Out/Look: National Lesbian and Gay Quarterly* 1 (1988): 52–61; and Carby, “It Jus Be’s Dat Way Sometime,” 9–24. Also see Angela Y. Davis, *Blues Legacies and Black Feminism: Gertrude “Ma” Rainey, Bessie Smith, and Billie Holiday* (New York: Vintage, 1999); and Hartman, *Wayward Lives*. Also see *Ma Rainey’s Black Bottom*, dir. George C. Wolfe, based on a play by August Wilson, produced by Denzel Washington (Culver City, CA: Escape Artists, 2020).
- 116 Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 117.
- 117 Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 117. Also see Sonja Ruehl, “Inverts and Experts: Radclyffe Hall and the Lesbian Identity,” in *Feminism, Culture and Politics*, ed. Rosalind Brunt and Caroline Rowan (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982), 15–36; and Esther Newton, “The Mythic Mannish Lesbian: Radclyffe Hall and the New Woman,” *Signs* 9, no. 4 (1984): 557–75.
- 118 See Elizabeth Wilson, *Women and the Welfare State* (London: Tavistock, 1987); Mary McIntosh, “The State and the Oppression of Women,” in *Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production*, ed. Annette Kuhn and AnnMarie Wolpe (London: Routledge Kegan and Paul, 1978), 254–89; and Michèle Barrett, “Feminism and the Politics of the State,” *Women’s Oppression Today* (London: Verso, 1980), 118. See Bunch, “Not for Lesbians Only,” 50–56. On social reproduction and the social factory see Dalla Costa, *Women and the Subversion of the Community*; James, *Sex, Race and Class*; and Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero*.
- 119 See Bunch, “Not for Lesbians Only,” 50–56.

CHAPTER THREE

- 1 Egan, “These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species,” 30. In this third edition, I trouble the settler-colonial character of the Canadian state on the northern part of Turtle Island, a term used by the Haudenosaunee and Anishinabek and adopted by many Indigenous people in what is now called North America. In the first two editions this was not central enough. On this, see the Introduction to this third edition. On the ignoring of the history of sexual morality and sexual offences in Canada, see Terry L. Chapman, “Sex Crimes in Western Canada, 1890–1920” (PhD diss., University of Alberta, 1984), 1–2, 20–21. For more recent work on critical sexual history in Canada, see Angus McLaren, “Sex Radicalism in the Canadian Pacific Northwest, 1890–1920,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2, no. 4 (April 1992): 527–46; Mariana Valverde, “‘When the Mother of the Race is Free’: Race, Reproduction, and Sexuality in First-Wave Feminism,” in *Gender Conflicts: New Essays*

in *Women's History*, ed. Franca Iacovetta and Mariana Valverde (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 3–26; Karen Dubinsky, "'Maidenly Girls' or 'Designing Women'?: The Crime of Seduction in Turn-of-the-Century Ontario," in Iacovetta and Valverde, *Gender Conflicts*, 27–66; Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*; and Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*.

- 2 Some of the useful early works that I draw on here are, Egan, "These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species"; Chapman, "Sex Crimes in Western Canada"; Terry L. Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada, 1890–1920," unpublished paper presented at the Northern Great Plain conference, Winnipeg, 1979; Chapman, "'An Oscar Wide Type': 'The Abominable Crime of Buggery' in Western Canada, 1890–1920," *Criminal Justice History*, no. 4 (1983): 97–118; and Chapman, "Male Homosexuality: Legal Restraints and Social Attitudes in Western Canada, 1890–1920," in *Law and Justice in a New Land: Essays in Western Canadian Legal History*, ed. Louis A. Knafla (Toronto: Carswell, 1986), 267–92; the work of the Canadian Gay and Lesbian Archives in Toronto. For gay history in Montréal, see Ross Higgins's work in *Sortie, Pink Ink, and Rites*. Also see the pioneering work of Indiana Maters, "Unfit for Publication: Notes Towards a Lavender History of British Columbia" (paper presentation, Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives Conference, Toronto, 1985); Lyle Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse and Homosexual Acts: The Case of Saskatchewan in the Settlement Era" (paper presentation, Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives Conference, Toronto, 1985); and John Grube, "Queens and Flaming Virgins: Towards a Sense of Gay Community," *Rites*, March 1985, 14–17. The Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Network was an important resource in developing this research. For a more comprehensive listing of sources, see Gary Kinsman, "Towards a Source List for Doing English-Canadian Lesbian/Gay Histories," *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, December 1985, 8–19; also see: September 1986; December 1987; and the final issue, November 1990. Also see Steven Maynard, "In Search of 'Sodom North': The Writing of Lesbian and Gay History in English Canada, 1970–1990," *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 21, nos. 1–2 (March–June 1994): 117–32. Some of the work of the history newsletter was carried on by the Toronto Centre for Lesbian and Gay Studies and its publication *Centre/fold*, which carried "Pages from the Past" in every issue. Since the first edition of this book, there has also been very exciting work done by Lesbians Making History in Toronto, esp. "People Think This Didn't Happen in Canada," *Fireweed: A Feminist Quarterly*, no. 28 (Spring 1989): 81–86, 142; Elise (now El) Chenier, "Tough Ladies and Troublemakers: Toronto's Public Lesbian Community, 1955–1965" (master's thesis, Queen's University, 1995); Silvera, "Man Royals and Sodomites," 48–60; Mary Louise Adams, "The Trouble with Normal: Post-War Teenagers and the Construction of Heterosexuality" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1994); Adams, "Precedent-Setting Pulp: Women's Barracks Was Deemed 'Exceedingly Frank,'" *Xtra*, September 3, 1993, 21; Maynard, "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall"; Ross Higgins, Line Chamberland, and Robert Champagne, "Mixed Messages: Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Yellow Press in Québec and Ontario During the 1950s–1960s," in *The Challenge of Modernity: A Reader on Post-Confederation Canada*, ed. Ian McKay (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1992), 421–38; Line Chamberland, "Social Class and Integration in Lesbian Culture," in *Women Changing Academe: The Proceedings of the 1990 CWSA Conference / Les femmes changent l'académie*, ed. Sandra Kirby et al. (Winnipeg: Sororal Publishing, 1991), 75–88; and Chamberland, "Remembering Lesbian Bars: Montréal, 1955–1975," *Journal of Homosexuality* 25, no. 3 (1993): 231–69; David Churchill, "Coming Out in a Cold Climate: A History of Gay Men in Toronto during the 1950s" (master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1993); Becki L. Ross, "The House That Jill Built: Lesbian Feminist Organizing in Toronto, 1976–1980," *Feminist Review*, no. 35 (Summer 1990): 75–91; and Ross, *The House That Jill*

Built. Also see Aerlyn Weissman and Lynne Fernie's exciting and witty film *Forbidden Love: The Unashamed Stories of Lesbian Lives* (Montréal: National Film Board of Canada, 1992), which is, in part, based on interviews with Canadian lesbians who were out in the 1950s and 1960s; and *Legal Memory*, directed by Lisa Steele and Kim Tomczak (Toronto: V Tape, 1992), which addresses the Leo Mantha case I refer to in chapter 7. Since 1995, I have also drawn on Warner, *Never Going Back*; Korinek, *Prairie Fairies*; Irving and Raj, *Trans Activism in Canada*; Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Ground*; and Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*.

- 3 On developments in Québec, see the work of Chamberland and of Higgins, cited above. A number of important lesbian and gay studies conferences with important historical dimensions have been organized in Montréal over the last few years: "La Ville en Rose: Lesbians and Gays in Montréal: Histories, Cultures, Societies," November 12–14, 1992; and the Groupe interdisciplinaire de recherches et d'études: homosexualité et société (GIREHS) held conferences on the "History of Gay and Lesbian Militancy in Québec," March 31, 1995, and a conference on "The National Question and Gays and Lesbians: Distinctions or Exclusions?," June 2, 1995. Also see Ross Higgins, "The Quest for Queer Québec: LGBTQ Studies in Montréal," in *Under the Rainbow: A Primer on Queer Issues in Canada*, ed. Jeanette A. Auger and Kate Krug (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2013), 32–53.
- 4 It is therefore difficult to easily or immediately determine from the court and police records the character of a particular legal case given they were all classified as "buggery." Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 11. Also see Chapman, "Sex Crimes in Western Canada," 17–18; and Chapman, "Male Homosexuality."
- 5 Vern L. Bullough, and Martha Voght, "Homosexuality and Its Confusion with the 'Secret Sin' in Pre-Freudian America," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 28, no. 2 (April 1973): 143–55.
- 6 See Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 2–3.
- 7 See Michael Bliss, "Pure Books on Avoided Subjects': Pre-Freudian Sexual Ideas in Canada," *Historical Papers* 5, no. 1 (1970): 80–108. On the relation of this to the construction of individual character and self-regulation, see Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 27–28. Also see Angus McLaren, "Sex, Science and Race Betterment," in *Our Own Master Race*, 68–88.
- 8 William Lund Clark, *Our Sons* (London, ON: William Lund Clark, 1914), 96–106. Clark toured Canada under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association and did sex-hygiene education for the Methodist Department of Temperance and Moral Reform. On William Lund Clark, see Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 27, 46, 70–72, 93.
- 9 See Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. For some very useful initial explorations of the construction of heterosexuality in Canada, see Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*; Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*; and for a later period, Adams, "The Trouble with Normal"; and Adams, *The Trouble with Normal*.
- 10 On reading official discourse such as medical and court reports "against the grain," see Terry, "Theorizing Deviant Historiography," 55–74. She reads the medical texts she is examining for "effects" of the violence of dominant discourses. At the same time, she is unable to specify the social basis for the "extra-discursive." For a critical way of reading and using court records, see Maynard, "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall," 207–42. Also see Maynard, "On the Case of the Case," 65–87. For later historical periods, particularly post-World War II, oral histories or other first-hand accounts, which will not be used systematically in this book until the 1950s, are vital. Also see Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation"; and Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*; and Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*

- 11 On the limitations of political economy, see Smith, “Feminist Reflections on Political Economy.” For Autonomist Marxist critiques of political economy, see Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically*; Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Marx*; and Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97. An important break with this political economy tradition is the innovative work of Bruce Curtis, esp. “Preconditions of the Canadian State: Educational Reforms and the Construction of a Public in Upper Canada, 1837–1846,” *Studies in Political Economy* 10, no. 1 (Winter 1983): 99–121. He develops an analysis of early Upper Canadian State formation where he points out that educational reforms in the late 1830s and 1840s were directed at the construction of political subjects in the wake of the 1837–38 rebellions. While this approach encompasses broader, political, cultural, and moral dimensions than the political economy tradition, it still has not dealt adequately with sex/gender relations as central to state formation and nation-building. Also see Curtis, *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836–1871* (London, ON: Althouse Press, 1988); and Curtis, “‘Illicit’ Sexuality and Public Education, 1840–1907,” in Prentice, *Sex in Schools*, 101–30. This kind of work is continued and extended in many of the articles in Allan Greer and Ian Radforth, eds., *Colonial Leviathan: State Formation in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992). On examining sexism and racism as constituent features of Canadian nation building see, Ng, “Sexism, Racism and Canadian Nationalism,” 182–96; and Himani Bannerji, *The Dark Side of the Nation* (Toronto: Canadian Scholar’s Press and Women’s Press, 2000). On developing social policies, social working and social struggles, see Chris Chapman and A.J. Withers, *A Violent History of Benevolence: Interlocking Oppression in the Moral Economies of Social Working* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019); and for later periods, see Manon Tremblay, ed., *Queer Mobilizations: Social Movement Activism and Canadian Public Policy* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2015).
- 12 See Donna Kahenrakwas Goodleaf, “‘Under Military Occupation’: Indigenous Women, State Violence and Community Resistance,” in *And Still We Rise: Feminist Political Mobilizing in Contemporary Canada*, ed. Linda E. Carty (Toronto: Women’s Press, 1993), 222–42; and *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance*, directed by Alanis Obomsawin (Montréal: National Film Board of Canada, 1993), 119 min. See references to Indigenous writings in the Introduction to the third edition and in Chapter 4.
- 13 Smith, “Women, Class and Family,” 19.
- 14 See Alex K. Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law: Homosexual, Exhibitionistic, and Pedophilic Offences in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), vii. In 1869, Canada required uniform criminal law and borrowed wholesale from England. In 1890, Canada used the Stephens Draft Code that had been prepared for Britain but had not been accepted there and had been made “available for export to the colonies that were in those days without the resources or the manpower to develop to any great extent their own criminal law” (36). There will be more on this in Chapter 6.
- 15 See Egan, “These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species,” 5–6; Bliss, “Pure Books on Avoided Subjects,” 80–108; and Wendy Mitchinson, “Historical Attitudes Toward Women and Childbirth,” *Atlantis* 4, no. 2, pt. 2 (Spring 1979): 16; and Mitchinson, *The Nature of Their Bodies: Women and Their Doctors in Victorian Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991).
- 16 Bliss, “Pure Books on Avoided Subjects,” 80–108. “British” is in quotes, given the relation between English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish state formation.
- 17 The connections between social-purity organizations can be seen in J.S. Shearer, introduction to *The Great War on White Slavery*, by Clifford G. Roe (Clifford G. Roe and B.G. Steadwell, 1911). Shearer was secretary of the Moral and Social Reform Council of Canada and is referred to as “the leader of the fight against white slavery in Canada,” 144; reprinted

in *War on the White Slave Trade* (Toronto: Coles, 1980). Also see A. Bell, ed., *Fighting the Traffic in Young Girls* (Ernest A. Bell, 1910), which contains a section by Shearer, “The Canadian Crusade,” and an article by William Alexander Coote, Secretary of the National Vigilance Association, London, England. Also see Reverend C.W. Watch, “Social Purity Work in Canada,” in *The National Purity Congress: Its Papers, Addresses, Portraits*, ed. Aaron M. Powell (New York: American Purity Alliance, 1896; New York: Arno Press, 1976), 272–79; and D.A. Watt, “The Canadian law for the Protection of Women and Girls, with Suggestions for Its Amendment and for a General Code,” in Powell, *The National Purity Congress*, 437–51. This was the first Social Purity conference held under the auspices of the American Purity Alliance, in Baltimore, October 14–16, 1895. Also see Linda Kealey, ed., *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada 1880s–1920s* (Toronto: The Women’s Press, 1979), 3; and Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*.

CHAPTER FOUR

- 1 Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*. Also see Maynard and Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*.
- 2 See Damien Lee and Geraldine King, “Re-Affirming Indigenous Citizenships: Two Spirit Family-Making and the Future of Belonging,” *Yellowhead Institute* (blog), March 4, 2020, <https://yellowheadinstitute.org/2020/03/04/re-affirming-indigenous-citizenships/>; Jodi A. Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); and Jodi A. Byrd, “What’s Normative Got to Do with It?: Toward Indigenous Queer Relationality,” *Social Text* 38, no. 4 (145) (December 2020): 105–23; Kim TallBear, *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013); Kim TallBear, “Failed Settler Kinship, Truth and Reconciliation, and Science,” *Indigenous STS* (blog), March 16, 2016, <https://indigenousts.com/failed-settler-kinship-truth-and-reconciliation-and-science/>; TallBear, “Making Love and Relations Beyond Settler Sex and Family,” 145–64; and Joshua LaBare and Kim TallBear, “Joshua LaBare and Kim TallBear | Matters of Life and Death,” *Anthropocene, Ecology, Pedagogy: The Future in Questions Speaker Series*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, December 15, 2015, YouTube video, 58:42, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tjivcwpBhSc>.
- 3 See Boston Lafenté, “Secwepemc Set Up New Camp In Hopes of Halting TMX Construction, Leads To Five Arrests,” *Martlet*, University of Victoria, October 23, 2020, <https://www.martlet.ca/news-secwepemc-new-camp-halts-tmx/>; Nasereddin, “The Struggle Against Canadian Repression at 1492 Land Back Lane”; Palmater, “Mi’Kmaq Treaty Rights.” Also see Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97. The newer writing that now informs my knowledge of Indigenous struggles includes: Coulthard, *Red Skins, White Masks*; Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*; Simpson, *Dancing on our Turtle’s Back*; Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*; Maynard and Simpson, “Towards Black and Indigenous Futures on Turtle Island: A Conversation,” 75–84; Simpson, “Interview with Leanne Betasamosake Simpson,” 139–48; Maynard and Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*; Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*; Audra Simpson, “The State is a Man”; Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*; and the work of Laura Hall, incl. “In Place and Time,” 43–55; and Hall, “White Settler Homonationalism.” Also see Martin Cannon, “The Regulation of First Nations Sexuality,” *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 18, no. 1 (1998): 1–18; Martin Cannon, *Men, Masculinity and the Indian Act* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019); and Martin Cannon and Lina Sunseri, eds., *Racism, Colonialism and Indigeneity in Canada: A Reader*, second ed. (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2018). I have changed “Native” and “Indian” from the second edition to “Indigenous,” aside from when it is in the quotations I use, or I have troubled it by placing it in scare quotation marks.

- 4 In this chapter, in the first and second editions, I drew on the early work of Ron G. Bourgeault, "The Indians, the Metis and the Fur Trade: Class, Sexism and Racism in the Transition from 'Communism' to Capitalism," *Studies in Political Economy* 12, no. 1 (Fall 1983): 45–80, quoted on 45.
- 5 For a critique of the use of "berdache," Morgensen writes, "I call berdache a colonial object to reference its colonial genealogy and Native critiques of its use.... I investigate it not by bracketing it outside common speech but by marking its circulation as an object of colonial thought. In my usage *berdache* never describes native culture: it only describes a colonial imaginary of indigeneity." *Spaces Between Us*, 239n3. In *Spaces Between Us*, see esp. "The Biopolitics of Settler Sexuality and Queer Modernities" and "Conversations on Berdache: Anthropology, Counterculturalism, Two Spirit Organizing," 31–87. Also see Morgensen, "Unsettling Queer Politics, What Can Non-Natives Learn from Two-Spirit Politics," in Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*, 132–52. Among the Bugis in South Sulawesi, Indonesia, there are five different genders, including one for what we might now call the "inter-sexed." See Fausto-Sterling, "The Five Sexes Revisited," 19–32; and Fausto-Sterling, "The Five Sexes." In this new context, also see my earlier references: Katz, *Gay American History*, 281–334; and Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 23–28 (on Katz's work on this topic, see Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 93–99); Martin B. Duberman, Fred Eggan, and Richard Clemens, eds., "Documents in Hopi Indian Sexuality: Imperialism, Culture and Resistance," in "Sexuality in History," special issue, *Radical History Review*, no. 20 (Spring/Summer 1979): 99–130; Evelyn Blackwood, "Sexuality and Gender in Certain Native American Tribes: The Case of Cross-Gender Females," *Signs* 10, no. 1 (Autumn 1984): 27–42; Harriet Whitehead, "The Bow and the Burden Strap: A New Look at Institutionalized Homosexuality in Native North America," in *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*, ed. Sherry B. Ortner and Harriet Whitehead (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 80–115; Walter L. Williams, *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986). This last is a useful contribution, although on some of its limitations, see Gary Kinsman, "Review of *The Spirit and the Flesh*, by Walter L. Williams," *Rites*, February 1988, 15. Also see Gay American Indians and Will Roscoe, eds., *Living the Spirit: A Gay American Indian Anthology* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), esp. Midnight Sun, "Sex/Gender Systems in Native North America," 32–32, and the first section on "Artists, Healers, and Providers: The Berdache Heritage." Will Roscoe, in his later work, has moved away from viewing "berdache" as a "traditional gay role" to seeing them as a third or fourth gender group, see "The Zuni Man-Woman," *Out/Look* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1988): 56–67; Roscoe, *The Zuni Man-Woman* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991); and Roscoe, *Changing Ones*, which came out after the second edition. On Roscoe's work, see Morgensen, "Unsettling Queer Politics," 139–40. In my interview with Roscoe in 1988, you can still see how my thinking was trapped in major ways within the colonizer mythology of the "berdache." Roscoe, "Berdache: Alternative Genders and Gays," interview with Will Roscoe, by Gary Kinsman, *Rites*, February 1988, 11–12. Also see Lang, "Lesbians, Men-Women and Two-Spirits," 202–18; Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*; and Driskill, *Asegi Stories*. As should be clear from my remarks in this section, I reject the notion of the cross-dressing/cross-working men and women, or third or fourth genders, as representing some form of "institutionalized homosexuality" or gay or lesbian role, or as queer or trans identifications. I find myself closest to the perspectives outlined by Midnight Sun, Qwo-Li Driskill, Chris Finley, Joseph Gilley, Scott Lauria Morgensen, Blackwood, and the later Roscoe. Also see the discussion between Mary McIntosh and Jeffrey Weeks, "Postscript: 'The Homosexual Role' Revisited," in Plummer, *The Making of the Modern*

- Homosexual*, 47–49. For commentary on problems of data and interpretation regarding “berdache,” see Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*, 24–36. Also see Jonathan Goldberg, “Sodomy in the New World: Anthropologies Old and New,” in Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet*, 3–18.
- 6 See Wesley Thomas and Sue-Ellen Jacobs, “‘...And We Are Still Here’: From Berdache to Two-Spirit People,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 23, no. 2 (October 1, 2007): 91–107.
 - 7 Chelsea Vowel, *Indigenous Writes: A Guide to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Issues in Canada* (Winnipeg: HighWater Press, 2016), 108. There were/are many different names used in different Indigenous languages and nations to refer to third and fourth gender groups and gender-diverse people.
 - 8 Goldberg, “Sodomy in the New World,” 12. The use of “tribe” here is unfortunate, especially when read in the Canadian context.
 - 9 Sylvia Van Kirk, *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670–1870* (Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer, 1980), 23–24; and see Karen Anderson, “Commodity Exchange and Subordination: Montagnais-Naskapi and Huron Women, 1600–1650,” *Signs* 11, no. 1 (Autumn 1985): 48–62; Anderson, “A Gendered World: Women, Men, and the Political Economy of the Seventeenth-Century Huron,” in Maroney and Luxton, *Feminism and Political Economy*, 121–65; Anderson, “As Gentle as Little Lambs: Images of Huron and Montagnais-Naskapi Women in the Writings of the 17th-Century Jesuits,” *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 25, no. 4 (November 1988): 560–76; and Anderson, *Chain Her by One Foot: The Subjugation of Native Women in Seventeenth-Century New France* (New York: Routledge, 1993). The practices of colonialism and genocide were centrally addressed against the social and political power of women in many Indigenous nations and against gender and erotic diversity in these cultures.
 - 10 Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 23.
 - 11 Xavier Mayne [Edward Stevenson], *The Intersexes: A History of Simisexuality as a Problem in Social Life* (Rome: Xavier Mayne, 1908; New York: Arno Press, 1975), 7–8.
 - 12 Katz, *Gay American History*, 288–90.
 - 13 On the derivation of “berdache,” see Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 86; and Blackwood, “Sexuality and Gender,” 27n1. Also see Katz, *Gay American History*, 293–98; and Paul-François Sylvestre, *Bougrerie en Nouvelle France* (Hull, QC: Editions Asticou, 1983), 27–34.
 - 14 Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*, 30–32.
 - 15 Along with Two-Spirit, “Indigequeer” or “Indigiqueer” are terms growing in popularity to describe queer Indigenous genders and sexualities. See Dolly Berlin, “Conversations with Our Relations: Thirza Cuthand,” *Never Apart*, April 2021, <https://www.neverapart.com/features/conversations-with-our-relations-thirza-cuthand/>; and Thirza Cuthand, “Indigequeer/Indigiqueer,” *TJ Cuthand: Filmmaker, Performance Artist, Writer* (blog), May 12, 2017, <https://www.thirzacuthand.com/2017/05/12/indigequeerindigiqueer/>. “Indigequeer” was first coined in the early 2000s by Thirza Cuthand, a Plains-Cree and Scottish video-artist and filmmaker from Little Pine First Nation, as a title for a Two-Spirit/queer film program during Vancouver’s Queer Film Festival in 2004. Indigequeer originated as a term that combined, in Cuthand’s words, Indigenous and queer. In their explanation for why it was created, she states, “I used it because some LGBTQ Indigenous people don’t feel as comfortable with the Two-Spirit title because it implies some dual gender stuff, which some people just don’t feel describes their identity. I know a lot of people don’t ID with the Queer label either. But I liked the idea of Indigequeer. Because Queer is kind of a confrontational label, it’s one of those old reclamations that makes people uncomfortable. Indigenous

- isn't a really confrontational label (although everything else about it is because we are all still all over the globe resisting) so putting the two together makes this word I really liked." The term Indigiqueer later began trending in the late 2010s throughout social media and was used in the title of the book *Full-metal Indigiqueer: Poems* (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 2017) by Joshua Whitehead, an Oji-Cree/nehiyaw Two-Spirit/Indigiqueer storyteller and scholar from Peguis First Nation.
- 16 On this, see Gay American Indians and Roscoe, *Living the Spirit*, esp. "Midnight Sun, "Sex/Gender Systems in Native North America," 32–42, and the first section on "Artists, Healers, and Providers: The Berdache Heritage"; Lang, "Lesbians, Men-Women and Two-Spirits," 202–18; Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*; Driskill, *Asegi Stories*; and Roscoe, *Changing Ones*. Also see Cannon, "The Regulation of First Nations Sexuality," 1–18; Cannon, *Men, Masculinity and the Indian Act*; and Ma-Nee Chacaby, with Mary Louisa Plummer, *A Two-Spirit Journey: The Autobiography of a Lesbian Ojibwa-Cree Elder* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2016). For more recent contributions, see Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Islands of Decolonial Love: Stories & Songs* (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2013); Qwo-Li Driskill, "Stolen from Our Bodies: First Nations Two-Spirits/Queers and the Journey to a Sovereign Erotic," *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 16, no. 2 (2004): 50–64; Billy-Ray Belcourt, *A History of My Brief Body* (Toronto: Hamish Hamilton, 2020); Belcourt, *This Wound Is a World* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019); Whitehead, *Full-Metal Indigiqueer*; Joshua Whitehead, *Jonny Appleseed* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2018); Jas M. Morgan, *Nitisanak* (Montréal: Metonymy Press, 2018); Arielle Twist, *Disintegrate/Dissociate* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2019); and Daniel Heath Justice, *Why Indigenous Literatures Matter* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2018).
 - 17 On this, see Albert McLeod, "Two-Spirit/Indigenous LGBTQ People and the Purge," *LGBT Purge*, "Briefing Documents," <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Monument-Briefing-Documents-EN-Albert-McLeod.pdf>. Also see Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*, 81–87.
 - 18 Alex Wilson, "How We Find Ourselves: Identity Development and Two Spirit People," *Harvard Educational Review* 66, no. 2 (July 1996): 303–18.
 - 19 See Blackwood, "Sexuality and Gender," which emphasizes cross-dressing/cross-working "women" in the face of a literature that has focused largely on cross-dressing/cross working "men."
 - 20 See Roscoe, "The Zuni Man-Woman," 56–67; and Kinsman, "Berdache: Alternative Genders and Gays," 11–12; and Roscoe, *Changing Ones*. Among the Zuni of what is now called New Mexico, gender formation was seen as akin to a process of baking. People and genders were made. For instance, the Zuni Ihamana We'wha went through one "male" initiation ritual but not the next one, and also learned many skills from women in the community. See Will Roscoe, *The Zuni Man-Woman*.
 - 21 Katz, *Gay American History*, 24.
 - 22 See Lang, "Lesbians, Men-Women and Two-Spirits," 202–18.
 - 23 Lang, "Lesbians, Men-Women, and Two-Spirits," 206. Katz, *Gay American History*, 26.
 - 24 On sodomy, see M. Jacqui Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).
 - 25 Jessica Johns and Selina Boan, "Everything Is Something Else: In Conversation with Billy-Ray Belcourt," *PRISM International*, December 4, 2017, <https://prismmagazine.ca/2017/12/04/everything-is-something-else-in-conversation-with-billy-ray-belcourt/>.
 - 26 Bourgeault, "The Indian, the Métis and the Fur Trade," 55. This is based on my reading of Bourgeault's argument.

- 27 Bourgeault, "The Indian, the Métis and the Fur Trade," 56.
- 28 Bourgeault, "The Indian, the Métis and the Fur Trade," 60–61.
- 29 Anderson, "Commodity Exchange and Subordination," 62.
- 30 See Anderson, "Commodity Exchange and Subordination"; and Anderson, "A Gendered World."
- 31 Bourgeault, "The Indian, the Métis and the Fur Trade," 86.
- 32 Trumbach, "London's Sodomites," 8. Also see the reference in Clellan S. Ford, *Smoke from Their Fires: The Life of a Kwakiutl Chief* (1941; repr., Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1995), 129–30. For other references to "berdache," see William Crawford, ed., *Homosexuality in Canada: A Bibliography*, second edition, Canadian Gay Archives publication, no. 9 (Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1984), 2–5.
- 33 Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 28.
- 34 Bourgeault, "The Indian, the Métis and the Fur Trade," 73.
- 35 Cannon, "The Regulation of First Nations Sexuality," 1–18.
- 36 Bonita Lawrence, "Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview," *Hypatia* 18, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 7.
- 37 Lawrence, "Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States," 7.
- 38 Lawrence, "Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States," 7.
- 39 Lawrence, "Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States," 8. See also Ann Stoler, "Carnal Knowledge: Gender, Race and Morality in Colonial Asia," in *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Post-modern Era*, ed. Micaela Di Leonardo (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).
- 40 See Yellowhead Institute, "Land Back: A Yellowhead Institute Red Paper" (Yellowhead Institute, October 2019), <https://redpaper.yellowheadinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/red-paper-report-final.pdf>.
- 41 TallBear, "Failed Settler Kinship, Truth and Reconciliation, and Science." Expanded in TallBear, "Making Love and Relations Beyond Settler Sex and Family." The use of hetero- and homonormative here is a bit too early since these concepts do not really emerge until the twentieth century.
- 42 Chris Finley, "Decolonizing the Queer Native Body (and Recovering the Native Bull-Dyke): Bringing 'Sexy Back' and Out of Native Studies' Closet," in Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*, 32.
- 43 TallBear, "Failed Settler Kinship, Truth and Reconciliation, and Science."
- 44 Vowel, *Indigenous Writes*, 236.
- 45 Zoe Todd, "Relationships," *Theorizing the Contemporary*, *Fieldsights*, January 21, 2016, <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/relationships>.
- 46 Zoe Todd, "Relationships."
- 47 TallBear, "Failed Settler Kinship, Truth and Reconciliation, and Science."
- 48 On whiteness, complicity, solidarity, and settler claims to kinship, also see Alexis Shotwell, "Claiming Bad Kin: Solidarity from Complicit Locations," *Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge: Bearing*, March 2019, 8–11, <https://www.blackwoodgallery.ca/publications/sduk/bearing/claiming-bad-kin>.
- 49 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Interim Report* (Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2012).
- 50 TallBear, "Failed Settler Kinship, Truth and Reconciliation, and Science."

- 51 See Goodleaf, “Under Military Occupation,” 225–42; Kanehsatake, dir. Obomsawin. On more recent struggles, see Lafenté, “Secwepemc Set Up New Camp”; Nasereddin, “The Struggle Against Canadian Repression”; Palmater, “Mi’kmaw Treaty Rights”; and Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97. See also “The Land Back Issue,” *Briarpatch*, September/October 2020, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/issues/view/september-october-2020>.
- 52 Groups such as Two-Spirited Peoples of the First Nations (Toronto) now exist across Turtle Island. See Morgensen, “Unsettling Queer Politics,” 132–52.

CHAPTER FIVE

- 1 Leo Johnson, “The Political Economy of Ontario Women in the Nineteenth Century,” in *Women at Work: Ontario, 1850–1930*, ed. Janice Acton, Penny Goldsmith, and Bonnie Shepard (Toronto: Canadian Women’s Educational Press, 1974), 17.
- 2 *Journal des Jesuites*, 1647–48; as referred to in Sylvestre, *Bougrerie en Nouvelle-France*, 31–34.
- 3 Jacques Briand, “Sodomy in New France,” *The Body Politic*, April 1978, 27.
- 4 Briand, “Sodomy in New France,” 27. Also see Sylvestre, “Trois Soldats Accusés des Sodomie,” in *Bougrerie en Nouvelle-France*, 37–43.
- 5 Briand, “Sodomy in New France,” 27; and Robert-Lionel Séguin, *La Vie libertine en Nouvelle-France au XVIIe siècle* (Montréal: Lemeac, 1972), 343–44.
- 6 See Jay Cassel, “Love in the Time of War: Same-Sex Activity in New France,” presentation at “Out of the Archives” Conference on the History of Bisexuals, Lesbians and Gay Men in Canada, York University, Toronto, January 14, 1994.
- 7 These thoughts were inspired by hearing Jay Cassel, “Love in the Time of War.” His book on sexually transmitted diseases in the Canadian state is referred to next chapter. Jay Cassel, *The Secret Plague: Venereal Disease in Canada, 1838–1939* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).
- 8 Robert Burns, “‘Queer Doings’: Attitudes Towards Homosexuality in 19th-Century Canada,” *The Body Politic*, December/January 1977, 4–7. The rest of this paragraph is based on Burns’s account.
- 9 Ed Jackson, “Some Further Comments,” *The Body Politic*, December/January 1977, 7.
- 10 Paul Romney, “...Horrible Indecent Liberties: The Trial of a Dancing Master, Toronto, 1840,” *The Body Politic*, February 1977, 24. And see Philip McLeod, “Remarks,” *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, December 1985, 5.
- 11 From records of sworn evidence of John Cooper before Robert Reynolds, Esq., Her Majesty’s Justice of the Peace in Canada West, Western District, April 5, 1842, in relation to the charge of sodomy against Samuel Moore and Patrick Kelly, reprinted in Stephen MacDonald, “Diggers,” *The Body Politic*, November 1984, 35–36.
- 12 McLeod, “Remarks,” 5. Also see the recent dance-film *Private Flowers*, about an infantryman at Fort York (Toronto) who was hanged for having sex with another man. Directed by HAU1 and featuring choreography performed by and co-created by Rodney Diverlus and Jera Wolfe: https://www.howardjdavis.com/privateflowers?utm_campaign=boaa8289-8eco-4bef-9ebf-d583b492b080&utm_source=so&utm_medium=mail&cid=5b8ea2b9-5835-46bd-9f52-7c3fee8b9b17
- 13 Weeks, “Inverts, Perverts, and Mary Annes,” 115–30.
- 14 Beth Light and Alison Prentice, eds., *Pioneer and Gentlewomen of British North America, 1713–1867* (Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1980), 204.
- 15 Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 13–14.

- 16 Bryan D. Palmer, "Discordant Music: Charivaris and Whitecapping in Nineteenth-Century British North America," *Labour / Le Travail* 3 (1978), 5–62; and Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstruction of Canadian Labour 1800–1980* (Toronto: Butterworth, 1983), 42–44. Most of the Canadian information here is based on Palmer. The word "charivari" originates in European shaming festivals. On aspects of this in a broader social and historical context, see Bryan D. Palmer, *Cultures of Darkness: Night Travels in the Histories of Transgression* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000).
- 17 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 44.
- 18 Quoted in Chris Brookes, *A Public Nuisance: A History of the Mimmers Troupe* (St. John's: University of Newfoundland, Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1988), esp. 29, and 23–30 more generally.
- 19 Chapman, "Sex Crimes in Western Canada," 10–11.
- 20 On the development of policing in what was to become Montréal, see Defund the Police Coalition (Montréal), "Defund to Abolish, the 400 Year Struggle to Abolish Policing in Montréal," in Pasternak, Stadnyk, and Walby, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*, 34–39.
- 21 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada."
- 22 Also see Maynard, "Rough Work and Rugged Men," 159–69. Also see Steven Maynard, "'Horrible Temptations': Sex, Men and Working-Class Male Youth in Urban Ontario, 1890–1935," *Canadian Historical Review* 78, no. 2 (June 1997): 191–235. On early lesbian history, see Maynard, "'Hell Witches in Toronto': Notes on Lesbian Visibility in Early Twentieth-Century Canada," *Left History* 9, no. 2 (Summer 2004): 191–205.
- 23 Gérard Fortin and Boyce Richardson, *Life of the Party* (Montréal: Vehicule Press, 1984), 38; cited in Maynard, "Rough Work and Rugged Men," 167.
- 24 Beth Light and Joy Parr, "Neither Child nor Wife," *Canadian Women on the Move, 1867–1920*, ed. Beth Light and Joy Parr (Toronto: New Hogtown Press/OISE, 1983), 49.
- 25 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 15.
- 26 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 16.
- 27 Chapman, 12. On an earlier case from Atlantic Canada, see Lorna Hutchinson, "Buggery Trials in Saint John, 1806: The Case of John M. Smith," *University of New Brunswick Law Journal* 40 (January 1991): 130–48.
- 28 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 13.
- 29 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 13–14.
- 30 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 14; and Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse and Homosexual Acts," 10. Also see Lyle Dick, "The Queer Frontier: Male Same-Sex Experience in Western Canada's Settlement Era," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 48, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 15–52; and Dick, "Same-Sex Intersections of the Prairie Settlement Era: The 1895 Case of Regina's 'Oscar Wilde,'" *Histoire sociale/Social history* 42, no. 83 (2009): 107–45.
- 31 From the headline of the *Medicine Hat Times*, quoted in Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse," 12.
- 32 Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse," 11–15.
- 33 Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse," 14.
- 34 Maynard, "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall," 219.
- 35 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 2.
- 36 Chapman, "Sex Crimes in Western Canada," 31.
- 37 Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse," 3.
- 38 Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse," 4–6.

- 39 Chapman, "Sex Crimes in Western Canada," 31–33. More on this next chapter. Also see Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, esp. "Racial Purity, Sexual Purity, and Immigration Policy," 104–28.
- 40 Maynard, "In Search of 'Sodom North,'" 128. The records of the trial are housed at the Provincial Archives of Nova Scotia. On anti-Black racism and sex-related offences, also see Robyn Maynard, *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present* (Halifax: Fernwood, 2017).
- 41 Matters, "Unfit for Publication." Also see Ali Kazemi, John Greyson, and Richard Fung, dirs., *Rex v. Singh* (2009), 30 min., <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qIcu-3J69D8>. Also see Ali Kazemi, John Greyson, and Richard Fung, *Rex v. Singh* (2009), DVD, 30 min., <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qIcu-3J69D8>.
- 42 Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 18.
- 43 Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*, 166.

CHAPTER SIX

- 1 Curtis, "Preconditions of the Canadian State," 103–107. Also see Curtis, "The Speller Expelled: Disciplining the Common Reader in Canada West," *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie* 22, no. 3 (August 1985): 346–68; Curtis, *Building the Educational State*; and Curtis, "'Illicit' Sexuality and Public Education, 1840–1907," 101–30.
- 2 Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Upper Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 40.
- 3 See Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*; also see nt. 1. For Foucault-derived literature on governance, see Burchell et al., *The Foucault Effect*; and Gane and Johnson, *Foucault's New Domains*; and Brock, ed., *Governing the Social in Neoliberal Times*.
- 4 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 9–10.
- 5 McLaren, "Birth Control and Abortion in Canada, 1870–1920," 320. Also see McLaren and McLaren, *The Bedroom and the State*; and McLaren, *Our Own Master Race*.
- 6 Heather MacDougall, "Public Health in Toronto's Municipal Politics: The Cardiff Years, 1833–1890," in *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 55, no. 2 (Summer 1981): 186–202.
- 7 Dorothy E. Smith, "Women's Inequality and the Family," in *Inequality: Essays on the Political Economy of Social Welfare*, ed. Allan Moscovitch and Glen Drover (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 163.
- 8 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 61.
- 9 See Joey Noble, "'Class-ifying the Poor': Toronto's Charities, 1850–1880," *Studies in Political Economy* 2 (1979): 109–28; and Susan E. Houston, "The 'Waifs and Strays' of a Late Victorian City: Juvenile Delinquents in Toronto," in *Childhood and Family in Canadian History*, ed. Joy Parr (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), 129–42; and Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*.
- 10 Beth Light and Joy Parr, introduction to *Canadian Women on the Move*, 2.
- 11 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 55.
- 12 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 14.
- 13 On the social construction of poverty, see Mitchell Dean, *The Constitution of Poverty: Toward a Genealogy of Liberal Governance* (London: Routledge, 1991); and Dean, "'A Social Structure of Many Souls': Moral Regulation, Government, and Self-Rule," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 2 (1994): 145–68. Also see Bryan D. Palmer and Gaetan Heroux, *Toronto's Poor: A Rebellious History* (Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 2016); and Chapman and Withers, *A Violent History of Benevolence*.

- 14 Noble, "Class-ifying the Poor," 113. For later years, after the historical period covered in the Noble article, see Margaret Hillyard Little, "'Manhunts and Bingo Blabs': The Moral Regulation of Single Mothers," *Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 19, no. 2 (1994): 233–47.
- 15 Wayne Roberts, "Rocking the Cradle for the World: The New Woman and Maternal Feminism, Toronto, 1877–1914," in Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 30.
- 16 T.R. Morrison, "Their Proper Sphere: Feminism, the Family and Child-Centred Social Reform in Ontario, 1875–1900, part 2," *Ontario History* 68, no. 2 (1976): 73.
- 17 See Houston, "The 'Waifs and Strays,'" 136; and Livy Visano, "Tramps, Tricks and Troubles: Street Transients and Their Controls," in *Deviant Designations: Crime, Law, and Deviance in Canada*, ed. Tom Fleming and Livy Visano (Toronto: Butterworth, 1983), 221.
- 18 See Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, 27–37.
- 19 Constance Backhouse and Leah Cohen, *The Secret Oppression: Sexual Harassment of Working Women* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1978), 57. Also see Gregory Kealey, ed., *Canada Investigates Industrialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973).
- 20 Susan Trofimenkoff, "One Hundred and Two Muffled Voices: Canada's Industrial Women in the 1880s," in *Canada's Age of Industry, 1849–1896*, ed. Michael S. Cross and Gregory S. Kealey (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), 220.
- 21 Alice Klein and Wayne Roberts, "Besieged Innocence: The 'Problem' and Problems of Working Women—Toronto, 1896–1914," in Acton, Goldsmith, and Shepard, *Women at Work*, 216.
- 22 Klein and Roberts, "Besieged Innocence," 218. Also see Jane Ursel, *Private Lives, Public Policy: 100 Years of State Intervention in the Family* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1992), esp. 83–99.
- 23 Klein and Roberts, "Besieged Innocence," 222.
- 24 Smith, "Women's Inequality and the Family," 182.
- 25 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 31–33, 80.
- 26 Roberts, "Rocking the Cradle," 16. This reference to Sodom and Gomorrah seems to refer to a notion of masturbation leading to a life of prostitution and immorality and not to the legal offence of sodomy or same-gender sex between women. In the United States, Pivar reports, some people "imagined the bicycle as a social vehicle for transporting girls into prostitution. Alarmists even feared bicycle seats might cause women's moral downfall." David J. Piver, *Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868–1900* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973), 176.
- 27 On the shifting historical and social character of constructs of race and ethnicity, see Roxana Ng, "Sexism, Racism, and Canadian Nationalism," 184–85.
- 28 MacLaren, "Birth Control and Abortion in Canada," 321–22; and Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 1, 4.
- 29 Between 1891 and 1901, the number of Canadians born of British stock declined while the number of Europeans and Asians born in Canada almost doubled. Non-British immigrants were considered by state officials and moral reformers as being mentally and physically inferior to Anglo-Canadians and of a lower sexual morality. They were associated with "feeble-mindedness" and "mental deficiency." Carol Lee Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English-Canadian Suffragists, 1877–1918* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), 89, 97, 109; Suzann Buckley, "Ladies or Midwives? Efforts to Reduce Infant and Maternal Mortality," in Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 131–34; Light and Parr, introduction to *Canadian Women on the Move*, 5; Suzann Buckley and Janice Dicken McGinnis, "Venereal

- Disease and Public Health Reform in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 63, no. 3, (1982): 346; and Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada, 1890–1920," 9.
- 30 Terry L. Chapman, "The Anti-Drug Crusade in Western Canada, 1885–1925," in *Law and Society in Canada in Historical Perspective Studies in History*, ed. Louis A. Knalpa and David Jay Bercuson (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1979), 89–90.
- 31 Light and Parr, introduction to *Canadian Women on the Move*, 2.
- 32 Chapman, "The Anti-Drug Crusade," 90–94; and Marie Campbell, "Sexism in British Columbia Trade Unions, 1900–1920," in *In Her Own Right: Selected Essays on Women's History in B.C.*, ed. Barbara Latham and Cathy Kess (Victoria: Camosun College, 1980), 174. It is interesting that there was no focus on same-gender sex among Chinese men who were denied access to Chinese women. Conversation between the author and Richard Fung, 1990s.
- 33 For some suggestions on the racial character of sex offence legislation, see Terry Chapman, "Early Eugenics Movement in Western Canada," *Alberta History* 25, no. 4 (Autumn 1977): 12; and Matters, "Unfit For Publication." On how race/ethnicity entered into sex offence legal proceedings, see Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*.
- 34 Maynard, *Policing Black Lives*, 20–82.
- 35 See Curtis, "The Speller Expelled"; Curtis, "Preconditions of the Canadian State"; Curtis, *Building the Educational State*; Curtis, "'Illicit' Sexuality and Public Education"; and Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*.
- 36 See Nancy M. Sheehan, "Women Helping Women: The WCTU and the Foreign Population in the West, 1905–1930," *International Journal of Women's Studies* 6, no. 5 (November/December 1983): 395–411; Wendy Mitchinson, "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and the Native Land': A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism," in Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 163. Also see Barbara Roberts, "Ladies, Women and the State: Managing Female Immigration, 1880–1920," in *Community Organization and the Canadian State*, ed. Roxana Ng, Gillian Walker, and Jacob Muller (Toronto: Garamond, 1990), 108–30.
- 37 Chapman, "Early Eugenics Movement in Western Canada," 9–10. Also see McLaren, *Our Own Master Race*, 99, 159, and 169.
- 38 Chapman, "Early Eugenics Movement in Western Canada," 9. Also see McLaren, *Our Own Master Race*. These anti-disability practices were often associated with anti-Indigenous racism and colonialism in sterilization practices. They lasted into the 1990s in Manitoba, and in many jurisdictions where they were officially ended, they still continued.
- 39 McLaren, "Birth Control and Abortion in Canada," 319.
- 40 Constance C. Backhouse, "Shifting Patterns in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Custody Law," in *Essays in the History of Canadian Law, Vol. 1*, ed. David H. Flaherty (Toronto: University of Toronto Press for the Osgood Society, 1981), 228. Also see Backhouse, "Nineteenth-Century Canadian Rape Law, 1800–92," in *Essays in the History of Canadian Law, Vol. 2*, ed. David H. Flaherty (Toronto: University of Toronto Press for the Osgood Society, 1983), 200–47; Backhouse, "Nineteenth-Century Canadian Prostitution Law: Reflection of a Discriminatory Society" (unpublished paper, October 1982); and Backhouse, *Petticoats and Prejudice: Women and Law in Nineteenth-Century Canada* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1991).
- 41 Buckley, "Ladies or Midwives?," 131; Light and Parr, introduction to *Canadian Women on the Move*, 5–6, "Managing the Family," 154, "Founding a Family," 112; and Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, 89–94.
- 42 Light and Parr, "Founding a Family," 112.

- 43 Light and Parr, "Founding a Family," 112. Also see Joy Parr, *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men and Change in Two Industrial Towns, 1880–1950* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).
- 44 James G. Snell, "The White Life for Two: The Defence of Marriage and Sexual Morality in Canada, 1890–1914," *Histoire sociale/Social History* 16, no. 31 (May 1983): 111–29. Also see Snell, *In the Shadow of the Law: Divorce in Canada, 1900–1939* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991); and James G. Snell and Cynthia Comacchio Abeele, "Regulating Nuptiality: Restricting Access to Marriage in Early Twentieth-Century English-Speaking Canada," *Historical Perspectives on Law and Society in Canada*, ed. Tina Merrill Loo and Lorna R. McLean (Toronto: Copp Clark Longman, 1994). Thanks to Chris Burr for these references.
- 45 Snell, "The White Life for Two," 113.
- 46 E. A. Lancaster, quoted in Snell, "The White Life for Two," 115.
- 47 Chapman, "Sex Crimes in Western Canada," 41.
- 48 Snell, "The White Life for Two," 112.
- 49 See Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 77–128.
- 50 Deborah Brock, "'Unwholesome Truths': Reforming Turn-of-the-Century Urban Ontario" (unpublished paper, April 1986), 12–13. Also see Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 77–103. On the history of slavery, and resistance to it in Canada, see Maynard, *Policing Black Lives*, 17–82.
- 51 See Brock, "'Unwholesome Truths,'" 12–13; and Snell, "The White Life for Two," 117–18, 122. Also see D.A. Watt, "The Canadian Law for the Protection of Women and Girls," 437–51.
- 52 Historical investigation reveals that "protective" legislation usually constructs certain legal or social incapacities in the "protected" group, and all too often comes to be used against the very groups it was designed to protect, whether it be women or young people.
- 53 Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*, 66.
- 54 Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*, 68.
- 55 Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*, esp. 66–71.
- 56 Snell, "The White Life for Two," 119.
- 57 On the family-wage system, see Michelle Barrett and Mary McIntosh, "The 'Family Wage': Some Problems for Socialists and Feminists," *Capital and Class* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1980): 51–72. As a result of this defence of marriage, the possibilities for conviction on sex-related offences increased as arrest rates increased. See Snell, "The White Life for Two," 127. Only in 1926 would the first major divorce legislation be passed in Canada, and only in 1968 would a general liberalizing divorce law finally be passed (Snell, 115).
- 58 See Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*.
- 59 See Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*; and Valverde, "Sex versus Purity," 10–11.
- 60 Weeks, *Coming Out*, 16–17.
- 61 Linda Kealey, "Introduction," in *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 9.
- 62 Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, ix.
- 63 Carol Lee Bacchi, "Race Regeneration and Social Purity: A Study of the Social Attitudes of Canada's English-Speaking Suffragists," *Histoire sociale/Social History* 11, no. 22 (November 1978): 467; Deborah Gorham, "Flora MacDonald Denison: Canadian Feminist," in Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 47–70; and Roberta J. Pazdro, "Agnes Deans Cameron," in Latham and Kess, *In Her Own Right*, 101–23.
- 64 Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, ix.
- 65 Bacchi, "Race Regeneration," 474.

- 66 For African-Canadian women's experiences, see Peggy Bristow, ed., *"We're Rooted Here and They Can't Pull Us Up": Essays in African Canadian History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994); Dionne Brand, "A Working Paper on Black Women in Toronto: Gender, Race and Class," in Bannerji, *Returning the Gaze*, 220–42; and Dionne Brand, *No Burden to Carry: Narratives of Black Women in Ontario, 1920s to 1950s* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1991). Also see Maynard, *Policing Black Lives*.
- 67 Roe, *The Great War on White Slavery*, 446.
- 68 Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, 112; and Roe, *The Great War on White Slavery*, 445.
- 69 Article in *Jack Canuck*, November 25, 1911, quoted in Egan, "These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species," 7.
- 70 Quoted in Maynard, "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall," 234.
- 71 For England, see Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*. For Canada, see Judy Bedford, "Prostitution in Calgary, 1905–1914," *Alberta History* 29, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 1–9; Deborah Nilson, "The 'Social Evil': Prostitution in Vancouver, 1900–1920," in Latham and Kess, *In Her Own Right*, 205–28; and Lori Rotenberg, "The Wayward Worker: Toronto's Prostitutes at the Turn of the Century," in Acton, Goldsmith, and Shepard, *Women at Work*, 33–69.
- 72 Nilson, "The 'Social Evil,'" 207.
- 73 See Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, esp. 116–43.
- 74 Social Survey Commission, *Report of the Social Survey Commission, Toronto: Presented to the City Council October 4th, 1915* (Toronto: Carswell Company, 1915). On the Social Survey Commission, also see Carolyn Strange, "From Modern Babylon to a City upon a Hill: The Toronto Survey Commission of 1915 and the Search for Sexual Order in the City," in *Patterns of the Past: Interpreting Ontario's History*, ed. Roger Hall, William Westfall, and Laurel Sefton MacDowell (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1988), 225–78; and Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, 102–15.
- 75 See Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 83.
- 76 Social Survey Commission, *Report*, 136.
- 77 Vice Commission of Chicago, *The Social Evil in Chicago: A Study of Existing Conditions* (Chicago: Vice Commission of Chicago, 1911), 296.
- 78 Vice Commission of Chicago, 73.
- 79 Vice Commission of Chicago, 297.
- 80 Vice Commission of Chicago, 73.
- 81 See Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*; and Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*. Also note how the laws against the "feeble-minded" were a part of a campaign against people with mental health and other disabilities.
- 82 Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*.
- 83 J.S. Shearer, introduction to Roe, *The Great War on White Slavery*, 23. Notice the racial emphasis on the Black plague.
- 84 W.J. Hunter, *Manhood Wrecked and Rescued* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1894), 71; and Bacchi, "Race Regeneration and Social Purity," 469, 471.
- 85 The Methodist Church is not necessarily the most "objective" of sources. See Bliss, "Pure Books on Avoided Subjects," 89–108; Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse and Homosexual Acts." Dick lists a number of other Canadian sex-advice titles, including J.E. Hett, *The Sexual Organs: Their Use and Abuse: The Subject Upon Which Men and Women Know the Least* (Berlin [Kitchener], ON: J.E.H. Hett, 1899); B.G. Jefferis, *Search Lights on Health: Light on Dark Corners: A Complete Sexual Science and a Guide to Purity and Physical Manhood, Advice to Maiden, Wife, Mother Love, Courtship and Marriage* (Toronto: J.L.

- Nichols, 1899); and Reta Gray, *Queer Questions Quaintly Answered, or Creative Mysteries Made Plain to Children* (Toronto: J.L. Nichols, 1899). Also see Dick, "The Queer Frontier," 15–52; and Dick "Same-sex Intersections of the Prairie Settlement Era," 107–45.
- 86 On the reports of Drs. Joseph Workman and Daniel Clarke, see Bliss, "Pure Books on Avoided Subjects."
- 87 On Bucke, see Wendy Mitchinson, "Gynecological Operations on Insane Women, London, Ontario, 1895–1901" (unpublished manuscript, University of Windsor, Department of History, 1980), 6, 13; published, Wendy Mitchinson, "Gynecological Operations on Insane Women: London, Ontario, 1895–1901," *Journal of Social History* 15, no. 3 (Spring 1982): 467–84. Also see Mitchinson, *The Nature of Their Bodies*.
- 88 Mary Wood-Allen and Sylvanus Stall, *What a Young Woman Ought to Know* (Philadelphia: VIR Publishing, 1894), 173–4.
- 89 Josephine E. Young, quoted in Roe, *The Great War on White Slavery*, 433.
- 90 Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 46.
- 91 Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problems*, 126.
- 92 Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 72–74.
- 93 Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, 113, 171; Chapman, "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada," 11; and Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 39. Also Beatrice Brigden, "One Woman's Campaign for Social Purity and Social Reform," in the *Social Gospel in Canada*, ed. Richard Allen (Ottawa: National Museums, 1975), 37–40, 44–47.
- 94 Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 69–70.
- 95 Department of Evangelism and Social Service, Department of Temperance and Moral Reform, Sixth Annual Report, 131. Fonds 17, Methodist Church (Canada) Department of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto, Ontario.
- 96 Clark, *Our Sons*, 153, 155.
- 97 Bliss, "Pure Books on Avoided Subjects"; and Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, 171.
- 98 Bliss, "Pure Books on Avoided Subjects."
- 99 Brock, "Unwholesome Truths," 36. Also see Arthur W. Beall, *The Living Temple: A Manual on Eugenics for Parents and Teachers* (Whitby, ON: A.B. Penhale Publishing Company, 1933); and Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 70–71.
- 100 VD (now referred to as sexually transmitted infections) was linked with "feeble-mindedness" and fear of non-Anglo immigrants, and with concerns over military efficiency given its rate of incidence among troops and recruits. This brought racism and ethnic-chauvinism together with practices against people with disabilities. It was feared that VD threatened national defence by "incapacitating Canadian manpower." Buckley and McGinnis, "Venereal Disease and Public Health Reform in Canada," 338. Also see Cassel, *The Secret Plague*, esp. 122–44.
- 101 Bland, "Guardians of the Race, or Vampires upon the Nation's Health?," 81.
- 102 Buckley and McGinnis, "Venereal Disease and Public Health Reform in Canada," 343. This points to the ambiguous and contradictory character of "public health" legislation. While it has brought about real gains, it has also extended state and medical surveillance of sexual life and has been used to brand certain sexual activities as deviant or "sick." On this, see my review article, Kinsman, "Which Public, Whose Health?" *Rites*, May 1986, 16–17; Kinsman, "Their Silence, Our Deaths," 39–60; and Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39. Also see Bland and Mort, "Look Out for the 'Good Time' Girl," 131–51; and Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities*. On the US experience, see Brandt, *No Magic Bullet*.
- 103 Quoted in Cassel, *The Secret Plague*, 141.

- 104 Cassell, *The Secret Plague*, 216.
- 105 Mayne, *The Intersexes*, 638.
- 106 Ezra Hurlburt Stafford, "Perversion," *Canadian Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, Toronto 3, no. 4 (April 1898): 179–85. The following references and quotes are all drawn from this article.
- 107 Krafft-Ebing himself moved from his 1887 position—that homosexuality is a disease with a biological basis—to his 1901 position, that some varieties of homosexuality are congenital anomalies. The emerging Canadian medical and psychological discourse regarding sex must be studied in much more detail: it affected state policy, newspaper reports, popular culture, and homosexual consciousness.
- 108 Ross Higgins, "L'Association Nocturne: A Montréal Cruising Story from 1886," *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Network Newsletter*, no. 3 (December 1987): 5–7. "L'Association Nocturne," *La Presse*, June 30, 1886, 4. The article was rediscovered by Cyrille Felteau, a journalist at *La Presse*, and reprinted, April 19, 1982, A5; and later in Felteau, *Histoire de la Presse*, vol. 1 (Montréal: Éditions la Presse Montréal, 1983), 170.
- 109 Maynard, "In Search of 'Sodom North,'" 127–28.
- 110 See Chauncey, *Gay New York*.
- 111 Maynard, "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall," 234.
- 112 Light and Prentice, *Pioneer and Gentlewomen of British North America*, 1–204, 214–15. Of course, all gender performance is passing in a social sense. See Fabien Rose, "A History of That Which Was Never Supposed to Be Possible," 64–184. Some reclaim many of these cross-dressing "women" as trans. In my view, this is projecting a current category too much into the historical past.
- 113 See Katz, *Gay American History*; and Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*. Fabien Rose engages in a critique of this work on passing, see, "A History of That Which Was Never Supposed to Be Possible," 172–74.
- 114 J.M. Le Moine, "Saint-Thomas, Quebec, 182," *L'Album du Tourisme* (Québec, 1872), 288–89, reprinted in Light and Parr, *Canadian Women on the Move*, 241. For use of the term "hermaphrodite" in a later period, see the section on Elsa Gidlow's experiences later in this chapter. At least one "cross-dressing woman" fought in the American Civil War. Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, 191–94. Also see Steven Maynard's critical review of *At Face Value: The Life and Times of Eliza McCormack/John White*, by Don Akenson, *Rites*, September/October 1991, 13.
- 115 Medical and Surgical Reporter, "The Higher Education of Women," *The Canada Lancet* 15, no. 9 (May 1883): 285. The relationship between this initial distinction and the later emergence of the "lesbian" remains to be explored more fully.
- 116 And much later for trans men. Other early experiences of female friendships that may have influenced the emergence of lesbian networks are explored by Frances Rooney, "Edith G. Watson, Photographer, and Victoria Hayward, Writer," in "Lesbiantics," special issue, *Fireweed*, no. 13 (1982): 60–68; and Frances Rooney, "Loring and Wyle, Sculptors," *Pink Ink*, July 1983, 18–20. Also see Duder, *Awfully Devoted Women*.
- 117 The scandals involving Wilde were to have an important effect on Canadian debates. Dick, for instance, refers to an 1895 editorial in the *Regina Leader*. Referring to Wilde's activities as "effeminating, debilitating and immoral," it describes his "vile companionships," "scandalous associations," "spiritual corrosion," and "moral leprosy" and calls for Wilde to be jailed for life. "Oscar Wilde in Jail," *The Leader* (Regina), April 11, 1895, quoted in Dick, "Heterohegemonic Discourse and Homosexual Acts," 8, 4. Also see Dick, "Same-sex Intersections of the Prairie Settlement Era," 107–45.

- 118 On Wilde, see Kevin O'Brien, *Oscar Wilde in Canada: An Apostle for the Arts* (Toronto: Personal Library, 1982).
- 119 On Whitman, see Lynch, "The Lovers of His Fellows and Hot Little Prophets," 29–31; and Lynch, "Walt Whitman in Ontario," 141–51; and Martin, *The Homosexual Tradition in American Poetry*. For Carpenter, see Canadian Gay Archives Publication No. 5, "Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto" 1982.
- 120 Deborah Gorham, "Flora MacDonald Denison," 55, 62, 67.
- 121 Dubinsky, *Improper Advances*, 140. This position was unfortunately all too common among white feminists and much of the white left during these years.
- 122 Gorham, "Flora MacDonald Denison," 66.
- 123 Gorham, "Flora MacDonald Denison"; and Egan, "These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species," 16.
- 124 Egan, "These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species," 16.
- 125 "A Comrade Passes," *The Canadian Theosophist* (Toronto) 11, no. 4 (June 15, 1921).
- 126 Weeks, *Coming Out*, 52; and Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 111.
- 127 Rev. James Carmichael, *Balford's Monthly Magazine*, Toronto, 1877; reprinted in Canadian Gay Archives, *Gay Archivist*, no. 4 (September 1981).
- 128 Elsa Gidlow, "Casting a Net: Excerpts from an Autobiography," *The Body Politic*, May 1982, 27–30; Gidlow, "Memoirs," introduction by Rayna Rapp, *Feminist Studies* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 103–27. Also see Gidlow, *Elsa: I Come with My Songs, The Autobiography of Elsa Gidlow* (San Francisco: Bootlegger Press, 1986). Elsa Gidlow died on June 8, 1986.
- 129 Gidlow, "Memoirs," 115.
- 130 Casey Adair and Nancy Adair, "Elsa," interview with Elsa Gidlow, in *Word is Out: Stories of Some of Our Lives* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1978), 17.
- 131 Gidlow, "Casting a Net," 30. This included Ellis's *Psychology of Sex* (1933) and Carpenter's *The Intermediate Sex* (1908) and *Towards Democracy* (1905).
- 132 Gidlow, "Casting a Net," 30.
- 133 Gidlow, "Casting a Net," 30.
- 134 Gidlow, "Casting a Net," 30. A 4-F classification was also used to stigmatize homosexual draftees in World War II in the US. See Allan Bérubé, "Coming Out Under Fire," *Mother Jones*, February/March 1983, 24; Bérubé, *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War Two* (New York: The Free Press, 1990).
- 135 On World War I experiences of military charges against, military imprisonment of, and attempts to purge men who had sex with men, see Sarah Worthman, "The Untold Queer History of WWI," LGBT Purge Fund, March 17, 2023, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/queer-wwi/>. Also see Jim Bronskill, "Punishment of First World War Soldiers for Sexual Orientation Detailed in New Study," *Canadian Press*, March 25, 2023, https://www.thecanadianpressnews.ca/politics/punishment-of-first-world-war-soldiers-for-sexual-orientation-detailed-in-new-study/article_28398aa2-f43b-5a50-a0ae-76661c66c3c9.html.
- 136 C.S. Clark, *Of Toronto the Good: A Social Study, the Queen City of Canada as It Is* (Montréal: Toronto Publishing Company, 1898), 89–90. Toronto as a social study was brought before the world by the remarks of Canadian delegates to the Social Purity Conference in Baltimore and the World's Convention of the Women's Christian Temperance Union held in Toronto in 1897. The following is based on my reading of this book.
- 137 Clark, *Of Toronto the Good*, 89–90.
- 138 For instance, a Swift Current, Saskatchewan, doctor refers to another doctor as "an Oscar Wilde type" in a 1913 letter to the province's Attorney General. This reference comes from Terry Chapman, *Lesbian/Gay History Researchers Network Newsletter*, no. 5 (December

- 1981):14. Also see Terry, “An Oscar Wilde Type,” 97–118. Another term then used was “third sex.” In 1913, an article refers to a “third-sex” costume at a costume party. “Toronto Skating Club Carnival,” *Toronto Saturday Night*, March 8, 1913, 38, quoted in Egan, “These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species,” 10. Also see Dick, “Same-Sex Intersections of the Prairie Settlement Era,” 107–45.
- 139 On this, see Steven Maynard’s work examining court and police records, as well as training school and reformatory records, esp. “Boys and Their Men: The Homosexual World of Working-Class Youth in Urban Ontario,” given in a preliminary fashion at the “Out of the Archives” conference, York University, 1994. See Maynard, “Horrible Temptations,” 191–235.
- 140 Maynard, “In Search of ‘Sodom North,’” 127.
- 141 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 216–20.
- 142 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 217.
- 143 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 211–13.
- 144 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 235.
- 145 See Strange, *Toronto’s Girl Problem*.
- 146 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 214.
- 147 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 240.
- 148 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 215.
- 149 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 237.
- 150 See Chauncey, *Gay New York*.
- 151 Philip C. Stenning, *Legal Status of Police: A Study Paper Prepared for the Law Reform Commission of Canada* (Ottawa: Law Reform Commission of Canada, 1981), 7.
- 152 Quoted in James Edward Jones, *Pioneer Crimes and Punishment in Toronto and the Home District* (Toronto: George N. Morang, 1924), 7.
- 153 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, viii.
- 154 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 36; also see remarks by Thompson on the importance of this new Criminal Code, quoted in Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 69–70.
- 155 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 3.
- 156 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 39. The following section is based on Gigeroff’s account, esp. 39–46, unless otherwise cited. Also see Graham Parker, “The Origins of the Canadian Criminal Code,” in Flaherty, *Essays in the History of Canadian Law*, vol. 1, 249–77; and R.C. MacLeod, “The Shaping of Canadian Criminal Law, 1892–1982,” *Historical Papers / Communications historiques* 13, no. 1 (1978): 64–75.
- 157 Chapman, “Sexual Deviation in Western Canada,” 13.
- 158 On Stead’s campaign, also see Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*, 81–134.
- 159 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 6th Parl., 4th sess., 2 (1890): 3161–3162.
- 160 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 6th Parl., 4th sess., 2 (1890): 3170.
- 161 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 6th Parl., 4th sess., 2 (1890): 3170.
- 162 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 6th Parl., 4th sess., 2 (1890): 3170.
- 163 These exchanges reveal the imprecise character of the official language of the day and the heterogeneous offences apparently included under the heading of “gross indecency.” Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 7th parl., 2nd sess., 2 (1892): 2968–69.
- 164 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 46–47. The following case may have influenced this law reform process. This story was reported in, “Canadian Scandal,” *San Francisco Call*, January 29, 1890; reprinted in Toronto Lesbian and Gay History Project, “Proposed History Projects,” no. 10 (1981):

Government has been acquainted with the facts of a most revolting story in which a young clergyman in the Province of Ontario figures conspicuously. Sir John Thompson admitted that the charges have been made, and says that it will, in his opinion, ensure the passage of the purity bill, which provides for the flogging of persons found guilty of such crimes.

It is unclear whether the “offence” is same- or different-gender in character.

- 165 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 210.
- 166 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 207–208.
- 167 Strange, *Toronto’s Girl Problem*, 224; and Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 230.
- 168 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 222.
- 169 See George Smith, “Policing the Gay Community,” 163–83.
- 170 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 224–29.
- 171 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 222–23.
- 172 Toronto, City Council, *Minutes of the Proceedings*, no. 1061 (1987): 1030, quoted in Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 223.
- 173 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 232–36
- 174 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 234.
- 175 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 234–35.
- 176 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 237–38.
- 177 See George Smith, “Policing the Gay Community”; and Kinsman, “Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation.”
- 178 Maynard, “Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall,” 238–42.
- 179 Quoted in Steven Maynard, “Saturday Night in the Bunkhouse: Prospects for Gay History,” *Rites*, March 1990, 12.
- 180 Egan, “These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species,” 8.
- 181 These struggles included the Winnipeg General Strike, and working-class union and community revolts in Cape Breton in the 1920s. Also see Smith, “Women’s Inequality and the Family,” 168; and Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 137. Also see Chapman and Withers, *A Violent History of Benevolence*. On the US experience, see Margot Canaday, *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).
- 182 Quoted in Veronica Strong-Boag, “Canada’s Women Doctors: Feminism Constrained,” in Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 124; and Katherine Arnup, “Education for Motherhood: Government Health Publications, Mothers and the State” (presentation, Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association annual meeting, Winnipeg, June 1986). Also see Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 53. This also shows the links between social welfare policies and practices directed against people with mental health and other disabilities.
- 183 Quoted in Katherine Arnup, *Education for Motherhood: Advice for Mothers in Twentieth-Century Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994).
- 184 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 234. Also see Ursel, *Private Lives, Public Policy*.
- 185 See Smith, “Women’s Inequality and the Family”; and Brigitte Kitchen, “Women’s Dependence,” in “Sexuality and the State,” special issue, *Atkinson Review of Canadian Studies* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 11–16.
- 186 Smith, “Women, Class and Family,” 31–32.
- 187 See Strange, *Toronto’s Girl Problem*, esp. 116–74.
- 188 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 189, 195.

- 189 Light and Parr, “Neither Child nor Wife,” 49.
- 190 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 192.
- 191 See Cynthia Wright, “‘Feminine Trifles of Vast Importance’: Writing Gender into the History of Consumption,” in Iacovetta and Valverde, *Gender Conflicts*, 229–60.
- 192 Vito Russo, *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies* (New York: Harper and Row, 1981). He provides a fun and intriguing exploration of American films, many of which would have been seen in Canada.
- 193 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 194. Also see Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 353.
- 194 See Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 331–54.
- 195 Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 94.
- 196 Mary Vipond, “The Image of Women in Mass Circulation Magazines in the 1920s,” in *The Neglected Majority*, ed. Susan Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 117–22. Much of the next two paragraphs draws on this article.
- 197 Vipond, “The Image of Women in Mass Circulation,” 121.
- 198 Strong-Boag, “Canada’s Women’s Doctors,” 129.
- 199 See Arnup, *Education for Motherhood*.
- 200 See Smith, “Women, Class and Family,” 31.
- 201 See Grube, “Queens and Flaming Virgins,” 10.
- 202 S.H. Hooke, *The Canadian Forum*, April 1929, quoted in Steven Maynard, “Radclyffe Hall in Canada,” 9.

CHAPTER SEVEN

- 1 John D’Emilio, “Gay Politics, Gay Community: San Francisco’s Experience,” *Socialist Review*, no. 55 (January/February 1981): 80–81.
- 2 These practices of criminalization and exclusion in Canada started much earlier. On World War I experiences of military charges against, military imprisonment of and attempts to purge men who had sex with men. See Sarah Worthman, “The Untold Queer History of WWI,” LGBT Purge Fund, March 17, 2023, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/queer-wwi/>. Also see Jim Bronskill, “Punishment of First World War Soldiers for Sexual Orientation Detailed in New Study,” *Canadian Press*, March 25, 2023, https://www.thecanadianpressnews.ca/politics/punishment-of-first-world-war-soldiers-for-sexual-orientation-detailed-in-new-study/article_28308aa2-f43b-5a50-a0ae-76661c66c3c9.html.
- 3 See Leisa D. Meyer, “Creating G.I. Jane: The Regulation of Sexuality and Sexual Behaviour in the Women’s Army Corps During World War II,” *Feminist Studies* 18, no. 3 (Fall 1992): 581–601.
- 4 See Allan Bérubé, “Marching to a Different Drummer: Lesbian and Gay GIs in World War II,” in Snitow et al., *Powers of Desire*, 88–99; Bérubé, “Coming Out Under Fire,” 22–29; and Bérubé, *Coming Out Under Fire*.
- 5 Bérubé, “Marching to a Different Drummer,” 21.
- 6 See Rose, *The Psychological Complex*.
- 7 See Ruth Pierson, “Women’s Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women into the Labour Force in World War II,” in Trofimenkoff and Prentice, *The Neglected Majority*, 144–45; Ruth Roach Pierson, *Canadian Women and the Second World War* (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1983); and Pierson, “They’re Still Women after All’: The Second World War and Canadian Womanhood” (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986).
- 8 United Church of Canada, Division of Evangelism and Social Services, *18th Annual Report* (Toronto: United Church House, 1943), 68. Series 1, Fonds 510, United Church of Canada Board of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto, Ontario. The following quotes are from the Chair’s Address to the Board.

- 9 United Church of Canada, *18th Annual Report*, 68.
- 10 United Church of Canada, Division of Evangelism and Social Services, *19th Annual Report* (Toronto: United Church House, 1944), 43. Series 1, Fonds 510, United Church of Canada Board of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto, Ontario. The following quotes are from the Chair's Address to the Board.
- 11 United Church of Canada, *19th Annual Report*, 42.
- 12 See Ruth Roach Pierson, "Ladies or Loose Women: The Canadian Women's Army Corps in World War II," *Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal* 4, no. 2 (Spring 1979): 235–66; Ruth Pierson, "The Double Bind of the Double Standard: VD Control and the CWAC in World War II," *Canadian Historical Review* 62, no. 1 (March 1981): 31–58; and Pierson, "They're Still Women After All."
- 13 W.R. Feasby, ed., *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services, 1939–1945*, vol. 2, *Clinical Subjects*, published by the authority of the Ministry of National Defence (Ottawa: Edmund Cloutier, Queen's Printer, 1953), 85–86. The following references are based on this text, as well as on Vol. 1, "Organization and Campaigns." Also see Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation"; Paul Norman Jackson, *One of the Boys: Homosexuality in the Military During World War II*, second ed. (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010); and the film based on Jackson's book, *Open Secrets*, directed by José Torrealba (Montréal: National Film Board of Canada, 2003), 52 min.
- 14 This may help to account for the Canadian war mobilization seeming to play less of a role in forming and expanding homosexual and lesbian networks than that in the United States.
- 15 Lewis H. Loeser, "The Sexual Psychopath in the Military Service: A Study of 270 Cases," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 102, no. 1 (July 1945): 99.
- 16 Bérubé, *Coming Out Under Fire*, 14.
- 17 Estelle B. Freedman, "Uncontrolled Desires': The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920–1960," *Journal of American History*, 74, no. 1 (1987): 83–106.
- 18 On these points, see Weir, "Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger," 256–74; also see Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation," 79–84, for more elaboration.
- 19 See Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation"; and Freedman, "Uncontrolled Desires," 83–106.
- 20 Sidney Katz, "The Truth About Sex Criminals," *Maclean's Magazine*, July 1, 1947, 12, <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1947/7/1/the-truth-about-sex-criminals>.
- 21 W.R. Feasby, ed., *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services, 1939–1945*, vol. 1, *Organization and Campaigns*, published by the authority of the Ministry of National Defence (Ottawa: Edmund Cloutier, Queen's Printer, 1953), 34.
- 22 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:100–101.
- 23 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:59.
- 24 Canadian Army, *Physical Standards and Instructions for the Medical Examination of Serving Soldiers and Recruits for the Canadian Army, Active and Reserve* (Ottawa, 1943), 62.
- 25 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:83.
- 26 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:83.
- 27 Canadian Army, *Physical Standards and Instructions*, 62.
- 28 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:84.
- 29 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:85.
- 30 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:86.
- 31 Canadian Army, *Physical Standards and Instructions*.
- 32 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:95.
- 33 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:401.
- 34 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:405.

- 35 Feasby, *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services*, 2:405, 417.
- 36 For more elaboration, see Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation," 86–89.
- 37 No doubt there were similar experiences for women, and these will be uncovered by lesbian and other historians.
- 38 Rick Archbold, "Old but Not Alone: Interviews by Rick Archbold," interview with Bert Sutcliffe, *The Body Politic*, December 1982, 28; also see H.F. Sutcliffe, "Frederick Sutcliffe, MBE, CD: An Autobiography" (unpublished autobiography, Toronto Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives, Toronto, 1981), esp. the addendum, "Will the Real Herbert Frederick Sutcliffe, MBE, CD, Please Stand Up (Or Come Out of the Closet and Be Frank)," 151–165, esp. 153. My research into the security regime campaign against lesbians and gay men allowed me to uncover more first-hand accounts of men and women who were affected by these policies in the military. On Bert Sutcliffe, see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 17–18, 123–26, 161–62.
- 39 Sutcliffe, *Herbert Frederick Sutcliffe*, addendum, 155.
- 40 Sutcliffe, *Herbert Frederick Sutcliffe*, addendum, 155.
- 41 Quoted in Dana Flavelle, "Homosexuality Destroyed Decorated Soldier's Career," *Toronto Star*, March 15, 1986, A15.
- 42 Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society," 81–83.
- 43 Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society," 176.
- 44 Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society," 196.
- 45 Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society," 207–208.
- 46 For some suggestive analysis that moves in this direction, see Barbara Ehrenreich, *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment* (Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1984); and Smith, "Women, Class and Family," 1–44.
- 47 Alfred Kinsey et al., *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948); and Alfred Kinsey et al., *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1953). The volumes are based on interviews with more than 10,000 white American and Canadian men and women. See also Paul Robinson et al., *The Modernization of Sex* (New York: Harper and Colophon, 1976), 53; and D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 34. Also see Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 70–74.
- 48 D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 36.
- 49 Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 70–72.
- 50 D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 36.
- 51 D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 37, 42.
- 52 The four-percent figure of those involved in exclusive homosexual behaviour has been used by right-wing groups like Renaissance and "Positive Parents" in Canada in the 1980s to demonstrate that gays are a very small minority, and by Citizens United for Responsible Education (CURE) in the 1990s. The right wing has often attempted to portray homosexuals as a tiny minority of men having nothing to do with the vast majority of men. More on these groups later. There are continuing "scientific" and political battles over the number of gay men and lesbians. Many of the surveys that have been conducted have major methodological flaws, including a lack of recognition of the fluidity and shifting character of sexualities, given the current social organization of sexuality and continuing heterosexism. Major critiques can also be made of the percentage of the population claimed as "heterosexual."
- 53 D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 83–84.
- 54 Two early articles may demonstrate how this took place in Canada. In September 1950, S.R. Laycock, Dean of Education and Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Saskatchewan and Director of the Division of Education and Mental Health of the Canadian Mental Hygiene Association, published "Homosexuality—A Mental Hygiene

- Problem," *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 63, no. 3 (September 1950): 245–50. An article in a play on Krafft-Ebing's "classic" *Psychopathia Sexualis* was published by John K. McCreary, "Psychopathia Homosexualis," *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 4, no. 2 (June 1950): 63–74. For later years, see Kenneth G. Gray, "Sexual Deviation: Problem and Treatment," in *Social Problems: A Canadian Profile*, ed. Richard Laskin (1955; repr., Toronto: McGraw Hill, 1964), 408–11; and P.C. Thomson, "Sexual Deviation," *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 80, no. 5 (March 1, 1959): 381–89. Also see Patricia E. Stevens and Joanne M. Hall, "A Critical Historical Analysis of the Medical Construction of Lesbianism," *International Journal of Health Services* 21, no. 2 (April 1, 1991): 291–307.
- 55 Laycock, "Homosexuality," 247.
- 56 McCreary, "Psychopathia Homosexualis," 74.
- 57 Johann Mohr and R.E. Turner, "Sexual Deviations, Part I," and Part II: "Homosexuality," in *Social Deviance in Canada*, ed. W.E. Mann (1967; repr., Toronto: Copp Clark, 1971), 363. For very different accounts, see Martin B. Duberman, *Cures: A Gay Man's Odyssey* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1991); Michael Riordan, "Blessed Are the Deviates: A Post-Therapy Check-Up on My Ex-Psychiatrist," in *Flaunting It! A Decade of Gay Journalism from The Body Politic: An Anthology*, ed. Edward Jackson and Stan Persky (Vancouver/Toronto: New Star/Pink Triangle Press, 1982), 14–20; and Blackbridge and Gilhooly, *Still Sane*.
- 58 See Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, 192–233. Also see Julien Henriques et al., *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity* (London: Methuen, 1984).
- 59 See Joseph H. Pleck, "The Theory of Male Sex Role Identity: Its Rise and Fall, 1936 to the Present," in *In the Shadow of the Past: Psychology Portrays the Sexes: A Social and Intellectual History*, ed. Miriam Lewin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 205–25; and Miriam Lewin, "Psychology Measures Femininity and Masculinity," in Lewin, *In the Shadow of the Past*, 155–78. Also see Elise (now El) Chenier, *Strangers in our Midst: Sexual Deviancy in Postwar Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).
- 60 For instance, Allen Louis Edwards, *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule* (New York: The Psychological Corp., 1953); and Ivan Scheier and Raymond B. Cattell, *Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire (NSQ): Handbook* (Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1961).
- 61 Edwards, *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule*.
- 62 This is an account of the *Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire*.
- 63 Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society." Also see Higgins, "Montréal 1953," 31–32. I am very much indebted to Ross Higgins for bringing this important work to my attention. This thesis was only hinted at in the joint work by Leznoff and his professor, William Westley, "The Homosexual Community," *Social Problems* 3, no. 4 (April 1956): 257–63; reprinted in a number of anthologies on deviancy and homosexuality in the 1960s. Also see Leznoff, "Interviewing Homosexuals," *American Journal of Sociology* 62, no. 2 (September 1956): 202–204. On Leznoff's work, also see Higgins, "Sense of Belonging." Also see Higgins, "Murder Will Out: Gay Identity and Media Discourse in Montréal," in *Beyond the Lavender Lexicon: Authenticity, Imagination, and Appropriation in Lesbian and Gay Languages*, ed. William L. Leap (New York: Routledge, 1995).
- 64 Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society," 12.
- 65 On the connection between the Chicago School and the Sociology Department at McGill, see Robert J. Brym with Bonnie J. Fox, *From Culture to Power: The Sociology of English Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989), 16–17.
- 66 Brym with Fox, *From Culture to Power*, 14.
- 67 Brym with Fox, 10–11, 166–67. Cory's book was first published in 1951 and argued for the new perspective that homosexuals were a minority group similar to national, religious, or ethnic

- minorities in the denial of civil rights and exclusion from the mainstream. See Donald Webster Cory, *The Homosexual in America: A Subjective Approach* (New York: Greenberg, 1951), 13–14.
- 68 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 1.
- 69 Leznoff and Westley, “The Homosexual Community.”
- 70 On the “role” of the queen, see Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 97–106; Leznoff and Westley, “The Homosexual Community”; and Grube, “Queens and Flaming Virgins,” 14–15, although it should be pointed out that at times Grube’s very useful account is marred by a structural-functionalist perspective.
- 71 Leznoff, “Interviewing Homosexuals,” 203; and Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society.”
- 72 The grant was reported in *The Gazette* (Montréal), June 11, 1953, 26. The police arrests are mentioned in “Interviewing Homosexuals,” 204. On the response of the gays he was interviewing, see Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 19.
- 73 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 19.
- 74 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 41.
- 75 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 32–41.
- 76 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 41.
- 77 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 34.
- 78 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 36.
- 79 This differs from Grube’s account that describes Peter as the queen of a middle-class group. See Grube, “Queens and Flaming Virgins,” 14–15.
- 80 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 69.
- 81 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 75.
- 82 Higgins, “Montréal 1953,” 31.
- 83 Quoted in Higgins, “Montréal 1953,” 31. This can be compared with Grube’s accounts of class conflict within gay community formation in Toronto; with reference to a middle-class “cultured gay group,” see the comment “but if you were ignorant or a stable boy you weren’t part of that society...” and the reference to class differences in clientele between the St. Charles and The Parkside (generally working-class) and Letros (generally middle-class) in 1950s Toronto. See “Oh my dear, carriage trade is...they’re coming uptown tonight,” and “oh...the piss elegant crowd are here tonight!” Grube, “Queens and Flaming Virgins,” 15. Also see Jim Egan’s description of class tensions where “gay life in Toronto in the 1950s and 1960s was on a series of levels, with your opera queens and the highly educated at the top, and the ribbon clerks at the bottom.” Egan, *Challenging the Conspiracy of Silence: My Life as a Canadian Gay Activist*, ed. Donald W. McLeod (Toronto: The Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives/Homewood Books, 1998). For the experiences of Peaches Latour and others, see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 130–31.
- 84 See Chauncey, *Gay New York*.
- 85 On this notion of gay space, see Grube, “Queens and Flaming Virgins,” 16. On queer space, also see Bell and Valentine, *Mapping Desire*; and Gordon Brent Ingram, Anne-Marie Bout-hillette, and Yolanda Ritter, eds., *Queers in Space: Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance* (Seattle: Bay Press, 1997).
- 86 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 28–29. This should be compared with Grube’s account that suggests that a significant number of the men his oral history project interviewed had been arrested but that even more effective was the climate of fear and intimidation instilled by the police. Grube, “Queens and Flaming Virgins,” 17.
- 87 Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society,” 165.

- 88 See Joan Nestle, "Butch-Femme Relationships: Sexual Courage in the 1950s," *Heresies*, no. 12 (1981): 21–24; in Nestle, *A Restricted Country* (Ithaca, NY: Firebrand Books, 1987), 100–109; Kennedy and Davis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold*; and Weissman and Fernie, dir., *Forbidden Love*. There is an overlap here with the emergence of some of the early historical experiences of trans men.
- 89 Chamberland, "Remembering Lesbian Bars," 231–69.
- 90 See El Chenier, "Risks, Roles and Rounders: Lesbian Bar Culture in Toronto, 1950–65" (paper presentation, "Out of the Archives" Conference, York University, Toronto, January 1994); Chenier, "Tough Ladies and Troublemakers"; and Chenier, "Rethinking Class in Lesbian Bar Culture," 85–118; reprinted in *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*, ed. Mona Gleason and Adele Perry (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2006). Also see Chenier, "A Place Like the Continental," in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 98–101. Chenier's work builds on and extends earlier work by the Lesbians Making History collective. See Lesbians Making History Collective, "People Think This Didn't Happen in Canada," 86. Also see comments in Ross, "The House That Jill Built," 86–87, 99.
- 91 Becki L. Ross, "'Destaining the (Tattooed) Delinquent Body': The Practices of Moral Regulation at Toronto's Street Haven, 1965–1969," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7, no. 4 (April 1997): 561–95.
- 92 See Weissman and Fernie, dir., *Forbidden Love*.
- 93 See Adams, "Precedent-Setting Pulp," 21.
- 94 Walter T. Cassidy, "The 1946 Windsor Park Patrol Campaign Against Queer Men," *Active History* (blog), June 17, 2021, <https://activehistory.ca/2021/06/windsorparks/>. Walter T. Cassidy, "The 1946 Windsor Park Patrol Campaign Against Queer Men," *Active History* (blog), June 17, 2021, <https://activehistory.ca/2021/06/windsorparks/>.
- 95 David Churchill, "Gay Sites and Public Space: Toronto in the 1950s" (paper presentation, "Out of the Archives" Conference, York University, Toronto, January 1994). Also see Churchill, "Coming Out in A Cold Climate."
- 96 This information comes in part from research on the security campaigns in the Ottawa area. See Philip Hannan, "Anniversary Essay XIX: Homosexual Ottawa," *Ottawa Citizen*, News, May 8, 1995, A9. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, esp. 200–209. On some ideas on becoming gay in Winnipeg during this time, see Orde Morton, "Joining a Minority," in *Winnipeg Made Me: A Memoir of Growing Up* (Orde Morton, 2022), 106–15.
- 97 See *One* 5, no. 3, March 1957, 22.
- 98 See *One*, October 1959; reprinted in *Xtra*, November 1985.
- 99 The important work of Jim Egan was brought to my attention by Philip McLeod and Robert Champagne. See Robert Champagne, "Canada's Pioneer Gay Activist Jim Egan," interview with Jim Egan and introduction, *Rites*, December/January 1986–87, 12–14; Egan, "Canada's Pioneer Gay Activist Jim Egan," interview with Jim Egan, by Robert Champagne, *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, no. 2 (September 1986): 11–14; and Alfred Taylor, "A Perfect Beginner: Jim Egan and the Tabloids," *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, September 1986, 15–18. Jim Egan, *Jim Egan: Canada's Pioneer Gay Activist*, comp. and ed. Robert Champagne (Toronto: Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Network, 1987). Also see Egan, *Challenging the Conspiracy of Silence*.
- 100 James Egan, "Parliamentary Legislative Committee Ignored this Letter from Homosexual Suggesting Changes in Criminal Code," *Justice Weekly*, March 19, 1955, 5, 14. It should be remembered that "Negro" was how Black people were most commonly referred to at this time.
- 101 Robert Champagne, "Interview with Jim Egan," in Egan, *Jim Egan*, 4.
- 102 See *Justice Weekly* (Toronto), 1953–1954.

- 103 The Lesbians Making History Collective, "People Think This Didn't Happen in Canada," 86.
- 104 More historical work is needed on the role of *Justice Weekly* and other scandal-sheets in lesbian and gay community formation. Ross Higgins has shown me copies of several Montréal tabloids that contained material on lesbian and gay-related issues. These include *Ici Montréal* (which contains the wonderful headline "Fifis Versus Homos," June 30, 1962), *Jour Nuit*, and *Sentimental*. See Ross Higgins, "Montréal Gays and Lesbians in the Yellow Press of the 50s," *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, no. 2 (September 1986): 9–11; and Higgins and Chamberland, "Mixed Messages," 422–31. Also see Eric Setliff, "Sex Fiends or Swish Kids, Gay Men in the Toronto Tabloids, 1946–1956," (master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1994); Setliff, "Between the Scandal Sheets (1949)," *Centre/Fold*, no. 8 (Spring 1995): 30–31; and Setliff, "Swish Kids and Sex Fiends," in *Gendered Pasts: Historical Essays in Femininity and Masculinity in Canada*, ed. Kathryn McPherson, Cecilia Morgan, and Nancy M. Forestell (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 1999), 158–78.
- 105 James Egan, "Civil Liberties and the Homosexual," *Toronto Star*, October 23, 1963, 7.
- 106 See Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 69–82.
- 107 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 39. This represented a certain separation within the law of sexual offences from offences against morality. See Gigeroff, 40, 46, 49–50.
- 108 See Philip Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation: Homosexuals and the Immigration Act, 1952–1977," *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 2 (1987): 1–27.
- 109 Province of Ontario, Legislative Assembly, *Report of the Select Committee to Study and Report Upon Problems of Delinquent Individuals and Custodial Questions and the Place of Reform Institutions Therein*, March 8, 1954 (Toronto, 1954), esp. 309–15.
- 110 Province of Ontario, Legislative Assembly, *Report*, 312.
- 111 This account is based on Philip Girard, "Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945" (unpublished paper, 1985); and Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation," 1–27.
- 112 See Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation," 6.
- 113 I wish I knew what "living on the avails of homosexuality" meant! Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation," 7.
- 114 Despite victories on the immigration front, there are also continuing problems regarding the immigration of lesbian/gay partners and spouses and refugees. See Kinsman, "Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities," 97–127.
- 115 See Katz, *Gay American History*, 81–90; and D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 40–53.
- 116 On this see Len Scher, *The Un-Canadians: Stories of the Blacklist Era* (Toronto: Lester Publishing, 1992). Also see David Austin, *Fear of a Black Nation, Race, Sexuality, and Security in Sixties Montréal* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2013); and Burnley "Rocky" Jones and James St. G. Walker, *Burnley "Rocky" Jones Revolutionary* (Halifax: Roseway/Fernwood, 2016), esp. "Black Power," 115–49.
- 117 R.G. Waldeck, "The International Homosexual Conspiracy," in *About Time: Exploring the Gay Past*, ed. Martin B. Duberman (1960; repr., New York: Gay Presses of New York, 1986), 199–202.
- 118 Wilson, *Women and the Welfare State*, 67.
- 119 Elizabeth Wilson, *Only Halfway to Paradise: Women in Postwar Britain, 1945–1968* (London: Tavistock, 1980), 101. For analysis of media coverage during these years, see Pearce, "How to Be Immoral and Ill."
- 120 Much of this section is based on the important work of Philip Girard, to whom I am grateful. See Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation," 1–27; and Girard, "Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945."

- 121 See John Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows: The RCMP Security Service* (Toronto: Totem Books, 1983), 111–18. The following section is partially based on the account in this book, 111–34. Also see, Sawatsky, *For Services Rendered: Leslie James Bennett and the RCMP Security Service* (Toronto: Penguin Books, 1983). For the broader social and political context, see Reginald Whitaker, “Origins of the Canadian Government’s Internal Security System, 1946–52,” *Canadian Historical Review* 65, no. 2 (June 1984): 154–83; and Whitaker, *Double Standard: The Secret History of Canadian Immigration* (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys, 1987); Reginald Whitaker and Gary Marcuse, *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945–1957* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994); John Watkins, *Moscow Dispatches: Inside Cold War Russia*, ed. Dean Beeby and William Kaplan (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1987). Also see Kinsman, “‘Character Weaknesses’ and ‘Fruit Machines’: Towards an Analysis of the Anti-Homosexual Security Campaigns in the Canadian Civil Service,” *Labour/Le Travail* 35 (Spring 1995): 133–61; and Daniel J. Robinson and David Kimmel, “The Queer Career of Homosexual Security Vetting in Cold War Canada,” *Canadian Historical Review* 75, no. 3 (September 1994): 319–45. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*; and Sarah Fodey, dir., *The Fruit Machine* (SandBay Entertainment/TVO, 2018); and Gary Kinsman, “Some Reflections on the Fruit Machine Documentary,” *Radical Noise*, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/10/14/some-reflections-on-the-fruit-machine-documentary/>; Gary Kinsman, “s4: The Fruit Machine,” *The Secret Life of Canada*, Podcast, 40:08 (CBC Podcasts, 2022), <https://www.cbc.ca/listen/cbc-podcasts/203-the-secret-life-of-canada>.
- 122 Pat Walsh, *Speak Up* (Toronto) 9, no. 8/9 (August/September 1981). Walsh was an executive member of the far-right World Anti-Communist League. *Speak Up* was a far-right newspaper.
- 123 Sawatsky, *For Services Rendered*, 173.
- 124 D.F. Wall, Memorandum to the Security Panel, “Security Cases Involving Character Weaknesses, with Special Reference to the Problem of Homosexuality,” May 12, 1959, 12–13. Document was secured through a Canadian Security and Intelligence Service (CSIS), Access to Information Request (AIR). In the language that is used in this excerpt we can see how the author is building on earlier notions of homosexuals as psychopathic personalities. See Kinsman, “Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation,” 71–89. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*.
- 125 See Dean Beeby, “Mounties Staged Massive Hunt for Gay Males in Civil Service. Police Kept Files on 8,200 During Diefenbaker-Pearson Era,” *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), April 24, 1992, A1; and “RCMP Hoped ‘Fruit Machine’ Would Identify Homosexuals,” April 24, 1992, A1. I will refer to the individual documents that the Canadian Press secured the release of throughout this section. I am very indebted to the work of Dean Beeby in making these initial Access to Information Requests. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, which relies in part on critical analysis of documents released through ATIP. I thank Patrizia Gentile who did much of the work on the ATIP requests.
- 126 See Kinsman, “‘Character Weaknesses’ and ‘Fruit Machines,’” 133–61.
- 127 Wall, “Security Cases Involving Character Weaknesses,” 12–13. The other situation leading to a focus on the ‘homosexual’ threat has to do with the cipher clerk sent back to Ottawa by David Johnson, Canadian ambassador in Moscow in the late 1950s, See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 93–95.
- 128 Thanks to Lisa Steele and Kim Tomczak for sharing their research on the Leo Mantha investigation with me. See *Legal Memory*, dir. Steele and Tomczak. Also see Neil Boyd, “All My Love, Leo,” *Angles*, July 1987, 9. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 65, 97–107.

- 129 Bruce Somers, interview by the author, June 10, 1994. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 102–103.
- 130 Alan Hustack, *They Were Hanged* (Toronto: J. Lorimer, 1987), 101.
- 131 See Chauncey, “Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion?,” in Duberman, Vicinus and Chauncey, *Hidden From History*, 294–317.
- 132 See “Homo Purges Confirmed,” *Rites*, April 1985, 7.
- 133 See Dean Beeby, “The Untold Story of How Lester Pearson Influenced the Dubious Spy Probe of a Gay Diplomat,” *Globe and Mail*, March 19, 2022, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-the-untold-story-of-how-lester-pearson-influenced-the-dubious-spy/>.
- 134 See Girard, “From Subversion to Liberation,” 5. Further research is needed to see if Girard’s assertion is accurate.
- 135 Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows*, 125.
- 136 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*.
- 137 The legacy of these practices continues informally today as the military and the RCMP grapple with the ending of their official discriminatory practices. This, despite the 1992 Michelle Douglas case that led to the overturning of the military’s anti-lesbian and anti-gay policy practices of discrimination. See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 410–28.
- 138 Canada, RCMP, Directorate of Security and Intelligence, *Report, 1967–1968*.
- 139 In 1984 it was reported that the RCMP had destroyed all of its files kept solely on the basis of sexual orientation. See John Duggan, “RCMP Destroys Files...Maybe,” *Rites*, October 1984, 7.
- 140 The Lesbians Making History Collective, “People Think This Didn’t Happen in Canada,” 84. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 75–76; and *Forbidden Love*, directed by Weissman and Fernie.
- 141 Directorate of Security and Intelligence, *Annual Report, 1962–1963*, 19.
- 142 Directorate of Security and Intelligence, *Annual Report, 1962–1963*, 30.
- 143 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*.
- 144 Quoted in the National Gay Rights Coalition/Coalition nationale pour les droits des homosexuels, “The Homosexual Minority and the Canadian Human Rights Act: A Brief Concerning Bill C-72 Prepared for Presentation to Members of Parliament,” February 1976, 15.
- 145 For more on resistance based on interviews with those directly affected, see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, esp. 1–21, 191–242.
- 146 Wake, who died in November 1993, had previously been a researcher for the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, which is examined later in this chapter. CSIS AIR, 91-088, Dr. F.R. Wake, “Report on Special Project,” December 19, 1962. Document was secured through a Canadian Security and Intelligence Service (CSIS), Access to Information Request (AIR). The following quotes are also from this text. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 168–90.
- 147 Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows*, 133.
- 148 See Leznoff, “The Homosexual in Urban Society.”
- 149 These included the Polygraph (lie-detector) test that, Wake argued, had too many problems to be useful; the Plethysmograph, which measures blood volume in the finger by electronic or pneumatic means; the Palmer Sweat Test, which responds to perspiration; the Projective Tests; Word Association Tests; the Pupillary Response Test; the Span of Attention Test, based on the time spent in attending to various images (which Zamansky of Northeastern University had constructed as an apparatus to test for homosexuality in 1956); and Masculinity/ Femininity Tests with all their gender and sexuality assumptions.

- 150 CSIS AIR, 91-088, Dr. F.R. Wake, "Report on Special Project," Appendix A, Word Association List, 1-3.
- 151 See Tom Waugh, "A Heritage of Pornography," *The Body Politic*, January 1983, 29-34; Waugh, "Photography: Passion and Power," *The Body Politic*, March 1984, 29-33; and Waugh, "Gay Male Visual Culture in North America During the Fifties: Emerging from the Underground," *Parallogramme* 12, no. 1 (Fall 1986): 63-67; Alan Miller, "Beefcake with No Labels Attached," *The Body Politic*, January 1983, 33; and Michael Bronski, *Culture Clash: The Making of a Gay Sensitivity* (Boston: South End Press, 1984), 160-74.
- 152 CSIS AIR, 91-088, Wake, "Report on Special Project," 17.
- 153 This can be contrasted with the research technologies and strategies examined in Terry, "Theorizing Deviant Historiography," 60; and Jennifer Terry, *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine and Homosexuality in Modern Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).
- 154 J.R.M. Bordeleau, Assistant Commissioner, Director, Security and Intelligence, memo to D.F. Wall, Secretary of the Security Panel, January 25, 1963, RCMP, 1. Document was secured through a Canadian Security and Intelligence Service (CSIS), Access to Information Request (AIR).
- 155 Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows*, 133-36.
- 156 Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows*, 135-37.
- 157 On World War I experiences, see Sarah Worthman, "The Untold Queer History of WWI," LGBT Purge Fund, March 17, 2023, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/queer-wwi/>. Also see Jim Bronskill, "Punishment of First World War Soldiers for Sexual Orientation Detailed in New Study," *Canadian Press*, March 25, 2023, https://www.thecanadianpressnews.ca/politics/punishment-of-first-world-war-soldiers-for-sexual-orientation-detailed-in-new-study/article_28398aa2-f43b-5a50-a0ae-76661c66c3c9.html.
- 158 This reference comes from Lynne Fernie, conversation with author. This narrative is developed in more detail in Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 128-30.
- 159 George Marshall, interview, *Two* (Toronto), July/August 1966, 12.
- 160 George Marshall, interview, *Two* (Toronto), July/August 1966, 12.
- 161 George Marshall, interview, *Two* (Toronto), July/August 1966, 12.
- 162 See Sutcliffe, *Frederick Sutcliffe*, 157-58; and Flavelle, "Homosexuality Destroyed Decorated Soldier's Career," A15.
- 163 See Queen's Regulations and Orders, Military Code, Government of Canada, July 3, 2019, <https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/corporate/policies-standards/queens-regulations-orders.html>. The Queen's Regulations and Orders are a section of the National Defence Act and are adjusted throughout the history of the Canadian military services. Regarding the military, the military leadership also argued that, given its distinctive character, there was no "private" realm in the military.
- 164 See Canadian Forces Administrative Order (CFAO) 19-20, *Sexual Deviation—Investigation, Medical Examination, and Disposal*, May 12, 1967, <https://cfbnameo.ca/2020/07/06/cfao-19-20/>.
- 165 Glenn Wheeler, "Unfit for Service," *The Body Politic*, March 1983, 29. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 364-82.
- 166 Quoted in Canada, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report* (Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1958), 8. This definition included the notion of "evil" that was taken over from religious and moral discourses. Criminal Sexual Psychopaths were not only criminal and dangerous but also "evil" men. This was sexual but also moral regulation.

- 167 Canada, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, ix; Edwin H. Sutherland, "The Diffusion of Sexual Psychopath Laws," *American Journal of Sociology* 56, no. 2 (1950): 142–48; Yvonne Chi-Ying Ng, "Ideology, Media and Moral Panics: An Analysis of the Jacques Murder" (master's thesis, University of Toronto, Centre of Criminology, November 1981), 59–60; D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 17; and George Chauncey, Jr., "The National Panic Over Child Abuse After World War II and the Emergence of Cold War Anti-Homosexual Politics" (presentation, "Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives" Lesbian/Gay History conference, Toronto, July 1985). Also see Robert Champagne, "Psychopaths and Perverts: The Canadian Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, 1954–58," *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, September 1986, 7–9. Also see Chenier, *Strangers in Our Midst*, 17–78.
- 168 Girard, "Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945," 83.
- 169 Girard, "Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945," 86–88, 96–98.
- 170 Freedman, "Uncontrolled Desires," 83–106.
- 171 None of the twenty-three men sentenced as criminal sexual psychopaths from 1948–55 were fathers of, or related to, those assaulted or harassed. See Canada, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*.
- 172 On textually mediated social organization, see Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power*; and Smith, *Texts, Facts and Femininity*. On this in relation to the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, see Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation."
- 173 See Kinsman, "Restoring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System," 211–69; and Kinsman, "The Mount Cashel Orphanage Inquiry: The Inscription of Child Abuse," in *Constructing Danger: The Misrepresentation of Crime in the News*, ed. Chris McCormick (Halifax: Fernwood, 1995), 76–93; and Kinsman, "The Hughes Commission," 17–19.
- 174 The commission heard testimony from thirty-five psychiatrists, twenty-one members of the legal profession, eleven medical doctors, twenty-one professors, six police officers, eleven representatives of Attorneys-General, twelve representatives of various departments of health. Two members of the Royal Commission attended the Diagnostic Centre at Menlo Park, New Jersey. Canada, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 2; for a breakdown, see 131–35. The *Wolfenden Report* and the Kinsey studies were also cited. On the use of RCMP records, Canada, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 61. Also see Chenier, *Strangers in our Midst*, 79–114.
- 175 On this, see the submission by Rev. Francis Howard Kelly Greer in the transcripts of the Public Hearings of the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, June 14–28, 1954, 318, 320–21, Osgoode Hall Law Library, Transcripts of the Hearings of the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to the Criminal Sexual Psychopath, 1954–58, Vol. 1–3. Citation from Elise (now El) Chenier, "The Criminal Sexual Psychopath in Canada: Sex, Psychiatry and the Law at Mid-Century," *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 20, no. 1 (2003): 75–101; reprinted in *Queerly Canadian: An Introductory Reader in Sexuality Studies*, ed. Maureen FitzGerald and Scott Rayter (Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2012), reported on below; and the submission by Axel Otto Olson, referred to below at a private session of the commission in 1956. My thanks to Robert Champagne for bringing these to my attention. See Axel Otto Olson, "1956: The Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths," edited and introduced by Robert Champagne, *Rites*, November 1986, 8–9.
- 176 Greer also endorsed the briefs submitted by the Welfare Council and the John Howard Society. Public hearings June 14–18, 1954, New Brunswick, PEI, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland,

- 315–23. The following quotes from Greer and McRuer come from these pages. This is in reference to the submission by Rev. Francis Howard Kelly Greer in the Transcripts of the Public Hearings of the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, June 14–28, 1954, 318, 320–21.
- 177 Canada, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 28.
- 178 As we will see, Jim Egan was unaware of it since it was not reported or referenced in Canada, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*.
- 179 “Congenital inversion” was also the hegemonic perspective in early homosexual rights organizing in Germany and Europe.
- 180 Hearings of the Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, 1956, 146.
- 181 See Canada, Private Sessions, Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, Montréal and Toronto, *Report*, commencing February 6, 1956, 137–47; edited in Robert Champagne, ed., introduction to “1956: The Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths,” by Axel Otto Olson, *Rites*, November 1986, 8–9.
- 182 Champagne, “Psychopaths and Perverts,” 8–9.
- 183 Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 27.
- 184 Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 27.
- 185 Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 27.
- 186 Jim Egan, “‘Toronto Fairy-Go-Round,’ So the Chief of Police Said to The Royal Commission,” *Justice Weekly*, November 7, 1959, 5; reprinted from *One*.
- 187 David N. Weisstub, *Law and Psychiatry in the Canadian Context: Cases, Notes and Materials* (Toronto: Pergamon Press, 1980), 693.
- 188 Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 121–24.
- 189 Girard, “Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945,” 94.
- 190 On the continuing resiliency of this narrative, see Kinsman, “Restoring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System,” 211–69; Kinsman, “The Mount Cashel Orphanage Inquiry,” 76–93; and Kinsman, “Making Homosexuality the Problem Once Again,” 17–19.
- 191 See Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, trans. Robert Baldick (New York: Vintage, 1962); and Gay Left Collective, “Happy Families? Pedophilia Examined,” in *The Age Taboo: Gay Male Sexuality, Power and Consent*, ed. Daniel Tsang (London: Gay Men’s Press, 1981), 53–64; John Fritz, “The Child as Legal Subject,” in *Education and the State, Vol. 2, Politics, Patriarchy and Practice*, ed. Roger Dale et al. (Sussex: Falmer Press, 1981), 285–302; Foucault, *History of Sexuality, Volume 1*; and Nikolas Rose, “Beyond the Public/Private Division: Law, Power and the Family,” in *Critical Legal Studies*, ed. Peter Fitzpatrick and Alan Hunt (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987).
- 192 See, for instance, United Church of Canada, “Barnyard Morals and Crimes of Youth,” *Annual Report*, no. 32 (1957): 46. Also see Mary Louise Adams, “Almost Anything Can Happen: A Search for Sexual Discourse in the Urban Spaces of 1940s Toronto,” *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 2 (1994): 224–25. Also see Adams, “The Trouble with Normal”; and Adams, *The Trouble with Normal*.
- 193 See Pearce, “How to Be Immoral and Ill,” 296–99.
- 194 Most studies indicate that ninety percent or more of sexual harassment and coercion of children is inflicted by heterosexual-identified men against girls, and that most occurs

within the family. Wini Brienes and Linda Gordon say, “approximately 92 percent of the victims are female and 97 percent of the assailants are males.” Brienes and Gordon, “The New Scholarship on Family Violence,” *Signs* 8, no. 3 (Spring 1983): 522. Also see Elizabeth Wilson, *What is to Be Done About Violence Against Women?* (London: Penguin, 1983), esp. 117–34. Ms. Spector, in a presentation to the World Congress on Violence and Human Existence in 1992, stated that only ten percent of assaulters are strangers, and 80 percent of those assaulted are girls. “Warnings About Sex Abuse May Miss the Mark, Experts Say,” *Globe and Mail*, July 14, 1992, A7. Statistics Canada reports that the assaulter is a stranger in only eight percent of sexual assault cases involving children, and in 48 percent of the reported cases, is a family member. The Vanier Institute of the Family reports that the young person knows the assaulter in 90 percent of reported cases. The “victims” are 70 to 80 percent girls and those accused are 94 percent men. This is reported in Alanna Mitchell, “Who’s to Blame?” *Globe and Mail*, July 22, 1994, A11. Carole Jenny, Thomas A. Roesler, and Kimberly L. Poyer report that of 269 cases of child sexual abuse studied, only two offenders were identifiable as gay or lesbian. Jenny, Roesler, and Poyer, “Are Children At Risk for Sexual Abuse by Homosexuals?,” *Pediatrics* 94, no. 1 (July 1994): 41–44. A young person’s risk of being molested by a heterosexual partner or a relative is more than 100 times greater than by an identifiable gay man, lesbian, or bisexual. This is reported in “Homosexuals No Threat,” *Globe and Mail*, Health Briefing, July 7, 1994, A11. This study is an impressive challenge to right-wing arguments that gays are “child molesters.”

- 195 On narratives of sexual danger, see Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*.
- 196 Girard, “Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945,” 91.
- 197 From the Parents’ Action League: Scientific Advisory Committee statement, April 25, 1955. Also see Hubert Pascoe, “Deviant Sexual Behaviour and the Sex Criminal,” in Laskin, *Social Problems*, 413–14.
- 198 *Justice Weekly*, October 8, 1958, 4. On the Parents’ Action League, also see Chenier, *Strangers in Our Midst*, 43–78.
- 199 Ron Kenyon, “You Can Curb Canada’s Sex Crimes,” *Liberty* (Toronto), August 1955, 68.
- 200 Kenyon, “You Can Curb Canada’s Sex Crimes,” 68.
- 201 Verbatim transcript of the *Star* “Forum.” The quotes below from the “experts” who spoke at this forum are from this text. Author’s Personal files.
- 202 Kenyon, “You Can Curb Canada’s Sex Crimes,” 68.
- 203 Rose, “Beyond the Public/Private Division,” 71.
- 204 Kenyon, “You Can Curb Canada’s Sex Crimes,” 69.
- 205 See Dr. R.E. Turner, interview, *ASK Newsletter* (Vancouver) 2, no. 4 (April 1965).
- 206 James Fraser, “Piecing It Together: The 1950s,” *Lesbian/Gay History Researchers Network Newsletter*, no. 5 (December 1981): 13; and “2,000 Hear Experts on Sex Deviates at Star Forum Meeting,” *Toronto Daily Star*, January 27, 1956, 1, 3; “Forum on Sex Offenders: Experts Answer Star Readers’ Questions,” *Toronto Daily Star*, January 28, 1956, 6; and “All Sex Deviates Not Criminals, Must Use Caution—Doctor,” *Toronto Daily Star*, January 27, 1956, 5.
- 207 *The Star*, letter to Nathan Phillips, 1. Toronto Star Citizens’ Forum, Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives [ArQuives], Toronto, Ontario.
- 208 “Star,” January 1956 (Toronto), reprinted in *One*, March 1956. *One Magazine*, Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives [ArQuives], Toronto, Ontario.
- 209 PAL apparently branched out to also concern itself with “juvenile delinquency,” sexually arousing literature, and campaigns for warnings in the schools against accepting rides from strangers. Chapters were organized across Ontario, elsewhere in Canada, and even in the United States. See Pascoe, “Deviant Sexual Behaviour and the Sex Criminal,” 413–14.

- 210 Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, *Report*, 117.
- 211 Thomson, "Sexual Deviation," 387.
- 212 Franklin Russell, "Clinic to Curb Sex Crimes Before They Happen," *Maclean's*, September 23, 1961, 30, 38, 47. Russell reports that Dr. Turner had lectured to an annual meeting of Ontario magistrates on how to recognize deviates. A colleague of his, Dr. Stokes, addressed cadets at the Ontario Police College.
- 213 Mohr and Turner, "Sexual Deviation, Part I," in Mann, *Social Deviance in Canada*, 353.
- 214 On this see Duberman, *Cures*. For a later period when more lesbian and gays have rejected this psychiatric terrorism, see *Phoenix Rising*, "Mad, Angry, Gay and Proud: A Lesbian and Gay Supplement."
- 215 Turner, interview, *ASK Newsletter* 2, no. 4 (April 1985).
- 216 Freedman, "Uncontrolled Desires," 103.
- 217 See Johann Mohr, R.E. Turner, and M.B. Jerry, *Pedophilia and Exhibitionism: A Handbook* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964); Mohr and Turner, "Sexual Deviations, Part IV: Paedophilia," *Applied Therapeutics* 9, no. 4 (April 1967): 362–65; and Mohr, "The Pedophilias: Their Clinical, Social and Legal Implications," *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal* 7, no. 5 (October 1962): 255–60. Krafft-Ebing had earlier coined the term "pedophilia erotica" as part of his typology of sexual diseases. See Tom O'Carroll, *Paedophilia: The Radical Case* (Boston: Alyson, 1982), 59–60.
- 218 Gigeroff, *Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 59.
- 219 Forms of "pedophile" resistance to oppression, taking up this category, reshaping it, or rejecting it (as among those who have defined themselves instead as "boy-lovers") had emerged by the 1970s. See Gay Left Collective, "Happy Families?," 59; and O'Carroll, *Paedophilia*, 59–60. Those homosexuals who tried to gain respectability by suggesting it was only those "deviants" interested in sex with young people who caused trouble also helped create this separate category of pedophilia. This position argues that it is not homosexuals but pedophiles who are the "real" deviants. In 1994, debates within the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), under pressure from the right wing in the United States and the United States government who were opposing ILGA's membership in an international United Nations body because of the alleged presence of "pedophiles" in ILGA's membership, led to the purging of the North American Man Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) and other "pedophile" groups from membership. This set a dangerous precedent of allowing the United States right wing to determine the membership of the international lesbian and gay organization. At the same time, NAMBLA has a sexual-libertarian position and neglects problems of sexual violence and harassment that young people face.
- 220 Mohr, "The Pedophilias," 205–206.
- 221 Of course, many gay men and lesbians exist within familial relations. See O'Brien and Weir, "Lesbians and Gay Men Inside and Outside Families," 111–39.
- 222 On this, see Gary Kinsman, "Restoring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System," 211–69; Kinsman, "The Mount Cashel Orphanage Inquiry," 76–93; and Kinsman, "Making Homosexuality the Problem Once Again," 17–19.
- 223 Marshall, "Pansies, Perverts and Macho Men," 133–34.
- 224 The term "transvestism" was originated by Hirshfeld in 1910. See Dave King, "Gender Confusions: Psychological and Psychiatric Conceptions of Transvestism and Transsexualism," in Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 159.
- 225 Although this new perspective was not yet hegemonic; for instance, Pascoe still thought that at the core of homosexuality was an inability to appreciate oneself as fully "masculine." Pascoe, "Deviant Sexual Behaviour and the Sex Criminal," 413–14.

- 226 Crane, *Gays and the Law*, 189.
- 227 See Irving and Raj, *Trans Activism in Canada*; Viviane K. Namaste, *Invisible Lives: The Erasure of Transsexual and Transgendered People* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); and Namaste, *Sex Change, Social Change: Reflections on Identity, Institutions, and Imperialism* (Toronto: Women's Press, 2005).
- 228 See John Money and Patricia Tucker, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975); Kristin Ireland, "Sex Reassignment Surgery in Ontario: Adrift in a Political and Cultural Climate," in *New World Coming, The Sixties and the Shaping of Global Consciousness*, ed. Karen Dubinsky et al. (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2009), 313–19; and Bernice L. Hausman, *Changing Sex: Transsexualism, Technology, and the Idea of Gender* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995).
- 229 See Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*; and Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*.

CHAPTER EIGHT

- 1 Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society*, 240–41; Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law*, 83. The reference to the "nauseating subject" is from Gigeroff, referring to Lord Vansittart introducing a debate in the House of Lords calling for the appointment of a committee on homosexuality, 83.
- 2 Carol Smart, "Law and the Control of Women's Sexuality: The Case of the 1950s," in *Controlling Women: The Normal and the Deviant*, ed. Gillian Williams and Bridget M. Hutter (London: Croom Helm, 1981), 48. Also see Lucy Bland, Trisha McCabe, and Frank Mort, "Sexuality and Reproduction: Three Official Instances," in *Ideology and Cultural Production*, ed. Michèle Barrett et al. (London: Croom Helm, 1979), esp. 100–109.
- 3 Smart, "Law and the Control of Women's Sexuality," 49–50. See Helen J. Self, *Prostitution, Women and the Misuse of the Law: The Fallen Daughters of Eve*, first ed. (London: Routledge, 2003); and Self, "Wolfenden and Prostitution: An Historical Review" (paper presentation, Wolfenden 50 Conference, London, June 2007). On the Canadian context, see Ummni Khan, "Homosexuality and Prostitution: A Tale of Two Deviances," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 283–305.
- 4 For more elaboration on this, see Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation." Also see Kinsman "Wolfenden in Canada," 183–205; and Kinsman, "Not a Gift from Above," esp. 78–81.
- 5 The report based its findings on documentary information provided by medical and criminal records. Great Britain, Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution, *The Wolfenden Report* (New York: Lancer, 1964), 20. The Wolfenden committee received submissions from many groups, including the Association of Chief Officers of Police for England and Wales, the Association of Headmasters, Headmistresses and Matrons of Approved Schools, the Association of Social and Moral Hygiene, the Association of Municipal Corporations, the Boy Scout Association, the British Medical Association, the British Psychological Society, the Church of England Moral Welfare Council, the General Council of the Bar, the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency, the Metropolitan Police, the National Association of Probation Officers, the Public Morality Council, the Admiralty and the Air Ministry, the Home Office Prison Commission, and the War Office. Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution, *The Wolfenden Report*, 233–39.
- 6 See Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*. Unless otherwise noted, these references to the Wolfenden Report refer to the Lancer edition:
- 7 Great Britain, Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution, *Report* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1962), 7. They make it clear that their focus was not on

homosexuality, or even homosexual behavior, but on homosexual offences. As they state: “We are concerned, in this part of our inquiry, with homosexual offences. Any lengthy or detailed study of the nature or origins of homosexuality, would in our view, have fallen outside our terms of reference.” *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, authorized American ed. (New York: Stein and Day, 1963), 27. They go on that “It is important to make a clear distinction between ‘homosexual offences’ and ‘homosexuality’ ...Homosexuality, then, is a state or condition, and as such does not, and cannot, come within the purview of the criminal law” (27). In the report they outline what they include under “homosexual offences” for England and Wales. These are: Buggery, Attempted buggery, Indecent assault on a male by a male, Acts of gross indecency between males, Procuring acts of gross indecency between males, Attempting to procure acts of gross indecency between males, Assaults with intent to commit buggery, Persistent soliciting or importuning of males by males for immoral purposes (where the “immoral purposes” involve homosexual behavior) and offences against bylaws (where the offences involve acts of indecency between person of the same sex) (55). The focus was not simply on gross indecency and buggery and, in a note, they point out that buggery is not only a “homosexual” offence.

- 8 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, section 61.
- 9 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 23–24.
- 10 Stuart Hall, “Reformism and the Legislation of Consent,” in *Permissiveness and Control: The Fate of the Sixties Legislation*, ed. National Deviancy Conference (London: MacMillan Press, 1980), 13.
- 11 Hall, “Reformism and the Legislation of Consent,” 14. Also see John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (1859).
- 12 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 39, 40–41. The following account is based on my reading of the report, unless otherwise cited, particularly, 10–15, 43–48, 88–89, 108–43.
- 13 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 13–14.
- 14 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 20.
- 15 Bland, McCabe, and Mort, “Sexuality and Reproduction,” 103–104.
- 16 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 53.
- 17 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 22. This is one of the few references to lesbianism in the report.
- 18 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 22.
- 19 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 26. Note the assumption of the normality of heterosexual life and the heterosexual standpoint taken up here.
- 20 Crane, *Gays and the Law*, 68.
- 21 *The Wolfenden Report*, quoted in Bland, McCabe and Mort, “Sexuality and Reproduction,” 102. This long legal history of viewing “buggery” as a particularly horrific crime can even be seen in the Hughes Commission Report into what went on at the Mount Cashel Orphanage in St. John’s in the 1970s and 1980s. Samuel Hughes writes of “buggery long known to the law as the ‘abominable crime.’” See Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Response of the Newfoundland Criminal Justice System to Complaints, *Report*, vol. 1, *Report* (St. John’s: The Commission, 1992), 200. The “homosexual offences” the recommendations of the report address include not only gross indecency and buggery but also indecent assault, prostitution-related offences, and importuning for immoral purposes, *The Wolfenden Report*, authorized American ed., 187–88.
- 22 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 67.
- 23 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 78.

- 24 On prostitution and the *Wolfenden Report*, also see Smart, "Law and the Control of Women's Sexuality," 40–59, for an excellent analysis of prostitution legislation in England in the 1950s. Also see Self, *Prostitution, Women and the Misuse of the Law*.
- 25 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 87.
- 26 Great Britain, *The Wolfenden Report*, 85.
- 27 Hall, "Reform and the Legislation of Consent," 10.
- 28 Bland, McCabe, and Mort, "Sexuality and Reproduction," 84.
- 29 The *Sexual Offences Act of 1967*, which applied to England and Wales, stated that "a homosexual act in private shall not be an offence provided that the parties consent thereto and have attained the age of twenty-one years." Later the Act defines homosexual acts as "buggery" and "gross indecency." They exclude the military and merchant navy from these provisions and the Act also includes the offence of procuring others to commit homosexual acts and living on the earnings of male prostitution. See *Sexual Offences Act 1967*, c. 60 (Eng. and Wales), http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1967/60/pdfs/ukpga_19670060_en.pdf.
- 30 United Church of Canada, *Annual Report, 1959*, no. 34 (Toronto: United Church House, 1959), 57.
- 31 Bland, McCabe, and Mort, "Sexuality and Reproduction," 104. Also see Kinsman, "Wolfenden in Canada," 183–205.
- 32 Mort, "Sexuality, Regulation and Contestation," 39.
- 33 On Wolfenden's influence on English obscenity and anti-porn legislation, see Annette Kuhn, "Public Versus Private: The Case of Indecency and Obscenity," *Leisure Studies* 3, no. 1 (1984): 53–65; Kuhn, "Covering Up Sex," *New Statesman*, February 24, 1984, 10–11; and Beverly Brown, "Private Faces in Public Places," *Ideology and Consciousness*, no. 7 (1980): 3–16. On Canada, see Kinsman, "Porn/Censor Wars and the Battlefields of Sex," in *Issues of Censorship*, ed. A Space (Toronto: A Space, 1985), 31–39. The Wolfenden approach influenced Canadian sexual legislation on these matters at least up to the publication of Paul Fraser, Special Committee on Pornography and Prostitution, *Pornography and Prostitution in Canada: Report* (Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1985), 2 vols.
- 34 Hall, "Reform and the Legislation of Consent," 2.
- 35 Bland, McCabe, and Mort, "Sexuality and Reproduction," 107.
- 36 Mort, "Sexuality, Regulation and Contestation," 42.
- 37 See Kuhn, "Public Versus Private," 53–65; Kuhn, "Covering Up Sex," 10–11; and Brown, "Private Faces in Public Places," 3–16.
- 38 See Victoria Greenwood and Jock Young, "Ghettoes of Freedom: An Examination of Permissiveness," in National Deviancy Conference, *Permissiveness and Control*, 166; and Weeks, *Coming Out*, 11.
- 39 Charles Kerrigan, "Gay Liberation and National Liberation," interview, *Rites*, June 1984, 15.
- 40 See Patrick Devlin, *The Enforcement of Morals* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965); and Ronald M. Dworkin, *The Philosophy of Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).
- 41 See H.L.A. Hart, *Punishment and the Elimination of Responsibility*, Hobhouse Memorial Trust Lecture, no. 31 (London: The Athlone Press, 1962); Hart, *Law, Liberty and Morality*, Harry Camp Lectures at Stanford University (London: Oxford University Press, 1963); and Yves Caron, "The Legal Enforcement of Morals and the So-Called Hart-Devlin Controversy," *McGill Law Journal* 15, no. 1 (February 1969): 9–47.
- 42 "License and Liberty," in United Church of Canada, Board of Evangelism and Social Services, *Annual Report, 1958* (1957; repr., Toronto: United Church House, 1958), 15.
- 43 *The Wolfenden Report*, authorized American ed., 6, which was "published in the United States of America and Canada with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationary Office."

- 44 Esther Newton, *Mother Camp: Female Impersonators in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 59. Newton's book is a wonderful account of drag queens, female impersonators, and the formation of gay cultures in the 1960s in the United States.
- 45 See Archbold, "Old but Not Alone," interview with Bert Sutcliffe, 28; and Sutcliffe, "Herbert Frederick Sutcliffe," 156.
- 46 Ross Higgins, "Notes for a Gay History of Montréal," *Pink Ink*, no. 2 (August 1983): 24; and Higgins, "Montréal 1953," 31–32. Also see Leznoff, "Homosexual in Urban Society."
- 47 Grube, "Queens and Flaming Virgins," 16.
- 48 The Municipal Hotel (67 Queen Street West) was frequented in the 1950s and early 1960s, Mulloney's Studio Tavern (66 Grenville Street) in the 1950s, the Hotel Metropole (141 King Street West) by the early 1960s, and the Red Lion bar of the Westbury Hotel in the early 1960s. Letro's (50 King Street East) was completely gay by 1965. By the 1960s, the St. Charles Tavern and the Parkside were predominantly gay. See Canadian Gay Archives, *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto* (Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1982). Also see Grube, "Queens and Flaming Virgins," 16.
- 49 See Ross, "The House that Jill Built," 87; Ross, *The House That Jill Built*; also see *Forbidden Love*, directed by Weissman and Fernie.
- 50 The Regency Club on Prince Arthur Street was the first private gay club in Toronto. The Melody Room, 457 Church Street, was gay-owned; it was destroyed by fire in 1966. The Maison de Lys/The Music Room, 575 Yonge Street, was run from 1962 to 1966 by the previously mentioned Sara Ellen Dunlop and Richard Kerr. For a description, see Rick Archbold, "Old but Not Alone: Interviews by Rick Archbold," interview with Mary Axten, *The Body Politic*, December 1982, 27. See Canadian Gay Archives, *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto*.
- 51 See Egan, *Jim Egan: Canada's Pioneer Gay Activist*.
- 52 This is where Mama Quilla II, a Toronto lesbian feminist band in the late 1970s and early 1980s took its name from. See Ross, *The House That Jill Built*, 68; and Ross, "The House That Jill Built," 98. Also see John Forbes, "Sarah Ellen Dunlop and the Music Room: A Memory," in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 127–28.
- 53 The Oak Leaf is the oldest homosexual-identified institution operating in Toronto. See Canadian Gay Archives, *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto*. Also see Zach Zwitter, "Last Shvitz at the Oak Leaf?," *NOW Toronto*, June 3, 2015, <https://nowtoronto.com/news/last-shvitz-at-the-oak-leaf/>. Arrests at the Oak Leaf go back to at least 1950, when two arrests on gross indecency and subsequent convictions took place. One of those charged was a soldier. These charges took place a few weeks after similar charges were laid at the Sanitary Baths in Toronto. See "Two Perverts Imprisoned for Indecency at Baths: Another Given Two Years," *Justice Weekly*, December 12–23, 1950, 9. This reference comes from the work of Walter Cassidy on *Queer Visibility in Windsor and Essex County*, a small part was published as, Walter T. Cassidy, "Canada's First Gay Bathhouse Raid: Windsor, 1964," *Active History*, March 3, 2021, <https://activehistory.ca/2021/03/29902/>.
- 54 Grube, "Queens and Flaming Virgins," 16; Canadian Gay Archives, *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto*; and William Johnson, "The Gay World," *Globe*, January 13, 1968, 5–8. On Hanlan's Point, also see Ed Jackson, "Hanlan's Point," in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 130.
- 55 The historical importance of Hanlan's Point was brought up by older gay and lesbian activists in response to Toronto City "development" plans to make the area into a major concert venue. Important community mobilizations forced the City to back off most of these plans and to recognize the historical queer importance of Hanlan's Point. See Mathew Silver,

- “I’ve Watched So Many Queer Spaces Disappear’: How Torontonians Feel about the Scrapped Development Plans for Hanlan’s Point,” *Toronto Life*, February 28, 2023, <https://torontolife.com/city/ive-watched-so-many-queer-spaces-disappear-how-torontonians-feel-about-the-scrapped-development-plans-for-hanlans-point/>.
- 56 See Grube, “Queens and Flaming Virgins,” 16. Also see Churchill, “Coming Out in a Cold Climate.” On installing of morality lights on Philosopher’s Walk, and on the bushes being cut down at Queen’s Park and Hanlan’s Point beach see, Adams, “Almost Anything Can Happen,” 229.
- 57 See Newton, *Mother Camp*, 100.
- 58 See Archbold, “Old but Not Alone,” interview with Mary Axton, 27; Canadian Gay Archives, *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto*; and Johnson, “The Gay World,” 5–8, who reports that in 1968 a coffee shop near Avenue Road had regular drag shows for straight and gay audiences.
- 59 Newton, *Mother Camp*, 37.
- 60 Newton, *Mother Camp*, 8.
- 61 See Jack Babuscio, “Camp and the Gay Sensibility” in *Gays and Film*, ed. Richard Dyer (London: British Film Institute, 1977), 40–57; the critique of it by Andrew Britton, “For Interpretation: Notes Against Camp,” *Gay Left*, no. 7 (Winter 1978/1979): 11–14; and Richard Dyer, “It’s Being So Camp as Keeps Us Going,” *The Body Politic*, no. 36 (September 1977): 11–13.
- 62 The following account of camp is based on Newton, *Mother Camp*, 105–11; and Derek Cohen and Richard Dyer, “The Politics of Gay Culture,” in *Gay Left Collective, Homosexuality*, 178.
- 63 Newton, *Mother Camp*, 110.
- 64 *Paris is Burning*, produced and directed by Jennie Livingston (Off White Productions, 1990), 77 min.
- 65 See Jackie Golsby, “Queens of Language: Paris is Burning,” in *Queer Looks: Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Film and Video*, ed. Martha Grever, John Greyson, Pratibha Parmar (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1993), 108–15; and for a critical approach, bell hooks, “Is Paris Burning?,” in *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1992), 145–56. Also see Kurt Mungal, “Ball Culture,” in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 251–53. On Jackie Shane, an important Black trans/gay singer in Toronto in the 1960s, see Steven Maynard, “A New Way of Lovin’: Queer Toronto gets Schooled by Jackie Shane,” in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 11–18; and Elaine Gaber-Katz, “How Jackie Shane Helped ‘Satisfy My Soul,’” in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 37–38; and Jin Haritaworn et al., “Marvellous Grounds: QTBIPOC Counter-Archiving Against Imperfect Erasures,” in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 219–23. Also see Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*; and Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*.
- 66 For a recent discussion about racism and the working conditions imposed on drag performers, see Kusha, Jade Electra, and Ryan Persade, “Drag Performers Resisting Fascism, Racism and Heteromascularity,” No Pride in Policing/Abolitionist and anti-Fascist Pride 2023, June 6, 2023, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1JL3v3U7MTg&list=PLlgNTzJ7mKzk8fxIVRNsToFIaGcM6aMBA&index=2>.
- 67 See Alan Miller, “The Way We Were,” *Action! 1*, no. 4 (1981); Miller, “Beefcake with No Labels Attached,” 33; Waugh, “A Heritage of Pornography,” 29–33; Waugh, “Photography, Passion and Power,” *The Body Politic*, no. 101 (March 1984): 29–33; Waugh, “Gay Male Visual Culture in North America During the Fifties”; and Bronski, *Culture Clash*, 160–74.
- 68 See Bronski, *Culture Clash*, 163. For an instance of censorship hitting lesbian-related material in Canada, see Adams, “Precedent-Setting Pulp,” 21.

- 69 Joan Nestle, "Butch-Femme Relationships: Sexual Courage in the 1950s," in *A Restricted Country*, 100.
- 70 See Kennedy and Davis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold*. On the emergence of lesbian cultures in Canada, see Lesbians Making History in Toronto, "People Think This Didn't Happen in Canada—But it Did," 81–86; *Forbidden Love*, directed by Weissman and Fernie; Chamberland, "Remembering Lesbian Bars, 1955–1975," 231–69; Chenier, "Risks, Roles and Rounders"; and Chenier, "Tough Ladies and Troublemakers"; Ross, "The House That Jill Built," 86–87, 99; and Ross, *The House that Jill Built*. Also see Duder, *Awfully Devoted Women*; and Millward, *Making A Scene*.
- 71 See Joan Nestle, "Lesbians and Prostitutes: An Historical Sisterhood," in *A Restricted Country*, 157–77.
- 72 Newton, *Mother Camp*, 111.
- 73 See articles in *Justice Weekly*, November 3 and 24, 1956.
- 74 Lesbian and Gay History Group of Toronto, *A History of the Relationship Between the Gay Community and the Metropolitan Police: A Brief Presented to Arnold Bruner for His Study of Relations Between the Homosexual Community and the Police* (Toronto: The Group, 1981), 2. The attribution of an organized community in the early 1960s is somewhat premature.
- 75 Lesbian and Gay History Group of Toronto, *A History of the Relationship Between the Gay Community and the Metropolitan Police*, 2.
- 76 Sidney Katz, "The Homosexual Next Door," *Maclean's*, February 22, 1964, 10–11, 28–30, <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1964/2/22/the-homosexual-next-door>.
- 77 Lesbian and Gay History Group of Toronto, 3.
- 78 Lesbian and Gay History Group of Toronto, 3; also see Canadian Gay Archives, *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto*. The very possibility of this charge being laid points to the vague character of "gross indecency."
- 79 A news item in *Gay* referred to a 1964 raid on a steam bath in Windsor. Also see Jack Batten, "The Homosexual Life in Canada: Will Trudeau's Change in the Law Make Any Difference?" *Saturday Night* 84, no. 9 (September 1969): 28–32. This is a reference to the raid on the Etna Steam Baths in Windsor which led to a keeping a common bawdy house and a number of found-in charges, including against US residents. This may very well have been the first police raid on a bathhouse using bawdy-house legislation in the Canadian context. See the *Windsor Star*, May 6, 1964, 6. This reference comes from the work of Walter Cassidy on Queer Visibility in Windsor and Essex County. See Cassidy, "Canada's First Gay Bathhouse Raid."
- 80 See Lesbians Making History in Toronto, "People Think This Didn't Happen in Canada—But it Did," 81–86; and Chenier, "Risks, Roles and Rounders"; Chenier, "Tough Ladies and Troublemakers." Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 213–14.
- 81 Higgins, "Notes for a Gay History of Montréal," 24.
- 82 See Smith, "Policing the Gay Community," 163–83.
- 83 D.E. Sanders [misspelled, Saunders], "Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders," *Criminal Law Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (November 1967): 27.
- 84 On the ideological work of "complaints" in mandating/justifying police action, see "Guelph Sex Video Policing: Internal Cop Documents," *Rites*, June 1986, 7.
- 85 *ASK Newsletter* 1, no. 5 (1964).
- 86 Unless otherwise cited, all references refer to Bruce Somers, interview with author, Toronto, May 24, 1986; and Doug Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986. Sanders was involved in support for the Indigenous rights movement in the 1970s and 1980s and won the Bora Laskin Award in 1985. Excerpts from these interviews

- are published in *Angles* (Vancouver) 3, no. 10 (October 1986): 14–15; and *Rites*, October 1986, 10–11, 15.
- 87 This is a reference to the Lupien/Boisvert case to which I refer later in this chapter. See Doug Sanders, “Homosexuality and the Law: The Mysterious Case of Everett George Klipfert,” *Georgia Straight* (Vancouver), September 27–October 3, 1968, 10–11, 17. This lack of police attention may in part have been due to the apparent absence of yellow press/police scandal sheets in Vancouver which would have drawn attention to gay activities.
- 88 See D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 57–91.
- 89 For instance, Doug Sanders was also involved in support for draft resisters to the American war in Vietnam and later in support work for the rights of Indigenous peoples. Doug Sanders died in 2022.
- 90 Champagne, “An Interview with Jim Egan,” in Egan, *Jim Egan*, 4. Excerpts from this interview are published in Champagne, “Canada’s Pioneer Gay Activist Jim Egan,” interview and introduction, *Rites*, December 1986/January 1987, 12–14.
- 91 See Neil Whaley, “His/Herstory: Gay Groundbreaker,” *Vancouver Gay Community Centre News*, February 1983, 39–41. Also, Ian Young, “Alienation,” *The Body Politic*, no. 55 (August 1979): 26. Other references upon which this section is based are the *ASK Newsletter*. All interview references refer to Bruce Somers, interview with author, Toronto, May 24, 1986; and Doug Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 92 Bruce Somers, interview with author, Toronto, May 24, 1986.
- 93 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 39–41.
- 94 Doug Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 95 See Alec Fadel, “Homosexual Offences in Ottawa 1950–1967: The Medicalization of the Legal Process” (master’s thesis, Concordia University, Montréal, 1994).
- 96 This list of initial objectives may have been based on those of the Mattachine Society.
- 97 Doug Sanders, *ASK Newsletter*, June 1965.
- 98 *ASK Newsletter* 1, no. 1 (April 1964): 2. On Evelyn Hooker, see references in D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*.
- 99 See D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 197–99. NACHO was founded in August 1966.
- 100 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 39–41.
- 101 Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 102 I have only seen the editorial for this issue.
- 103 Sanders, letter to Larry Dewers, 1968, undated, Sanders’s personal files.
- 104 On Jane Rule, see *Fiction and Other Truths: A Film About Jane Rule*, directed by Aerlyn Weissman and Lynne Fernie (Toronto: Great Jane Productions, 1995), 57 min.
- 105 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 39–41.
- 106 *ASK Newsletter* 2, no. 6 (June 1965).
- 107 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 40. This periodization of ASK’s first and second phase was suggested by Sanders in our interview with Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 108 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 39–40.
- 109 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 39–40.
- 110 *ASK Newsletter* 1, no. 4 (July 1964): 4.
- 111 On this see Ross, “The House that Jill Built,” 97n27. There are some similarities with the perspective held by the leaders of the Daughters of Bilitis in the United States in generally putting down working-class bar dykes and butch/femme cultures; see D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 92–125.
- 112 In June 1967, the newsletter reported that ASK members visiting Seattle met not only with the Dorion (homophile) group but also with the Female Educational Movement (FEM).

- ASK Newsletter also reprinted an article by Lynda E.D. Turner, "Women in Canadian Society," and referred to Renate Wilson's article, "What Turns Women to Lesbianism," *Chatelaine*, October 1966. Also see Bob Cummings, "The Lesbians," *Georgia Straight* (Vancouver), September 13–19, 1968, 9–12; October 4–10, 1968, 9–12; and November 1–7, 1968, 9–12.
- 113 Cummings, "The Lesbians." Norma Mitchell is interviewed in the November 1–7, 1968 issue.
- 114 Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 115 Alastair Heron, ed., *Toward A Quaker View of Sex: An Essay by a Group of Friends* (London: Friends Home Services Committee, 1963).
- 116 ASK Newsletter 1, no. 2 (May 1964).
- 117 ASK Newsletter 1, no. 2 (May 1964), 9.
- 118 Somers, interview with author, Toronto, May 24, 1986.
- 119 United Church of Canada, Commission of Christian Marriage and Divorce, *Toward a Christian Understanding of Sex, Love, Marriage: A First Report* (Toronto: The Board of Christian Education of the United Church of Canada, 1960), 14–16.
- 120 Dr. Tibor Chibes, professor of Pastoral Care, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, DC, "Christian Attitudes Towards Homosexuality," in *Annual Report, 1964*, by United Church of Canada, Evangelism and Social Service (Toronto: United Church House, 1964), 142–47. For the somewhat interrelated discussions in the United Church on abortion rights, see Katrina Ackerman, Bruce Douville, and Shannon Stettner, "Is Abortion Ever Right?: The United Church of Canada and the Debate over Abortion Law Reform, 1960–1980," in Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 52–73.
- 121 Jack Cahill, "Homosexuals Cannot Be Christians, Montréal Church Leader Insists," *Toronto Daily Star*, June 1, 1966, D3.
- 122 "Church Council Aims to Aid Homosexuals," *Globe and Mail*, June 2, 1965, 9. This section is also based on Somers, interview with author, Toronto, May 24, 1986; and Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 123 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 5413. Peters was also involved in the 1960s in pushing for easier divorce legislation.
- 124 Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual, *A Brief to be Presented to the Ontario Select Committee on Youth, 1966–1967*, Doug Sanders's personal files.
- 125 Somers, interview with author, Toronto, May 24, 1986. Also reported on in Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 131, 176.
- 126 In England, both the church assembly of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Advisory Committee supported the recommendations of the *Wolfenden Report*. On the importance of shifts within the churches in England in bringing about law reform, see Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents*, 35. In the United States, a Council on Religion and the Homosexual was established in 1964 following a conference involving gay and lesbian activists and Protestant ministers. See D' Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 193.
- 127 ASK Newsletter, July 1964.
- 128 See Alan Horsfall, "Battling for Wolfenden," in *Radical Records: Thirty years of Lesbian and Gay History, 1957–1987*, ed. Bob Cant and Susan Hemmings (London: Routledge, 1988), 15–33.
- 129 ASK Newsletter, November 1964.
- 130 ASK Newsletter, September 1964, 3–5.
- 131 ASK Newsletter, September 1964, 3–5.
- 132 ASK Newsletter, April 1964, 3.
- 133 "Seek to Form Society to Aid Sex Deviants," *Globe and Mail*, July 25, 1964, 4.
- 134 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 5413.

- 135 ASK Newsletter, September 1964, 4; and “Seek to Form Society to Aid Sex Deviants,” *Globe and Mail*, July 25, 1964, 4.
- 136 *Two* (Toronto), no. 5 (1964).
- 137 See Sanders, interview, *Angles* (Vancouver), October 1986, 14–15; and *Rites*, October 1986, 10–11, 15; and Nate Cole, “Lawyers Support Homosexuality Ban: Bar Association Defeats Bid to Follow British Proposal,” *Vancouver Sun*, June 16, 1966.
- 138 Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 139 Sanders, “Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders,” 27–29.
- 140 Sanders, “The Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders,” *ASK Newsletter*, June 1967, 3.
- 141 Sanders, “The Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders,” 3.
- 142 From the interview with Sanders cited earlier. Also see Weisstub, ed., “The *Queen v. Lupien*,” *Law and Psychiatry in the Canadian Context*, 300–303. This was possibly a trans-related legal case. We get no sense from the legal case or from Sanders’s of how Boisvert may have seen themselves.
- 143 Sanders, “The Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders,” 3.
- 144 Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 145 Transcript of the *Lupien/Boisvert* case, 8–10, Doug Sanders’s personal files. The following quotes are also from this transcript.
- 146 Transcript of the *Lupien/Boisvert* case, 13.
- 147 ASK, letter to its members, *ASK Newsletter*, January 10, 1968, LGBTQ Serials, Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (ArQuives), Toronto.
- 148 Doug Sanders, letter to Paul Bédard, August 24, 1968, in Sanders’s files.
- 149 Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 150 Douglas E. Sanders submission to the Royal Commission on Security, 1968, F0039-02-42, *Gays of Ottawa*, Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (ArQuives), Toronto.
- 151 Doug Sanders, interview with author, 1994.
- 152 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 41. A part of recovering Canadian lesbian and gay histories for the 1960s will be further examination and rediscovery of ASK’s activities and its connections across the country.
- 153 Whaley, “His/Herstory,” 41.
- 154 See Miller, “The Way We Were.” Also see Donald W. McLeod, *A Brief History of GAY, Canada’s First Gay Tabloid, 1964–1966* (Toronto: Homewood Books, 2003); and McLeod, “Tabloid Journalism and the Rise of a Gay Press in Toronto,” in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 108–10.
- 155 See D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 202.
- 156 Don Philip, “The Philosophy of Law,” *Gay* 1, no. 8 (July 30, 1964): 9.
- 157 This may have been related to Jim Egan’s suggestion to set up a chapter of *One* in Toronto. Also see a number of issues of *Two* online at [Queer Music Heritage, Two](http://www.queermusicheritage.com/two-mag.html), <http://www.queermusicheritage.com/two-mag.html>.
- 158 *Two*, 1964, 2, <http://www.queermusicheritage.com/two-mag1.html>.
- 159 *Toronto Daily Star*, February 6, 1966; Canadian Gay Archives, *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto*; and Miller, “The Way We Were.”
- 160 These columns were published in the *Toronto Telegram*, April 11, 14, 15, 1964.
- 161 Jim Egan, “Guest Editorial,” *Two*, 1964, 19, <http://www.queermusicheritage.com/two-mag1.html>. Remember that Negro was how Black people were often referred to at this time.
- 162 This needs to be followed up in uncovering more of the histories of gay men of colour in early gay scenes in Toronto. See Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*; and Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*.

- 163 See D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 202.
- 164 See Ross, "The House That Jill Built," 99n50; and Anonymous, "What is a Downtown Butch?," *Two*, July/August 1966, 11.
- 165 ASK Newsletter 2, no. 5 (May 1967).
- 166 From Doug Sanders's personal files; and Sanders, discussions with author.
- 167 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 8 (1968–1969): 8598.
- 168 Paul Bédard, letter to Doug Sanders, May 26, 1969, Sanders's personal files.
- 169 These remarks on Bédard are based on William Spencer, "Canada's Leading Homosexual Speaks Out," *Weekend Magazine*, September 13, 1969.
- 170 On Bédard, see Ross Higgins, "Lives, Oral Narratives, and Writing the Past" (presentation, "Out of the Archives" Conference, York University, Toronto, January 1994).
- 171 Katz, "The Homosexual Next Door," 11.
- 172 Katz, "The Homosexual Next Door," 10–11, 28–30; and Katz, "The Harsh Facts of Life in the 'Gay' World," *Maclean's*, March 7, 1964, 18, 34–38, <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1964/3/7/the-harsh-facts-of-life-in-the-gay-world>.
- 173 Katz, "The Truth About Sex Criminals," 46–48.
- 174 Champagne, "An Interview with Jim Egan," in Egan, *Jim Egan*, 4; Katz, "The Homosexual Next Door," 10–11, 28–30. Also see, Ron Fulton "Society and the Homosexual," *Toronto Telegram*, April 11, 14, 15, 1964. In 1967, John Hubert's play *Fortune in Men's Eyes* (New York: Grove Press, 1967) was published, which addressed homosexuality in the Canadian prison system.
- 175 See Katz, "The Homosexual Next Door," 10–11, 28–30.
- 176 See Katz, "The Harsh Facts of Life in the 'Gay' World," 18, 34–38.
- 177 William Nichols, "Homosexuality: Changing the Law Could Raise Morality," *Vancouver Sun*, July 6, 1965.
- 178 Many of these supported the reform effort, including Johnson, "The Gay World," 5–8.
- 179 Renate Wilson, "What Turns Women to Lesbianism."
- 180 Réjeanne Rancourt and Thérèse Limoges, "Homosexuality Among Women," *Canadian Nurse*, December 1967, 42–44. Also referred to in Ross, "The House That Jill Built," 84.
- 181 See, for instance, articles by Thomson, "Sexual Deviation," 381–89; Pascoe, "Deviant Sexual Behaviour and the Sex Criminal," 206–11.
- 182 Anonymous, "Living with Homosexuality," *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 86, no. 19 (May 12, 1962): 375–78. Also see Martin B. Duberman, "Gay in the Fifties," *Gay Sunshine*, Spring 1977; reprinted in *Salmagundi*, no. 58–59 (Fall 1982/Winter 1983): 42–75; and Duberman, *Cures*.
- 183 Alan W. Mewett, "Sexual Offences in Canada," *Criminal Law Quarterly* 2, no. 1 (May 1959): 29. It is important to note here that he argued for removing sections from the criminal code which did not take place in the 1969 reform. Also see Mewett, "Morality and the Criminal Law," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 14, no. 2 (1962): 213–28, in which he basically accepts the Wolfenden approach, arguing that where there is no social harm there can be no crime.
- 184 Raymond Spencer Rodgers, *Sex and the Law in Canada: Text, Cases and Comment* (Ottawa: Policy Press, 1962).
- 185 Rodgers, *Sex and the Law in Canada*, 6.
- 186 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*. It is his main work referenced and used in this book. Other work includes: "The Evolution of Canadian Legislation with Respect to Homosexuality, Pedophilia, and Exhibitionism," *Criminal Law Quarterly* 8, no. 4 (1965/1966): 445–54; "Sexual Offences in Relation to Homosexual, Exhibitionistic and Pedophilic Sexual Offences with Particular Reference to Canadian Legislation and Case Law"

- (LLM thesis, University of Toronto, 1966). Also, Gigeroff, Johann Mohr, and R.E. Turner, "Sex Offenders on Probation: Homosexuality," *Federal Probation* 33, no. 1 (1969): 36–39.
- 187 K.G. Gray, foreword to Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, vi.
- 188 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 186–87.
- 189 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 189.
- 190 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 195.
- 191 The 37 percent figure is actually not from the *Wolfenden Report*, but from the Kinsey Report, on sexual activity among men. At the same time, this is a very interesting entry of Wolfenden and Kinsey into a legal-defence argument. Kinsey, et al., *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*.
- 192 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 196.
- 193 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 199.
- 194 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 201.
- 195 This is not actually the case. In a literal reading of the *Wolfenden Report*, this activity in a car in a parking lot would still be in "public."
- 196 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 211–12.
- 197 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 204.
- 198 Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviation in the Criminal Law*, 207.
- 199 See Fadel, "Homosexual Offences in Ottawa 1950 to 1967."
- 200 Doug Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 201 This account comes from an interview conducted by Doug Sanders with Klippert following his sentencing as a "dangerous sexual offender" at the Prince Albert Penitentiary. It was published as Sanders, "An Exclusive Interview...", *ASK Newsletter* (Vancouver), February 1968, 16. Also see Sanders, "Homosexuality and the Law," 10–11, 17. Also see Kinsman, "Wolfenden in Canada," 194–95; Kinsman, "Not A Gift from Above," 79; and the video documentary on the Everett George Klippert case, *History's Courtroom*, episode 1001, "The Bedrooms of the Nation," hosted by Kirk Makin, prod. by Michael Maclear, aired April 2002, on History Television, Leading Cases Productions Limited and Screenlife Productions Limited (Toronto); and Kevin Allen, dir., "Gross Indecency: The Everett Klippert Story," *STORYHIVE*, prod. Calgary Gay History Project, 17:04, July 31, 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QABY0q7jfc>. On the use of the Klippert case in the context of the apology moment in 2016–17, see Steven Maynard in, "To Forgive and Forget? Homonationalism, Hegemony, and History in the Gay Apology," *Active History*, 2017, <http://activehistory.ca/papers/to-forgive-and-forget-homonationalism-hegemony-and-history-in-the-gay-apology/>. On the use of the Klippert case to push for the apology, which will be addressed in Chapter 11, and the "sanitization" of the sex that Klippert often engaged in with older teenagers, also see John Ibbitson, "In 1965, Everett Klippert Was Sentenced to a Life Behind Bars. His Crime? Being Gay," *Globe and Mail*, February 27, 2016, F1; Ibbitson, "Gay-Pardon Decision Applauded but Still Faces Obstacles," *Globe and Mail*, February 29, 2016, A1; and Ibbitson, "The Day Ottawa Got Out of Our Bedrooms," *Globe and Mail*, March 1, 2016, A10. Klippert did not receive a posthumous expungement of his convictions for "gross indecency" until 2020. See Kevin Allen, "Everett Klippert Coda," *Calgary Gay History* (blog), March 12, 2021, <https://calgarygayhistory.ca/2021/03/11/everett-klippert-coda/>.
- 202 Sanders, "Homosexuality and the Law," 10.
- 203 Sanders, "Homosexuality and the Law," 10.
- 204 Supreme Court of Canada, Application for Appeal, Memorandum of Argument, *Klippert v The Queen* 1967 SCR 822 (November 18, 1966); also see Caron, "The Legal Enforcement of Morals," 9–47; and Sanders, "Homosexuality and the Law," 10–11, 17.

- 205 Supreme Court of Canada, Application for appeal, Memorandum of Argument, *Canada Law Reports*, Supreme Court of Canada, *Klippert v The Queen* 1967 SCR 831.
- 206 For more elaboration, see Kinsman, “Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation.”
- 207 Sanders, “The Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders,” 3.
- 208 Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 209 Gigeroff, *Deviations in Criminal Law*, 121. How the law regarding “gross indecency” operated to obscure the local character of actual sexual relations is key. This was the method in its vagueness.
- 210 *Klippert v The Queen* 1967 SCR 836. This also demonstrates the tradition of legal reform in Canada flowing through Parliament and not the courts. This tendency has been modified with the Charter and its conception of state formation, which allows the courts a greater role.
- 211 “Supreme Court Ruling Makes Homosexual Liable for Life,” *Toronto Star*, November 7, 1967, C1; “Law on Homosexuals Will Be Amended,” *Toronto Daily Star*, November 8, 1967, B1.
- 212 “A Return to the Middle Ages,” *Toronto Daily Star*, November 10, 1967, A6.
- 213 “Not Parliament’s Intention,” editorial, *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), November 11, 1967, 6.
- 214 See Sidney Katz, “Homosexuals Shocked by Life Term Ruling,” *Toronto Daily Star*, November 11, 1967, 5. His second article, “Gentle George Klippert—Must He Serve LIFE?” *Toronto Daily Star*, November 18, 1967, B10.
- 215 Reported in Sanders, “Homosexuality and the Law,” 10.
- 216 The fuller quote, which is hardly ever referenced, and which carries a rather different meaning is: “There’s no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation...what is done in private between adults doesn’t concern the Criminal Code...when it becomes public, this is a different matter.” See Hooper, Kinsman, and Pearlston, “Anti-69 FAQ”; more generally, The Anti-69 Network, <https://anti-69.ca/>; Hooper, “The State’s Key to the Bedroom Door,” 102nn2–3, 116; and Kinsman, “Not A Gift from Above,” 74–97.
- 217 Klippert was released following the 1969 changes in the interpretation of this sentencing section. Attempts to contact him in the 1970s and 1980s were unsuccessful. For later information on the Everett George Klippert case, see *History’s Courtroom*, episode 1001, “The Bedrooms of the Nation”; and Kevin Allen, dir. “Gross Indecency: The Everett Klippert Story.”
- 218 Lesbian and Gay History Group, *A History of the Relationship between the Gay Community and the Metropolitan Toronto Police*, 3.
- 219 *Toronto Telegram*, July 19, 1967.
- 220 “Homosexuality and the Law,” *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), July 8, 1967, 6.
- 221 Robert Johnstone, “New Bill of Rights, Obscenity Change Shelved by Lawyers,” *Toronto Daily Star*, September 7, 1968, 12. Decades later, the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs issued what they referred to as an apology for this position against the ’69 reform without apologizing for the use of this language. The statement acknowledged that police charges against gay sex increased significantly after the ’69 reform. Many activists, including myself, did not accept such an apology. See John Chidley-Hill, “Police Chiefs Sorry For 1968 Fight Against Decriminalization of Homosexuality,” *HuffPost*, December 10, 2020, https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/police-apologize-decriminalization-homosexuality_ca_5fd2ac1bc5b61d81b33d3feb?guccounter=2.
- 222 Crane, *Gays and the Law*, 41.
- 223 Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 224 D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 199.

- 225 ASK Newsletter, February 1968.
- 226 Resolution adopted by the NACHO conference in Chicago, August 13–17, 1968. Doug Sanders, letter forwarded to Pierre Trudeau, August 24, 1968, Sanders's personal files. Also, NACHO, Fourth Meeting, August 12–17, 1968, Chicago, Illinois, 6, Houston LGBT History, <http://www.houstonlgbthistory.org/misc-promethean.html>.
- 227 See Ehrenreich, *The Hearts of Men*.
- 228 See the Anti-69, "Just Society' Plenary," <https://anti-69.ca/justsociety/>. On the White Paper, see Sarah Nickel, "Reconsidering 1969: The White Paper and the Making of the Modern Indigenous Rights Movement," *Canadian Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (June 2019): 223–38. Also see Hall, "Revisiting '69 Celebrations and Challenging Settler Homonationalism in the (Un)Just Society," 228–44. On the politics of Pierre Elliot Trudeau, see Christo Aivalis, *The Constant Liberal: Pierre Trudeau, Organized Labour, and the Canadian Social Democratic Left* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2018).
- 229 See Kathleen McDonnell, "Claim No Easy Victories: The Fight for Reproductive Rights," in *Still Ain't Satisfied!: Canadian Feminism Today*, ed. Maureen Fitzgerald, Connie Guberman, and Margie Wolfe (Toronto: Women's Press, 1982), 32–42; McDonnell, *Not an Easy Choice: A Feminist Re-Examines Abortion* (Toronto: The Women's Press, 1984), 17–19; and Janine Brodie, Shelley Gavigan, and Jane Jenson, *The Politics of Abortion* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992). Also see Rachael Johnstone, "Is That Really Necessary?: The Regulation of Abortion in Canada and the Framework of Medical Necessity," in Dummitt and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 259–79.
- 230 Victoria Greenwood and Jock Young, *Abortion in Demand* (London: Pluto Press, 1976), 17.
- 231 Eleanor Wright Peline, *Abortion in Canada* (Toronto: New Press, 1972), 31–45.
- 232 On the construction of people with disabilities in the '69 reform, see Dani Normandeau, "Disability and Resistance: Intersections in the 1969 Criminal Code Reform," *Anti-69*, <https://anti-69.ca/JustSociety/#DaniNormandeau>; and River Rossi, "Disability, Politics, and Collectively Reimagining Justice: Challenging the Ableist Contours of the 1969 Canadian Criminal Code Reform," in *Disability Injustice: Confronting Criminalization in Canada*, ed. Kelly Fritsch, Jeffrey Monaghan, and Emily van der Meulen (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2022), 239–58.
- 233 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5–8 (1968–1969): 4717–8669; Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Proceedings*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 1, issue 1–15 (1969): 171–668. Also see Hooper, "Queering '69," 257–73; Hooper "The State's Key to the Bedroom Door," 101–20; and Kinsman, "Not A Gift from Above," 74–97. Also see Robert Leckey, "'Repugnant': Homosexuality and Criminal Family Law," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 225–44; and Kyle Kirkup, "The Gross Indecency of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure," *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 263–82. Also see Hooper, Kinsman, and Pearlston, "Anti-69 FAQ."
- 234 George Smith, "In Defence of Privacy: Or Bluntly Put, No More Shit," *Action!* 3, no. 1 (1983).
- 235 On the Bill 7 debate in Ontario in 1986, see Becki Ross, "Sexual Dis/Orientation, or Playing House: To Be or Not Be Coded Human," in Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 133–45.
- 236 On the Bill 167 debate in Ontario in 1994, see *Gay Pride and Prejudice*, dir. Nancy Nicol.
- 237 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Proceedings*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 1, issue 1–15 (1969): 197.
- 238 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 4728.
- 239 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Proceedings*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 1, issue 1–15 (1969): 655.

- 240 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 4717. Although it needs to be stressed that neither “gross indecency” or “buggery” were repealed.
- 241 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 4719.
- 242 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 4725.
- 243 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 8 (1968–1969): 8576–77.
- 244 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Proceedings*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 1, issue 1–15 (1969): 659.
- 245 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 4722.
- 246 See Brodie, Gavigan, and Jenson, *The Politics of Abortion*. Also see Johnstone, “‘Is That Really Necessary?’” 259–79.
- 247 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7602–03.
- 248 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Proceedings*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 1, issue 1–15 (1969): 662.
- 249 There was also a later reference by J.P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): “We have not yet heard a member speak in support of any form of homosexuality or lesbian conduct. Let us not forget that women are involved in this matter.... The only thing the chamber has heard about for the last four days is homosexuality, but let us not forget that there are lesbians in this country.” Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7757. On lesbians, the ’69 reform and the 1968 Divorce Act, also see Karen Pearlston, “Avoiding the Vulva,” 37–53; and Pearlston, “‘Something More,’” 200–22. Marcel Lambert also argued that adolescents of high-school years needed protection from “incipient” homosexuality. “You become aware of a ring of persons engaged in unnatural conduct. It may take place among girls, and I have known of that, or among boys. You tell them that not only is it morally wrong, but it is against the law.” Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7512.
- 250 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Proceedings*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 1, issue 1–15 (1969): 662.
- 251 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7616.
- 252 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 539.
- 253 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 539.
- 254 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 4747.
- 255 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7606.
- 256 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 4759. I heard Mr. Lewis make the following remark in the mid-1970s in response to a question about gay rights: “My wife and I do not believe people should be discriminated against on the basis of how they were born.”
- 257 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7699.
- 258 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 6 (1968–1969): 5626.
- 259 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7610.
- 260 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 5 (1968–1969): 5414.
- 261 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7767–68.
- 262 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7759.
- 263 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 6 (1968–1969): 5944.
- 264 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7609.
- 265 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7608.

- 266 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7754.
- 267 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7756.
- 268 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 6 (1968–1969): 5945.
- 269 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7773.
- 270 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7760.
- 271 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7613.
- 272 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7614.
- 273 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7615.
- 274 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7751.
- 275 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7673.
- 276 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7695.
- 277 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7753.
- 278 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7753.
- 279 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 8 (1968–1969): 8701–703. This included 11 Conservatives in favour and 44 against the law reform.
- 280 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, *Debates*, 28th Parl., 1st sess., 7 (1968–1969): 7758.
- 281 Smith, “In Defence of Privacy.”
- 282 Smith, “In Defence of Privacy.”
- 283 Batten, “The Homosexual Life in Canada,” 28–32.
- 284 Smith, “In Defence of Privacy,” 1.
- 285 August 28 Gay Day Committee, “We Demand,” in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 217.

CHAPTER NINE

- 1 These were not, however, the first movements to focus on gay and lesbian concerns, see Chapter 2. There is a long history of organizing regarding sexual and gender relations going back to the nineteenth century.
- 2 See John Marshall, “Pansies, Perverts and Macho Men,” 133–54; and Dave King, “Gender Confusions,” 155–83. Also see Stryker, *Transgender History*; Leslie Feinberg, *Trans Liberation: Beyond Pink or Blue* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998); Namaste, *Sex Change, Social Change* (although Namaste is often far too critical of transgender politics); and Irving and Raj, *Trans Activism in Canada*.
- 3 See D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 176–239.
- 4 On the Stonewall riots, see Duberman, *Stonewall*. Also see Carter, *Stonewall*; and Marc Stein, ed., *The Stonewall Riots*. And see Stryker, *Transgender History*, 105–11. On the earlier 1966 Compton’s Cafeteria Riot, see Stryker, *Transgender History*, 84–98.
- 5 Later this would be extended to many countries in the “Third World.” See Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, including: Norma Mogrovejo, “Lesbian Visibility in Latin America: Reclaiming Our History,” 71–90; James N. Green, “Desire and Militancy: Lesbians, Gays and the Brazilian Workers Party,” 57–70; Sherry Joseph and Pawan Dhall, “No Silence Please, We’re Indians!” 157–77; Dennis Altman, “The Emergence of Gay Identities in Southeast Asia,” 137–56; Mark Gevisser, “Mandela’s Stepchildren: Homosexual Identity in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” 111–36; and Tremblay, Paternotte, and Johnson, *The Lesbian and Gay Movement and the State*.
- 6 For commentaries on and analysis of this early period, for the United States, see Karla Jay and Allan Young, *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation* (1972; repr., New York: Pyramid, 1974); and Donn Teal, *The Gay Militants* (New York: Stein and Day, 1971). For England, see Aubrey Walter, ed., *Come Together: The Years of Gay Liberation, 1970–73* (London: Gay Men’s Press, 1980); and Weeks, *Coming Out*, 185–206. For Canada, see Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*; Paul-François Sylvestre, *Les homosexuels s’organisent: au Québec*

et ailleurs (Montréal: Éditions Homeureux, 1979); and Ross, *The House That Jill Built*, esp. 24–40. Also see Lisa Power, *No Bath but Plenty of Bubbles: An Oral History of the Gay Liberation Front, 1970–1973* (London, New York: Cassell, 1995); and Tommi Avicoli Mecca, ed., *Smash the Church, Smash the State! The Early Years of Gay Liberation* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2009).

- 7 See Andrew Hodges and David Hutter, *With Downcast Gays: Aspects of Homosexual Self-Oppression* (Toronto: Pink Triangle Press, 1977). This notion of self-oppression can be criticized just as can the notion of “false consciousness” because it does not adequately address the social context wherein people might, in this case, remain “closeted” (fear that they will be fired, the need for familial support against racism, not viewing themselves through classifications of gay, lesbian, or homosexual etc.). These very real social pressures cannot simply be gotten rid of with moral pronouncements about “self-oppression.” The social world and people’s consciousness must both be transformed. However, given the specific character of lesbian/gay oppression and the importance of psychological discourse in its organization, this understanding of “self-oppression” has been rather useful. At the same time, a certain overinvestment of gay and lesbian liberation politics in the necessity of “coming out” as a central strategy for liberation has led to continuing tendencies to blame those who will not or have not yet come out. This approach also ignores the class and racialized dimensions of “coming out” and also presumes a universal strategy for gay/lesbian/queer liberation which may make little sense given the differential social organization of gender and eroticism in different societies and places. I have learned much from the work of Didi Khayatt on questions of coming out and the experiences of women in Egypt who have sex with other women. See, for instance, Khayatt, “Terms of Desire,” 213–32. This focus on coming out has informed the politics of “outing” in the 1990s, which views those who have not come out as not only “self oppressed” but also as damaging to the gay and lesbian (and sometimes the AIDS) struggles. On this, see Larry Gross, *Contested Closets: The Politics and Ethics of Outing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993); and Kinsman, “Outing and the Dismantling of the Closet,” review of *Contested Closets*, by Larry Gross, *Lesbian and Gay Studies Newsletter* 21, no. 2 (July 1994): 37–38.
- 8 Ross, *The House That Jill Built*, 24–30.
- 9 For accounts of feminist organizing in Canada that do not adequately address lesbian involvement, see Nancy Adamson, Linda Briskin, and Margaret McPhail, *Feminist Organizing for Change: The Contemporary Women’s Movement in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1988); and Ruth Roach Pierson, Marjorie Griffin Cohen, Paula Bourne, and Philinda Masters, *Canadian Women’s Issues*, vol. 1, *Strong Voices: Twenty-five Years of Women’s Activism in English Canada* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1993). Also see Judy Rebick, *Ten Thousand Roses: The Making of a Feminist Revolution* (Toronto: Penguin, 2005); and Philinda Masters, with the Broadside Collective, eds., *Inside Broadside: A Decade of Feminist Journalism* (Toronto: Second Story Press, 2019). Also see issues of the newspaper *The Other Woman*, published in Toronto from 1972–77, *Rise Up! A Digital Archive of Feminist Activism*, <https://riseupfeministarchive.ca/publications/other-woman-a-revolutionary-feminist-newspaper-toronto/>; and other materials at *Rise Up!*
- 10 This is why I disagree with Peter Drucker’s argument in *Warped* that underestimates the historical and social importance of these liberation movements and the possibilities they opened up. While Drucker notes the important struggles of the 1960s and early 1970s that produce conditions for rupture with earlier same-sex formations (195–210), he also emphasizes a certain continuity between the homophile organizing (after the overthrow of the early left leadership in Mattachine) of the 1950s and early 1960s, which focused on white and gendered middle-class respectability, and the “normality” constructed from the later 1970s

- on, leading up to what I call the neoliberal queer. He suggests that there are: “some striking similarities between the homophile movements that grew up before the mid-1960s and the gay right of recent decades—leapfrogging over the radical legacy of the liberationist interregnum between them” (286). While gay liberation and lesbian feminism were, in part, a significant rebellion against the limitations of homophile organizing rooted in a previous historical period, this revolt was generally not as clear as it needed to be on a critical engagement with class relations and class struggle and the need for an anti-capitalist perspective. While I also see the connections Drucker points to between homophile organizing and gay normalization, they occur in very different social and historical contexts and at very different points in a shifting racialized class organization of sexualities and genders. Also see Kinsman, “Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer, Reviews #1.”
- 11 Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (New York: Basic Books, 1981). Also see Gay Flames’s pamphlet, *Gay Liberation Meets the Shrinks*, no. 6 (New York: Gay Flames, early 1970s). The approach that “homosexuality” was a mental illness was partially put in place in the Canadian context in the debates around the 1969 reform. See Chapter 8.
 - 12 Weisstub, *Law and Psychiatry in the Canadian Context*, 113.
 - 13 See Joseph Harry and William B. DeVall, *The Social Organization of Gay Males* (New York: Praeger, 1978), 2; and Thomas Szasz, *Sex by Prescription: The Startling Truth About Today’s Sex Therapy* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981). It was only in 1995 that the American Medical Association reversed a thirteen-year-old policy of recommending “treatment” for gay men and lesbians who were unhappy with their homosexuality. See Wayves (Halifax), February 1995, 20.
 - 14 See Bonnie Burstow, “A History of Psychiatric Homophobia,” *Phoenix Rising* 8, no. 3/4 (July 1990): 539. Burstow published many books on anti-psychiatry and died in January 2020.
 - 15 On conversion therapy and the struggles against it, see Peter Gajdics, “Canada’s Failed Plot To End Conversion Therapy,” *Xtra*, September 2, 2020, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/canada-conversion-therapy-ban-bill-c-18-178588>. This struggle is returned to in Chapter 11.
 - 16 Weisstub, *Law and Psychiatry in the Canadian Context*, 113.
 - 17 World Health Organization, *Mental Disorders: Glossary and Guide to Their Classification in Accordance with the Ninth Revision of the International Classification of Diseases* (Geneva: World Health Organization, 1978), 40–41. Distributed in Canada by the Canadian Public Health Association. Sexual deviation and disorders are defined thus in this text: “The sexual activity of affected persons is directed primarily either toward people not of the opposite sex or toward sexual acts not associated with coitus normally, or toward coitus performed under abnormal circumstances” (40).
 - 18 World Health Organization, *Mental Disorders*, 40–41.
 - 19 See Gilhooly and Blackbridge, *Still Sane*; and *Phoenix Rising* 8, no. 3/4 (July 1990), esp. Bonnie Burstow, “A History of Psychiatric Homophobia,” 539.
 - 20 This history has yet to be pulled together, although valuable resources exist in publications, archives, in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*; Ross, *The House That Jill Built*; in some of the other references mentioned in this chapter, and in the memories and papers of people still actively involved in activism. Also see Warner, *Never Going Back*; Donald W. McLeod, *Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada, A Selected Annotated Chronology, 1964–1975* (Toronto: ECW Press/Homewood Books, 1996); Donald W. McLeod, *Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada: A Selected Annotated Chronology 1976–1981* (Toronto: Homewood Books, 2017); McCaskell, *Queer Progress*; Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*; Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban*

- Justice*; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*; Peter Graham with Ian MacKay, *Radical Ambitions: The New Left in Toronto* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2019), 307–20. On one small aspect of this history—the controversy over *The Body Politic*’s publication of the “Men Loving Boys Loving Men” article in 1977—can be traced in part through Becki Ross’s, “Like Apples and Oranges: Lesbian Feminist Responses to the Politics of *The Body Politic*,” *Fuse* 16, no. 4 (May/June 1993): 19–28; and Ross, *The House That Jill Built*, 165–75. I feel that her account—while correctly pointing to the need to defend *The Body Politic*—does not adequately take into account the limitations of the paper’s sexual-libertarian position during this period. Also see Chris Bearchell, Rick Bebout, and Alexander Wilson, “Another Look,” in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 166–74. The last issue of *The Body Politic* was no. 135, February 1987. Also see David Churchill, “Personal Ad Politics: Race, Sexuality and Power,” *Left History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Historical Inquiry* 8, no. 2 (2003): 114–34; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 218–21.
- 21 Sylvestre, *Les homosexuals s’organisent*, 40–42. Also see Marion Foster and Kent Murray, *A Not So Gay World: Homosexuality in Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1972).
 - 22 Ross Higgins, “The Linguistic Impasse: Gay Organizing in Montréal,” *Rites*, October 1985, 8. Higgins, presentation on the Front de Libération Homosexuelle (conference on the History of Gay and Lesbian Militancy in Québec, sponsored by the Groupe Interdisciplinaire de Recherches et Études: Homosexualité et Société (GIREHS), Université du Québec à Montréal, March 31, 1995). Also see Robert Schwartzwald, “Le Front de libération homosexuel du Québec et les limites de la contre-culture,” in *La Contre-culture au Québec*, ed. Karim Larose and Frédéric Rondeau (Montréal: Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 2016), 453–90. Also see Higgins, “The Quest for Queer Quebec: LGBTQ Studies in Montréal,” 32–53; and Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 270–72; and Patrizia Gentile, “À bas la repression contre les homosexuels!’: Resistance and Surveillance of Queers in Montréal, 1971–76,” in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 69–74.
 - 23 August 28 Gay Day Committee, “We Demand,” 217–20. The offence of gross indecency was abolished on January 1, 1988, but can still be used for offences alleged to have occurred prior to that date. For an update on the current offences that can be used against queer sex, see Chapter 11. Also see the recording from the event celebrating the 50th anniversary of the “We Demand” protest, hosted by the Canadian Centre for Gender and Sexual Diversity (CCGSD) with the support of the Anti-69 Network and Fredericton Pride. Canadian Centre for Gender and Sexual Diversity, “We Still Demand: The Past, Present and Future of 2SLGBTQIA Activism,” August 27, 2021, YouTube video, 1:34:44, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BC5nnHrW-X4>; CCGSD, “We Still Demand: Interview with Cheri DiNovo,” September 2, 2021, YouTube video, 24:21, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sDwdQPzomas>; and CCGSD, “We Still Demand: Interview with Paul J. MacDonald,” September 2, 2021, YouTube video, 30:59, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EX4kZy75oh8>.
 - 24 On early organizing in Halifax, see Rebecca Rose, *Before the Parade*. On organizing in the Atlantic provinces, also see Joanna Everett, “Mobilization on the Periphery: LGBTQ Activism and Success in Atlantic Canada,” in Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 125–41; and Nathaniel M. Lewis, “Punch[ing] More Than Its Weight’: LGBTQ Organizing in Halifax, Nova Scotia,” in Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 250–70. On St. John’s, see Gays and Lesbians Together, “Here to Stay!’: Lesbians and Gays in Newfoundland and Labrador, Fighting for Our Rights (St. John’s, NL: Gays and Lesbians Together, 1991), 14; and Rollmann, *A Queer History of Newfoundland*.
 - 25 Quoted in Ross, *The House That Jill Built*, 34–35.

- 26 On LOOT see Ross, *The House That Jill Built*. On lesbian organizing in Canada, also see Sharon Dale Stone, "Lesbian Mothers Organizing," in Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 198–208; and Stone, "Lesbians Against the Right," in *Women and Social Change: Feminist Activism in Canada*, ed. Jeri Wine and Janice Ristock (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1991), 236–53. On lesbian feminist organizing in the United States in relation to social movement-theory, see Verta Taylor and Nancy E. Whittier, "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization," in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClung Mueller (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 104–29. Also see, on Lesbians Against the Right and lesbian organizing in Toronto, *Dykes in the Streets*, directed by Almerinda Travassos (Toronto: Almerinda Travassos, 2019), 38 min. On APPLE and early lesbian organizing in Halifax, see Rose, *Before the Parade*, 80–96.
- 27 See Julia Creet, "A Test of Unity: Lesbian Visibility in the British Columbia Federation of Women," in Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 183–97.
- 28 See Masters with the Broadside Collective, *Inside Broadside*.
- 29 Brian Waite, "A Strategy for Gay Liberation," in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 221–23. For my critique of it, see Kinsman, "Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s," 144–46. Also see Tom Warner, "Fifteen Years of Struggle," interview with Tom Warner, by John Wilson, *Rites*, March 1987, 12.
- 30 See Bill Fields, "The Rise and Fall of the Fifty Per Cent Solution: Lesbians in the Canadian Gay Rights Movement" (unpublished paper, University of Regina, 1983), *The Body Politic* fonds, Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (ArQuives), Toronto, Ontario. This was a central struggle that lesbians willing to work with gay men in the 1970s engaged in. They won the 1977 National Gay Rights Coalition conference in Saskatoon to this position, but this was defeated at the conference in Halifax in 1978. This important struggle is not adequately addressed in Miriam Smith, *Lesbian and Gay Rights in Canada: Social Movements and Equality Seeking, 1971–1995* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999); or in Rose, *Before the Parade*, 73.
- 31 See Ross, *The House That Jill Built*.
- 32 Editorial, "Within These Walls," *Gay Left*, Spring 1976, 4.
- 33 Lambda Business Council Membership Directory, 1986. The Lambda Business Council lasted until at least 1992. It was largely replaced by the Church/Wellesley Business Improvement Association (BIA), recognized in 2002. The emergence and development of BIAs helped to set the stage for the emergence of the neoliberal queer in a number of centres across Canada.
- 34 Gayle Rubin, quoted in John D'Emilio, "Gay Politics, Gay Community," 93.
- 35 On rural lesbians and gay men, see Michael Riordan, *Out Our Way: Gay and Lesbian Life in the Country* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1996); and on gay men and lesbians in the Atlantic provinces, see Barnholden, "A Different Drummer," 6–15. In the early years of the AIDS crisis some people living with AIDS/HIV would move back home when they were ill. Also see Rose, *Before the Parade*; and Everett, "Mobilization on the Periphery," 125–41; and Lewis, "Punch[ing] More Than Its Weight," 250–70.
- 36 For the San Francisco experience, see D'Emilio, "Gay Politics, Gay Community," 94–95. Also see Randy Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street: The Life and Times of Harvey Milk* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982). On Vancouver, see Terence John Fairclough, "The Gay Community of Vancouver's West End: The Geography of a Modern Urban Phenomenon" (unpublished master's paper, University of British Columbia, August 1985). Also see the new work on queer space and geography, such as in Bell and Valentine, *Mapping Desire*; and Michael P. Brown, *Replacing Citizenship: AIDS Activism and Radical Democracy* (New York: Guilford Press, 1997).

- 37 The media construction of “special interest group” has been taken up by right-wing politicians to discount the concerns of the poor, trade unions, feminists, Black, Indigenous, and racialized people, and lesbians and gay men. The only groups that, it seems, are never defined as “special interest groups” are corporations and capitalists. The term operates by constructing the group as having “special interests” that are somehow counterposed to the “general interest,” or to the “public.” This has become an important discursive device for undercutting the legitimacy of a number of social-justice-seeking movements. White, middle-class, cis, and non-disabled people are almost never defined as “special interest groups.” Instead, we must turn our critical focus to contesting the hegemonies of these groups.
- 38 See Ed Jackson, “Close but Not Enough: The Toronto Municipal Elections,” in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 100–101.
- 39 See Douglas Sanders, “Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights,” *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1994): 137, 143. Later we see the emergence of openly gay politicians in the Liberal and Conservative Parties.
- 40 See Amber Hollibaugh, “Right to Rebel,” in Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 207–15. Also D’Emilio, “Gay Politics, Gay Community,” 100–101. In Toronto, four thousand leaflets were distributed in bars on the evening of February 6, 1981, calling for a demonstration at midnight. See Gerald Hannon, “Raids, Rage and Bawdy Houses” in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 273–76. Also see the film *Track Two*, directed by Harry Sutherland, produced by Gord Keith, Harry Sutherland, and Jack Lemmon (Toronto: Keith, Lemmon, and Sutherland Communications, 1982), 83 min. The importance of bars was not as clear in the response to the defeat of Bill 167 in 1994 in Toronto, which was organized rather differently and focused around “familial” and spousal identifications. Also see videos *Gay Pride and Prejudice*, dir. Nancy Nicol, on the struggle to support Bill 167; and also the section on the bath raids in *Stand Together*, directed by Nancy Nicol (Toronto: v Tape, 2002), 124 min.
- 41 D’Emilio, “Gay Politics, Gay Community,” 101.
- 42 Roger Ricklefs, “Campaigns to Sell to Homosexual Market Are Being Launched by More Big Firms,” *Wall Street Journal*, May 13, 1975, 44. Also see “Gays: A Major Force in the Marketplace,” *Business Week*, September 3, 1979, 118.
- 43 Randal Oulton, “Gay Marketing is in the Pink,” *Globe and Mail*, August 15, 1992, D4.
- 44 On studies on class and queers, see Mary Virginia Lee Badgett, *Money, Myths and Change: The Economic Lives of Lesbians and Gay Men* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); and Amy Gluckman and Betsy Reed, eds., *Homo Economics: Capitalism, Community, and Lesbian and Gay Life* (New York: Routledge, 1997).
- 45 Quoted in “Gays: A Major Force in the Marketplace,” 118.
- 46 “Gays: A Major Force in the Marketplace,” 118.
- 47 Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*, 165.
- 48 The ad was reprinted in *Gay Community News* (Boston), April 18, 1981, 2. Also see an advertising report for *Esprit*, an unsuccessful slick/commercial gay magazine in Toronto in 1975: “more and more firms are turning their advertisements towards the gay marketplace...today advertisers are realizing the vast market potential that has of yet been untapped...the average homosexual wage earner brings home between \$10,000 and \$18,000 annually and they tend to spend more of their disposable income on clothes, records, movies, liquor, furniture, etc. than their counterpart in the straight world. Gay people are more image conscious and therefore tend to spend more of their disposable income to keep this up.” “A Report on Advertising Possibilities and Potential in Canada: New Sales Views,” *Esprit*, 1975.
- 49 *Xtra*, June 25, 1993, 25.

- 50 Steven Maynard, "What Color Is Your Underwear?," in "Queer Licks," special issue, *Borderlines*, no. 32 (1994): 6.
- 51 Ken Waxman, "The Rise of Gay Capitalism," *Toronto Life*, September 1976, 34–36, 48–51, 149–50, 152, 155.
- 52 See Michael Lynch, "Our Image," review of "The Rise of Gay Capitalism," by Ken Waxman, *The Body Politic*, October 1976, 3. Also see Kinsman, "Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s," 151–54.
- 53 At the same time, in response to our struggles for spousal benefits, many large corporations have agreed to provide them. They often do not see any compelling financial reasons to oppose them and also feel they can make for more committed, responsible, and "productive" workers. On this, regarding trans workers, see Dan Irving, "Normalized Transgressions: Legitimizing the Transsexual Body as Productive," in "Queer Futures," special issue, *Radical History Review*, no. 100 (Winter 2008): 38–59.
- 54 Maynard, "What Color Is Your Underwear?," 9. There are major limitations to consumer-based claims to "citizenship." For a more materialist account of claims to citizenship, see David Evans, *Sexual Citizenship: The Material Construction of Sexualities* (London: Routledge, 1993).
- 55 For example, Paul Trollope, "Bath Workers Vote Down Union: Organizer to Make Second Try," *The Body Politic*, May 1979, 14. Paul Trollope died in November 2017.
- 56 Weeks, "Capitalism and the Organization of Sex," in Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 11.
- 57 These constraints include the entry of dominant social relations into the organization of gay communities through police activity, licensing practices, media images, the limits of capital expansion for small businesses like bars and baths, the socially dominant patterns of eroticization that limits our imagination of sexual possibilities, practices of racialization, and historically and socially defined forms of masculinities and femininities.
- 58 See Gregg Blachford, "Male Dominance and the Gay World," in Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 184.
- 59 Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*, 8. But there are also major class, race and gender differences within this community formation.
- 60 See Gay Left Collective, "Self and Self-image," *Gay Left*, Winter 1979, 5.
- 61 I use pornography to cover sexually explicit materials per se. There are many types of pornography with different social characteristics and relations to social power. Since the mid-1980s in North America, a new lesbian porn made for lesbians has emerged and become the target for censorship in Canada. See Andrea Zanin, "'Your Cuntry Needs You': The Politics of Early 1990s Canadian s/m Dyke Porn," in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 185–202. Also see Cossman et al., *Bad Attitude/s on Trial*.
- 62 On the social construction of femininities, see Smith, "Femininity as Discourse," 159–208. We need more work on the discourses and practices of masculinities and femininities.
- 63 Christine R. Riddiough, "Culture and Politics," in *Working Papers on Gay/Lesbian Liberation and Socialism*, ed. New American Movement (Chicago: New American Movement, 1979), 14. At the same time, the existence of bars and baths has become much more precarious in current capitalist conditions, and this is now intensified by the impacts of the pandemic.
- 64 See *Gay Pride and Prejudice*, dir. Nancy Nicol; and Rayside, *On the Fringe*. As we will see, the struggle over same-sex marriage had a rather different character.
- 65 See Gary Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39; and Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 311–33; and Kinsman, "From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights," 221–24.

- 66 See McCaskell, "The Bath Raids and Gay Politics," 169–88; McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, esp. 137–69; Smith, "Policing the Gay Community," 163–83. On the bath raids and resistance to them also see Hooper, "Enough is Enough"; and Hooper, "More Than Two Is a Crowd," 53–81.
- 67 See Steven Maynard, "When Queer is Not Enough," 14–18. Also see Kinsman, "From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights," 229–31.
- 68 On the limitations of identity politics, see, among others, Adams, "There's No Place Like Home," 22–33. For a more poststructuralist critique, see Butler, *Gender Trouble*. For critiques of identity politics, also see Bannerji, "The Passion for Naming," 17–40; and Holloway, *How to Change the World*.
- 69 On racism and gay men of colour, see Anton, "Racism in the Gay Community: A Closer Look," *Pink Ink*, August 1983; Gerald Chan, "Out of the Shadows," *Asianadian* 2, no. 1 (Summer 1979): 10–12; Richard Fung, "Gay Asians of Toronto," *Asianadian* 5, no. 4 (April/Spring 1984): 9–11; and Richard Fung's videos: on gay Asians, see *Orientations*, dir. Richard Fung (Toronto: Gay Asians Toronto, 1984), 56 min. On gay Asian men and white gay porn, see *Chinese Characters*, dir. Richard Fung (Toronto: The Canada Council, 1986), 21 min.; and his revisiting of *Orientations*, *Re: Orientations*, dir. Richard Fung (New York: Third World Newsreel, 2016); Fung, "Looking for My Penis," 145–68; and Fung, "The Trouble with 'Asians,'" in *Negotiating Lesbian and Gay Subjects*, ed. Monica Dorenkamp and Richard Henke (New York: Routledge, 1995), 123–30. On racism and gay men of colour, also see Mercer and Julien, "Race, Sexual Politics, and Black Masculinity," 97–164; Mercer, "Skin Head Sex Thing," 169–222; and Tomas Almaguer, "Chicano Men: A Cartography of Homosexual Identity and Behavior," in "Queer Theory, Lesbian and Gay Sexualities," special issue, *differences* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 75–100; Pei Lim, "Racism and Gay Male Porn: Taking Control of the Images," interview with Pei Lim, by Gary Kinsman, *Rites*, February 1987, 14–15. On lesbians of colour, see Lorde, *Zami*; and Lorde, *Sister Outsider*; "Lesbians of Colour. Loving and Struggling: A Conversation between Three Lesbians of Color," in "Women of Color," special issue, *Fireweed*, Spring 1983, 66–72; Makeda Silvera, "Sister Outsider: Rage and Vision," review of *Sister Outsider*, by Audre Lorde, *Rites*, September 1984, 22; "Lesbians and Gays of Color," special issue, *Rites*, November 1985; Silvera, "Man Royals and Sodomites," 48–60; Silvera, ed., *Piece of My Heart*; Jackie Goldsby, "What It Means To Be Coloured Me," *Out/Look*, no. 9 (Summer 1990): 817; Omosupe, "Black/Lesbian/Bulldagger"; Helen (charles), "Queer Nigger," 97–106; Karen/Miranda Augustine, "Bizarre Women, Exotic Bodies And Outrageous Sex: Or If Annie Sprinkle Was A Black Ho She Wouldn't Be All That," in "Queer Licks," special issue, *Border/Lines*, no. 32 (1994): 22–24; Dionne Brand, *Bread Out of Stone* (Toronto: Coach House, 1994). Also see Beth Brant, "The Good Red Road: Journeys of Homecoming in Native Women's Writing," in Carty, *And Still We Rise*, 355–69; and Mona Oikawa, Dionne Falconer, and Ann Dector, eds., *Resist: Essays Against a Homophobic Culture* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1994). Also see Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*; Beverly Bain, "Fire, Passion, and Politics: The Creation of Block-orama as Black Queer Diasporic Space in the Toronto Pride Festivities," in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 81–97; Walcott, *Queer Returns*; Wesley Crichlow, *Buller Men and Batty Bwoys: Hidden Men in Toronto and Halifax Black Communities* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004). On the controversy over the publication of a racist ad in *The Body Politic*, April 1985, 30; see Churchill, "Personal Ad Politics," 114–34; McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 218–21; and Haritaworn and Moussa with Ware, introduction to *Marvellous Grounds*, 1–2.

- 70 See the insightful Bérubé, "How Gay Stays White," 234–65.
- 71 See Michael Alhonte, "The Politics of Ageism," *Gay Insurgent*, 1981, 6–7; and Alhonte, "Confronting Ageism," in *The Age Taboo*, ed. Daniel Tsang (Boston: Alyson, 1981), 156–59; and Sasha Alyson, with Beth Ireland, *Young, Gay and Proud* (Boston: Alyson, 1980).
- 72 For the earlier period, see Mark Whitehead, *Gay Youth and Sexual Laws* (Toronto: Gay Youth Group, 1976), "Gay Youth Toronto" vertical file, Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives, Toronto. In 1988 the age of consent for "anal intercourse," which replaced "buggery," was lowered to eighteen in "private" but was still criminalized if it involved more than two people or was in "public." There have been successful lower-level court challenges to the constitutionality of this section. In 1988 the offence of "gross indecency" was abolished and the basic age of sexual consent was set at fourteen. For sexual activity with those in positions of trust or authority or in a relation of dependence, the age of consent was set at eighteen. It is illegal to buy the sexual service of anyone under the age of eighteen. See "Young People and Sex," in *Forum 128* (Toronto: CLGRO, 1993). Against the opposition of gay youth and AIDS activists, the basic age of consent was raised from 14 to 16 in 1996. Also see Chapter 11.
- 73 See David Adkin, *Out: Stories of Lesbian and Gay Youth*, directed by David Adkin, produced by Silve Basmajian (Montréal: National Film Board of Canada, 1993), 40 min.; and also the Central Toronto Youth Services video, Nicol, dir., *Gay Pride and Prejudice*.
- 74 See Smith, "The Ideology of 'Fag,'" 309–35. Also see Khayatt, "Compulsory Heterosexuality," 149–63.
- 75 See George Smith, "Fraser Committee Anti-sexual and Simplistic," an edited version of the Right to Privacy Committee submission to the Special Committee on Pornography and Prostitution, *Action!* 4, no. 1 (1984). For the problems lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth encounter in residential services, see O'Brien, Travers, and Bell, *No Safe Bed*; and O'Brien, "The Social Organization of the Treatment of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Youth," 37–57.
- 76 See Andrew Sorfleet and Chris Bearchell, "The Sex Police in a Moral Panic: How the 'Youth Porn' Law Is Being Used to Censor Artists and Persecute Youth Sexuality," *Parallelograme* 20, no. 1 (1994): 8–21; "Young People and Sex," *Forum 125* (Toronto: CLGRO, 1993); and *After the Bath*, directed by John Greyson, shown on *Rough Cuts*, aired May 5, 1995, on CBC Newsworld.
- 77 See O'Brien and Weir, "Lesbians and Gay Men Inside and Outside Families," 11–40.
- 78 See Gay Fathers of Toronto, *Gay Fathers: Some of Their Stories, Experience and Advice* (Toronto: Gay Fathers, 1981). This book, however, does not adequately investigate the isolation that gay fathers experience and why they need support groups not only to deal with the problems in their families but also to make up for the lack of support from within the gay men's community.
- 79 On lesbian mothers, see Francie Wyland, *Motherhood, Lesbianism and Child Custody* (Bristol: Falling Wall Press, 1977); Gillian E. Hanscombe and Jackie Foster, *Rocking the Cradle: Lesbian Mothers and the Challenge in Family Living* (Boston: Alyson, 1982); and Kathy Arnup, "Lesbian Mothers and Child Custody," in "Sexuality and the State," ed. Ian Lumsden, special issue, *Atkinson Review of Canadian Studies* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 35–40; Wendy Gross, "Judging the Best Interests of the Child: Child Custody and the Homosexual Parent," *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 1, no. 2 (1985/1986): 505–31; Sharon Dale Stone, "Lesbian Mothers Organizing," 198–208; Dian Day, "Lesbian/Mother," in Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 35–47; Katherine Arnup, "'Mothers Just Like Others': Lesbians, Divorce and Child Custody in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 3, no. 1 (1989–1990): 18–32; Arnup, "'We Are Family!': Lesbian Mothers in Canada," *Resources for*

- Feminist Research* 20, no. 3/4 (Fall/Winter 1991): 101–107; Arnup, “Finding Fathers: Artificial Insemination, Lesbians and the Law,” *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 7, no. 1 (1994): 97–115; and Arnup, ed., *Lesbian Parenting: Living With Pride and Prejudice* (Charlottetown: Gynergy, 1995). Also see Kinsman and Gibson, “Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood,” 245–63. On queer parenting, see Epstein, *Who’s Your Daddy?*; and Epstein-Fine and Zook, *Spawning Generations*.
- 80 Gerald Hannon, “No Sorrow, No Pity,” in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 64–72; and Joanne Doucette, “Being Disabled in the Lesbian Community: A Lot of Places are Out of Bounds,” *Rites*, March 1985, 9; Disabled Lesbian Caucus of the Disabled Women’s Network, “Access For Disabled Women,” *Rites*, February 1987, 4; and Joanne Doucette, “Redefining Difference: Disabled Lesbians Resist,” in Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 61–72. Also see Eli Clare, *Exile and Pride: Disability, Queerness, and Liberation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015); A.J. Withers, *Disability Politics and Theory* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2012); and Chapman and Withers, *A Violent History of Benevolence*.
- 81 See Alex McLelland, “Histories of Living in a Negative Relation to the Law: Resistance to HIV Criminalization,” in Fritsch, Monaghan, and van der Meulen, *Disability Injustice*, 72–93.
- 82 Blachford, “Male Dominance and the Gay World,” 184–210. Blachford builds on the work of the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies in applying notions of resistance and accommodation to the experiences of gay men. The following references are to this article.
- 83 On this see Nestle, “Butch-Femme Relationships”; Joan Nestle, ed., *The Persistent Desire: A Femme/Butch Reader* (Boston: Alyson, 1992); Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Madeline Davis, “The Reproduction of Butch-Fem Roles: A Social Constructionist Approach,” in Peiss and Simmons, *Passion and Power*, 241–56; and Kennedy and Davis, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold*, esp. 323–71; and *Forbidden Love*, dir. Weissman and Fernie. Some of this history bridges into genderqueer histories and the histories of trans men. On some of this, see Joan Nestle, Clare Howell, and Riki Wilchins, eds., *GenderQueer: Voices from Beyond the Sexual Binary* (Los Angeles: Alyson Books, 2002).
- 84 Dennis Altman does not seem to understand this with his notion of the “homosexualization” of America. He does not make an adequate distinction between the cultural production of oppressed groups like gays and the cultural production and reproduction of the dominant social order. This lets him place on equivalent levels the “Americanization” of gay culture—the effect of the hegemonic culture on gay cultures and the homosexualization of America—and the subordinate culture’s impact on the dominant culture. His analysis misses how hegemonic cultural production systematically works to separate gay cultural production from its gay cultural, social, and erotic contexts, thereby repackaging it in a “neutral” straight fashion for the mass market. Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*. His analysis also needs more attention to class and race differences. Also see Kinsman, “Constructing Sexual Problems,” 101–22.
- 85 See Stephen Madison, “A Queered Pitch,” *Red Pepper* (London), February 1995, 27.
- 86 See Rachel Giese, “Lesbian Chic: I Feel Pretty and Witty and Gay,” in “Queer Licks,” special issue, *Border/Lines*, no. 32 (1994): 27–29.
- 87 See Chauncey, *Gay New York*; and Newton, *Mother Camp*. On some of the problems with cross-dressing and gender passing, see Rose, “A History of That Which Was Never Supposed to be Possible,” 165–84.
- 88 See Maynard, “What Color Is Your Underwear?,” 4–9.
- 89 For instance, see Butler, *Gender Trouble*, although she focuses more on gender “performativity” in social discourse than the actual social performance of gender. Also see the

- problems in Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1993). For a rather different approach, see Smith “Telling the Truth After Post-Modernism,” 96–130; and Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*.
- 90 Ki Namaste, “Too Queer for Middle America,” *Fuse*, Summer 1995, 27–28. Also see Viviane Namaste, *Sex Change, Social Change*. Also see Kate Bornstein, *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women and the Rest of Us* (New York: Routledge, 1994); and Bornstein and S. Bear Bergman, eds., *Gender Outlaws: The Next Generation* (Berkeley, CA: SEAL Press, 2010).
- 91 Rubin, “Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality,” 267–319. Rubin argues for a separation of sexual and gender analysis and has had a major influence on the development of queer theory, including Sedgwick’s very influential *The Epistemology of the Closet*.
- 92 This observation comes from Didi Khayatt, personal conversation with author. An important exception who continues an important focus on gender is George Chauncey, see Chauncey, *Gay New York*.
- 93 Marshall, “Pansies, Perverts, and Macho Men,” 154.
- 94 This is suggested in Adrienne Rich, “Compulsory Heterosexuality,” in Stimpson and Persons, *Women, Sex and Sexuality*, 62–91.
- 95 See Newton, “The Mythic Mannish Lesbian,” 557–75.
- 96 See Nestle, “Butch-Femme Relationships,” 21–24; Nestle, “The Femme Question,” in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, 232–41.
- 97 Mariana Valverde, “The Religion of the ‘Race’ of Women: A Critique of Mary Daly,” *Rites*, October 1985, 14–15; and Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure*, 192–98. This approach can also be deployed in anti-trans directions, as well as against sex workers and sexual materials.
- 98 See McIntosh, “Queer Theory and the War of the Sexes,” 30–52.
- 99 Rubin, “Sexual Politics, the New Right and the Sexual Fringe,” in Tsang, *The Age Taboo*, 109.
- 100 See Gallagher and Wilson, “Sex, Power and the Politics of Identity,” interview with Michel Foucault, 27–30; and Maynard, “The Party with God,” 122–52.
- 101 Didi Herman, “Law and Morality Revisited: The Politics of Regulating Sado-Masochistic Porn and Practice” (paper presentation, Canadian and American Law and Society Association Conference, Calgary and Phoenix, June 1994). She raises some similar concerns, although in a far more alarmist and moralistic fashion. By suggesting that these practices need to be regulated and then not suggesting any non-criminal forms of regulation, Herman, by implication, lends support to criminalization perspectives. On BDSM, also see Mike Macnair, “The Contradictory Politics of SM,” in Shepherd and Wallis, *Coming on Strong*, 147–62; Tim Edwards, *Erotics and Politics: Gay Male Sexuality, Masculinity and Feminism* (London: Routledge, 1994), esp. 74–89; SAMOIS, *What Color is Your Handkerchief? A Lesbian S/M Reader* (Berkeley, CA: SAMOIS, 1979); and SAMOIS, *Coming to Power: Writings and Graphics on Lesbian S/M* (Boston: Alyson, 1982); and Robin Ruth Linden et al., eds., *Against Sadomasochism: A Radical Feminist Analysis* (East Palo Alto, CA: Frog in the Well, 1982), which generally takes up a very troubling sexual-pessimist and anti-porn feminist perspective, but a number of the contributions by feminists of colour make visible some important insights.
- 102 Jeffrey Weeks, “The Development of Sexual Theory and Sexual Politics,” in *Human Sexual Relations: Towards a Redefinition of Sexual Politics*, ed. Mike Brake (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 306.
- 103 For an elaboration of this position, see Mariana Valverde, “Feminism Meets Fist-Fucking: Getting Lost in Lesbian s&M,” *The Body Politic*, February 1980, 43. Also see Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure*.

- 104 See Ed Jackson, "History: Doing It in the Archives," *The Body Politic*, September 1982, 33–34, which records some of the discussion at the Wilde 1982 history conference. Also see John Boswell, "Revolutions, Universals, Categories," *Salmagundi*, no. 58/59 (Fall 1982/Winter 1983): 89–113, wherein he makes a distinction between the "nominalist" (i.e., in his view, the "emergence thesis") and what he calls the "realist" approach. Also, see the controversies surrounding the "Sex and the State" lesbian/gay history conference held in Toronto, July 1985. Rick Bebout, "Sex and the State: Finding History—Making History," *The Body Politic*, September 1985, 30–33; Gary Kinsman, Pamela Walker, and Kerry Burke, "Sex and the State: Conference Notes," *Rites*, September 1985, 8–9; the controversies include contributions by Wayne Dynes, Barry Adam, Gary Kinsman, and Stephen Murray in the *Sociologists' Gay Caucus Newsletter*, October 1985 and January 1986; and Jeffrey Weeks, "Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives," *History Workshop Journal*, no. 21 (Spring 1986): 206–209. For a later analysis on some of these debates, see Katz, "Envisioning the World We Make," esp. "Model," and "Conclusion."
- 105 For instance, see Steven Epstein, "Gay Politics and Ethnic Identity: The Limits of Social Constructionism," *Socialist Review*, no. 93/94 (May/August 1987): 9–56; and Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality*; and Kinsman, review, "The Construction of Homosexuality, David F. Greenberg," *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 15, no. 1 (Winter 1990): 112–15.
- 106 Sedgwick, *The Epistemology of the Closet*, 40.
- 107 Dennis Altman, "What Changed in the Seventies?," in Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 61.
- 108 Harry and Devall, *The Social Organization of Gay Males*, 135.
- 109 See Raymond Breton. "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants," *American Journal of Sociology* 70, no. 2 (1964): 195–205.
- 110 Stephen O. Murray. "The Institutional Elaboration of a Quasi-Ethnic Community in Canada," in *Homosexuality International Perspective*, ed. Harry and Mon Singh Das (New Delhi: Vikas, 1980), 39. McCaskell seems much more accepting of this perspective than I am. *Queer Progress*, 464. Also see Kinsman, "Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s," 153–54. For a rather different social-geography approach, see Catherine J. Nash, "Contesting Identity: Politics of Gays and Lesbians in Toronto in the 1970s," *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 12, no. 1 (March 2005): 113–35; Nash, "Toronto's Gay Village, 1969–1982: Plotting the Politics of Gay Identity," *Canadian Geographer* 50, no. 1 (May 2006): 1–16; and Nash, "Consuming Gay Liberation: Gay Business, Politics, and Toronto's Barracks Raids," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 48, no. 1 (2014): 82–105.
- 111 Murray, "The Institutional Elaboration of a Quasi-Ethnic Community in Canada," 41.
- 112 See Roxana Ng, "Sex, Ethnicity or Class: Some Methodological Considerations" (unpublished paper, British Sociological Society meeting, April 1982); Ng, "Constituting Ethnic Phenomenon: An Account from the Perspective of Immigrant Women," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 13, no. 1 (January 1981): 97–108; Ng, "Immigrant Women and the State: A Study in the Social Organization of Knowledge" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1984); and Ng, "Immigrant Women in Canada: A Socially Constructed Category," *Resources for Feminist Research* 15, no. 1 (March 1986): 13–15. On the development of the Canadian state policy of multiculturalism, see Ng, "Multiculturalism as Ideology," 35–48.
- 113 See, for example, the Toronto Right to Privacy Committee, presented by Bob Gallagher, Paul Rapsey, and John Burt, Brief to the Ontario Provincial Legislature's Standing Committee on Resource Development, September 25, 1981; and the Right to Privacy Committee, "We Are a Community!," Brief to the Council of the City of Toronto Neighborhoods

Committee Concerning “Out of the Closet: Study of Relations Between the Homosexual Community and the Police” by Arnold Bruner, November 3, 1981 (Toronto: Right to Privacy Committee, 1981). Also see Hooper, “Enough is Enough.”

114 Paul Walter, president of the Metro Toronto Police Association, declared in 1981 that the Toronto police “have grave concerns about recognizing homosexuals as a legitimate minority with status under human rights legislation.” Quoted in Alden Baker, “Gays No Minority Group, Police Association Says,” *Globe and Mail*, August 29, 1981, 5. On this, also see Kinsman, “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s,” 153–54; and Hooper, “Enough is Enough.” Renaissance, a right-wing moral-conservative group, has also tried to separate gays from “legitimate” minorities, as has Citizens United for Responsible Education in Ontario. This has also become one of the main lines of attack used by right-wing groups in the United States. In 1996, the most recent federal politicians to reject lesbians and gay men as being part of a minority group were the Reform Party and Liberal backbenchers Roseanne Skoke and Tom Wappel. This position continued to be upheld by members of the Reform and the Conservative Parties in the years after this.

115 See Joyn Cozjin, “Sydney 1981: A Community Taking Shape,” *Gay Information*, Autumn/Winter 1982, 4–10; for an interesting critique of “community” as a mirage of gay politics in the 1980s.

116 For a similar approach in relation to feminism, see Bannerji, “Introducing Racism: Notes towards an Anti-Racist Feminism,” and “But Who Speaks for Us? Experience and Agency in Conventional Feminist Paradigms,” in *Thinking Through*, 41–95. Also see Elizabeth V. Spelman, *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988).

117 See Bannerji, “But Who Speaks for Us?,” 55–95.

118 See Gary Kinsman, “1984: The Police are Still with Us,” *Rites*, May 1984, 10–11; Gary Kinsman and Doug Wilson, “Police Entrapment: Fighting Back with Courtwatch,” interview with Dennis Findlay and Philip McLeod, *Rites*, November 1984, 9–11. Some of these men may see themselves as bisexual and others as straight men who occasionally engage in sex with men. In AIDS education, this is why the formulation “men who have sex with men” was developed.

119 See Alan P. Bell, Martin S. Weinberg, and Sue Kiefer Hammersmith, *Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981). For a critique, see George Smith, “Sexual Preference: Their Statistics, Our Lives,” review of *Sexual Preference*, by Bell, Weinberg, and Hammersmith, *The Body Politic*, December 1981, 29–30.

120 See Levay, *The Sexual Brain*. For more critical commentary, see Kay Diaz, “Are Gay Men Born That Way?” *Z Magazine*, December 1992, 42–46; Vines, *Raging Hormones*, esp. 85–123; and Kinsman, “Queerness Is Not in Our Genes,” 262–84. Also see Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body*; Robert Alan Brookey, *Reinventing the Male Homosexual: The Rhetoric and Power of the Gay Gene* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002); and Rebecca M. Jordan-Young, *Brain Storm: The Flaws in the Science of Sex Differences* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

121 An example of gay organizing that relied on this minority-community approach in relation to schooling might help clarify its limitations as well as the persistence of the right wing on these questions. In 1980, lesbian and gay groups approached the Toronto Board of Education to ask for a formal liaison committee between the board and the gay and lesbian community. Their main line of approach was that gays were a legitimate minority group just like the other communities that had liaison committees. This simple request provoked a beehive of opposition. Moral-conservative groups like Renaissance and “Positive Parents” sprang into action, arguing that this proposal challenged the “traditional” family as well

as “parents’ rights” to control the moral upbringing of their children. They campaigned against the “recruiting” of young people by homosexuals. The media focused on this mobilization of bigotry, which they portrayed as “parental opposition” to the proposal; as a result, it was dropped like a hot potato. The board did, however, adopt a sexual-orientation protection clause, which applied to its own employees. Unfortunately, the needs and concerns of lesbian and gay students were ignored, and the following clause was included in the resolution: “That the Board will not countenance the proselytization of homosexuality within its jurisdiction.” No similar policy existed in relation to heterosexuality. Discussion of homosexuality was allowed only “when it arises out of the curriculum” and, of course, homosexuality was not a regular and legitimate part of the school curriculum. In adopting this anti-proselytization clause and in limiting discussion of homosexuality, the board gave ground to the heterosexist ideology that lesbians and gay men are a special threat to young people. This language of “proselytization” drew on the legislation enacted under the Thatcher regime in the UK, and later legislation used in Russia and other Eastern European states. In retrospect, it is clear that the Board did not view gays and lesbians as a minority community just like the others. The response elicited by the simple request for a liaison committee posed fundamental questions about sexuality, schooling, and family. See Leo Casey, “Gay Rights: The Election and the Toronto Board,” *Mudpie*, November 1980, 13; and Bob Davis, “Toronto’s Right-Wing Hate Campaign: Some Thoughts,” *Mudpie*, April 1981. Later in the 1980s, the Board discussed a policy on sex education that included more progressive proposals for the teaching of issues regarding lesbianism and homosexuality. In 1986 there was a struggle again to have the Board address lesbian and gay concerns. This occurred after the federal government had made announcements regarding equality rights and the murder of a gay man by Toronto Board of Education students. (On some of this, see the fictionalized video, *The Making of Monsters*, directed by John Greyson (Canadian Centre for Advanced Film Studies, 1990), 35min. It focused on the needs and concerns of lesbian and gay students themselves, many of whom spoke out quite strongly and forcefully at board meetings. In the end, there was only a partial victory.) See John Campey, “School Board Votes to Fight Discrimination with One Hand Tied Behind Its Back,” *Rites*, May 1986, 4. In 1991 the Toronto Board of Education majority supported efforts to integrate some lesbian and gay concerns into aspects of the school curriculum. A draft resource document was prepared by an advisory committee that did not include a single open lesbian or gay member, although it did include Joseph Berger—a psychiatrist notorious for his efforts to “cure” homosexuals. The first draft was critiqued by the Lesbian and Gay Employees Group of the Board for its heterosexist and homophobic content and a second draft was then produced, which was substantially rewritten with the inclusion of edited excerpts from the work of lesbian academic Helen Lenskyj. See Toronto Board of Education, “Sexual Orientation: Homosexuality, Lesbianism and Homophobia,” in *A Resource Guide for Teachers of Health Education in Secondary Schools: Draft for Review* (Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, February 1992). The right wing responded that the new draft was “anti-family” and “anti-heterosexual” and Citizen’s United for Responsible Education (CURE) began to mobilize “parental” opposition to the new Board policy. See John Campey, Tim McCaskell, John Miller, and Vanessa Russell, “Opening the Classroom Closet: Dealing with Sexual Orientation at the Toronto Board of Education,” in Prentice, *Sex in Schools*, 82–100. For a similar controversy in Kingston, see “Kingston Board Controversy: Homophobia Got to Go!,” *Rites*, March 1987, 5. In New York City, the right wing was able to organize a furore over the Rainbow “multicultural” curriculum because it would have mentioned gay and lesbian families to grade-school children, which led to the proposed language being changed. See Margaret Cerullo, “Hope and Terror: The Paradox of Gay and Lesbian Politics in the

- '90s," *Radical America* 24, no. 3 (1990): 16. On the scrutinizing of queer (and other) sexualities among women teachers, see Sheila L. Cavanagh, *Sexing the Teacher: School Sex Scandals and Queer Pedagogies* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2007),
- 122 Gay Left Collective, "Happy Families? Paedophilia Examined," *Gay Left*, Winter 1978/1979, 3.
- 123 For a similar discussion of the relationship between movement and community regarding lesbians and feminism, see Nym Hughes, Yvonne Johnson, and Yvette Perreault, *Stepping Out of Line: A Workbook on Lesbianism and Feminism* (Vancouver: Press Gang, 1984).
- 124 See Gary Kinsman, "Whitewash: The Moral Panic," *Pink Ink*, October 1983, 12–13; Dennis Altman, "AIDS: The Politicization of an Epidemic," *Socialist Review*, no. 78 (1984): 93–109; Evan Collins and Gary Kinsman, "The Politics of AIDS," *Rites*, February 1985, 12–13, 17; Patton, *Sex and Germs*; and Patton, *Inventing AIDS*; Dennis Altman, *AIDS in the Mind of America* (Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1986); and his *Power and Community: Organizational and Cultural Responses to AIDS* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1994); Kinsman, "Their Silence, Our Deaths," 39–60; Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39; and Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 31–33. Also see the interviews at the AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/>. On the dangers of the criminalization of HIV, see Alexander McClelland, *The Criminalization of HIV Non-Disclosure in Canada: Experiences of People Living with HIV* (Montréal: Alexander McClelland, 2019), <https://www.alexandermcclelland.ca/blog-1/2019/11/21/the-criminalization-of-hiv-in-canada-experiences-of-people-living-with-hiv>. Also see David M. Halperin and Trevor Hoppe, eds., *The War on Sex* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), esp. 347–406.
- 125 The headline comes from "AIDS Fiend Strikes Again," *Chronicle Herald* (Halifax), September 19, 1988, 1. See Kinsman, "Constructing Sexual Problems," 121.
- 126 Kinsman, "Their Silence, Our Deaths," 39–60; Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39; and Kinsman, "Responsibility' as a Strategy of Governance," 393–409.
- 127 See Kinsman, "Responsibility' as a Strategy of Governance," 393–409. To update this, we need to look at the development of undetectable viral loads with anti-viral treatments and how undetectable means untransmissible (U = U).
- 128 See Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," esp. 128; Herman, *Rights of Passage*, esp. 27–28, 59–61, 132–33; and Karen Andrews, "Ancient Affections: Gays, Lesbians and Family Status," in Arnup, *Lesbian Parenting*, 358–77.
- 129 See Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," 123; and Herman, *Rights of Passage*, 25–26, 133–39.
- 130 See Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," 103, 108, 123, 127; and Herman, *Rights of Passage*, 28.
- 131 See Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," 99–143.
- 132 Also see Carol Allen, "Who Gets to Be Family: Some Thoughts on the Lesbian and Gay Fight for Equality," in Carty, *And Still We Rise*, 101–107. On the Charter, see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War Queers*, 391–401; and Kinsman, "From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights," 224–29.
- 133 See John Wilson, "Spousal Benefits Conference: On Our Own Terms?," *Rites*, September 1989, 4, 18; Rayside, *On the Fringe*; and Susan Ursel, "Bill 167 and Full Human Rights," in Arnup, *Lesbian Parenting*, 341–43. Also see McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 268–69; Kinsman, "From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights," 228–29.
- 134 See Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," 122–23; Rayside, *On the Fringe*; Ursel, "Bill 167 and Full Human Rights," 341–51; and Nicol, dir., *Gay Pride and Prejudice*.
- 135 Andrews and Whitworth, "Hate, Injustice and Same-Sex Beliefs," *Globe and Mail*, June 23, 1994, A27.

- 136 Some of these concerns are raised by Susan Ursel in “Bill 167 and Full Human Rights,” 346–51.
- 137 See Jeff Lindstrom, “Limited Adoption Rights Granted, but Appeal Could Still Be Filed after Election,” *Xtra*, May 26, 1995, 12.
- 138 See Cindy Filipenko, “BC Grits Slam Adoption,” *Xtra*, May 20, 1995, 12.
- 139 For more elaboration, see Kinsman, “‘Responsibility’ as a Strategy of Governance,” 393–409. This is one of the lines of development leading towards homonormativity, homonationalism, and the neoliberal queer.
- 140 See Mort, “Sexuality: Regulation and Contestation”; and see Chapter 8.
- 141 See Brettel Dawson, in *Radically Rethinking Regulation: Workshop Report*, compiled by Mariana Valverde (Toronto: Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, 1994), 20–22.
- 142 barbara findlay, “A Lesbian’s Relationship Is Finally Recognized, but Only So the Government Can Deny Her a Welfare Cheque,” *Xtra*, September 2, 1994, 15.
- 143 “Drug Cards and Welfare,” Bill 167 Supplement, *Capital Xtra*, June 17, 1994, iii. Also see McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, esp. 324–25, 460.
- 144 Brenda Cossman, in Valverde, *Radically Rethinking Regulation*, 23–24.
- 145 This shift to issues of youth sexuality can be seen, for instance, in the federal government’s policy reports on sex-related questions, Robin F. Badgley, *Report of the Committee on Sexual Offences against Children and Youths*, 2 vols. (Ottawa: Dept. of Supply and Services, 1984); and Fraser, *Pornography and Prostitution in Canada*, which shift a good deal of attention to sexual legislation focusing on distinctions between adult and youth. On this, see Deborah R. Brock and Gary Kinsman, “Patriarchal Relations Ignored: An Analysis and Critique of the Badgley Report on Sexual Offences against Children and Youths,” in *Regulating Sex: An Anthology of Commentaries on the Findings and Recommendations of the Badgley and Fraser Reports*, ed. John Lowman et al. (Burnaby: School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University, 1986), 107–25. On the youth-pornography law, see next chapter.
- 146 On this, see Susan Hemmings, “Horrific Practices: How Lesbians Were Presented in the Newspapers of 1978,” in Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 162–67.
- 147 Weeks, “Capitalism and the Organization of Sex,” 18.

CHAPTER TEN

- 1 On some of this, see Dorothy E. Smith and George W. Smith, “Re-organizing the Job Skills Training Relation: From ‘Human Capital’ to ‘Human Resources,’” in *Education for Work, Education as Work: Canada’s Changing Community Colleges*, ed. Jacob Muller (Toronto: Garamond, 1990), 171–76, 184–86. On the emergence of neoliberalism, see Gary Kinsman, “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s,” 138–41; Drucker, *Warped*, 220–28; Klein, *The Shock Doctrine*; and McNally, *Another World Is Possible*. On homonormativity, see Lisa Duggan, *The Twilight of Equality?* On homonationalism, see Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*; and Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*.
- 2 For work on authoritarian statism, see Poulantzas, *State, Power, Socialism*, esp. 203–47; and Stuart Hall et al., *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* (London: MacMillan Press, 1979), 218–323. In my view these tendencies toward more authoritarian state formation are neither monolithic, inevitable, nor free of contradiction. Central to all forms of neoliberalism is support for the expansion of policing, prisons, and carceral relations. On this, see Dillon, *Fugitive Life*.
- 3 See Gordon and Hunter, *Sex, Family and the New Right*; Petchesky, *Abortion and Women’s Choice*; and Allen Hunter, “In the Wings: New Right Organization and Ideology,” *Radical America* 15, no. 1/2 (Spring 1981): 113–38.

- 4 See Cerullo, "Hope and Terror," 10–16; Suzanne Parr, "Community Organizing and the Religious Right: Lessons From the Measure 9 Campaign: An Interview with Suzanne Parr," *Radical America* 24, no. 4 (1997): 67–75; and Suzanne Parr, "Up against Hate: Lessons from Oregon's Measure Nine Campaign: Interview with Suzanne Parr," *Gay Community News*, April 1993, 3, 11; Cindy Patton, "Tremble, Hetero Swine!," in Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet*, 143–61; and Lisa Duggan, "Queering the State," *Social Text*, no. 39 (Summer 1994): 1–14. In the historical present many of the campaigns then directed against lesbians and gay men are now directed against trans people and drag queens, including trans young people.
- 5 Quoted in Maggie French, "Loves, Sexualities, and Marriages: Strategies and Adjustments," in *Modern Homosexualities: Fragments of Lesbian and Gay Experience*, ed. Kenneth Plummer (London: Routledge, 1992), 87; Vicki Carter, "Abseil Makes the Heart Grow Fonder: Lesbian and Gay Campaigning Tactics and Section 28," in Plummer, *Modern Homosexualities*, 217–26; and see Davina Cooper, *Sexing the City: Lesbian and Gay Politics within the Activist State* (London: Rivers Oram, 1994). Later, somewhat similar moral-conservative legislation is used in Russia and some Eastern European countries.
- 6 Because of space limitations, I am unable to fully explore the emergence and organizing of this "anti-permissive" sentiment. See the above sources for a fuller exposition of this process. Also see Hall et al., *Policing the Crisis*, for a wonderful analysis of the social organization of "moral panics" in England during the 1970s surrounding "mugging." They show how the media, the judiciary, and the police organized existing anti-permissive sentiments into a "moral panic" over racially coded crime. Also see Stuart Hall, "The Great Moving Right Show," in *The Politics of Thatcherism*, ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques (1983; London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983), 172–86. Racism, especially anti-Black racism, has been central to this "anti-permissive" law-and-order political project.
- 7 See Hunter, "In the Wings," 129–33.
- 8 See Laurie E. Adkin, "Life in Kleinland: Democratic Resistance to Folksy Fascism," *Canadian Dimension*, April/May 1995, 40. The right-wing Social Credit government in British Columbia in 1983–84 directly attacked the rights of lesbians and gay men, as well as those of many other groups. Under the banner of "restraint" and despite popular opposition, the government dismantled the province's Human Rights Commission and legislation and abolished rent controls, employment-standards legislation, and much more. Some of the cutbacks on women's services were justified by the Socreds because they allegedly served only "homosexual women." Women were told to take up the slack for abandoned government programs. The government's right-wing offensive not only restricted lesbians' and gay men's abilities to have our rights recognized and our grievances redressed, but also clearly limited the social space in which our communities could grow and organize. See Sara Diamond, "Lesbians against the BC Budget," *Pink Ink*, October 1983, 9–10; and Betty Baxter, "Building Solidarity," *Pink Ink*, December/January 1984, 4, 6–7. And see Kinsman, "From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights," 218–20.
- 9 Organizing by REAL Women, for instance, was partly responsible for the Secretary of State deciding to refuse to fund women's programs that supported lesbian rights or women's right to choose on abortion. See Becki Ross, "Heterosexuals Only Need Apply: The Secretary of State's Regulation of Lesbian Existence," *Resources for Feminist Research* 17, no. 3 (September 1988): 35–39.
- 10 On the moral-conservative right wing in Canada, see Lorna Erwin, "REAL Women: Anti-Feminism and the Welfare State," *Resources for Feminist Research* 17, no. 3 (September 1988): 147–49, and Erwin, "What Feminists Should Know about the Pro-Family Movement in Canada: A Report on a Recent Survey of Rank-and-File Members," in *Feminist*

Perspectives: Prospect and Retrospect, ed. Peta Tancred-Sheriff (Kingston: Published for the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women by McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988), 266–78; and Herman, *Rights of Passage*, esp. 77–127. Also see Tom Warner, *Losing Control: Canada's Social Conservatives in the Age of Rights* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2010).

- 11 For 2023, this needs to be updated and revised to include developments at the federal level, with the merger of the Conservative and Reform parties, and the development of right-wing Conservative and also Liberal governments—at both federal and provincial levels—in which moral-conservative and right-wing forces have been able to play an important role. Developments in Quebec have their own distinct history with the current (2023) CAQ (Coalition Avenir Québec) and Frances Legault neoliberal government that has been less moral conservative but quite racist.
- 12 Hudson Hilsden's moral-conservative Interchurch Committee on Pornography has been credited with helping the federal Tories formulate their anti-porn proposals. See "Sex Tory Style," *Rites*, July/August 1986, 3. The same Hilsden is also the chair of the "Coalition for Family Values" that fought against sexual-orientation protection in Ontario in 1986 and has been active in opposing Bill 167 in Ontario and the hate-crimes sentencing legislation on the federal level.
- 13 I try to not use "backlash" as an explanation for the opposition that feminists and lesbian/gay activists confront. This implies an automatic relation between advances for feminism and lesbian and gay rights and a "backlash," which is not at all accurate: it is not a hydraulic relation. Rather, I argue that the social relations of "backlash" that mobilize some people against these movements are socially organized, in part through mass-media coverage. On some of this, see Janice Newson, "'Backlash' against Feminism: A Disempowering Metaphor," *Resources for Feminist Research* 20, nos. 3/4 (September 1991): 93–97. I would raise somewhat similar concerns about the more current usage of "backfire."
- 14 See Hemmings, "Horrific Practices," esp. 162–67. More recently, there has been the construction of trans women as threats to other women regarding bathroom use and, more generally, as "social threats." On some of this, see Sheila L. Cavanagh, *Queering Bathrooms: Gender, Sexuality, and the Hygienic Imagination* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010).
- 15 CBS Reports, "Gay Power, Gay Politics," produced by Grace Dieckhaus and George Crile, aired April 26, 1980, on CBS. Also see the work of Jill Thomas and George Smith on the social construction of this production, including George Smith, "Telling Stories: CBS Woos Viewers with Sex, Violence, and Drama in Their Made-for-TV special *Gay Power, Gay Politics*," *Fuse*, March/April 1981, 62–64.
- 16 Harry Reasoner, the anchorman, uses this expression in the closing lines of the program.
- 17 National Gay Task Force to the National News Council, letter of complaint, National LGBTQ Task Force records, 1973–2017, 7301, Cornell University Library; and Randy Alfred to the National News Council, letter of complaint, July 10, 1980, Randall Alfred Collection, "Gay Power, Gay Politics" Records, 2013-16, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Historical Society, San Francisco.
- 18 Dorothy E. Smith. "The Ideological Practice of Sociology," *Catalyst*, no. 8 (1974): 39–54.
- 19 See Edward Jay Epstein, *News from Nowhere: Television and the News* (New York: Random House, 1973), chap. 5, "The Resurrection of Reality"; Mark Fishman, *Manufacturing the News* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980); and George Smith, "Media Frames: How Accounts are Produced and Read," *Fuse*, January/February 1983, 279–83.
- 20 Smith, "The Social Construction of Documentary Reality," 260.

- 21 See Gaye Tuchman, *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality* (New York: The Free Press, 1978), 109.
- 22 Like the coroner, Mayor Feinstein, journalist Charles McCabe, and statistics from the Kinsey Institute.
- 23 CBS Reports, "Gay Power, Gay Politics."
- 24 For an elaboration of the active role of texts (including TV documentaries) in the organization of social relations, see Dorothy E. Smith, "The Active Text: A Textual Analysis of Social Relations of Public Textual Discourse," in *Texts, Facts and Femininity*, 120–58.
- 25 Graham Murdock, "Political Deviance: The Press Presentation of a Militant Mass Demonstration," in Cohen and Young, *Manufacture of News*, 173.
- 26 CBS Reports, "Gay Power, Gay Politics."
- 27 Pearce, "How to Be Immoral and Ill," 300. On violence against lesbians and gay men, also see Gary David Comstock, *Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); New Brunswick Coalition for Human Rights Reform, *Discrimination and Violence Encountered by Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual New Brunswickers* (Fredericton, NB: New Brunswick Coalition for Human Rights Reform, 1990); and Carolyn Gibson Smith, "Proud but Cautious": *Homophobic Abuse and Discrimination in Nova Scotia* (Halifax: Nova Scotia Public Interest Research Group, 1994). Also see Douglas Victor Janoff, *Pink Blood: Homophobic Violence in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); and Doug Meyer, *Violence Against Queer People: Race, Class, Gender and the Persistence of Anti-LGBT Discrimination* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015).
- 28 Ed Jackson, "Close but Not Enough: The 1980 Toronto Municipal Election," in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 265–66. Also see John Sewell, "Speaking up for the Gay Community, 1979," in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 194–96; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 130–34.
- 29 Renaissance Commission on the Family, *Liberation*, October 1980.
- 30 See Leo Casey and Gary Kinsman, "Whose Freedom and Whose Press?," in Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 27. One front of struggle that has emerged out of queer and AIDS activism is what can be referred to as "media activism": attempts to get more supportive framings adopted by the mass media by seizing the initiative and challenging and changing the language that is used. One group that has emerged is Toronto's OUT! SPOKEN, an action and advocacy group to end media discrimination against lesbians, bisexuals, and gays. See *The "OUT! Spoken" Styleguide: A Guide for the Media on Lesbian, Bisexual, Gay and HIV/AIDS Issues* (Toronto: OUT! Spoken, 1995). There has also been the development of alternative media (and now social media), which present new possibilities but also have their own limitations.
- 31 Yvonne Chi-Ying Ng, "Ideology, Media and Moral Panics: An Analysis of the Jacques Murder" (master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1981). Also see Zoe Newman, "The Spectacle of Public Sex(uality): Media and State Surveillance of Gay Men in Toronto in the 1970s," in *Expanding the Gaze: Gender and the Politics of Surveillance*, ed. Emily van der Meulen and Robert Heynen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 213–39. Also see Tom Hooper's mainstream media interview on this topic, "1977, Killing of Toronto Shoe-shine Boy, 40 Yrs Later, Emanuel Jaques," on *Global News, LGBT Canada In The Media*, video, September 3, 2017, 6:36, <https://youtu.be/YreFqA9KNE>.
- 32 On the moral character of the city and city streets and centres, see Mariana Valverde, "The City as Moral Problem," in *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*, 129–54; and Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*. Also see Newman, "The Spectacle of Public Sex(uality)," 213–39.
- 33 On my use of "ideological," see the work of Dorothy E. Smith, including *The Conceptual Practices of Power*; Smith, *Texts, Facts and Femininity*; and Smith, "Politically Correct":

- An Ideological Code,” in *Beyond Political Correctness: Toward the Inclusive University*, ed. Stephen Richer and Lorna Weir (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 23–50.
- 34 Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*.
- 35 See “Media Fosters Bigotry with Murder Coverage,” *The Body Politic*, September 1977, 1, 4; “Victims of a Media Orgy,” *The Body Politic*, September 1977, 2.
- 36 See Chapter 7; Kinsman, “Restoring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System,” 21–69; and Kinsman, “The Mount Cashel Orphanage Inquiry.”
- 37 See the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Rights Coalition, *Forum: News and Views of the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Rights Coalition* 4, no. 1 (Winter 1979). The Truxx rebellion created the basis, along with a behind-the-scenes lobbying campaign, for sexual-orientation protection to be quietly adopted in Québec. Manon Tremblay suggests in her work that the Parti Québécois government was partially motivated by “homonationalism” in passing sexual-orientation protection in late 1977. In my view, this use of homonationalism is far too early. See Manon Tremblay, “Quebec and Sexual Diversity: From Repression to Citizenship?,” in Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 108, 121n2; Manon Tremblay, “Mouvements sociaux et opportunités politiques: les lesbiennes et les gays et l’ajout de l’orientation sexuelle à la Charte québécoise des droits et libertés,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 46, no. 2 (2013): 295–322. On Truxx, also see Ross Higgins, *De la clandestiné à l’affirmation: pour une histoire de la communauté gaie montréalaise* (Montréal: Comeau & Nadeau, 1999); Higgins, “La regulation sociale de l’homosexualité,” 67–102. Also see Gentile, “À bas la reprepression contre les homosexuels!,” 68–80.
- 38 See Lesbian and Gay History Group of Toronto, “A History of the Relationship between the Gay Community and the Metropolitan Police,” submission to the Bruner Study, 1981.
- 39 See J. Stuart Russell, “The Offence of Keeping a Common Bawdy-House in Canadian Criminal Law,” *Ottawa Law Review*, 14, no. 2 (1982): 275.
- 40 See Russell, “The Offence of Keeping a Common Bawdy-House,” 275. Bawdy-house charges for sex between men in bathhouses go back to at least the raid on the Etna Steam bath in Windsor in 1964 where both keeper and found-in charges under the bawdy-house law were laid. On this see *The Windsor Star*, June 27, 1964, 5. Thanks to Walter Cassidy and his work on “Queer Visibility in Windsor/Essex” for this reference. See Cassidy, “Canada’s First Gay Bathhouse Raid: Windsor, 1964.” There was also a raid on the International in Toronto in 1968, and they picked up with the clean-up campaign prior to the 1976 summer Olympics in Montréal. See Hooper, “Bathhouse Raids in Canada 1968–2004,” graph, Anti-69, April 2018.
- 41 On the social organization of the police raids and how they were textually mediated through the bawdy-house section of the Criminal Code, see Smith, “Policing the Gay Community,” 163–83; and Smith, “Political Activist as Ethnographer,” 44–70. Also see Hooper, “Enough is Enough.”
- 42 Phil Scraton uses this expression in his work on the police to describe a negotiated tolerance between police and working-class “criminal” practices like street gambling. See Scraton, *The State of the Police* (London: Pluto, 1985). For later work on policing, see Kristian Williams, *Our Enemies in Blue: Police and Power in America* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2007); Maya Schenwar, Joe Macaré, and Alana Yu-lan Price, eds., *Who Do You Serve, Who Do You Protect?: Police Violence and Resistance in the United States* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016). Also see INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, ed., *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016).
- 43 Thomas S. Fleming, “The Bawdy-House ‘Boys’: Some Notes on Media, Sporadic Moral Crusades, and Selective Law Enforcement,” *Canadian Criminology Forum* 3, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 109. Also see Hooper, “Enough Is Enough”; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 137–89.

- 44 See Gerald Hannon, "Making Gay Sex Dirty," *The Body Politic*, May 1981, 8–10; and Fleming, "The Bawdy-House 'Boys,'" 112.
- 45 See Right to Privacy Committee, *Action!* 1, no. 3.
- 46 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Minutes of Proceedings*, 32nd Parl., 1st sess., issue 81 (1982): 8.
- 47 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Minutes of Proceedings*, 32nd Parl., 1st sess., issue 81 (1982): 23. My mother once went out with Donald Banks. I am so glad he did not end up being my father.
- 48 Fleming, "The Bawdy-House 'Boys,'" 105.
- 49 Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, *Minutes of Proceedings*, 32nd Parl., 1st sess., issue 81 (1982): 24, 26.
- 50 Shearing suggests, "What distinguishes the scum from the public is that the scum are structurally in conflict with, and are enemies of, the public. The scum are... 'in essence' troublemakers, while the public are 'in essence' their victims. In distinguishing between the scum and the public as two classes who oppose each other as enemies, the police culture makes available to the police a social theory that they can use in the context of their work to define situations and to construct a course of action in response to them. This theory enables the police to transcend the situated features of encounters by relating them to a broader social context that identifies the 'real trouble-makers' and 'real victims.'" Clifford D. Shearing, "Subterranean Processes in the Maintenance of Power: An Examination of the Mechanisms Coordinating Police Action," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 18, no. 3 (August 1981): 288.
- 51 For an excellent analysis of the textually mediated character of police campaigns against the gay community, see Smith, "Policing the Gay Community," 163–83; Smith, "Political Activist as Ethnographer," 44–70. Also see McCaskell, "The Bath Raids and Gay Politics," 169–88; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, esp. 137–69. Also see Hooper, "Enough Is Enough."
- 52 If I was rewriting this section today, the anti-Black racism and police violence against Black communities would be painted into the picture in a much stronger fashion. This would include the murders of Buddy Evans and Albert Johnson. On Black organizing against the police, see Ruth Nortey, "A History of Toronto Activism against anti-Blackness," in Pastermak, Walby, and Stadnyk, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*, 19–27. Black, Indigenous, and other people of colour were also involved in the resistance to the bath raids, as Syrus Marcus Ware has stressed. This ranges from participation in the demonstrations against the bath raids, in the Right to Privacy Committee events and organizing, and the mobilization of Gay Asians Toronto to defend an Asian man charged in the bath raids. See Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*, 2018; the Marvellous Grounds (website), <http://marvellousgrounds.com/>; and Syrus Warcus Ware, "QueersXCops," uploaded by the the Canadian Students for Sensible Drug Policy, Ryerson University, Toronto, February 25, 2020, Facebook live video, 2:00:30, <https://www.facebook.com/CSSDPRyerson/videos/293038195520341/>. On the more general context of relations between white gay activists and Black activists during these years, see Kinsman, "Queer Regulation and Resistance in the 1970s," 153–54.
- 53 See McCaskell "The Bath Raids and Gay Politics," 169–88.
- 54 See Gary Kinsman, "'Fuck You 52!': Some Notes Towards a Radical History of Toronto Pride 1981," *Radical Noise* (blog), June 7, 2021, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2021/06/07/%ef%bb%bf-fuck-you-52-some-notes-towards-a-radical-history-of-toronto-pride-1981/>. In a very different way, this has been kept alive with the organizing of Abolitionist Pride since 2020.

- 55 David White and Pat Sheppard, *Report on the Police Raids on Gay Steambaths* (Toronto: Toronto City Council, 1981).
- 56 Arnold Bruner, "Out of the Closet: Relations between the Homosexual Community and the Police," in *Report to Mayor Arthur Eggleton and the Council of the City of Toronto* (Toronto: City Council, September 24, 1981). This report deals mostly with gay men. "Women in Gay Society" is a total of three pages, 61–63.
- 57 Arnold Bruner, "Out of the Closet: Relations between the Homosexual Community and the Police," 162.
- 58 The Toronto Gay Community Council, which was formed after the February 1981 bath raids, was pulled apart by debates over dialogue committees with the police. While the majority decided to support the position of the RTPC and Gay Liberation Against the Right Everywhere (GLARE) to oppose such dialogue, more moderate forces went ahead and engaged in such collaboration with the police anyway, undermining and destroying the Council.
- 59 See Stephen Hester and Peter Elgin, *A Sociology of Crime* (London: Routledge, 1992), 154–57; Scraton, *The State of the Police*; Paul Gilroy, "Police and Thieves," in *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain*, ed. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham (London: Hutchinson, 1982), 143–82; Paul Gilroy, "Myth of Black Criminality," in *The Socialist Register, 1982*, ed. Martin Eve and David Musson (London: Merlin Press, 1982), 47–56; and Paul Gilroy, "Lesser Breeds without the Law," in *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics Of Race and Nation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 72–113. Also see Maynard, *Policing Black Lives*; and Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*.
- 60 While I had a position that was very critical of the police when I wrote the second edition, I had not yet adopted an explicit abolitionist approach. This came later with further engagement with Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* and with the work of Angela Davis and other Black feminists, on the basis of learning from the inability of the police to reform themselves in even limited ways, and with a greater understanding of carceral forms of capitalism. See Maynard, *Policing Black Lives*. I continue to be influenced by the work of Angela Davis including Davis, Dent, Meiners, and Richie, *Abolition. Feminism. Now.*; Kaba, *We Do This 'Til We Free Us*; and Ruth Wilson Gilmore, *Change Everything: Racial Capitalism and the Case for Abolition* (Chicago: Haymarket, 2023). Also see Alex S. Vitale, *The End of Policing*, updated ed. (London and New York: Verso, 2021). Also see the Introduction to this third edition, and the revised and updated Conclusion (Chapter 12).
- 61 Smith, "In Defence of Privacy."
- 62 See Scott Tucker, "Our Right to the World," *The Body Politic*, July/August 1982, 29–33; Leo Casey, "Sexual Politics and the Subversion of the Public Sphere: A Defense of Feminism and Gay Liberation," in *Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Liberation and Socialism*, ed. Itala Rutter (New York: Gay and Lesbian Task Force of the Democratic Socialists of America's Feminist Coalition, 1984), 8–16; and Scott P. Anderson, "Privacy: An Issue for the '80s?," *The Advocate*, January 20, 1983, 23–25. The distinction between public and private is socially and historically made and is differentiated along raced, gendered, and class lines.
- 63 These statistics are from the important work of the Right to Privacy Committee and Gay Court Watch in Toronto, which provided support for people arrested on gay-related charges. See Tom Hooper, "Friend of the Court': Legal Resistance at Old City Hall," in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 188–90. Also see Hooper, "Enough Is Enough."
- 64 On how local police request assistance from the Ontario Provincial Police and for an account of washroom sex in police language, see "Guelph Sex Video Policing: Internal Documents," *Rites*, June 1986, 7.

- 65 See Yanni Vassilas, "Guelph Fights Police Busts," *Rites*, September 1985, 4.
- 66 See Gary Kinsman, "1984: The Police Are Still with Us," *Rites*, May 1984, 10–11; Kinsman and Wilson, "Police Entrapment Fighting Back with Court Watch," 9–11; and Smith, "In Defense of Privacy."
- 67 On the history of obscenity legislation in Canada, see Kirsten Johnson, "A History of Federal Obscenity Legislation in Canada," in *Undressing the Canadian State: The Politics of Pornography from Hicklin to Butler* (Halifax: Fernwood, 1995), 38–57; Kinsman, "Porn/Censor Wars and the Battlefields of Sex," 31–39; and Mariana Valverde and Lorna Weir, "Thrills, Chills and the 'Lesbian Threat,' or The Media, the State and Women's Sexuality," in *Women Against Censorship*, ed. Varda Burstyn (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985), 99–106.
- 68 Judge Vanek's judgement in the Glad Day trial, March 4, 1983.
- 69 In 1984 the conviction against Kevin Orr, who worked at Glad Day, was overturned when the appeal judge agreed with the defence lawyer that Vanek had partially relied on the obsolete Hicklin obscenity test—which defined obscenity as anything that "depraves or corrupts."
- 70 Even though the prohibition on anal sex had been partially challenged in the *Joy of Gay Sex* case in 1987, Canada Customs memorandum D-911 was only changed to remove "anal penetration" as grounds for seizing materials in September 1994, just prior to Little Sisters' challenge to the constitutionality of Canada Customs' seizures in the BC Supreme Court finally being heard. See Cindy Filipenko, "Canada Customs Changes the Rules: Anal Sex Flip-flop Appears Timed to Influence Court Challenge," *Xtra*, October 14, 1994, 1. Also see Chris Defoe, "Little Sister v. Big Brother," *Globe and Mail*, October 8, 1994, C10. Also see Fuller and Blackley, *Restricted Entry*. On January 19, 1996, the British Columbia Supreme Court finally came down with its decision in the Little Sister's case. The decision was only a partial victory, and the basic constitutionality of Canada Customs censorship powers was upheld. Later in the 2000s there was a lessening of these state censorship practices.
- 71 hooks, *Black Looks*.
- 72 There exists now not only the genre of "lesbian" porn made for the titillation of straight men, but also that made by and for lesbians. On *Bad Attitude*, one of the new lesbian sex magazines, see Ingrid MacDonald and Kate Lazier, "The Politics of Lesbian Sexual Imagination: Good Girls with Bad Attitudes," *Rites*, September 1985, 11–15. On lesbian erotic images, also see Kiss and Tell Collective, *Drawing the Line: Lesbian Sexual Politics on the Wall*, photography by Susan Stewart (Vancouver: Press Gang, 1991); and Kiss and Tell Collective, *Her Tongue on My Theory: Images, Essays and Fantasies*, photography by Susan Stewart (Vancouver: Press Gang, 1994). Also see Zanin, "Your Cuntry Needs You," 185–202.
- 73 See Bill C-114, introduced in June 1986, and Bill C-54, tabled in May 1987. See Dany Lacombe, *Blue Politics: Pornography and the Law in the Age of Feminism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 99–136.
- 74 See Justice John Sopinka, Majority decision, Supreme Court of Canada, *R. v. Butler* (1992) 1 SCR 452, <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/844/index.do?q=donald+butler>. I argue that the Butler decision was a partial shift in the definition and interpretation of the obscenity section that still focuses on the "undue exploitation of sex" clause. I argue this against both those who feel that the decision actually incorporated a feminist perspective and those who feel it is almost an entirely new and more dangerous piece of legislation. On interpretations of Butler, see Clare Barclay and Elaine Carol, "Obscenity Chill," 18–28; Thelma McCormack, "Keeping Our Sex 'Safe': Anti-Censorship Strategies vs. the Politics of Protection," *Fireweed* 1 (Winter 1993): 25–34; Johnson, *Undressing the Canadian State*, chap. 4, 58–87; Lacombe, *Blue Politics*, 133–36; and Kiss and Tell Collective,

- Her Tongue on My Theory*, 75–92. Didi Herman in her account and analysis of the Butler decision seems to largely accept the Women’s Legal Education and Action Fund’s (LEAF) analysis of the decision and to not notice its implication for lesbians, gay men, and feminists involved in doing sexually explicit work. See Herman, “Law and Morality Revisited.” Also see Cossman et al., *Bad Attitude/s On Trial*.
- 75 See Carole Vance, “Negotiating Sex and Gender in the Attorney General’s Commission on Pornography,” in *Sex Exposed: Sexuality and the Pornography Debate*, ed. Lynne Segal and Mary McIntosh (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1993), 29–49.
- 76 On the *Bad Attitude* trial following the Butler decision, see Becki Ross, “‘Wunna His Fantasies’: The State/d Indefensibility of Lesbian Smut,” *Fireweed* 2, no. 38 (Spring 1993): 38–47. Also see Cossman et al., *Bad Attitude/s On Trial*.
- 77 Eleanor Brown, “Gay Sex Ruled Obscene: Court Rules Glad Days Porn is Degrading and Harmful,” *Xtra*, July 24, 1992, 1, 21. See also *R. v. Glad Day Bookshop Inc. and Jearld Moldenhauer v. Deputy Minister of National for Customs and Excise*, July 14, 1992, Ontario Court of Justice.
- 78 See Dennis Altman, “AIDS: The Politicization of an Epidemic,” 93–109; and Altman, *AIDS in the Mind of America*. Also see the Canadian AIDS Society, *Homophobia, Heterosexism and AIDS* (Ottawa: The Canadian AIDS Society, 1991); Kinsman “‘Their Silence, Our Deaths,’” 39–60; and Kinsman, “Managing AIDS Organizing,” 213–39. The account presented in this section is based largely on these last three references. Also see Kinsman, “AIDS Activism,” 311–33; and the Interviews, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/>.
- 79 See Canada, Ministry of Health and Welfare, *Building an Effective Partnership: The Federal Government’s Commitment to Fighting AIDS* (Ottawa: Ministry of Health and Welfare, 1990); and Canada, Ministry of Health and Welfare, *HIV and AIDS: Canada’s Blueprint* (Ottawa: Ministry of Health and Welfare, 1990); and my critical analysis in Kinsman, “Managing AIDS Organizing,” 213–39.
- 80 On the history of “public health,” see Alan Sears, “‘To Teach Them How to Live’: The Politics of Public Health from Tuberculosis to AIDS,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 5, no. 1 (1992): 61–83; and Sears, “Before the Welfare State: Public Health and Social Policy,” *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 32, no. 2 (May 1995): 169–88. Also see Patton, *Sex and Germs*, 58–61; and Patton, *Inventing AIDS*; and Kinsman, “AIDS Activism,” 311–33.
- 81 See Kinsman, “Constructing Sexual Problems,” 96–134. This perspective is in contrast to the “Patient Zero” mythology partially produced in Randy Shilts, *And the Band Played On: Politics, People and the AIDS Epidemic* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1987). For a critique, see Douglas Crimp, “How to Have Promiscuity in An Epidemic,” in Crimp, *AIDS*, 238–47. For a wonderful musical antidote to this perspective, see John Greyson’s delightful *Zero Patience*, directed and written by John Greyson (Toronto: Strand Releasing, 1993), 95 min.; and Susan Knabe and Wendy Gay Pearson, *Zero Patience: A Queer Film Classic* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2011).
- 82 See Patton, *Inventing AIDS*.
- 83 Quoted in Canadian AIDS Society, *Homophobia, Heterosexism and AIDS*. On Canadian media coverage, also see Ivan Emke, “Speaking of AIDS in Canada: The Texts and Contexts of Official, Counter-Cultural and Mass Media Discourses Surrounding AIDS” (PhD diss., Carleton University, Ottawa, 1991).
- 84 There was also widespread racism in the framing and construction of “African AIDS,” through which racist, anti-Black colonial relations were reconstructed under the guise of scientific objectivity. See Cindy Patton, “Inventing ‘African AIDS,’” in *Inventing AIDS*,

- 77–97; and Simon Watney, “Missionary Positions: AIDS, ‘Africa’ and Race,” in *Practices of Freedom*, 103–20. Also see Renee Sabatier, *Blaming Others: Prejudice, Race and Worldwide AIDS*, ed. Jon Tinker (Philadelphia: New Society, 1988); Paul Farmer, *AIDS and Accusation: Haiti and the Geography of Blame* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); and Evelyn Hammonds, “Missing Persons, African American Women, AIDS and the History of Disease,” *Radical America* 24, no. 2 (1990): 7–23. For later work, see OmiSoore H. Dryden, “‘A Queer Too Far’: Blackness, ‘Gay Blood,’ and Transgressive Possibilities,” in Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 116–32.
- 85 On this history see Cindy Patton, “Resistance and the Erotic: Reclaiming History, Setting Strategy as We Face AIDS,” in *AIDS: Social Representations, Social Practices*, ed. Peter Aggleton, Graham Hart, and Peter Davies (London: Falmer Press, 1989), 237–51. Also see Patton, *Inventing AIDS*; and Patton, *Fatal Advice*.
- 86 See Patton, *Inventing AIDS*, esp. 58–64.
- 87 See Roxana Ng, *The Politics of Community Services: Immigrant Women, Class and the State* (Toronto: Garamond, 1988); and Ng, Walker, and Muller, *Community Organization and the Canadian State*. Also see INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, ed., *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex* (Cambridge, MA: South End, 2007).
- 88 In relation to heterosexual sex, penetrative vaginal intercourse is presented as the “real thing” and not the range of other sexual activities that some feminists had suggested in an attempt to expand safety and eroticism for women. Safer sex becomes simply the use of condoms in a form of condom reductionism—which is not to suggest that proper use of condoms is not crucial but that there are also other erotic activities that can be engaged in. There was also no focus on the re-negotiation of responsibility and power in heterosexual relations, even though it is much easier for a man to infect a woman through unprotected penis-in-vagina intercourse than the other way around. On some of this, see the Women’s Committee of ACT UP, *Women, AIDS and Activism* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1991). Also see Cindy Patton, *Last Served? Gendering the HIV Pandemic* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1994); Patton, *Fatal Advice*.
- 89 See Patton, *Inventing AIDS*.
- 90 See Michael Callen, *Surviving AIDS* (New York: HarperCollins-Perennial, 1991). On ACT UP activism, see Sarah Schulman, *Let the Record Show: A Political History of ACT UP New York, 1987–1993* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2021).
- 91 See George Smith, “AIDS Treatment Deficits: An Ethnographic Inquiry into the Management of the AIDS Epidemic, the Ontario Case” (paper presentation, Fifth International AIDS Conference, Montréal, June 1989); and Smith, “Political Activist as Ethnographer.” These unethical double-blind placebo-controlled trials have unfortunately continued with COVID-19. See Kinsman, “SILENCE=DEATH, ACTION=LIFE.”
- 92 There was an important victory on this front in Ontario in December 1994—after years of activist pressure—when the Ontario NDP government finally announced it would bring in a catastrophic drug-funding policy. On how this was won through the activism of AIDS ACTION NOW!, see Glen Brown, interview by Alexis Shotwell and Gary Kinsman, May 25, 2014/November 11, 2014, AIDS Activist History Project, https://aidsactivisthistory.files.wordpress.com/2016/06/aahp_-_glen_brown.pdf; and Brent Southin, interview by Alexis Shotwell and Gary Kinsman, February 8, 2014, AIDS Activist History Project, https://aidsactivisthistory.files.wordpress.com/2016/06/aahp_-_brent_southin.pdf
- 93 In research and clinical trials, there has been a focus on men and sometimes the exclusion of women from trials. This sexism has been linked to the lack of understanding of women’s

- distinct experiences of HIV infection and AIDS—which has often led doctors to mis-diagnose women with HIV/AIDS. See Women’s Committee of ACT UP, *Women, AIDS and Activism*.
- 94 On federal AIDS policies, also see David Rayside and Evert Lindquist, “AIDS Activism and the State in Canada,” *Studies in Political Economy* 39, no. 1 (Autumn 1992): 37–76; and Rayside and Lindquist, “Canada: Community Activism, Federalism and the New Politics of Disease,” in *AIDS in the Industrialized Democracies: Passions, Politics and Policies*, ed. David L. Kirp and Ronald Bayer (Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press), 49–98. While these articles are very useful, I find that they tend to over-emphasize the impact of community-based groups on state policy and to underestimate the regulatory aspects of strategies adopted by state agencies. Also see Kinsman, “AIDS Activism,” 311–33. On drug users in the Downtown East Side and the Vancouver PWA Coalition, see Taylor Perry, “From West End to Eastside: The Vancouver HIV/AIDS Epidemic, 1983–2013,” *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2016): 103–30.
- 95 See John Holloway, *How to Change the World*; Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*; and Holloway, *In, Against, and Beyond Capitalism*; Kinsman, “AIDS Activism,” 311–33; and Kinsman, “Within, Against, and Beyond.”
- 96 See Mykhalovskiy and Smith, *Hooking Up to Social Services*.
- 97 On the development of professional class and racialized relations within the AIDS Committee of Toronto, expressed as racism towards a representative of the Haitian community, see Kinsman, “From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights,” 222–23.
- 98 AIDS is also increasingly recognized as having a global character. It cannot simply be dealt with within the framework of the nation-state. This international character is tied into global relations of racism and imperialism that must also be confronted. Dealing with AIDS on a global level requires the transfer of resources to affected parts of Africa and other parts of the “Third World,” and ensuring that treatments are freely available in these countries. This is also the case with the COVID-19 Pandemic. Also see ACT-UP (New York), *AIDS ACTION NOW!* (Toronto), “Montréal Manifesto,” June 1989, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.omeka.net/items/show/67>; and AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/AAHP>.
- 99 See Kinsman, “Restoring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System,” 211–69; Kinsman, “The Hughes Commission,” 17–19; and Kinsman, “The Mount Cashel Orphanage Inquiry,” 76–93. There is a relation between this “homosexualizing” focus and the focus on “sexual abuse” in what took place in the residential schools, which is often abstracted from its broader organizing contexts in colonialism, genocide, racism, physical violence, and death.
- 100 See Robin F. Badgley, *Report of the Committee on Sexual Offences against Children and Youths*, 2 vols. (Ottawa: Dept. of Supply and Services, 1984); Fraser, *Pornography and Prostitution in Canada*. Also see Brock and Kinsman, “Patriarchal Relations Ignored,” 107–25.
- 101 See Glen Wheeler, “Tackling Abuse and Other Taboos,” *NOW*, March 19–25, 1987, 7–8.
- 102 See Alan J.C. King et al., *Canada Youth and AIDS Study* (Kingston: Social Program Evaluation Group, Queen’s University, 1988), 86.
- 103 On May 24, 1995, the Ontario Court of Appeal released a decision agreeing with the constitutional challenge to the anal-intercourse age of consent being set at eighteen. Two of the judges found the law discriminatory on the basis of age, while Court of Appeal Justice Rosalie Abella argued that it “disadvantages gay men by denying them until they are eighteen a choice available at the age of fourteen for those who are not gay.” Abella quoted in the publication of the Sudbury All Gay Alliance, August 1995, 2–3. Also see Eleanor Brown, “Have Sex, Go to Jail: Court Ruling That Teens Can Have Anal Sex May Be Appealed,” *Capital Xtra*, June 30, 1995, 21. In response, the police and courts announced they would drop

- the twenty-two outstanding anal-intercourse charges against men rounded up through the use of the youth-pornography law. See the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario, *Newsletter*, August 1995, 6. The anal-sex section was not finally abolished until 2019.
- 104 See Sorfleet and Bearchell, "The Sex Police in a Moral Panic," 8–21; Forum 128, "Young People and Sex" (Toronto), 1993; Joseph Coutere (researcher), "The Trials of London," on *Ideas* (CBC Radio), October 7, 1994; and John Greyson, "After the Bath," on *Rough Cuts*, CBC, aired May 5, 1995, on CBC Newsworld. Also see Gerald Hannon, "The London Kiddie Porn Ring That Wasn't," *Globe and Mail*, March 11, 1995, A1; Joseph Coutere, "The London Kiddie Porn Ring That Isn't," *Xtra*, September 23, 1994, 15; Coutere, "Complaints Filed," *Xtra*, September 23, 1994, 15; and Coutere, "Complaints Filed," *Xtra*, June 23, 1995, 35. The ability of the police to arrest and the courts to convict on anal-sex charges was complicated by the Ontario Court of Appeal decision mentioned in note 103.
- 105 See "Youth Porn Campaign," *Gazette* (Halifax), July/August 1994, 17.
- 106 Brenda Cossman, in Valverde, *Radically Rethinking Regulation*, 23.
- 107 Jim Young, Doug Wilson, and John Foster, "1984: James Bond Comes to Ottawa," *Rites*, July/August 1984, 14–15.
- 108 "RCMP: No Queers Please," *Rites*, July/August 1985, 4. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 401–405.
- 109 Young, Wilson, and Foster, "1984: James Bond Comes to Ottawa," 14–15.
- 110 See *Rites*, April 1985, 3–5.
- 111 For instance, in 1974 a member of the armed forces in Petawawa, Ontario, was discharged for his homosexuality even though he had committed no crime nor been guilty of misconduct. The National Gay Rights Coalition/Coalition nationale pour les droits des homosexuels, "The Homosexual Minority and the Canadian Human Rights Act: A Brief Concerning Bill C-72 Prepared for Presentation to Members of Parliament," February 1976, 14. In 1976, Jacques Gallant took the armed forces to court over discrimination. In 1977, Barbara Thornborrow and Gloria Cameron were expelled from the military when they were discovered to be lesbians. See Coalition for Gay Rights in Ontario, *The Ontario Human Rights Omission: A Brief to the Members of the Ontario Legislature* (Toronto: The Coalition, 1981), 14. Darl Wood was expelled in 1978 and Stéphane Sirard in 1982. And in 1985, the Shelburne lesbian purge took place. The list could go on and on. The report of the federal committee on equality rights lists the numbers of discharges under CFAO-19-20: for 1981, 37; for 1982, 45; for 1983, 44; and in 1984, 38. See the Canada, House of Commons, Parliamentary Committee on Equality Rights, *Equality for All* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1985), 30, https://parl.canadiana.ca/view/oop.com_HOC_3301_24_4/1?r=0&s=. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, esp. 238–42, 354–82.
- 112 Wheeler, "Unfit for Service," 29. Many of these arguments are the same ones that have been used to prevent lesbians and gay men from openly serving in the US military.
- 113 See Lawrence Braithwaite, "Armed and Dangerous: A Gay Soldier on Misogyny, Homophobia and Racism in the Canadian Armed Forces," in *Rites*, November/December 1991, 13–14. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 351–54.
- 114 See Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," 118. I submitted an affidavit in support of Michelle Douglas in this case. Also see "The Ongoing Struggle to Access Historical Government Records," *Purge LGBT* (blog), February 10, 2022, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/the-ongoing-struggle-to-access-historical-government-records/>. It includes the following excerpt from Marcel Masse, Minister of National Defence to Prime Minister Mulroney on why they were not going to fight Michelle Douglas's legal challenge. In the summer of 1992, Masse wrote:

If we proceed to try the Douglas case, there will be three unavoidable consequences:
(a) we will be perceived as refusing to acknowledge the existing law of Canada (This may well result in the award of punitive and exemplary damages);
(b) the Canadian Forces' reputation will be brought into disrepute; and
(c) the evidence generated at trial will seriously embarrass the Government.

I urge that you give your immediate approval to settle the Douglas case and the other pending sexual orientation cases and to abandon the current Canadian Forces policy with respect to sexual orientation in accordance with the advice and recommendations previously provided by the Attorney General of Canada.

Yours sincerely,

Marcel Masse

- 115 On the impact of the Charter, see James E. Jefferson, "Gay Rights and the Charter," *University of Toronto Faculty of Law Review* 43, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 70–89; See Parliamentary Committee on Equality Rights, *Equality for All*, 12–13. Also see Herman, *Rights of Passage*, although at times her account and analysis are rather far removed from extra-legal and extra-parliamentary struggles that have been an important part of this process; and Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," 118. Also see Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 391–401.
- 116 For instance, there was an attempted "moral panic" organized against a safe-sex article for gay men that was part of the "Lesbian and Gay Supplement" of *The Muse* (The Memorial University Student paper) in St. John's and across the country in February 1991. See Patrick Barnholden and Padraic Brake, "A Gay Man's Guide to Erotic Safer Sex," in "Lesbian and Gay Supplement," *The Muse*, February 15, 1991, 13.
- 117 Doug Sanders, interview with author and Rob Champagne, Vancouver, June 14, 1986.
- 118 On the Egan decision, see A. Lawyer, "Egan and Nesbitt: An Analysis," and "Supreme Court Rules," *Wayves*, June 1995, 1; Philip Hannon, "Checkered Victory: No Pension for Spouse of 47 Years, Court Rules," *Xtra*, June 9, 1995, 1, 12.
- 119 See Sanders, "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights," 120.
- 120 On the social organization of the campaign against political correctness, see Richer and Weir, *Beyond Political Correctness*, esp. Dorothy E. Smith, "'Politically Correct': An Ideological Code," 23–50; and Lorna Weir, "PC Then and Now: Resignifying Political Correctness," 50–87. Also see Dorothy E. Smith, "'Politically Correct': An Organizer of Public Discourse," in *Writing the Social*, 172–94.
- 121 On the various struggles within the United Church, see Michael Riordon, *The First Stone: Homosexuality and the United Church* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1990). On the struggle in Nova Scotia, see my interview with Maureen Shebib, "The Long Lobby for Legal Protection," *Rites*, September 1989, 8–9; and Barnholden, "A Different Drummer," 6–15. For earlier years, see Rose, *Before the Parade*; and Robin Metcalfe, *OUT: Queer Looking, Queer Acting Revisited* (Halifax: The Khyber Centre for the Arts, 2014).
- 122 I was part of an unsuccessful lobbying campaign for sexual-orientation protection in Newfoundland and Labrador in 1991. See Gays and Lesbians Together, "Here to Stay!," *Wayves*, November 1995. This struggle continued with the efforts of Newfoundland Gays and Lesbians for Equality. In late 1995, the Newfoundland Supreme Court ruled that sexual-orientation protection must be read into the provincial Human Rights code. Also see Rollmann, *A Queer History of Newfoundland*.
- 123 Fleming, "The Bawdy-House 'Boys,'" 109. I would use, however, the word "partial decriminalization" of buggery and gross indecency and not "legalization" of these offences to describe what took place in 1969. See Kinsman, "Not A Gift from Above," 74–97; and Tom Hooper, "'The State's Key to the Bedroom Door,'" 101–20.

- 124 Ontario, Standing Committee on Resource Development, Hearings on the Human Rights Code, 32nd Parl., 1st sess., September 16, 1981, 26–27. Renwick is now deceased. On the Board of Education, see Chapter 9.
- 125 For more elaboration, see Kinsman, “‘Responsibility’ as a Strategy of Governance,” 393–409.
- 126 See my comments in Kinsman, “Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer, Review Essays, #2,” esp. the section, “Different kinds of Neoliberalism—Is there a ‘Mature’ Neoliberalism?”

CHAPTER ELEVEN

- 1 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 429–58.
- 2 On the general development of these new technological forms of communication and forms of social interaction see Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber-Marx*.
- 3 *The Crying Game*, directed and written by Neil Jordan, produced by Stephen Woolley (Los Angeles: Miramax Films, 1992), 111 min.
- 4 Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure*, 144.
- 5 On this social relationality also see Smith, “Femininity as Discourse.”
- 6 This chapter is not an attempt at a history of queer and trans organizing from 1996 until the time of writing, although resources for this will be found here. For other resources, see Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*; Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*; McCaskell, *Queer Progress*; Warner, *Never Going Back*; Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*; Millward, *Making a Scene*; Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*; and Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!* Also see Rose, *Before the Parade*, and Rollman, *A Queer History of Newfoundland*.
- 7 On memory work, see Frankenburg, *White Women, Race Matters*; and Haug, *Beyond Female Masochism*.
- 8 This is a limitation in Peter Drucker’s analysis in *Warped*. Also see, Kinsman, “Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer Reviews # 1.”
- 9 On neoliberal capitalism see Kinsman, “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s,” 138–41; Drucker, *Warped*, 220–28; Klein, *The Shock Doctrine*; McNally, *Another World Is Possible*; Dillon, *Fugitive Life*; and on interconnections with migration and borders see Walia, *Border and Rule*.
- 10 See Kinsman, “Not a Gift from Above,” 74–97; Kinsman “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s,” 137–62; and Kinsman, “From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights,” 209–32.
- 11 On this see Walia, *Border and Rule*, esp. 169–211.
- 12 See Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*; Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 38–49; Rao, *Out of Time*; Drucker, *Warped*; Sears, “Queer Anti-Capitalism,” 92–112; and Sears, “Body Politics,” 171–91; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*.
- 13 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 122.
- 14 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 465.
- 15 See Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 16 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 451, 465.
- 17 See, among others, the early but suggestive Funk and Mueller, *Gender Politics and Post-Communism*.
- 18 See Kinsman “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s,” 137–62; and Kinsman, “From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights,” 209–32. Also see Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 97–127.

- 19 Duggan, *The Twilight of Equality?*; Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*; Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*.
- 20 See Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*; and Christina B. Hanhardt, *Safe Space: Gay Neighborhood History and the Politics of Violence* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013).
- 21 On Pride Toronto and ASOs, see McCaskell, *Queer Progress*. On ASOs, see Kinsman, "Managing AIDS Organizing," 213–39; and Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 311–33.
- 22 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*.
- 23 Drucker, *Warped*, 233.
- 24 See Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*; Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*, chap. 3, "Intimate Control, Infinite Detention," 114–65.
- 25 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 459.
- 26 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 346.
- 27 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 366.
- 28 See Chanelle Gallant and J.P. Hornick, "Open Letter Regarding the Appointment of Myron Demkiw as Chief of Police," October 2022, Google Forms, <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc7ZCoRqgEbxPAG6pEorNdSCUHCubTw4636N2iNqteCtk-qmA/viewform>. See also Joanna Lavoie, "Women at centre of Pussy Palace Bathroom Raid Decry Myron Demkiw's Appointment As Toronto's Next Police Chief," *CTV News Toronto*, October 12, 2022, <https://toronto.ctvnews.ca/women-at-centre-of-pussy-palace-bathroom-raid-decry-myron-demkiw-s-appointment-as-toronto-s-next-police-chief-1.6106712>.
- 29 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 367. Rae was successfully sued by Demkiw and other police officers involved in the raid. See Gallant and Hornick, "Open Letter Regarding the Appointment of Myron Demkiw as Chief of Police."
- 30 See Chanelle Gallant, "No-Cop Zone? Reflections on the Pussy Place Raid," 215–18; and Chanelle Gallant, "20 Years Ago Women Fought the Police, and Won," *Xtra*, September 14, 2020, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/queer-womens-bathroom-police-179581>. Also see Alisha Stranges, "Talking Sex: Engaging with the Pussy Palace Oral Histories," *LGBTQ History, Digital Collaboratory*, April 10, 2022, <https://lgbtqdigitalcollaboratory.org/talking-sex/>.
- 31 Hooper, "Bathroom Raids in Canada 1968–2004," graph, *Anti-69*, April 2018.
- 32 See excerpts of speeches made at the Repeal the Youth Porn Law Rally, March 12, 1994, Gary Kinsman et al., "Keep Your Fucking Laws Off Our Bodies: Organizing to Repeal the Youth Porn Law," *Parallogramme* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1994): 13–14, https://walnet.org/csis/news/toronto_94/parallel-9406-2.html.
- 33 See Kinsman, "'Responsibility' as a Strategy of Governance," 393–409.
- 34 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 460.
- 35 On some of this, see Ross and Sullivan, "Tracing Lines of Horizontal Hostility," 604–21; and Ross, "Whorganizers and Gay Activists," 256–71; and Hanhardt, *Safe Space*. On Toronto for an earlier period, see Emma McKenna, "The White-Painters of Cabbagetown: Neighborhood Policing and Sex Worker Resistance in Toronto, 1986–1987," *Sexualities* 25, no. 7 (June 29, 2021): 867–91.
- 36 See Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*.
- 37 See David J. Roberts and John Paul Catungal, "Neoliberalizing Social Justice in Infrastructure Revitalization Planning: Analyzing Toronto's More Moss Park Project in its Early Stages," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108, no. 2 (2018): 454–62; Helen Jefferson Lenskyj, "Waving A Rainbow Flag Over Poor Communities," *NOW Magazine*, October 26, 2015, <https://nowtoronto.com/waving-a-rainbow-flag-over-poor-communities>; and

- Queer Trans Community Defence, “Moss Park: Whose Park? Whose ‘Redevelopment,’” *Radical Noise*, June 3, 2016, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2016/06/03/moss-park-whose-park-whose-redevelopment/>; Gary Kinsman, “Brief Report on No Pride in Gentrification of Moss Park Community Meeting,” *Radical Noise*, April 13, 2016, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2016/04/13/brief-report-on-no-pride-in-gentrification-of-moss-park-community-meeting/>.
- 38 See Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 97–127. Connections can be made here between the limitations of formal rights and equality and the purely legal “emancipation” of slaves from slavery rather than the substantive freedom Black people need. See Walcott, *The Long Emancipation*.
- 39 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 234.
- 40 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 253.
- 41 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 332–33.
- 42 OmiSoore Dryden, “Black Queer Radical Thought in the Unjust Society” (presentation, Anti-69 Forum, Carleton University, Ottawa, March 24, 2019), <https://anti-69.ca/vids/#OmiSooreDryden>.
- 43 W. van der Meide, *The Intersection of Sexual Orientation and Race: Considering the Experiences of GLBT People of Colour and Two-Spirited People. A Research Paper Prepared for Egale Canada* (Ottawa: Egale, 2001), www.egale.ca/intersections/.
- 44 Dryden, “Black Queer Radical Thought in the Unjust Society.”
- 45 Quoted in McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 449.
- 46 Everett, “Mobilization on the Periphery,” 130. The use of “periphery” referring to the East Coast is troubling. While in some ways socially and politically accurate within the dynamics of Canadian state and capitalist formation, it also must be questioned.
- 47 See Alexa DeGagne, “‘Severely Queer’ in Western Canada: LGBTQ2Q Activism in Alberta,” in Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 170–71.
- 48 See Nicholas Matte, “Rupert Raj, Transmen, and Sexuality: The Politics of Transnormativity in *Metamorphosis* Magazine during the 1980s,” in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 131–32.
- 49 See Miriam Smith, “LGBTQ Activism: The Pan-Canadian Political Space,” in Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 56–59.
- 50 *M. v. H.* (1999) 2 SCR 3, <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1702/index.do>.
- 51 See Patrick Barnholden, “Does the ‘Straight’ Jacket of the Family Fit You?,” *New Socialist* 2, no. 3 (July/August 1999), http://newsocialist.org/old_mag/magazine/20/article03.html.
- 52 See Suzanne Lenon, “The Governmentality of Gay Rights: Queer Love in Neoliberal Times,” in Brock, *Governing the Social in Neoliberal Times*, 67–68.
- 53 Tom Warner, “Bill 5: Same-Sex Partner Law,” *Outwards: Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario Newsletter*, November 1999.
- 54 Steven Maynard, “Modernization or Liberation?,” *Capital Xtra*, March 17, 2000, 10. Also see McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 368.
- 55 This trajectory ruptures with the earlier perspectives referred to in the Introduction to the second edition of this book developed in Segal, *Straight Sex*.
- 56 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 268–69.
- 57 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 285.
- 58 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 324.
- 59 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 324–25.
- 60 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 460.
- 61 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 325.
- 62 See Kinsman, “‘Responsibility’ as a Strategy of Governance,” 393–409.

- 63 See Drucker, *Warped*, esp. 340–52.
- 64 Kinsman and Gibson, “Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood,” 247–48.
- 65 This draws on Kinsman and Gibson, “Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood,” 249–50.
- 66 This also draws on Kinsman and Gibson, “Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood,” 247–48, 250.
- 67 See Kinsman and Gibson, “Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood,” 250–51.
- 68 See Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire*, second ed., 301, 323n73.
- 69 See Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire*, second ed., 304–306.
- 70 Drucker, *Warped*, 364.
- 71 See the theoretical work leading up to *Wages for Housework*, including Dalla Costa, *Women and the Subversion of the Community*; James, *Sex, Race and Class*; and Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero*.
- 72 See Brodie, Gavigan, and Jenson, *The Politics of Abortion*; Patricia Antonyshyn, B. Lee, and Alex Merrill, “Marching for Women’s Lives: The Campaign for Free-Standing Abortion Clinics in Ontario,” in Cunningham, *Social Movements/Social Change*; Shannon Stettner, ed., *Without Apology: Writings on Abortion in Canada* (Edmonton: Athabasca University Press, 2016), 129–56; Shannon Stettner, Kristin Burnett, and Travis Hay, eds., *Abortion, History, Politics, and Reproductive Justice after Morgentaler* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2018); and Action Canada for Sexual Health and Rights, “The 1970 Abortion Caravan: Celebrating 50 Years,” Resources, Reports and Analysis, Action Canada for Sexual Health and Rights, 2020, <https://www.actioncanadashr.org/resources/reports-analysis/2020-05-12-1970-abortion-caravan-celebrating-50-years>. Also see Martha Paynter, *Abortion to Abolition: Reproductive Health and Justice in Canada* (Halifax and New York: Fernwood Publishing/Columbia University Press, 2022).
- 73 See Adrian Edgar, “Dr. Adrian Edgar on the Impending Closure of Clinic 554,” *NB Media Co-op*, October 10, 2019, <https://nbmediacoop.org/2019/10/10/dr-adrian-edgar-on-impending-closure-of-clinic-554/>; and Hadeel Ibrahim, “Clinic 554 and Abortion Access: Five Key Questions Answered,” *CBC News*, September 10, 2020, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/clinic-554-abortion-access-new-brunswick-election-1.5713098>.
- 74 See Suzanne Lenon, “Marrying Citizens! Raced Subjects? Re-thinking the Terrain of Equal Marriage Discourse,” *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 17, no. 2 (2005): 405–21.
- 75 See Kenyon Farrow, “Is Gay Marriage Anti-Black?,” in Conrad, *Against Equality*, 33–44.
- 76 See Suzanne Lenon, “What’s So Civil about Marriage? The Racial Pedagogy of Same-Sex Marriage in Canada,” *darkmatter*, no. 3 (2008): 26–36; and Lenon, “Why Is Our Love an Issue?: Same-Sex Marriage and the Racial Politics of the Ordinary,” *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture* 17, no. 3 (2011): 351–72.
- 77 Lenon, “Why Is Our Love an Issue?,” 351–72.
- 78 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 371.
- 79 Brenda Cossman, “No Sex Please: National Lobby Group Stands Up for Respectable Rights Only,” *Daily Xtra*, February 25, 1999.
- 80 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 382.
- 81 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 386.
- 82 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 382.
- 83 Dryden, “A Queer Too Far,” 119.
- 84 Dryden, “A Queer Too Far,” 119. The reference is to the brilliant article by Bérubé, “How Gay Stays White,” 246.

- 85 Dryden, "Black Queer Radical Thought in the Unjust Society." On common-sense racism, see Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 86 A conversation with Marlon M. Bailey, Priya Kandaswamy, and Mattie Undora Richardson, "Is Gay Marriage Racist?," in *That's Revolting!: Queer Strategies for Resisting Assimilation*, ed. Mattilda Bernstein Sycamore (Brooklyn: Soft Skull Press, 2004), 91–92.
- 87 Alan Sears, "Is There Sex After Marriage?," *New Socialist* 5, no. 3 (September/October 2005): 38–39.
- 88 Sears, "Is There Sex After Marriage?," 38–39.
- 89 See Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 63–82. The slogan "Love is Love" was also picked up after the Orlando shooting at the Pulse Club in June 2016. This operated to also deflect attention away from how this attack largely hit Latinx and people of colour queer people. On this, see Kinsman, "Interview with Gary Kinsman," in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 135.
- 90 Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 63.
- 91 Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 64.
- 92 Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 69.
- 93 Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 76. Chrys Ingraham, *White Weddings: Romancing Heterosexuality in Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2008).
- 94 Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 78.
- 95 Christopher Samuel, *Conform, Fail, Repeat: How Power Distorts Collective Action* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2017), 70.
- 96 Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 80.
- 97 Ingraham, *White Weddings*.
- 98 Lenon, "What's So Civil About Marriage?," 26–36.
- 99 Lenon, "What's So Civil About Marriage?," 26–36.
- 100 See El Chenier, "Liberating Marriage: Gay Liberation and Same-Sex Marriage in Early 1970s Canada," in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 29–30. Also see El Chenier, "Love-Politics: Lesbian Wedding Practices in Canada and the United States from the 1920s to the 1970s," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 27, no. 2 (May 2018): 294–321.
- 101 Chenier, "Liberating Marriage," 30.
- 102 Chenier, "Liberating Marriage," 47–48.
- 103 Law Commission of Canada, *Beyond Conjuality, Recognizing and Supporting Close Personal Adult Relationships* (Ottawa: Law Commission of Canada, 2001); Tom Warner, "Fighting the Anti-Queer Right-Wing," *New Socialist*, January/February 2004, 32–34.
- 104 Gary Kinsman, "Don't Get Me to the Church on Time: Ending Social Discrimination Against Same-Sex and Other Relationships," *Radical Noise*, January 9, 2015, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2015/01/09/from-my-archives-dont-get-me-to-the-church-on-time-ending-social-discrimination-against-same-sex-and-other-relationships/>.
- 105 Kate Bornstein, "Open Letter to LGBT Leaders Who Are Pushing Marriage Equality," in Conrad, *Against Equality*, 24–25. Also see John D'Emilio, "The Marriage Fight is Setting Us Back," in Conrad, *Against Equality*, 51–56; and "Beyond Same-Sex Marriage: A New Strategic Vision for All Our Families and Relationships," *MR Online*, August 8, 2006, <https://mronline.org/2006/08/08/beyond-same-sex-marriage-a-new-strategic-vision-for-all-our-families-relationships/>.
- 106 For instance, see George Chauncey, *Why Marriage?: The History Shaping Today's Debate Over Gay Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 2004). Chauncey only comments in a note that he is personally critical of same-sex marriage. For a critical perspective on this work by Chauncey, also see Martin Duberman, *Has the Gay Movement Failed?* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2018), 54–60.

- 107 Kinsman, "Don't Get me to the Church on Time." Also see Conrad, *Against Equality*.
- 108 Alan Sears, "Can Marriage Be Queer?," *New Socialist*, March/April 2001; Sears, "Is There Sex After Marriage?," 38–39; Michael Warner, "Beyond Gay Marriage," in *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); and Valerie Lehr, *Queer Family Values: Debunking the Myth of the Nuclear Family* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999).
- 109 See Drucker, *Warped*, 340–52.
- 110 Drucker, *Warped*, 28.
- 111 Drucker, *Warped*, 345.
- 112 Gary Kinsman, "Don't Get Me to the Church on Time."
- 113 Kathleen A. Lahey and Kevin Alderson, *Same-Sex Marriage: The Personal and the Political* (Toronto: Insomniac Press, 2004); Sylvain Larocque, *Gay Marriage: The Story of a Canadian Social Revolution* (Toronto: Lorimer, 2006). These books need a more critical approach, and gay marriage was hardly a social revolution.
- 114 Larocque, *Gay Marriage*.
- 115 River Rossi, "Networks of Care Beyond Same Sex Marriage: The Enforcement of Settler Homonationalism in Canada's *Civil Marriage Act*" (unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Department of Indigenous and Canadian Studies, Ottawa, 2017).
- 116 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 387.
- 117 Kinsman, "Constructing Sexual Problems," 111.
- 118 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 448.
- 119 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 394.
- 120 See Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*; Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*.
- 121 There are limitations with the term "Islamophobia" that are similar to the limitations of "homophobia," which tend to present problems of institutional and social relations as problems of individual psychology.
- 122 S. Hussan, "I Went to the Canadian Mosque Where Six Muslims Were Killed: On the Ways We Counter Collective Forgetting," *Canadaland*, January 25, 2018, <https://www.canadaland.com/visiting-the-quebec-city-mosque-where-six-muslims-were-killed/>.
- 123 See Said, *Orientalism*.
- 124 Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 429–58. Also see Gentile and Kinsman, "National Security and Homonationalism," 133–49. Also see Nayrouz Abu Hatoum and Ghaida Moussa, "Becoming Through Others: Western Queer Self-Fashioning and Solidarity with Queer Palestine," in Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*, 169–86. On connections of the "war on terror" with migration, border security and more, see Walia, *Border and Rule*.
- 125 See Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*; Puar, "Rethinking Homonationalism," 336–39; and Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*.
- 126 OmiSoore H. Dryden and Suzanne Lenon, "Introduction: Interventions, Iterations, and Interrogations that Disturb the (Homo)Nation," in Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 3–19.
- 127 Gentile and Kinsman, "National Security and Homonationalism," 133–49.
- 128 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 467.
- 129 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 420–21, 429–59.
- 130 Shailagh Keane, "Women Resist, Police Repress: Gendered Police Violence at the Toronto G20," in *Whose Streets? The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*, ed. Tom Malleson and David Wachsmuth (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011), 115–24.
- 131 A focus on defence of the fossil fuel industry as a matter of "national security" has now been followed by provincial legislation protecting "critical infrastructure" from protest. See

- Brenden Devlin, "Critical Infrastructure Protection: Dangerous Politics in Manitoba, Alberta and Beyond," *Canadian Dimension*, February 17, 2021, <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/critical-infrastructure-protection-dangerous-politics-in-manitoba-alberta-and-beyond>; also Kinsman, "Forgetting National Security in 'Canada,'" 133–39. It was also on this basis that the federal Emergency Act was declared against the "Freedom Convoy" and the border blockades in early 2022, setting a very dangerous precedent for Indigenous, climate justice, and other struggles.
- 132 Terry Weber, "Ottawa Tables Bill to Raise Age of Consent to 16," *Globe and Mail*, June 23, 2006, A2; and Sue Bailey, "Tory Bill Raises Age of Consent From 14 to 16," *Toronto Star*, June 23, 2006, A4.
- 133 This argument comes initially from the Wolfenden Report and is carried through in the 1969 reform and legal changes to the anal-intercourse offence since then. See Chapter 8.
- 134 Gareth Kirkby, "Conservatives First Battle: Age of Consent Legislation," *Xtra*, February 7, 2006, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/conservatives-first-battle-age-of-consent-legislation-39306>; Gareth Kirkby and Krishna Rau, "Age of Consent: A Special Report," *Xtra*, March 22, 2006, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/age-of-consent-22037>; Debra Black, "Age of Consent Uproar: Will Law Protect Vulnerable Kids...or 'Criminalize' Teenage Sex?," *Toronto Star*, June 19, 2006, A1.
- 135 Marge Piercy, *Woman on the Edge of Time* (New York: Knopf, 1976).
- 136 Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire*, second ed., 346–47.
- 137 Brenda Cossman, "Harm is the New Indecency Test," *Xtra*, January 4, 2006, 9, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/harm-is-the-new-indecency-test-39322>.
- 138 See Andrea Zanin, "In Healthy, Consensual BDSM, Saying 'Yes' Is Just the Beginning," *Globe and Mail*, October 28, 2014, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/relationships/in-healthy-consensual-bdsm-saying-yes-is-just-the-beginning/article21352358/>; and Nicola Luksic, "BDSM in Canada is 50 Shades Of Legal Grey," *CBC News*, February 26, 2015, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/bdsm-in-canada-is-50-shades-of-legal-grey-1.2969194>.
- 139 See Chapter 10. Also see Bet Cecill, Richard Banner, and John Kozachenko, Vancouver Interviews, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/vancouver-interviews/>; and Glen Brown, Philip Berger, Toronto Interviews, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/toronto-interviews/>.
- 140 Kirkup, "The Gross Indecency of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure," 263–82.
- 141 Kinsman, "'Responsibility' as a Strategy of Governance," 393–409; Also see Eric Mykhalovskiy, "The Problem of 'Significant Risk': Exploring the Public Health Impact of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure," *Social Science & Medicine* 73, no. 5 (2011): 668–75; Mykhalovskiy, "The Public Health Implications of HIV Criminalization: Past, Current and Future Research Implications," *Critical Public Health* 25, no. 4 (2015): 373–85; and Eric Mykhalovskiy and Glenn Betteridge, "Who? What? Where? When? And with What Consequences? An Analysis of Criminal Cases of HIV Non-Disclosure in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 27, no. 1 (2012): 31–53. Also see McClelland, *The Criminalization of HIV in Canada*.
- 142 June Callwood, *Trial Without End: A Shocking Story of Women and AIDS* (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 1996).
- 143 James Miller, "African Immigrant Damnation Syndrome: The Case of Charles Ssenyonga," *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 2, no. 2 (June 2005): 31–50.
- 144 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 400–401. Also see Rinaldo Walcott, "Black Cumjoy: Pleasure and a Racist Virus," in *RAW, PrEP, Pedagogy, and the Politics of Barebacking*, ed. Ricky Verghese (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2019), 71–89. Also see Eric Mykhalovskiy et

- al., “Callous, Cold and Deliberately Duplicitous”: Racialization, Immigration, and the Representation of HIV Criminalization in Canadian Mainstream Newspapers (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 2016), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2874409.
- 145 Walcott, *Queer Returns*, 206; quoted in OmiSoore Dryden, “It Is in Us to Give: Black Life and the Racial Profiling of Blood Donation,” in Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 212.
- 146 Marilou Gagnon and Christine Vezina, “HIV Criminalization as ‘Risk Management’: On the Importance of Structural Stigma,” in *Seeing Red*, ed. Hindmarch, Orsini, and Gagnon, 55.
- 147 See McClelland, *The Criminalization of HIV in Canada*, 5. Also see the other references to HIV criminalization, n145.
- 148 Kirkup, “The Gross Indecency of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure,” 263–82.
- 149 *R. v. Cuerrier* (1998) 2 SCR 371, <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1646/index.do>.
- 150 Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, *Disclosure of HIV Status After Cuerrier: Resources for Community Based AIDS Organizations* (Toronto: Canadian AIDS Society, 2004), <http://www.hivlegalnetwork.ca/site/disclosure-of-hiv-status-after-cuerrier-resources-for-community-based-aids-organizations/?lang=en>.
- 151 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 398–99.
- 152 Heather Worth, Cindy Patton, and Margaret T. McGehee, “Legislating the Pandemic: A Global Survey of HIV/AIDS in Criminal Law,” *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 2, no. 2 (June 2005): 15–22.
- 153 Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, *Disclosure of HIV Status After Cuerrier*.
- 154 See McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 369–70.
- 155 *R. v. Mabior* (2012) 2 SCR 584, <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/10008/index.do>.
- 156 Gagnon and Vezina, “HIV Criminalization as ‘Risk Management,’” 62. Also see Mykhalovskiy, “The Problem of ‘Significant Risk,’” 668–75; Mykhalovskiy, “The Public Health Implications of HIV Criminalization,” 373–85; and Mykhalovskiy and Betteridge, “Who? What? Where? When? And with What Consequences?,” 31–53.
- 157 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 413–15.
- 158 McClelland, *The Criminalization of HIV in Canada*, 6.
- 159 Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, Coalition des organismes communautaires québécois de lutte contre le sida (COCQ-SIDA), and the HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario (HALCO), “Statement: Court Decision Means Lawmakers Must Act to End Unjust, Unscientific Prosecutions of People Living With HIV,” HIV Legal Network, August 7, 2020, <http://www.aids-law.ca/site/statement-court-decision-means-lawmakers-must-act-to-end-unjust-unscientific-prosecutions-of-people-living-with-hiv/?lang=en>.
- 160 See Kinsman, “Fuck You 52!”
- 161 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 431.
- 162 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 380.
- 163 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 430–31.
- 164 See Gary Kinsman, “A Contribution to the History of the First Sudbury Pride March in 1997,” *Radical Noise*, November 7, 2017, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2017/11/04/a-contribution-to-the-history-of-the-first-sudbury-pride-march-in-1997/>.
- 165 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 452.
- 166 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 394.

- 167 Hannon quoted in *Queer Progress*, 395. Gerald Hannon died in 2022. While we did not really agree, I really appreciated his sex worker and liberationist activism and writing. See Ed Jackson, “Gerald Hannon, A Key Figure In the Gay Liberation Movement, Has Died at Age 77,” *Xtra*, May 9, 2022, <https://xtramagazine.com/power/activism/gerald-hannon-tributes-222459>. Also see Gerald Hannon, *Immoral, Indecent and Scurrilous: The Making of an Unrepentant Sex Radical* (Toronto: Cormorant Books, 2022).
- 168 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 404.
- 169 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 405.
- 170 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 405.
- 171 Miriam Smith, “Homophobia and Homonationalism: LGBTQ Law Reform in Canada,” *Social and Legal Studies* 29, no. 1 (2020): 78. Also see “Corporate Equity Training,” Training and Workshops, Egale, <https://egale.ca/training-workshops/>.
- 172 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 419.
- 173 Smith, “Homophobia and Homonationalism,” 73.
- 174 Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 38.
- 175 Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 38.
- 176 Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 45.
- 177 Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 47.
- 178 See “Call from Canadian Civil Society to Support Uganda’s LGBTQ Communities,” Position Statements, Calls To Action and Media Releases, Dignity Network Canada, March 31, 2023, <https://dignitynetwork.ca/wp-content/uploads/Call-To-Support-Ugandas-LGBTIQ-Communities-ENG.pdf>. Later, after the anti-homosexual legislation was passed, the World Bank (a neo-colonial, imperialist, capitalist institution) took measures against the Ugandan government. Instead, we need to rely on resistance, within Uganda and other African countries, and a global community- and union-based solidarity campaign.
- 179 McCaskell, *Queer Progress* 456
- 180 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*.
- 181 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 383.
- 182 See interviews with Valerie Scott and Ryan Hotchkiss, Jamie Lee Curtis (who died in 2019), and Andrew Sorfleet, Interviews, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/>. Also see the video of sex worker activism at the 1989 Montreal AIDS conference, “Premiere of Our Bodies, Our Business (2016),” AIDS Activist History Project, January 4, 2017, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/2017/01/>. See also Scholar Strike Canada, “Harm Reduction and Abolition Politics,” March 22, 2022, YouTube video, 1:16:10, <https://www.youtube.com/live/ChVRCjyf8I?feature=share>.
- 183 “Bill C-75: Joint Statement on the Repeal of Criminal Code Laws Used Against LGBTQ2S+ People and Sex Workers,” *Radical Noise*, September 25, 2018, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/09/27/bill-c-75-joint-statement-on-the-repeal-of-criminal-code-laws-used-against-lgbtq2s-people-and-sex-workers/>.
- 184 See David Hugill, *Missing Women, Missing News: Covering Crisis in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside* (Halifax: Fernwood, 2010); Ling, *Missing from the Village*; the Independent Civilian Review of Missing Persons Investigations (website), <http://www.autcon.net/mm/>; and Kinsman, “Contested Terrains.” On the Pickton murders, see The Missing Women Commission of Inquiry (website), <http://missingwomen.library.uvic.ca/>; “NPPC and Maggie’s Toronto Statement on Missing Persons Review,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, April 10, 2021, <https://www.noprideinpolicing.ca/nppc/missing-persons/>; and Elle Ada Kur and Jenny Duffy, on behalf of Maggie’s Toronto Sex Workers, “Sex Worker Justice – By Us, For Us, Toronto Sex Workers Resisting Carceral Violence,” in Pasternak, Walby, and Stadyk, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*, 98–112.

- 185 Emily van der Meulen and Elya M. Durisin, “Sex Work Policy: Tracing Historical and Contemporary Developments,” in Van der Meulen, Durisin, and Bruckert, *Red Light Labour*, 34–38.
- 186 Valerie Scott, “Valerie Scott of CORP on Empowering Prostitutes: Whores Fight Back!,” *Rites*, May 1986, 8–9, 19. Also see interview with Valerie Scott and Ryan Hotchkiss, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/toronto-interviews/#Scott>.
- 187 In Vancouver, the police themselves drove sex workers onto the streets even before the famous Hutt decision in 1978 said that street soliciting had to be “pressing and persistent” before the police could lay charges.
- 188 See Ross and Sullivan, “Tracing Historical Lines of Horizontal Hostility,” 604–21; Ross, “Whoreorganizers and Gay Activists,” 256–71.
- 189 *Canada (Attorney General) v. Bedford* (2013) 3 SCR 1101, <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/13389/index.do>.
- 190 See Van der Meulen and Durisin, “Sex Work Policy,” 36–38; and Naomi Sayers, “The (Un) Constitutionality of PCEPA,” in *Sex Work Activism in Canada: Speaking Out, Standing Up*, ed. Amy Lebovitch and Shawna Ferris (Winnipeg: ARP, 2019), 21–22.
- 191 See Sayers, “The (Un) Constitutionality of PCEPA,” 20–25.
- 192 See Sayers, “The (Un) Constitutionality of PCEPA,” 30.
- 193 See Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform, *Safety, Dignity, Equality: Recommendations for Sex Work Law Reform in Canada* (Canada: Sex Work Law Reform, March 2017), <http://sexworklawreform.com/recommendations/>; reprinted in Lebovitch and Ferris, *Sex Work Activism in Canada*, Appendix 5, 425.
- 194 See AnnaLee Lepp, “Collateral Damage: Anti-Trafficking Campaigns, Border Security, and Sex Worker Rights Struggles in Canada,” in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 222–49. Also see Butterfly: Asian and Migrant Sex Worker Network (website), <https://www.butterflysw.org/>. The Ontario government introduced new “anti-trafficking” legislation in 2021, largely focused on young sex workers, which will have a major impact on racialized young people, extending regulations and criminalization over their lives. See “NPPC Statement on Bill 251,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, April 7, 2021, <https://www.noprizeinpolicing.ca/nppc/bill-251/>.
- 195 Elene Lam and Chanelle Gallant, “Rights Not Rescue: Defending Migrant Sex Workers from Policing,” in Pasternak, Walby, and Stadnyk, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*, 118–30.
- 196 On one aspect of this, see *Migrants, Know Your Rights: Ontario’s Emergency COVID ID Requirement*, prepared by Butterfly: Asian and Migrant Sex Worker Support Network, International Human Rights Program, University of Toronto, Faculty of Law, *No One is Illegal and the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty* (International Human Rights Program: Toronto, 2020), <https://ihrp.law.utoronto.ca/news/new-digital-guide-migrants-know-your-rights-ontarios-emergency-covid-id-requirement>.
- 197 “NPPC Statement on Bill 251,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, April 7, 2021, <https://www.noprizeinpolicing.ca/nppc/bill-251/>. This also comes up in Chapter 12.
- 198 See Samantha Cole, “Pornhub Just Purged All Unverified Content From the Platform,” *VICE*, December 14, 2020, <https://www.vice.com/en/article/jgqjyy/pornhub-suspended-all-unverified-videos-content>.
- 199 Gary Kinsman and Jamie Magnusson, “Review of PCEPA: NPPC Submission to the House of Commons Committee on Justice and Human Rights,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, February 14, 2022, <https://www.noprizeinpolicing.ca/nppc/pcepa-review/>.
- 200 See the Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform, “Our Constitutional Challenge to PCEPA,” 2022, <https://sexworklawreform.com/our-constitutional-challenge-to-pcepa-2/>.

- 201 Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Reform, “Our Constitutional Challenge to PCEPA,” 2022, <https://sexworklawreform.com/our-constitutional-challenge-to-pcepa-2/>.
- 202 See <https://www.butterflysw.org/say-no-to-bill-224>. While some progress has been made in this campaign, this struggle continues.
- 203 George Smith, “The Ideology of ‘Fag,’” 309–35; Khayatt, “Compulsory Heterosexuality,” 149–63; and Rebecca Haskell and Brian Burtch, *Get That Freak: Homophobia and Transphobia in High Schools* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2010).
- 204 See Shawn S. Oakes, “Another Look at ‘The Ideology of Fag’: The Social Organization of High Schools and the Gay Student Experience” (fourth year honours essay, Laurentian University, Greater Sudbury, ON, April 2011).
- 205 John Sinopoli, “Thwarted Prom Plans, Catholic School Board Says No to Same-Sex Date,” *Xtra*, March 21, 2002; Sinopoli, “Prom Feeding Frenzy,” *Xtra*, April 3, 2002, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/prom-feeding-frenzy-45582>; and Glenn Wheeler, “Marc Hall’s Legal Jam,” *NOW* (Toronto), May 16, 2002, <https://nowtoronto.com/news/marc-halls-legal-jam>.
- 206 Charles McVety is the president of Canada Christian College and was president of Canada Family Action. For more on him, see McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 408–409, 418. The Ontario Conservative government of Doug Ford attempted to grant limited university accreditation to his right-wing college. Luckily, this failed.
- 207 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 418.
- 208 Rose, *Before the Parade*, 10.
- 209 See Jasbir Puar, “In the Wake of It Gets Better,” *The Guardian*, November 16, 2010, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/nov/16/wake-it-gets-better-campaign>.
- 210 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 443.
- 211 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 442.
- 212 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 444.
- 213 On some of this see Girard, “From Subversion to Liberation,” 1–27.
- 214 See Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 97–127.
- 215 Cynthia Wright, “Nationalism, Sexuality and the Politics of Anti-Citizenship,” in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 250–69. On the broader context of border regimes, racism and neoliberal capitalism, see Walia, *Border and Rule*.
- 216 Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 97–98.
- 217 See Murray, *Real Queer?*; Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 97–127; and Azar Masoumi, “‘Come Out and Be Free!’: Coming Out and the (International) Government of Sexualities Governing the Social,” in Brock, *Governing the Social in Neoliberal Times*, 283–98.
- 218 Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 97–127.
- 219 See “Safe Third Country,” Canadian Council on Refugees, updated February 22, 2021, <https://ccrweb.ca/en/safe-third-country>. Also see Amanda Coletta, “Canada’s Top Court Hears That US is Unsafe For Asylum Seekers,” *Washington Post*, October 6, 2022, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/10/06/canada-supreme-court-safe-third-country-agreement/>.
- 220 See Migrant Rights Network, “What is the STCA?,” March 26, 2023, <https://migrantrights.ca/what-is-the-stca/>. Unfortunately, a number of LGBT+ organizations accepted invitations to the state dinner for Biden, including Egale, the LGBT Purge Fund, the Dignity Initiative, and the Rainbow Railroad. This only legitimizes what the Trudeau and Biden administrations have done.
- 221 Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 118–21.

- 222 See the Migrant Rights Network (website), <https://migrantrights.ca/>. There is currently major organizing for status for all across the Canadian state.
- 223 Kathryn Trevenen and Alexa DeGagne, "Homonationalism at the Borders and in the Streets, Organizing Against Exclusion and Incorporation," in Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 102–103.
- 224 Trevenen and DeGagne, "Homonationalism at the Borders and in the Streets," 102–107.
- 225 Trevenen and DeGagne, "Homonationalism at the Borders and in the Streets," 103.
- 226 Trevenen and DeGagne, "Homonationalism at the Borders and in the Streets," 103–104.
- 227 Trevenen and DeGagne, "Homonationalism at the Borders and in the Streets," 105.
- 228 Trevenen and DeGagne, "Homonationalism at the Borders and in the Streets," 105–106.
- 229 See Kinsman, "Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities," 97–127.
- 230 See the Migrant Rights Network (website), <https://migrantrights.ca/>.
- 231 See "Indesirables," *Even the Dust, Anti-Police Publication* (Montreal); and Kinsman, "Stop the Crackdown on Consensual Queer Sex." Also see McCann, *Park Cruising*.
- 232 On the racist character of these murders, see David K. Seitz, "'Missing' Racialized Violence, Disturbing Continuities: Countertopographies of Violence in the Bruce McArthur Murders," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 459–82; and Jin Haritaworn, "On These Bones: The Queer Regenerations of the Toronto Gay Village Serial Killings," *TOPIA: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies* 40 (May 2019): 15–41.
- 233 On Alloura Wells, see Kur and Duffy, on behalf of Maggie's Toronto Sex Workers Action Project, "Sex Worker Justice – by Us, for Us, Toronto Sex Workers Resisting Carceral Violence," 98–112.
- 234 Also see Ling, *Missing from the Village*; and the Independent Civilian Review into Missing Persons Investigations (website), <https://www.missingpersonsreview.ca/>.
- 235 Edward Keenan, "What Is Chief Saunders Thinking, Adding Insult To Gay Community's Injury?," *Toronto Star*, February 27, 2018, <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/star-columnists/2018/02/27/chief-saunders-what-did-you-really-mean.html>.
- 236 Kinsman, "Contested Terrains."
- 237 "NPPC and Maggie's Toronto Statement on Missing Persons Review," NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, April 19, 2021, <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/nppc/missing-persons/>.
- 238 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 339.
- 239 See Kinsman and Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers*, 434. Also see Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile, with the assistance of Heidi Mcdonell and Treanor Mahood-Greer, "In the Interests of the State": *The Anti-Gay, Anti-Lesbian National Security Campaigns in Canada—A Research Report* (Sudbury: Laurentian University, 1998).
- 240 We Demand an Apology Network documents. The We Demand an Apology Network, "Submission On the Urgent Need for an Official State Apology and Redress For Those Affected by the Anti-Gay/Anti-Lesbian Purges In the Public Service and the Military," *LGBT Purge*, June 8, 2017, <http://lgbtpurge.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/We-Demand-An-Apology-Network.pdf>; and The We Demand an Apology Network, "Points Needed in an Apology," author's personal files.
- 241 See *The Fruit Machine*, dir. Sarah Fodey; and Kinsman, "Some Reflections on the Fruit Machine Documentary."
- 242 There were a series of campaigning articles by John Ibbitson, starting with "Everett Klippert's Story: The Long, Late Redemption of a Man Punished for Being Gay in the 1960s," *Globe and Mail*, February 27, 2016, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/everett-klipperts-story/article28927305/>. On Klippert, see Chapter 8. This call for a pardon

- (later reformulated as the expungement of convictions) was later expanded to also include addressing the purges of LGBT public servants and members of the military.
- 243 See LGBT Purge (website), <https://lgbtpurge.com/>.
- 244 Steven Maynard, "To Forgive and Forget? Homonationalism, Hegemony, and History in the Gay Apology," *Active History*, 2017, <http://activehistory.ca/papers/to-forgive-and-forget-homonationalism-hegemony-and-history-in-the-gay-apology/>; Ian Liujiia Tian, "Divine Queer Sorrow, Or Beyond Mythical Reparations," *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies* 46 (2023): 260–279; and Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*.
- 245 Egale, Legal Issues Committee, *Just Society Report: Grossly Indecent: Confronting the Legacy of State Sponsored Discrimination Against Canada's LGBTQ2SI Communities* (Toronto: Egale, 2016), <https://lgbtpurge.com/case-documents/>. I participated in making many comments on sections of a number of drafts of the *Just Society Report*. Most of my comments and suggestions were not incorporated or addressed.
- 246 On the *Just Society Report*, also see Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 543–66.
- 247 See Kinsman, "Not A Gift from Above," 76.
- 248 Egale, Legal Issues Committee, *Just Society Report*, 7.
- 249 See Kinsman, "Not A Gift from Above," 74–97; Gary Kinsman, "Anti-69 101," Anti-69 Conference Videos, Anti-69, uploaded May 22, 2019, <https://anti-69.ca/vids/#GaryKinsman>; and Tom Hooper, Gary Kinsman, and Karen Pearlston, "Frequently Asked Questions," Anti-69, <https://anti-69.ca/faq/>; and Anti-69 (website), <https://anti-69.ca/>.
- 250 Taylor, *How We Get Free*.
- 251 Taylor, *How We Get Free*. See among others, Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex," 139–67; Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins," 1241–99. Also see Bannerji, "Interview with Himani Bannerji," in Bhandar and Ziahad, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 107–108.
- 252 On struggle concepts, see Ebert, *Ludic Feminism and After*. Here Ebert is referring to concepts like exploitation which are crucial to our analysis and organizing as is intersectionality for Black feminists and others. At the same time Ebert's analysis is limited by the "red fundamentalist" perspective she takes up. See Gary Kinsman, "Fundamentalist Problems," *New Socialist*, July 1997, 20.
- 253 Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 543.
- 254 Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 548.
- 255 See Driskill, *Asegi Stories*; Kim TallBear, "Failed Settler Kinship, Truth and Reconciliation, and Science"; Kim Tallbear, "Making Love and Relations Beyond Settler Sex and Family"; Billy-Ray Belcourt, *This Wound Is a World* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019); Belcourt, *A History of My Brief Body* (Hamish Hamilton: Penguin Canada, 2020); and Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us*.
- 256 Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 563.
- 257 Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 549.
- 258 Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 556.
- 259 Also see Marcus McCann, *Park Cruising*; Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 552.
- 260 Egale, Legal Issues Committee, *Just Society Report*, qt. in Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 553.
- 261 See Kevin Edwards, "Canadian Banks and Economic Control in the Caribbean," *NACLA* (North American Congress on Latin America), March 15, 2012, <https://nacla.org/blog/2012/3/15/canadian-banks-and-economic-control-caribbean>.
- 262 Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 556; and see Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 263 Lenon, "'Making it Right,' Keeping it White," 557.

- 264 Lenon, “‘Making it Right,’ Keeping it White,” 564
- 265 Lenon, “‘Making it Right,’ Keeping it White,” 566.
- 266 Lenon, “‘Making it Right,’ Keeping it White,” 564
- 267 Lenon, “‘Making it Right,’ Keeping it White,” 562
- 268 Lenon, “‘Making it Right,’ Keeping it White,” 564.
- 269 See LGBT Purge Fund (@lgbt_fund), profile page, Twitter, https://twitter.com/lgbt_fund?lang=en.
- 270 John Ibbitson, “How Will LGBTQ Canadians Take Trudeau’s Apology? Eight Views on Canada’s Injustice,” *Globe and Mail*, November 24, 2017, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/lgbtq-canada-apology/article37071384/>.
- 271 Gary Kinsman, “Why I Could Not Sign the Contract and Confidentiality Agreements to Be On the Advisory Council For the Apology,” *Radical Noise*, September 17, 2017, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2017/09/27/why-i-could-not-sign-the-contract-and-confidentiality-agreements-to-be-on-the-advisory-council-for-an-apology/>.
- 272 The We Demand an Apology Network, “Points Needed in an Apology,” author’s personal files.
- 273 Lenon, “‘Making it Right,’ Keeping it White,” 545. Also see Tian, “Divine Queer Sorrow.”
- 274 The We Demand an Apology Network, “The We Demand an Apology Network Submission on the Urgent Need for an Official State Apology”; and The We Demand an Apology Network, “Points Needed in an Apology,” quoted in Gary Kinsman, “Remember This: A Brief Statement on Memorializing Resistance to the Canadian War on Queers,” *Radical Noise*, October 15, 2019, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/10/15/gary-kinsman-remember-this-a-brief-statement-on-memorializing-resistance-to-the-canadian-war-on-queers/>.
- 275 Justin Trudeau, “Remarks by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau to Apologize to LGBTQ2 Canadians,” Speeches, Prime Minister of Canada, November 28, 2017, <https://pm.gc.ca/en/news/speeches/2017/11/28/remarks-prime-minister-justin-trudeau-apologize-lgbtq2-canadians>.
- 276 Smith, “Homophobia and Homonationalism,” 78.
- 277 See Jim Bronskill, “718 Victims of Canadian Government’s Gay Purge Compensated in Settlement,” *Global News*, July 13, 2019, <https://globalnews.ca/news/5491739/gay-purge-victims-canada/>. The number is so small due to the fact that that many purged had already died, as well as the lack of mainstream media outreach by the Purge Fund.
- 278 Ross, Roy, and Satalic v. R (2017), T-370-17 (FC) (Final Settlement Agreement), 176, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Final-Settlement-Agreement.pdf>.
- 279 See “Historical Document Collection,” LGBT Purge Fund, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/projects/#historical-document-collection>.
- 280 See “The Ongoing Struggle to Access Historical Government Records,” LGBT Purge Fund, February 10, 2022, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/the-ongoing-struggle-to-access-historical-government-records/>.
- 281 See the LGBT Purge Fund, “Historical Document Agreement with the Federal Government,” January 24, 2023, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/historical-document-agreement/>.
- 282 See “Government,” Get Involved, Egale, <https://egale.ca/get-involved/#government-partners>.
- 283 For some of my concerns, see Gary Kinsman, “Remember This: A Brief Statement on Memorializing Resistance to the Canadian War on Queers,” Briefing Documents, LGBT Purge Fund, 2019, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Monument-Briefing-Documents-EN-Gary-Kinsman.pdf>; and Canadian Heritage, “LGBTQ2+ National Monument / Monument national LGBTQ2+,” March 24, 2022, YouTube video, 34:23, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=noD6GqGr8nc>.

- 284 Canadian Heritage, “LGBTQ2+ National Monument / Monument national LGBTQ2+,” March 24, 2022, YouTube video, 34:23, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=noD6GqGr8nc>.
- 285 I also know from personal experience and that of others that lesbian and gay historians who have done work for the museum have not always been treated well and sometimes have had their projects dramatically changed by the Museum. See El Chenier, “Queering Monuments at SFU, Intro to Public History, Part One,” streamed September 17, 2020, YouTube video, 12:59, <https://youtu.be/EVr9Wc1oVky>.
- 286 “Advisory Council Announced for CMHR Exhibition on the LGBT Purge,” LGBT Purge Fund, October 5, 2021, <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/advisory-council-announced-for-cmhr-exhibition-on-the-lgbt-purge/>
- 287 See Anti-69 (website), “Funding 1969,” <https://anti-69.ca/funding/>.
- 288 Organizing within the “sector” of state-funded LGBT+ social service agencies has been more critical of the federal government, largely on funding grounds. In 2023, this generated the emergence of Momentum, whose President is Fae Johnstone, a trans woman. Momentum has called for federal state action, especially in response to the rise of the anti-trans/anti-drag/anti-queer right-wing. Unfortunately, in practice, these calls to action were focused on policing and criminalizing legislation and, combined with Fierté Canada Pride’s calls for more police and private security for Pride celebrations in 2023, led to more problems created by police at Pride events in several locations. At the Toronto Trans March, which I attended, the police presence forced Indigenous drummers to leave, with the police doing drone surveillance of the march and taking videos and photos of participants. On Momentum Canada, see www.momentumcanada.net (website). On the federal funding for policing and private security, see www.fiertecanadapride.org/blog/fierte-canada-pride-receives-15-million-in-federal-funding-to-support-pride-festivals-responding-to-rising-anti-2slgbtqia-hate.
- 289 Patrizia Gentile, Tom Hooper, Gary Kinsman, and Steven Maynard, “Bill C-66: Historians Speak Out,” *Active History*, December 12, 2017, <http://activehistory.ca/2017/12/c66/>. Also see Smith, “Homophobia and Homonationalism,” 65–84.
- 290 See Tom Hooper, “Queering ’69: Mythologies and Heritage Grants to Egale and Pride Toronto,” uploaded by HIST1086, Between Postwar and Present Day Conference, May 7, 2021, YouTube Video, 18:36, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zDRuTGN2-Wo>.
- 291 Gary Kinsman, “Bill C-65: A Continuing Flaw in the Apology to the LGBTQ2S+ Communities That Must Be Fixed,” *Radical Noise*, September 21, 2018, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/09/21/bill-c-75-a-continuing-flaw-in-the-apology-to-the-lgbtq2s-communities-that-must-be-fixed/>. Also see Smith, “Homophobia and Homonationalism,” 65–84.
- 292 Tom Hooper, “Bill C-75: Historian Tom Hooper calls for repeal of the Bawdy House Law Before the Justice Committee,” uploaded by HIST1086, November 15, 2018, YouTube video, 5:43, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VRysTWKKqEM>.
- 293 See the Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform, “Media Statement: Amendments to the Expungement Act: Liberals Once Again Pay Lip Service to Equality,” March 8, 2023, <http://sexworklawreform.com/media-statement-amendments-to-the-expungement-act-liberals-once-again-pay-lip-service-to-equality/>; and Steven Maynard, Gary Kinsman, Patrizia Gentile, and Tom Hooper, “Sex Workers Are Left Out in the Cold By Ottawa’s Unjust Conviction Amendments,” *The Conversation*, March 20, 2023, <https://theconversation.com/sex-workers-are-left-out-in-the-cold-by-ottawas-unjust-conviction-amendments-201810>.
- 294 Steven Maynard, personal communication with author. Also thanks to Tom Hooper. See Maynard, Kinsman, Gentile, and Hooper, “Sex Workers Are Left Out in the Cold by Ottawa’s Unjust Conviction Amendments.”

- 295 Tom Hooper, personal communication with the author. Also see Charlie Pinkerton, “Law to Wipe LGBT Criminal Records Has Deleted Just Nine Crimes,” *iPolitics*, March 24, 2021, <https://ipolitics.ca/2021/03/24/law-to-wipe-lgbt-criminal-records-has-deleted-just-nine-crimes/>. See also Maynard, Kinsman, Gentile, and Hooper, “Sex Workers Are Left Out in the Cold By Ottawa’s Unjust Conviction Amendments.”
- 296 See Kevin Allen, “Everett Klippert Coda,” *Calgary Gay History*, March 11, 2021, <https://calgarygayhistory.ca/2021/03/11/everett-klippert-coda/>.
- 297 See Steven Maynard, “Pride and Prejudice: With Only 9 LGBTQ Criminal Record Expungements, What’s to Celebrate?,” *The Conversation*, June 17, 2021, <http://theconversation.com/pride-and-prejudice-with-only-9-lgbtq-criminal-record-expungements-whats-to-celebrate-161308>.
- 298 See interviews with Janet Conners and Mary Gagnon, Nova Scotia Interviews, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/nova-scotia-interviews/>.
- 299 Dryden, “It Is in Us to Give,” 212.
- 300 Dryden, “It Is in Us to Give,” 212–13. Also see OmniSoore Dryden, “Why Anti-Black Racism in Canadian Blood Donation is Also a Gay Issue,” *Xtra*, February 5, 2020, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/blood-donation-anti-black-racism-gay-canada-166900>.
- 301 Dryden, “It Is in Us to Give,” 218.
- 302 Dryden, “It Is in Us to Give,” 221.
- 303 Dryden, “A Queer Too Far,” 119.
- 304 Dryden, “A Queer Too Far,” 120.
- 305 Gary Kinsman, “Linking Past and Present to Understand and Uproot Anti-Black Homophobia at Canadian Blood Services” (unpublished deputation, June 18, 2021).
- 306 See All Blood is Equal (website), <https://allbloodisequal.ca/>; and Bad Blood (website), <https://www.badbloodproject.com/>. In 2016, Christopher Karas launched a human rights challenge to the policy excluding men who have sex with men from donating blood. On this human rights challenge, see Rachel Aiello, “Feds Lose Attempt to Block Human Rights Inquiry into Blood Ban,” *CTVNews*, June 11, 2021, sec. Politics, <https://www.ctvnews.ca/politics/feds-lose-attempt-to-block-human-rights-inquiry-into-blood-ban-1.5466797>. See *Karas v. Canadian Blood Services and Health Canada*, 2020 CHRT 12 (CanLII), <https://canlii.ca/t/j8cwq>; *Canada (Attorney General) v. Karas*, 2021 FC 594 (CanLII), <https://canlii.ca/t/jgdcb>. And it is not just about blood bans—there are also prohibitions against donations of tissues and organs if the donor has had sex with men. See Camille Bains (Canadian Press), “Nova Scotia Mom Wants Policy Change for Organ, Tissue Donors After Gay Son’s Death,” *CTV News (Atlantic)*, May 2, 2023, <https://atlantic.ctvnews.ca/nova-scotia-mom-wants-policy-change-for-organ-tissue-donors-after-gay-son-s-death-1.6376823>.
- Also see Kevin Hurrant, “‘Robbed of the legacy he wanted to leave.’ A Gay Man’s Family Fights for the Right to Donate Organs and Tissues,” *Xtra*, August 23, 2023, <https://xtramagazine.com/health/tissue-organ-donation-gay-men-255923>.
- 307 See “ABCs of Eligibility to Donating Blood, Platelets, and Plasma,” Plasma, Canadian Blood Services, <https://www.blood.ca/en/blood/am-i-eligible/abcs-eligibility>.
- 308 See Jacques Gallant, “Proposal to Lift Gay Blood Ban Submitted to Health Canada,” *Toronto Star*, December 15, 2021, sec. Federal Politics, <https://www.thestar.com/politics/federal/2021/12/15/proposal-to-lift-gay-blood-ban-submitted-to-health-canada.html>.
- 309 Jacques Gallant, “Canada’s New Blood Donor Policy Still Excludes Many Gay and Bisexual Men, Critics Say,” *Toronto Star*, May 6, 2022, sec. Federal Politics, <https://www.thestar.com/politics/federal/2022/05/06/canadas-new-blood-donor-policy-still-stigmatizes>

- people-with-hiv-critics-say.html. Also see Emma Prestwich, “Canadian Blood Services’ Policy Change Still Stigmatizes Queer Community, Says HIV/AIDS Advocate,” *Broadview Magazine*, May 6, 2022, <https://broadview.org/canadian-blood-services-blood-ban/>. Thanks to Christopher Karas for his clarifications on what is going on with this shift in blood policies. Also see No Pride in Policing Coalition with OmiSoore Dryden, Christopher Karas, and Gary Kinsman, “When is ending a blood ban not ending a blood ban?,” Facebook, June 11, 2022, <https://www.facebook.com/events/738274247317912/?ref=newsfeed>.
- 310 See Egale Canada (@egalecanada), “A major step in the right direction toward equality with Health Canada’s announcement of ending its discriminatory blood ban. Everyone should have the ability to donate blood regardless of their gender or sexual orientation,” Twitter post, April 29, 2022, <https://twitter.com/egalecanada/status/1520104857469923239>.
- 311 See Mike Albanese, “Health Coalitions Share Ethical Concerns with For-Profit Deal by Canadian Blood Services,” *City News Vancouver*, September 20, 2022, <https://vancouver.citynews.ca/2022/09/20/ethical-concerns-plasma-canadian-blood-services/>.
- 312 Amy Sequenzia, “Autistic Conversion Therapy—Autistic Women & Nonbinary Network (AWN),” *Autistic Women and Nonbinary Network (AWN)* (blog), April 27, 2016, <https://awn.network.org/autistic-conversion-therapy/>.
- 313 Thanks to engaging conversations with Ander Negrazis for making me aware of this. See Alex Kronstein, “Treating Autism as a Problem: The Connection Between Gay Conversion Therapy and ABA,” *Nova Scotia Advocate*, July 11, 2018, <https://nsadvocate.org/2018/07/11/treating-autism-as-a-problem-the-connection-between-gay-conversion-therapy-and-aba/>; and Alex Kronstein, “Alex Kronstein: More Fruit of the Poisonous Tree—‘Treating’ Autism and the so-Called Kinder, Gentler ABA,” *Nova Scotia Advocate*, July 23, 2018, <https://nsadvocate.org/2018/07/23/alex-kronstein-more-fruit-of-the-poisonous-tree-treating-autism-and-the-so-called-kinder-gentler-aba/>.
- 314 Cassandra Kislenco, “Why the ‘Treatment’ of Autism Is a Form of Conversion Therapy,” *Xtra*, April 20, 2022, <https://xtramagazine.com/health/autism-conversion-therapy-221581>.
- 315 Rose, *Before the Parade*, 47.
- 316 See Peter Gajdics, “Canada’s Failed Plot to End Conversion Therapy,” *Xtra*, September 2, 2020, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/canada-conversion-therapy-ban-bill-c-18-178588>.
- 317 On the rise of racist forms of nationalism directed against migrants and Black and other people of colour as a crucial part of this, see Walia, *Border and Rule*, esp. 169–211.
- 318 DeGagne, “‘Severely Queer’ in Western Canada,” 163–83.
- 319 Hadeel Ibrahim, “Clinic 554 and Abortion Access: Five Key Questions Answered,” *CBC News*, September 10, 2020, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/clinic-554-abortion-access-new-brunswick-election-1.5713098>.
- 320 See Nathalie Sturgeon, “‘Both Angry and Terrified’: LGBTQ2 Community Decries Higgs’ Comments,” *Global News*, May 17, 2023, <https://globalnews.ca/news/9706694/lgbtq2-community-decries-higgs-comments/>. Also see Natalie Stechyson, “As New Brunswick Changes its LGBTQ Policy in Schools, Advocates Worry it is Just the Beginning,” *CBC News*, June 28, 2023, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick-trans-lgbtq-higgs-1.6889957>. In September 2023, the anti-trans attacks directed at young people in schools have extended to conservative provincial governments in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario, and the policies adopted at the federal Conservative Party convention. See Rinaldo Walcott, “The Conservative Attack on Gay Life: Right-wing Forces Have Turned to Using Parental Rights to Obscure and Reinitiate the Fight against Queer and Trans Lives,” *Canadian Dimension*, September 7, 2023, <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/the-conservative-attack-on-gay-life>.

- 321 See Adriana Michell and Hannah Walters-Vida, “One Month Later,” *The Silhouette*, July 18, 2019, <https://www.thesil.ca/one-month-later>.
- 322 Scholar Strike Canada, “This Demands an Abolitionist Reckoning.”
- 323 Alessia Passafiume, “TDSB school marks International Day of Pink with Stonewall Riots Survivor while dozens of protestors rallied outside,” *The Toronto Star*, April 12, 2023, <https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2023/04/12/international-day-of-pink-celebration-planned-for-tdsb-students-with-stonewall-riots-survivor.html>.
- 324 See Smith, “Homophobia and Homonationalism,” 65–84.
- 325 Egale, Legal Issues Committee, *Just Society Report*, <https://lgbtpurge.com/case-documents/>.
- 326 Egale (website), “Our Partners,” <https://egale.ca/our-partners/>.
- 327 This includes not only mainstream currents like the New Democratic Party (NDP), but also more radical voices like Klein, in the *The Shock Doctrine*.
- 328 Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 2015.
- 329 Janoff, *Pink Blood*; and Meyer, *Violence Against Queer People*.
- 330 Khayatt, “Compulsory Heterosexuality,” 149–63; and Smith, “The Ideology of ‘Fag,’” 309–35.
- 331 See Smith, “Homophobia and Homonationalism,” 65–84.

CHAPTER TWELVE

- 1 As mentioned earlier, I am not able to integrate the impact of the Russian imperialist war against Ukraine here, or the “whiteness” of much of the mainstream LGBT+ response.
- 2 These official statistics reported in the Introduction to this edition do not include what are referred to as “COVID long-haulers,” many of whom are counted as “recovered” but who are suffering from long-term health and disability problems relating to COVID-19 infection. They are no longer infectious, and most do not require hospitalization, but they are still suffering long-term health consequences of COVID-19 infection. At the same time, they do not statistically exist and therefore find it difficult to have their health, treatment and social support needs recognized and addressed. See the website for the COVID Long Haulers Support Group Canada (website), <https://covidlonghaulcanada.com/>.
- 3 There is a general consensus on this along with debate on the particular forms this takes but see, among others, John Vidal, “Destruction of Habitat and Loss of Biodiversity Are Creating the Perfect Conditions for Diseases Like COVID-19 to Emerge,” *Ensis*, March 17, 2020, <https://ensia.com/features/covid-19-coronavirus-biodiversity-planetary-health-zoonoses/>. Also see Rob Wallace, “Competing with Nature: COVID-19 as a Capitalist Virus,” interview by Ashley Smith, *Spectre*, October 16, 2020, <https://spectrejournal.com/competing-with-nature/>.
- 4 See Egale Canada, African-Canadian Civic Engagement Council (ACCEC), INNOVATIVE, “Impact of COVID-19 on the LGBTQ12S Community—Second National Report,” Egale, <https://egale.ca/egale-in-action/covid19-impact2/?eType=EmailBlastContent&eId=c33c3283-0b13-43bd-ae53-acad87fc869e#FullReport>. This study largely relies on quantitative comparisons of LGBTQ12S people with more general surveys of the Canadian population, but it does point out that Black and racialized LGBTQ12S people are most affected.
- 5 Holloway, *We Are the Crisis of Capital*.
- 6 No Pride in Policing Coalition (NPPC), “Statement of Demands: Defund and Abolish All Police,” NPPC, <https://noprideinpolicing.ca/>. Punam Khosla and I developed the first draft of this statement for the NPPC.
- 7 NPPC, “Statement of Demands: Defund and Abolish All Police.”
- 8 NPPC, “Statement of Demands: Defund and Abolish All Police.”

- 9 NPPC, “Statement of Demands: Defund and Abolish All Police.”
- 10 See Kinsman, “Not a Gift from Above,” 74–97; Kinsman “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s,” 137–62; and Kinsman, “From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights,” 209–32.
- 11 See “Pride Toronto Board Decision to Train Police Recruits, Collaborate with the Police on ‘Harm Reduction’ Violates Decision of Pride Membership,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, January 17, 2022, <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/nppc/pride-policing/>. In 2023, this was extended, with Pride Toronto demanding and receiving more state funding to cover police and private security expenses, which led to intensified policing of the Trans March. See Benn Musset, “Pride Toronto No Longer Expected to Cut Programming Thanks to Emergency Federal Funding,” *Toronto Star*, June 5, 2023, https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/pride-toronto-no-longer-expected-to-cut-programming-thanks-to-emergency-federal-funding/article_a324did5-b075-57e3-89fc-7c52f5fae74.html.
- 12 See “Choosing Real Safety.”
- 13 See Beverly Bain and Gary Kinsman, “Context Notes: Abolitionist Pride, 2022,” No Pride in Policing Coalition, <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/statements/abolitionist-pride-2022/>. On “No More Shit! Abolitionist and anti-Fascist Pride Month” organizing in 2023 see: <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/>.
- 14 See We Can’t Police Our Way Out of the Pandemic (website), <https://www.wecantpolice.thepandemic.ca/>.
- 15 For critiques of the mobilization of “herd immunity” in the pandemic, see Haiven, “‘Herd Immunity’ Was Originally About Vaccination.” Also see Friedman, “Yih and Kulldorf’s ‘Radical’ Covid Strategy.”
- 16 The dominant public health strategy pursued by the federal and most provincial governments within Canadian state formation has been to oscillate between “flatten the curve” (which it must be remembered was not to prevent infection but was only to prevent hospitals from being overwhelmed) and “reopen the economy” which has led to the spread of death and infection and along with the emergence of “variants of concern” prepared the way for the current waves of infection. For a different approach, see Daniel Sarah Karasik, “Suppress the Virus Now!,” *Briarpatch*, November 8, 2020, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/suppress-the-virus-now>; and Suppress the Virus Now Coalition, “Suppress the Virus Now Coalition Statement,” *Briarpatch*, January 21, 2021, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/suppress-the-virus-now-coalition-statement>. Also see Daniel Sarah Karasik, “Uncontrollable,” *Briarpatch*, March 18, 2021, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/uncontainable>. This article provides excellent illustrations of mass and workplace struggles that have taken place during the pandemic but, in my view, underestimates the significance of the global uprising against anti-Black racism and the police. Also see Kinsman, “From Silence=Death! To Capitalism=Death!”
- 17 See Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, *Ecofeminism* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1993) Mies died in May 2023.
- 18 See Bannerji, *Thinking Through*; Bannerji, *Inventing Subjects: Studies in Hegemony, Patriarchy, and Colonialism* (London: Anthem Press, 2001); Bannerji, *Demography and Democracy: Essays on Nationalism, Gender, and Ideology* (Toronto: Canadian Scholar’s Press, 2011); Bannerji, *The Ideological Condition: Selected Essays on History, Race and Gender* (Boston: Brill, 2020); Drucker, *Warped*; Drucker, *Different Rainbows*; Massad, *Desiring Arabs*; McCaskell, *Queer Progress*; Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*; Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*—and I look forward to their forthcoming second edition of this powerful collection; Rao, “Global Homocapitalism”; Rao, *Out of Time*; Walia, *Border and Rule*.

- 19 See Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*; Phillip Pike, dir., *Our Dance of Revolution*, documentary, 102 min. (Roaring River Films, 2019); Debbie Douglas, “That Collective House on Dewson Street,” in Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*; Makeda Silvera, “From St. Helens Avenue to Dewson Street,” in *Any Other Way*, 178–80; Sharon Fernandez, “Desh Pardesh: A Cultural Festival With Attitude,” in *Any Other Way*, 261–64; OmiSoore H. Dryden, “Ma-Ka Juk Yuh: A Genealogy of Black Queer Liveability in Toronto,” in Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Queering Urban Justice*, 62–83; Jinthana Haritaworn, “It Was a Heterotopia: Four Decades of Queer of Colour Art and Activism in Toronto, Interview with Richard Fung,” in *Marvellous Grounds*, 35–45; and Alan Li, “Power in Community, Queer Asian Activism from the 1980s to the 2000s,” in *Marvellous Grounds*, 47–60. On the Black Women’s Collective, see Belinda Deneen Wallace, “Our Lives: Scribal Activism, Intimacy, and Black Lesbian Visibility in 1980s Canada,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2–3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 334–59; and Christopher G. Smith, “‘Where u From, Who u Wit?!’ Black Pride Festivals as Itinerant Hospitality,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2–3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 395–414. On Black presence in Pride Toronto, see R. Cassandra Lord, “We Have Always Been Here: Pelau MasQUEERade Disturbing Toronto Pride History,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2–3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 360–94.
- 20 See AIDS Activist History Project, interviews with Douglas Stewart, Dionne Falconer, Anthony Mohamed, and Kim Bernard, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/>.
- 21 Bain, “Fire, Passion, and Politics,” 88. I have learned a great deal from the ongoing recovery of Black feminist and queer histories in Toronto by Beverly Bain. See Khaleel Grant, “Organizing for Abolition in Toronto: A Conversation with Dr. Beverly Bain,” *Active History*, July 14, 2021, <https://activehistory.ca/2021/07/organizing-for-abolition-in-toronto-a-conversation-with-dr-beverly-bain/>.
- 22 See interview with Nicole Tanguay, AIDS Activist History Project, Toronto Interviews, May 19, 2018, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/toronto-interviews/#Tanguay>. Also see the important work of Toronto Indigenous Harm Reduction (TIHR), <https://ohrn.org/resources/toronto-indigenous-harm-reduction-tihr/>.
- 23 Mathieu Brûlé, “‘Seducing the Unions’: Organized Labour and Strategies for Gay Liberation in Toronto in the 1970s,” in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 55–58.
- 24 Some of this is recounted in Prabha Khosla, “Labour Pride: What Our Unions Have Done for Us?” (Toronto: World Pride Committee of the Toronto and York Region Labour Council, June 2014).
- 25 Khosla, “Labour Pride,” 20.
- 26 For more information, see Bérubé, “No Red-Baiting! No Race-Baiting! No Queen-Baiting!”
- 27 On Mary Ross, see Kinsman, “A Contribution to the History of the First Sudbury Pride March in 1997.”
- 28 Gary Kinsman, “Remembering and Resistance: The Transformation of Pride Toronto, 1981–2017” (LGBTTIQA2S Lives: Our Struggles, Our Victories, Our Challenges conference, Montreal, 2017).
- 29 See Dan Irving, “Contested Terrains of a Barely Scratched Surface, Exploring the Formation of Alliances between Trans Activists, and Labour, Feminists, and Gay and Lesbian Organizing” (PhD diss., Toronto: York University, 2005); and Trish Salah, “Reflections on Trans Organizing, Trade Unionism and Radical Communities,” in Irving and Raj, *Trans Activism in Canada*, 149.
- 30 Some of this is recorded in Irving and Raj, *Trans Activism in Canada*. Also see Stryker, *Transgender History*; Mattilda Bernstein Sycamore, ed., *Nobody Passes: Rejecting the*

- Rules of Gender Conformity* (Emeryville, CA: Seal Press, 2006); Nestle, Howell, and Wilchins, *GenderQueer*; and Smith and Stanley, *Captive Genders*.
- 31 See Dan Irving, “Normalized Transgressions: Legitimizing the Transsexual Body as Productive,” *Radical History Review* 100 (January 1, 2008): 38–59; and Gary Kinsman, “Trans Politics and Anti-Capitalism: An Interview with Dan Irving,” *Upping the Anti* 4 (October 26, 2009), <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/04-trans-politics-and-anti-capitalism>.
- 32 Viviane K. Namaste, “Changes of Name and Sex for Transsexuals in Quebec: Understanding the Arbitrary Nature of Institutions,” in *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*, ed. Caelie Frampton (Halifax: Fernwood, 2006), 160–67.
- 33 See Cheri DiNovo, *The Queer Evangelist: A Socialist Clergy’s Radically Honest Tale* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2021).
- 34 River Rossi, “Disability, Politics, and Collectively Reimagining Justice: Challenging the Ableist Contours of the 1969 Canadian Criminal Code Reform,” in Fritsch, Monaghan, and van der Meulen, *Disability Injustic*, 252–53.
- 35 See Spade, *Normal Life*.
- 36 See Smith and Stanley, *Captive Genders*.
- 37 Bobby Noble, “Trans-ing the Canadian Passport: On the Biopolitical Storying of Race, Gender and Borders,” in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 270–84. On radical trans approaches also see Gleeson and O’Rourke, *Transgender Marxism* (London Pluto Press, 2021).
- 38 Andrew Nguyen, “15,000 People Marched in Brooklyn for Black Trans Lives,” *The Cut*, June 15, 2020, <https://www.thecut.com/2020/06/fifteen-thousand-marched-in-brooklyn-for-black-trans-lives.html>.
- 39 Anti-trans women are increasingly working with right-wing social forces. See Samantha Schmidt, “Conservatives Find Unlikely Ally in Fighting Transgender Rights: Radical Feminists,” *Washington Post*, February 7, 2020, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2020/02/07/radical-feminists-conservatives-transgender-rights/>.
- 40 Jude Ellison S. Doyle, “How the Far-Right Is Turning Feminists into Fascists,” *Xtra*, April 1, 2022, <https://xtramagazine.com/power/far-right-feminist-fascist-220810>.
- 41 Doyle, “How the Far-Right Is Turning Feminists into Fascists”; Kat S., “The TERFs to Dissident Right Pipeline,” *Radix*, August 21, 2020, <https://archive.ph/DaiiO>.
- 42 Among others, see Judith Butler, “Judith Butler on the Culture Wars, JK Rowling, and Living in ‘Anti-Intellectual Times,’” interview by Alana Ferber, *New Statesman*, September 22, 2020, <https://www.newstatesman.com/international/2020/09/judith-butler-culture-wars-jk-rowling-and-living-anti-intellectual-times>.
- 43 Chase, “Hermaphrodites with Attitude,” 172–87.
- 44 Kessler, *Lessons from the Intersexed*.
- 45 Egale Canada, “Egale’s Submission to the UN Committee Against Torture (UN CAT) for Intersex Rights,” *Egale*, October 18, 2018, <https://egale.ca/egale-submission-to-the-un-committee-against-torture/>; Morgan Holmes, *Intersex: A Perilous Difference* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 2008); Holmes, ed., *Critical Intersex* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
- 46 Kessler, *Learning from the Intersexed*.
- 47 See Lepp, “Collateral Damage,” 222–49; and Butterfly: Asian and Migrant Sex Workers Network (website), <https://www.butterflysw.org/>; John Lowman, “Geography, Crime and Social Control” (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1983), esp. chap. 8, “Proactive Law Enforcement and Displacement: The Problem of Street Prostitution in Vancouver, 1975–1979.” Also see Lowman, “You Can Do It, But Don’t Do It Here: Some Comments

- on Proposals for the Reform of Canadian Prostitution Law,” in Lowman et al., *Regulating Sex*, 193–213. In Toronto, the “clean up Yonge Street campaign” had a similar impact and also drove women working in sex work onto the streets. With the late 1970s and early 1980s came the recession and more sex workers on the streets. See Brock, *Making Work, Making Trouble*; and Buckert, Durisin, and van der Meulen, *Red Light Labour*.
- 48 Many of these battles were long and heated. One of the major confrontations was over the Kimberly Nixon legal case. Nixon, as a trans woman, was prevented from being a volunteer with Vancouver Rape Relief. She challenged this through a human rights complaint and a series of legal challenges that were mostly unsuccessful. In 2007, the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed Nixon’s request to appeal a lower court ruling against her. Despite her lack of personal legal success, this struggle established a firm basis among many feminists, including those working against violence against women, that trans women must be able to participate in rape crisis centres and sexual assault crisis centres.
- 49 Harsha Walia, “Slutwalk: To March or Not to March,” *Rabble.ca*, May 18, 2011, <https://rabble.ca/news/2011/05/slutwalk-march-or-not-march>. Also see the film *Slut Nation: Anatomy of a Protest*, directed by Wendy Coburn (Toronto: V-Tape, 2014), video, 36:29 min. Coburn died in 2015.
- 50 See Mariame Kaba and Shira Hassan, interviewed by Sarah Jaffe, “From ‘Me Too’ to ‘All of Us’: Organizing to End Sexual Violence Without Prisons,” in Kaba, *We Do This ‘Til We Free Us*, 41–48.
- 51 See Brenda Cossman, *The New Sex Wars: Sexual Harm in the #MeToo Era* (New York: NYU Press, 2021).
- 52 See Chris Francescani, “The Rise and Fall of Kevin Spacey: A Timeline of Sexual Abuse Allegations,” *ABC News*, June 3, 2019, <https://abcnews.go.com/US/rise-fall-kevin-spacey-timeline-sexual-assault-allegations/story?id=63420983>.
- 53 On this, see the perceptive article, Peter Drucker, “#MeToo and Queer Experience,” *Salvage*, May 3, 2020, <https://salvage.zone/articles/metoo-and-queer-experience/>. For instance, mainstream forces within the Democratic Party in the United States of America in 2020 mobilized some of the dynamics coming out of the #MeToo campaigns against more progressive gay Democratic Party candidate Alex Morse, who engaged in consensual acts with men 18 and over, none of whom were students of his. They associated consensual queer sex with “harassment” and “abuse.” They used these accusations to damage his campaign. While this was actively resisted, he was still defeated in the nomination fight. Kevin Henderson and Joseph J. Fischel, “Four Ways to Escape a Sex Panic,” *Boston Review*, August 25, 2020, <http://bostonreview.net/gender-sexuality/kevin-henderson-joseph-j-fischel-four-ways-escape-sex-panic>.
- 54 Drucker, “#MeToo and Queer Experience.”
- 55 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 431. Also see Robyn Letson, “Coming Out? Against Apartheid: A Roundtable About Queer Solidarity and Palestine,” *Upping the Anti* 13 (March 2012): 137–51, <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/13-coming-out-against-apartheid>. Also see Christopher Samuel, *Confirm, Fail, Repeat: How Power Distorts Collective Activism* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2017), 3–4, 69–70.
- 56 Yves Engler, “Toronto’s Jewish Defence League is a Far Right Group with Powerful Friends,” *Rabble.ca*, April 5, 2017, <https://rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/yves-englers-blog/2017/04/toronto-jewish-defence-league-far-right-group-powerful>. Also see Michael Kaminer, “JDL Compares Gay People to Nazis,” *Forward*, April 15, 2011, <https://forward.com/schmooze/137077/jdl-compares-gay-people-to-nazis/>.
- 57 See Omar Barghouti, *BDS: Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions: The Global Struggle for Palestinian Rights* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2011).

- 58 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 406–407, 421–27, 432–37, 451–52. Also see Yasmeeen Abu-Laban and Abigail B. Baken, *Israel, Palestine and the Politics of Race: Exploring Identity and Power in a Global Context* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2020), 175–203.
- 59 See Barghouti, *BDS: Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions*. Pinkwashing can be seen as the social practices that construct a state as pro-queer to hide its oppressive actions.
- 60 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 422.
- 61 See “Open Letter to Pride Toronto from Founders of Pride in 1981,” *Queers Against Israeli Apartheid* (QUAIA), May 27, 2010, <https://queersagainstapartheid.org/2010/05/27/open-letter-to-pride-toronto-from-founders-of-pride-in-1981/>.
- 62 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 432. This was repeated outside the TD Bank at Queen and Bay as part of the Abolitionist Pride March in 2022.
- 63 See Kinsman, “Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neoliberal Queer Review Essays, #2.” Also see Kinsman, “Interview with Gary Kinsman,” in Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 134.
- 64 The Dignity Initiative is a network of Canadian organizations interested in human rights for LGBTI people globally. See Dignity Network/Réseau Dignité (website), <http://www.dignityinitiative.ca/en/>.
- 65 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 421–22.
- 66 Gentile and Kinsman, “National Security and Homonationalism,” 133–49.
- 67 In July 2014, the Israeli military launched a major offensive against people in Gaza. More than 2,200 people were killed and more than 11,000 wounded. See Hanaa Hasan, “Remembering the 2014 Israeli Offensive Against Gaza,” *Middle East Monitor*, July 8, 2018, <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20180708-remembering-the-2014-israeli-offensive-against-gaza/>.
- 68 See Gary Kinsman, “Letter of Complaint to the Halifax Pride Committee Regarding Booth Promoting Tourism to Tel Aviv,” *Radical Noise*, July 25, 2014, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2014/07/27/letter-of-complaint-to-the-halifax-pride-committee-regarding-booth-promoting-tourism-to-tel-aviv/>.
- 69 See El Jones, “The Coup at the Pride Meeting,” *Halifax Examiner*, October 6, 2016, <https://www.halifaxexaminer.ca/featured/the-coup-at-the-pride-meeting/>.
- 70 See Natalie Kouri-Towe, “Textured Activism: Affect Theory and Transformational Politics in Transnational Queer Palestine-Solidarity Activism,” in “Intimacies/Affect and Transgressing Borders/Boundaries: Gendering Space and Place,” special issue, *Atlantis* 37, no. 1 (2015): 23–34; and Letson, “Coming Out? Against Apartheid,” 137–51. Also see Abu Hatoum and Moussa, “Becoming Through Others,” 169–86.
- 71 On homonationalism, see Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*; Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*; and Gentile and Kinsman, “National Security and Homonationalism,” 133–49.
- 72 QUAIA (website), <https://queersagainstapartheid.org/>.
- 73 See David Moscrop, “A Toronto Educator Is Being Attacked for Standing up for Palestinians,” *Washington Post*, June 1, 2021, sec. Opinion, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2021/06/01/canada-israel-tdsb-javier-davila-cancel-culture-education-moscrop/>.
- 74 Desmond Cole, “Under Investigation: Anti-Palestinian Racism at the Toronto District School Board,” *Yes, Everything!* (blog), July 10, 2021, <https://www.yeseverything.ca/blog/under-investigation-anti-palestinian-racism-at-the-toronto-district-school-board>.
- 75 Javier Davila has pointed out that one of the board members (the treasurer) of the auditing firm Crowe Soberman is on the board of the Jewish National Fund in Toronto. The Jewish National Fund engages in a series of discriminatory practices against Palestinians

- including support for dispossession of Palestinians from their land. The firm also sponsors many anti-Palestinian/pro-Israeli apartheid fund-raising events. Personal communication from Javier Davila, September 2022. In 2023, the Abolitionist and anti-fascist Pride march supported the Palestinian struggle and the BDS campaign. In response, B'nai Brith and other pro-Israeli apartheid groups challenged NDP MPP Sarah Jama, who attended the event and the No Pride in Policing Coalition, for not only opposing the police but also for being “antisemitic,” when this is not at all the case. See the right-wing article by John Best, “Hamilton Police Association, Ontario Solicitor General, Weigh in on MPP Sarah Jama’s Backing of Extreme Anti-Police, Anti-Israel Group,” *Bay Observer*, July 15, 2023, <https://bay-observer.ca/mpp-sarah-jama-backs-extreme-anti-police-anti-israel-group/>.
- 76 See Makeda Silvera, “Proud Life: Sherona Hall, April 25, 1948–Dec 30, 2006,” *Xtra*, February 14, 2007, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/proud-life-sherona-hall-19633>.
- 77 I am very glad that, in different ways, Beverly Bain and Kiké Roach are uncovering and remembering these histories of struggle that involved Black activists, including Black queer and feminist activists.
- 78 See Ruth Nortey, “A History of Toronto Activism against Anti-Blackness,” in Pasternak, Walby, and Stadnyk, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*, 19–27.
- 79 Taylor, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation*.
- 80 See Sandy Hudson and Rodney Diverlus, “The Origin Story of Black Lives Matter Canada,” in Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 3–16. Also see Cole, *The Skin We’re In*.
- 81 See Nick Green, *Body Politic* (Toronto: Playwrights Canada Press, 2019). The play ran in May/June of 2016 at Buddies in Bad Times.
- 82 See Churchill, “Personal Ad Politics,” 114–34; and McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 218–21.
- 83 Sumaya Dalmar was a young Somali trans woman who was killed in Toronto in February 2015. See Nadijah Robinson with Amalia M. Duncan-Rapheal, “The Mourning Dress: Creating Spaces of Healing for Black Freedom,” in Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*, 213. On Monica Forester, a long-time trans and sex worker activist, see Monica Forester and Chantalle Gallnat, “Organizing on the Corner: Trans Women of Colour and Sex Worker Activism in Toronto in the 1980s and 1990s,” interview by Syrus Marcus Ware, in *Marvellous Grounds*, 23–33.
- 84 Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, “Marvellous Grounds, An Introduction,” 1–2, in *Marvellous Grounds*.
- 85 Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, introduction to *We Still Demand!*, 22–23n22; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, “Marvellous Grounds, An Introduction,” 1–2.
- 86 Tim McCaskell, “Why One Gay Activist Isn’t Happy with Toronto Police’s Apology,” *Xtra*, June 28, 2016, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/why-one-gay-activist-isnt-happy-with-toronto-polices-apology-71381>.
- 87 McCaskell, “Why One Gay Activist Isn’t Happy with Toronto Police’s Apology.”
- 88 Also see Jade Crimson Rosa Da Costa, “Pride Parades in Queer Times: Disrupting Time, Norms, and Nationhood in Canada,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 434–58. Also see Christopher Samuel, *Confirm, Fail, Repeat: How Power Distorts Collective Activism* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2017), 4, 69–70, 75, 176–82.
- 89 Public Safety Canada, “Government of Canada Working with Pride Toronto to Improve Safety of LGBTQ2 Communities,” News Release, Government of Canada, November 24, 2018, <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-safety-canada/news/2018/11/government-of-canada-working-with-pride-toronto-to-improve-safety-of-lgbtq2-communities.html>. Also see Hooper, “Tom Hooper’s Complaint to the Pride Toronto Board”; Hooper, “\$1,850,000 Misdirection of Funds and Settler Colonialism.”

- 90 See “Pride Toronto Board Decision to Train Police Recruits, Collaborate with the Police on ‘Harm Reduction’ Violates Decision of Pride Membership,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, January 17, 2022, <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/nppc/pride-policing/>.
- 91 Yusra Khogali, “From Sudan to ‘Sijui’ and All Black Lives In-BE-Tween” (master’s thesis, Toronto: Social Justice Education Department, OISE, University of Toronto, 2018); and also see Kinsman, “Forgetting National Security in ‘Canada,’” 135–36.
- 92 Jayda Hope, “Looking for Change after Black Lives Matter,” *Briarpatch*, March 3, 2022, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/looking-for-change-after-black-lives-matter>. See Black Lives Matter Sudbury (website), <https://blmsudbury.ca/>.
- 93 Khogali, “From Sudan to ‘Sijui’ and All Black Lives In-BE-Tween.”
- 94 See “BLM Wildseed Funding,” NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, July 16, 2021, <https://www.noprideonpolicing.ca/nppc/blm-wildseed/>.
- 95 Sahra (@bolshkevikkaddie), “Joint Statement with @SarahJama_ about Why We Left @BLM_TO,” Twitter post, January 19, 2022, <https://twitter.com/bolshkevikkaddie/status/1483852015948156931>.
- 96 See “Funding 1969,” Anti-69, <https://anti-69.ca/funding/>; and Hooper, “\$1,850,000 Misdirection of Funds and Settler Colonialism.”
- 97 See Anti-69 (website), <https://anti-69.ca/>.
- 98 See Abram Lutes, “‘Band by Band’: Russel Diabo on Efforts to ‘Terminate’ Indigenous Rights,” *NB Media Co-op*, July 26, 2019, <https://nbmediacoop.org/2019/07/26/band-by-band-russell-diabo-on-efforts-to-terminate-indigenous-rights/>.
- 99 See Kinsman, “Some Critical Reflections on Watching Sex, *Sin and 69*.”
- 100 There are two versions of this article. The longer one is published as Cossman, “The 1969 Criminal Amendments,” 245–62. The shorter one, which is slightly modified, is Cossman, “Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories.” Also see my critique: Kinsman, “Critical Reflections on Brenda Cossman’s ‘Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories.’”
- 101 Cossman, “The 1969 Criminal Amendments,” 246.
- 102 Cossman, “The 1969 Criminal Amendments,” 247.
- 103 Cossman, “The 1969 Criminal Amendments.”
- 104 Also see the work of Tom Hooper including “Enough Is Enough.”
- 105 Kinsman, “Critical Reflections on Brenda Cossman’s ‘Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories.’”
- 106 See Walia, *Border and Rule*; and Sharma, *Home Rule*.
- 107 Massad, *Desiring Arabs*; Drucker, *Different Rainbows*; and Drucker, *Warped*.
- 108 See Kinsman, “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities,” 97–127.
- 109 See Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1, An Introduction*.
- 110 Drucker, *Warped*; and Drucker, *Different Rainbows*.
- 111 Some ideas towards this for the Canadian context are developed in Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*
- 112 Drucker, *Warped*, 63, 288–89.
- 113 Drucker, *Warped*, 35.
- 114 Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 47.
- 115 Rao, “Global Homocapitalism,” 47.
- 116 See Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*.
- 117 See Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*; and Katz, “Envisioning the World We Make,” and “Introduction.”
- 118 See Lang, “Lesbians, Men-Women, and Two-Spirits,” 202–18; and Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*.
- 119 On this and critiques of gender passing see Rose, “A History of That Which Was Never Supposed to Be Possible,” 165–84.

- 120 On this see Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*; and Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*.
- 121 Holloway, *How to Change the World Without Taking Power*.
- 122 See earlier references to sexual naturalism in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. Also see the early Jeff Minson, "The Assertion of Homosexuality," *m/f* 5/6 (1981): 19–39, for a useful critique of the politics of coming out as revealing the truth about one's personality. Nonetheless, Minson dangerously tends to dismiss the relevance of any gay politics based on coming out, or any politics based on homosexual identifications. The political problems of deconstructionist theory are evident in this article. Some of these same problems are continued in deconstructionist currents within "queer theory." The focus on coming out and identity in gay politics was also shaped by the largely white and often middle-class gays who initially constructed this politics.
- 123 This conference was held in Toronto in July 1985. This comment was an important defining remark for the conference and was made in the closing session. It is remembered slightly differently by different people. See Ingrid MacDonald, "We'll Deconstruct When They Deconstruct," in "Confronting Heterosexuality," special issue, *Resources for Feminist Research* 19, no. 3/4 (December 1990): 89. Lisa Duggan remembers it as "Deconstruct Heterosexuality First," in Duggan, "Queering the State," 6.
- 124 Duggan, "Queering the State," 4–5.
- 125 On false universals and the violence of abstraction, see Bannerji, *Thinking Through*.
- 126 This has sometimes been the case with people's readings of the important work of Judith Butler and in some of the interpretations of her work. See Butler, *Gender Trouble*; and Butler, *Bodies That Matter*.
- 127 Himani Bannerji, "The Passion of Naming"; and Holloway, *How to Change the World Without Taking Power*; Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*; and Ziya Jones, "Rinaldo Walcott on How to Build a Better Queer Future," *Xtra*, October 28, 2021, <https://xtramagazine.com/health/rinaldo-walcott-211379>.
- 128 See Corrigan, *Social Forms/Human Capacities*; and Brock et al., *Power and Everyday Practices*.
- 129 Drucker, *Warped*.
- 130 On ideology critique, see Bannerji, *Thinking Through*; Bannerji, *The Dark Side of the Nation*; Bannerji, *Inventing Subjects*; Bannerji, *Demography and Democracy*; and Bannerji, *The Ideological Condition*; and Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power*; and Smith, *Texts, Facts and Femininity*.
- 131 See Nicholas Matte, "Rupert Raj, Transmen, and Sexuality," 117–36.
- 132 See Suzanne Kessler and Wendy McKenna on the medical and professional regulation of transsexualities. This focuses on the shifting of one's place within the gender binary but does not radically challenge this binary. It leads to a naturalization and normalization of that person's new place in the gender binary. Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*; and Kessler and McKenna, "Who Put the 'Trans' in Transgender? Gender Theory and Everyday Life," in Lafont, *Constructing Sexualities*, 223–26. Also see Bornstein, *Gender Outlaw*; and Bornstein and Bergman, *Gender Outlaws*.
- 133 Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes," 262–84.
- 134 McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 125.
- 135 See Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body*; and Kinsman, "Queerness Is Not in Our Genes," 262–84.
- 136 See Diana Fuss, *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference* (New York: Routledge, 1989). The conceptualization of "strategic essentialism" comes from the important post-colonial work of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Other Asias* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008), 260.

- 137 Duggan, "Queering the State," 6.
- 138 Duggan, "Queering the State," 6.
- 139 It is this that John Holloway does not always seem to recognize in his general critique of identity politics. See Holloway, *How to Change the World Without Taking Power*.
- 140 Fung, "The Trouble With 'Asians,'" 128. Fung was responding to the kinds of analysis that Paul Gilroy develops in *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000).
- 141 On the significance of Black Life in the face of Black erasure and death, see Walcott and Abdillahi, *BlackLife*. See also Idil Abdillahi, *Black Women Under State: Surveillance, Poverty, and the Violence of Social Assistance* (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2022).
- 142 See Bannerji, "A Passion for Naming." For a similar position, also see Jeffrey Weeks, "Exploring the Myths and Makings of a Sexual Minority," *The Advocate*, April 28, 1983, 35–36, 42–43. In my early writing, I was very inspired by and influenced by the work of Jeffrey Weeks, who emerged from the collective context of *Gay Left*. You can even say he was a bit of a "hero" for me. Unfortunately, starting at least with his illuminating *Sexuality and Its Discontents* (1985), Weeks became more influenced by liberal and pluralist approaches and developed a less critical social perspective, including some support for Tony Blair. In his insightful *The World We Have Won* (2007), he exaggerates how much our social movements have changed the world and democratized everyday life, and neglects the continuing problems of capitalist, racist, and patriarchal social relations. See Weeks, *The World We Have Won: The Remaking of Erotic and Intimate Life* (London: Routledge, 2007).
- 143 See Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*
- 144 Most discussions of social policy also get trapped within existing social forms and state relations. Regarding the social relations of struggle over social policies, I refer to a broad sense of struggles over "social policy" moving us beyond existing state and social relations. This is in contrast to the discussions of public policy in Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*. While there is some discussion of social and public policy as contested terrains of struggle, in this book, the social form of public policy is simply accepted and equality rights are then demanded within them—these public policies are not more crucially troubled and put in question. In my view, critical discussion of social and public policies always needs to put existing racist, capitalist social forms in question.
- 145 See Dean, *Straights*.
- 146 Kinsman and Gibson, "Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood," 245–63.
- 147 Gay Left Collective, "Happy Families? Paedophilia Examined," *Gay Left*, 4.
- 148 For some ideas, we can look to utopian feminist fiction, including Piercy, *Woman on the Edge of Time*. Also see Ursula Le Guin, *The Left Hand of Darkness* (New York: Ace Books, 1969); Le Guin, *The Dispossessed* (Harper and Row, 1974); and some of the amazing work of Octavia Butler, including her Patternist series, *Seed to Harvest* (New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2007), and *Lilith's Brood* (New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2007).
- 149 Just scratching the surface, see work by Dave Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, revised ed. (London: Verso, 2002); Roediger, *Colored White: Transcending the Racial Past* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002); Ware, *Beyond the Pale*; Black and Ware, *Out of Whiteness*; Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*; Rassmussen et al., *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness*; and Frankenburg, *White Women, Race Matters*. Also see Shotwell, *Knowing Otherwise*.
- 150 Katz, "Envisioning the World We Make."
- 151 Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*.

- 152 Katz, *Gay American History*.
- 153 Katz, "Envisioning the World We Make," and "Introduction." At the same time as I find this project incredibly inspiring, I question Katz's use of "mode of production theory," given this is also very much about social relations of reproduction, and the need for a "model" based on Max Weber's notion of an "ideal type." There are important problems with the Weberian mobilizations of ideal-type models, which are never historically concrete or actual. Instead, they provide a "model" that can be imposed on, or in softer versions, compared to, actuality. On some of this see Derek Sayer, *Capitalism and Modernity: An Excursus on Marx and Weber* (London: Routledge, 1991).
- 154 On this see Katz, "Envisioning the World We Make," "Model," and "Conclusion."
- 155 See Chapman and Withers, *A Violent History of Benevolence*, 125–81.
- 156 Smith, "Homophobia and Homonationalism," 65–84.
- 157 On the social remaking of sexual practices in the context of AIDS, see Patton, *Sex and Germs*; Patton, *Inventing AIDS*; and Patton, *Fatal Advice*.
- 158 See Hindmarch, Orsini, and Gagnon, *Seeing Red*; and McClelland, *The Criminalization of HIV in Canada*.
- 159 See Gary Kinsman, "Some Notes on Learning from AIDS Activism"; in French, Kinsman, "Quelques leçons du militantisme anti-SIDA pour s'organiser dans le contexte de la pandémie du Coronavirus (COVID-19)"; and Kinsman, "Learning from AIDS Activism for Surviving the COVID-19 Pandemic," 83–92; and Kinsman, "Sick of the System Interview."
- 160 See Varghese, *RAW, PrEP, Pedagogy, and The Politics of Barebacking*. On "barebacking," see Tim Dean, *Unlimited Intimacy: Reflections on the Subculture of Barebacking* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).
- 161 For early public health safe sex guidelines, see Jessica Migala, "Sex During the Coronavirus Pandemic: What's Safe, and What Experts Don't Want You to Do," *Health*, June 16, 2020, <https://www.health.com/condition/infectious-diseases/coronavirus/sex-during-coronavirus-pandemic>; and Toronto Public Health, "COVID-19 Fact Sheet," City of Toronto Government, https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/076c-Safer_sex_during_COVID-19.pdf. Also see Marcus McCann, "Yes, People Still Meet for Sex in the Parks. No It's Not a Problem," *Medium*, October 15, 2020, <https://marcusmccann.medium.com/yes-people-still-meet-for-sex-in-parks-no-its-not-a-problem-3db910d30c61>. He describes creative safe sex efforts in the context of COVID-19. See also Marcus McCann, *Park Cruising*; and Paul Gallant, "Bathhouses Outlasted the AIDS Epidemic, But Will They Survive COVID-19?" *Xtra*, October 19, 2020, <https://www.dailyxtra.com/bathroom-lgbtq2-community-business-183391>. Sexual policing against men seeking sex with other men and against sex workers has continued during the pandemic, including through the use of "public health" Covid regulations. On London, England, see Matilda Davies, "Police Fine Men Cruising for Gay Sex on London's Hampstead Heath for Breaking Coronavirus Restrictions," *PinkNews*, December 22, 2020, <https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2020/12/22/hampstead-health-gay-cruising-police-fine-covid-19-regulations/>.
- 162 See Rachel Treisman, "As Monkeypox Spreads, Know the Difference Between Warning and Stigmatizing People," *NPR*, July 26, 2022, <https://www.npr.org/2022/07/26/1113713684/monkeypox-stigma-gay-community>.
- 163 See Steven Epstein, "Governing Sexual Health: Bridging Biocitizenship and Sexual Citizenship," in *Biocitizenship: The Politics of Bodies, Governance, and Power*, ed. Kelly Happe, Jenell Johnson, and Marina Levina (New York: New York University Press, 2018), 21–50; and Ricky Varghese and Benjamin J.F. Weil, "Privilege, Race, and Imagined Immunities in the time of COVID," Centre for Ethics, University of Toronto, March 5, 2021, <https://>

- ethics.utoronto.ca/events/ricky-varghese-benjamin-weil-privilege-race-imagined-immunities-in-the-time-of-covid-race-ethics-power-flash-event/. Also see other on-line events organized by the Centre for Ethics at U of T during the pandemic on these questions.
- 164 For example, see Christopher T. Connor, "The Gay White Colonizers: NYE Circuit Parties in Mexico," *Washington Blade*, January 21, 2021, <https://www.washingtonblade.com/2021/01/21/the-gay-white-colonizers-nye-circuit-parties-in-mexico/>.
- 165 For a fascinating exploration of aspects of this, see Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process, Volume One: The History of Manners* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978); and *The Civilizing Process, Volume Two: Power and Civility* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982).
- 166 See Ross and Sullivan, "Tracing Lines of Horizontal Hostility," 604–21; and Ross, "Whornganizers and Gay Activists," 256–71.
- 167 Kirkup, "The Gross Indecency of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure," 263–82.
- 168 See Noble, "Trans-ing the Canadian Passport," 270–84.
- 169 On cultural revolution, see Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*.
- 170 In the Canadian context, while anal sex, the bawdy-house laws, and vagrancy have now finally been repealed, there remain many offences that can still be used against queer sex and practices including "indecent acts," a range of practices of state censorship of our sexualities and presentations including "obscenity" and "immoral theatrical presentations," "nudity," the criminalization of people living with HIV, and anti-sex worker provisions. See Patrizia Gentile, Tom Hooper, Gary Kinsman, and Steven Maynard, the gay and lesbian historians group, "Another Flawed Bill: Gay and Lesbian Historians on C-75," *Radical Noise*, June 12, 2018, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/06/12/another-flawed-bill-gay-and-lesbian-historians-on-bill-75/>.
- 171 Insider- and outsider-based strategies are discussed further in Caelie Frampton et al., "New Directions for Activist Research," in *Sociology for Changing the World*, ed. Frampton, Kinsman, Thompson, and Tilleczeck, 247–57.
- 172 See Dean Spade, *Mutual Aid: Building Solidarity During this Crisis (and the Next)* (London: Verso, 2020).
- 173 Drucker, *Warped*.
- 174 See Carole S. Vance, "Pleasure and Danger: Toward a Politics of Sexuality," in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, 1–27.
- 175 See Jamie Magnusson and Beverly Bain, "Expanding the Policing and Prison Industrial Complex: Containing Cities and Privatizing Public Space through Surveillance, Criminalization, and Financialized Racial Capitalism," NPPC – No Pride in Policing Coalition, January 2022, <https://www.noprudeinpolicing.ca/nppc/jan-2022-discussion-paper/>.
- 176 Driskill, "Stolen From Our Bodies," 56.
- 177 Kinsman, "Stop the Crackdown on Consensual Queer Sex." On Queers Crash the Beat and Project Marie, see *Queers Crash the Beat* (website), <https://queerscrashthebeat.com/project-marie/>; See "Indesirables," *Even the Dust, Anti-Police Publication*.
- 178 See Ling, *Missing from the Village*; the Independent Civilian Review of Missing Persons Investigations (website), <https://www.missingpersonsreview.ca/>; and Kinsman, "Contested Terrains." On the Picton murders, see The Missing Women Commission of Inquiry (website), <http://missingwomen.library.uvic.ca/>.
- 179 See Gary Kinsman, "The Porn Debate," *Fuse*, Summer 1984, 37–84; and Kinsman, "Porn/Censor Wars and the Battlefields of Sex," 31–39. Also see Waugh, "A Heritage of Pornography," 29–33; Waugh, "Photography, Passion and Power," 29–33; and Waugh, "Men's Pornography: Gay vs. Straight," *Jump Cut*, March 1985, 30–35, <https://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC3ofolder/PornWaugh.html>. Also see Zanin, "Your Cuntry Needs

- You,” 185–202; and Naomi de Szegheo-Lang, “Disruptive Desires: Reframing Sexual Space at the Feminist Porn Awards,” in Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 66–81.
- 180 Anti-porn feminists often focused against sexual depictions themselves. There have also been important perspectives put forward by anti-censorship feminists. See Burstyn, *Women Against Censorship*; and Segal and McIntosh, *Sex Exposed*. For more recent feminist analysis, see Heather Berg, *Porn Work: Sex, Labor, and Late Capitalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2021).
- 181 See Zanin, “Your Cuntry Needs You,” 185–202.
- 182 See Prentice, *Sex in Schools*.
- 183 Kirkup, “The Gross Indecency of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure,” 263–82; and McClelland, *The Criminalization of HIV in Canada*.
- 184 Much of the work of the Badgley Committee relied on police work, see Brock and Kinsman, “Patriarchal Relations Ignored,” 107–25.
- 185 On “sexual pessimism,” see Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure*, 14–15. For the anti-porn feminist view, see the work of Catharine MacKinnon, a leading anti-porn feminist in the United States. MacKinnon’s work was used in the Women’s Legal Education and Action Fund’s intervention in the Butler case. See Kramer, *Undressing the Canadian State*, 61–67.
- 186 See Davis, *Women, Race and Class*. Also see the critiques made regarding anti-Black racism, including the marginalization of the involvement of Black women in the anti-lynching movements in Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (1975; repr., New York: Pelican Books, 1986).
- 187 See Andrea Smith, *Conquest*.
- 188 On sexual libertarianism, see Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents*; Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure*, 16–17; and Kinsman, “The Porn Debate,” 37–84; and Kinsman, “Porn/Censor Wars,” 31–39. Also see Kiss and Tell Collective, “Questioning Censorship” in *Her Tongue on My Theory*, 93–110.
- 189 On Wilhelm Reich, see Paul A. Robinson, *The Freudian Left: Wilhelm Reich, Geza Roheim, Herbert Marcuse* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1969), 9–73; and Wilhelm Reich, *The Sexual Revolution: Toward a Self-Governing Character Structure*, trans. Theodore P. Wolfe (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1962).
- 190 Churchill, “Personal Ad Politics,” 114–34; McCaskell, *Queer Progress*, 218–21; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, “Marvellous Grounds, An Introduction,” 1–2.
- 191 See Courtney McFarlane, “Censorship, Passion and Identity,” *Border/Lines* 32 (1994): 34–35; and Augustine, “Bizarre Women, Exotic Bodies and Outrageous Sex,” 22–24; Lim, “Racism and Gay Male Porn,” 14–15. Also see the controversy over a racist ad published in *The Body Politic*, April 1985, 30; Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, “Marvellous Grounds, An Introduction,” 1–2.
- 192 On this see Smith, “Politically Correct”; and Weir, “PC Then and Now,” 51–87. Also see Smith, “Politically Correct: An Organizer of Public Discourse.”
- 193 See Sarah Hagi, “Cancel Culture Is Not Real—At Least Not in the Way People Think,” *Time*, November 21, 2019, <https://time.com/5735403/cancel-culture-is-not-real/>.
- 194 In 2021, Jordan Peterson resigned from the University of Toronto. He returned to podcasting and continued to speak on right-wing issues. On Peterson, see Ben Burgis and Matt McManus, “Why Jordan Peterson is Always Wrong,” *Jacobin*, April 24, 2020, <https://jacobinmag.com/2020/4/jordan-peterson-capitalism-postmodernism-ideology>. In 2023, Petersen continued to speak out against trans people and “marxism.” The College of Psychologists of Ontario ordered him to undergo social media communications coaching, after concerns were raised regarding his exclusionary remarks.

- 195 See Michell and Walters-Vida, "One Month Later"; and Gary Kinsman et al., "Regarding Safety from Violence and Hate During Last Weekend's Pride Festivities in Toronto," *Radical Noise*, June 28, 2019, <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/06/29/regarding-safety-from-violence-and-hate-during-last-weekends-pride-festivities-in-toronto/>. When Islamic fundamentalists are involved in right-wing protests, anti-fascist organizing should also take up a clear anti-Islamophobia position.
- 196 See Mark Bray, *Antifa: The Anti-Fascist Handbook* (Brooklyn: Melville House, 2017).
- 197 Often, in anti-censorship feminist and gay discussions, all currents within radical feminism are reduced to the anti-porn radical feminism of Andrea Dworkin and Catharine MacKinnon. There are, however, more grassroots and movement-oriented forms of radical feminism. It is the current represented by Dworkin and MacKinnon that has gotten tangled up with some forms of liberal feminism and has influenced state discussions, thereby being able to be used by more right-wing forces, particularly regarding the regulation of porn. Most recently, some of these forces have undergone a pre-feminist regression, and some refer to such "feminists" as TERFs and SWERFs. See my earlier comments on this in the Introduction to this edition. MacKinnon, to the dismay of some anti-trans women claiming to be feminists, has come out in support of transgender-equality rights. See Catherine A. MacKinnon, "A Feminist Defence of Transgender Sex Equality Rights," *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 34, no. 2 (2023): 88. The contributions of Andrea Dworkin cannot be reduced to her anti-porn feminism, see Martin B. Duberman, *Andrea Dworkin: The Feminist as Revolutionary* (New York: New Press, 2020). Also see Cossman, *The New Sex Wars*.
- 198 See Tucker, "Our Right to the World," 29–33.
- 199 See Floyd, *The Reification of Desire*.
- 200 See Valverde, *Sex, Power and Pleasure*; contributions in Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, although many of the contributions in this volume are clearly from a more sexual-libertarian direction; contributions in Burstyn, *Women Against Censorship*; Ann Ferguson, "Sex War: The Debate Between Radical and Libertarian Feminists," *Signs* 10, no. 1 (Autumn 1984): 12, although often her arguments are too close to anti-porn feminism for me; Ilene Philipson, "The Repression of History and Gender: A Critical Perspective on the Feminist Sexuality Debate," *Signs* 10, no. 1 (Autumn 1984): 113–18.
- 201 See Zanin, "Your Cuntry Needs You," 185–202; and de Szegheo-Lang, "Disruptive Desires," 66–81.
- 202 See Kinsman, "Porn/Censor Wars," 31–39.
- 203 This is what the Repeal the Youth Pornography Law Campaign attempted to do in 1994 and early 1995 in Toronto. See the speeches given at the Repeal the Youth Porn Law rally on March 12, 1994, Kinsman et al., "Keep Your Fucking Laws Off Our Bodies."
- 204 See Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents*. Also see Weir and Casey, "Subverting Power in Sexuality," 139–57.
- 205 I am much more critical of "radical pluralism" than I was in the second edition of this book. There are too many residues of a liberalism that does not transform social relations in Weeks's use of the term. There are also too many associations between his use of radical pluralism and the post-Marxist, postmodernist, "radical democratic" politics of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe and others who have abandoned notions of class struggle. See Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*.
- 206 Bannerji, "But Who Speaks for Us?," 71–72.
- 207 For a still very useful analysis of the social organization of law, see Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, "How the Law Rules," in *Law, State and Society*, ed. Bob Fryer, Alan Hunt, and Doreen MacBarnet (London: Croom Helm, 1981), 21–53.

- 208 For important suggestions moving in this direction, see Ching-In Chen, Jai Dulani, and Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha, eds., *The Revolution Starts at Home: Confronting Intimate Violence Within Activist Communities* (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2016); and Ardath Whynacht, *Insurgent Love: Abolition and Domestic Homicide* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2021).
- 209 Whynacht, *Insurgent Love*.
- 210 Ken Popert, "Race, Moustaches, and Sexual Prejudice," *The Body Politic*, June 1983, 34. Also see McCaskell's critical commentary, *Queer Progress*, 185–87.
- 211 On a transitional sexual perspective, although I disagree with her specific use of it, see Ferguson, "Sex War." The use of "transitional" is an attempt to link current struggles with what is required for the realization of social relations where oppressive sexual and gender regulation is overcome. On the transitional method and program, see Leon Trotsky, "The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International," 1938, based on *The Transitional Program* (Labor Publications, 1981), Marxists.org, 2006, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1938/tp/>.
- 212 See Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*
- 213 Barrett and McIntosh, *The Anti-Social Family*.
- 214 For instance, see the mobilization of anti-Black racist structural functionalism in Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action*, United States, Department of Labor, Office of Policy Planning and Research (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965).
- 215 See the interesting legal decision establishing that a gay man and a heterosexual women can be in a "conjugal" relationship, Tyler Dawson, "Federal Court Rules a Gay Man and a Straight Woman Can Be in a 'Conjugal Relationship,'" *National Post*, September 29, 2020, <https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/federal-court-rules-a-gay-man-and-straight-woman-can-be-in-a-conjugal-relationship>.
- 216 Some ideas for a feminist "family policy" were developed in Jean Coussins and Anna Coote, *The Family in the Firing Line: Discussion Document on Family Policy*, Poverty Pamphlet, no. 51 (London: Child Poverty Action Group/National Council for Civil Liberties, 1981). Unfortunately, this useful pamphlet does not unearth the practices of institutionalized heterosexuality, nor does it deal with lesbians and gay men in relation to families. Also see Barrett and McIntosh, *The Anti-Social Family*; and Lynne Segal and the Socialist Society, eds., *What is To Be Done about the Family?* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1983). For a more recent family abolitionist approach see M.E. O'Brien, *Family Abolition, Capitalism and the Communizing of Care* (London Pluto Press, 2023).
- 217 See Epstein-Fine and Zook, *Spawning Generations*.
- 218 Amber Hollibaugh describes some of the experiences of lesbians and gay men talking about their lives and sexualities during the campaign against the Briggs Initiative in California. See Hollibaugh, "Sexuality and the State," *Socialist Review* 45 (May/June 1979): 55–72. This has also been the experience in some of the successful campaigns against right-wing anti-lesbian and anti-gay State referendums in the United States.
- 219 Drucker, *Warped*.
- 220 The People's Vaccine Alliance, "Campaigners Warn That 9 Out of 10 People in Poor Countries Are Set to Miss Out On COVID-19 Vaccine Next Year," Oxfam International, December 9, 2020, <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/campaigners-warn-9-out-10-people-poor-countries-are-set-miss-out-covid-19-vaccine>.
- 221 Kinsman, "AIDS Activism," 311–33.
- 222 See Gary Kinsman, "Some Notes on Learning from AIDS Activism"; in French, Kinsman, "Quelques leçons du militantisme anti-SIDA pour s'organiser dans le contexte de la

- pandémie du Coronavirus (COVID-19)”; Kinsman, “Learning from AIDS Activism for Surviving the COVID-19 Pandemic,” 83–92; and Kinsman, “Sick of the System Interview.”
- 223 Alan Sears, “AIDS and the Health of Nations: Public Health and the Politics of HIV Testing” (paper presentation, Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association meetings, Victoria, BC, 1990); Sears, “To Teach Them How to Live,” 61–83; Sears, “Health from Below in a Global Pandemic”; and Kinsman, “AIDS Activism,” 31–33.
- 224 See Gary Kinsman, “Some Notes on Learning from AIDS Activism”; in French, Kinsman, “Quelques leçons du militantisme anti-SIDA pour s’organiser dans le contexte de la pandémie du Coronavirus (COVID-19)”; Kinsman, “Learning from AIDS Activism for Surviving the COVID-19 Pandemic,” 83–92; and Kinsman, “Sick of the System Interview.” Also see AIDS Activist History Project (website), <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/>.
- 225 See Brent Southin, Glen Brown, and Tim McCaskell, Toronto Interviews, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/toronto-interviews/>; and Michael Hendricks & René LeBoeuf, Montreal Interviews, AIDS Activist History Project, <https://aidsactivisthistory.ca/interviews/montreal-interviews/>.
- 226 ACT-UP (New York), AIDS ACTION NOW! (Toronto), “Montréal Manifesto.”
- 227 See Corrigan and Sayer, *The Great Arch*; and Holloway, *How to Change the World Without Taking Power*; and Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*.
- 228 See Corrigan and Sayer, “How the Law Rules,” 21–53.
- 229 See Kaba, “Police ‘Reforms’ You Should Always Oppose,” in *We Do This ‘Til We Free Us*, 70–71.
- 230 Kinsman, “Direct Action as Political Activist Ethnography.”
- 231 See Thorborn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97.
- 232 Although there are often many good activists associated with the NDP, we cannot rely on the NDP for our liberation. While they have been allies in pushing forward some of our demands, they are not consistent in doing this and, at times, have opposed us—for instance, when they supported raising the age of consent to sixteen. The more radical and far-reaching our struggles are, the less they support them, at least regarding the NDP leadership. In relation to Indigenous struggles, struggles against policing, and for Palestinian rights, they often oppose our struggles and become part of containment strategies for them, as they have during the recent uprisings against anti-Black and anti-Indigenous racism and the police. See Thorburn and Kinsman, “Navigating Contemporary Struggles,” 86–97. Increasingly, the NDP leadership is on the other side, opposing our struggles. The recent accord between the federal NDP and the Liberal government means that the NDP will be even more useless for our purposes.
- 233 On pedagogy, see Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos (New York: Continuum, 1970). Also see the important work of bell hooks on pedagogy and revolutionary teaching and learning.
- 234 Karl Marx, *Early Writings* (New York: Vintage Books, 1975), 422.
- 235 See Carolyn Egan, Linda Lee Gardner, and Judy Vashti Persad, “The Politics of Transformation: Struggles with Race, Class, and Sexuality in the March 8th Coalition,” in Cunningham, *Social Movements/Social Change*, 20–47.
- 236 See Sheila Rowbotham, “The Women’s Movement and Organizing for Socialism,” in *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*, ed. Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright (London: Merlin, 1979), 132–44. There are important critiques of this article and the book more generally for the lack of any central addressing of racism, colonialism, and imperialism/empire. On this see Kinsman, “Interview,” 125–27.
- 237 Kinsman, “Not a Gift from Above”; Kinsman “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s,” 137–62; and Kinsman, “From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights,” 209–32.

- 238 See Chapman and Withers, *A Violent History of Benevolence*.
- 239 On radical hope, also see Drucker, "The Principle of Hope," in *Warped*, 383–95. Also see Ernst Bloch, *The Principle of Hope, Volume 1*, translated by Neville Plaice (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986).
- 240 Mariame Kaba, "Hope is a Discipline," interview by Kim Wilson and Brian Sonenstein, in *We Do This 'Til We Free Us*, 26–28.
- 241 See Magnusson and Bain, "Expanding the Policing and Prison Industrial Complex."
- 242 See Max Haiven and Alex Khasnabish, *The Radical Imagination: Social Movement Research in the Age of Austerity* (London: Zed Press, 2014); and Alex Khasnabish and Max Haiven, eds., *What Moves Us: The Lives and Times of the Radical Imagination* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing/Upping the Anti/Radical Imagination, 2017).
- 243 Lenon, "The Governmentality of Gay Rights," 80. And see Vivek Shraya, *What I Love About Being Queer* (Toronto: Vivek Shraya, George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology, 2013).
- 244 Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure*, 203–32.
- 245 Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Islands of Decolonial Love*; Maynard and Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*.
- 246 See bell hooks's many writings and talks on love, including bell hooks, *All About Love: New Visions* (1999; repr., New York: William Morrow, 2018).
- 247 See Spade, *Mutual Aid*. On life-making practices from below, see Susan Ferguson, "Life-Making or Death-Making?," *Midnight Sun*, October 17, 2021, <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/life-making-or-death-making/>.
- 248 Hennessy, *Profit and Pleasure*, 210.
- 249 See Duberman, *Has the Gay Movement Failed?* On early gay liberation perspectives, see Mario Mieli, *Towards a Gay Communism: Elements of a Homosexual Critique* (London: Pluto, 2018).
- 250 Bunch, "Not for Lesbians Only."
- 251 See Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (London: Routledge, 1998); Drucker, *Warped*, 384–88; and Holloway, *Crack Capitalism*, esp. 119–24.
- 252 Rao, "Global Homocapitalism," 48.
- 253 See also Maynard and Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*.
- 254 See Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*.
- 255 Audre Lorde, "Uses of the Erotic: The Erotic as Power," in *Sister Outsider*, 53–59.
- 256 Subcommandante Insurgente Moisés, EZLN, "Zapatista Communique—Part Six: A Mountain on the High Seas," Love and Rage Media, October 5, 2020, <https://loveandrage.media.org/2020/10/09/zapatista-communicue-part-six-a-mountain-on-the-high-seas/>.

AFTERWORD

- 1 Andrea Houston, "Canvassing the Village," *Xtra*, March 14, 2013, <https://xtramagazine.com/culture/canvassing-the-village-39636>.
- 2 Eden Debebe, "Pride Toronto accused of misallocation of government funds in new report," *OmniTV News*, January 26, 2022, <https://www.omnitv.ca/pride-toronto-accused-of-misallocation-of-government-funds-in-new-report>.
- 3 Steven Maynard, Gary Kinsman, Patrizia Gentile, and Tom Hooper, "Sex Workers Are Left Out in the Cold by Ottawa's Unjust Conviction Amendments," *The Conversation*, March 20, 2023, <https://theconversation.com/sex-workers-are-left-out-in-the-cold-by-ottawas-unjust-conviction-amendments-201810>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdillahi, Idil. *Black Women Under State: Surveillance, Poverty, and the Violence of Social Assistance*. Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2022.
- Abu-Hatoum, Nayrouz, and Ghaida Moussa. "Becoming Through Others: Western Queer Self-Fashioning and Solidarity with Queer Palestine." In Haritaworn et al., *Queering Urban Justice*, 169–86.
- Abu-Laban, Yasmeen, and Abigail B. Bakan. *Israel, Palestine, and the Politics of Race: Exploring Identity and Power in a Global Context*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2020.
- Ackerman, Katrina, Bruce Douville, and Shannon Stettner. "Is Abortion Ever Right: The United Church of Canada and the Debate over Abortion Law Reform, 1960–1980." In Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 52–73.
- Acton, Janice, Penny Goldsmith, and Bonnie Shepard, eds. *Women at Work, 1850–1930*. Toronto: Canadian Women's Educational Press, 1974.
- ACT-UP (New York), and AIDS ACTION NOW! (Toronto). "Montreal Manifesto." AIDS Activist History Project, June 1989. <https://aidsactivisthistory.omeka.net/items/show/67>.
- Adair, Casey, and Nancy Adair. *Word Is Out: Stories of Some of Our Lives*. San Francisco: New Glide Publications, 1978.
- Adam, Barry D. *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987.
- Adams, Mary Louise. "Almost Anything Can Happen: A Search for Sexual Discourse in the Urban Spaces of 1940s Toronto." *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 19, no. 2 (1994): 217–32.
- . "Precedent-Setting Pulp: Women's Barracks Was Deemed 'Exceedingly Frank.'" *Xtra!*, September 3, 1993.
- . "The Trouble with Normal: Post-War Teenagers and the Construction of Heterosexuality." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1994.
- . *The Trouble with Normal: Post-War Youth and the Making of Heterosexuality*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1997.
- . "There's No Place Like Home: On the Place of Identity in Feminist Politics." *Feminist Review*, no. 31 (Spring 1989): 22–33.
- Adamson, Nancy, Linda Briskin, and Margaret McPhail. *Feminist Organizing for Change: The Contemporary Women's Movement in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Adkin, David, dir. *Out: Stories of Lesbian and Gay Youth*. Produced by Silva Basmajian. Montreal: National Film Board of Canada, 2018. 40 min.
- Adkin, Laurie E. "Life in Kleinland." *Canadian Dimension*, May 4, 1995, 31.
- Aivalis, Christo. *The Constant Liberal: Pierre Trudeau, Organized Labour, and the Canadian Social Democratic Left*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2018.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui. *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Alhonte, Michael. "Confronting Ageism." In Tsang, *The Age Taboo*, 156–59.
- . "The Politics of Ageism." *Gay Insurgent*, 1981.

- Allen, Carol. "Who Gets to Be Family: Some Thoughts on the Lesbian and Gay Fight for Equality." In Carty, *And Still We Rise*, 101–7.
- Allen, Kevin. "Everett Klippert Coda." *Calgary Gay History*, March 11, 2021. <https://calgarygayhistory.ca/2021/03/11/everett-klippert-coda/>.
- Almaguer, Tomas. "Chicano Men: A Cartography of Homosexual Identity and Behavior." *Queer In "Theory, Lesbian and Gay Sexualities."* Special issue, *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 75–100.
- Altman, Dennis. *AIDS in the Mind of America*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1986.
- . "AIDS: The Politicization of an Epidemic." *Socialist Review* 14, no. 6 (December 1984): 93–109.
- . "The Emergence of Gay Identities in Southeast Asia." In Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 137–56.
- . *The End of the Homosexual?* St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2013.
- . *The Homosexualization of America: The Americanization of the Homosexual*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.
- . *Global Sex*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- , ed. *Homosexuality, Which Homosexuality?* London: GMP Publishers, 1989.
- . *Power and Community: Organizational and Cultural Responses to AIDS*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1994.
- . "What Changed in the Seventies?" In Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 61.
- Alyson, Sasha. *Young, Gay and Proud!* 1st ed. Boston: Alyson, 1980.
- Amin, Samir. *Eurocentrism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1989.
- Anderson, Karen. "A Gendered World: Women, Men and the Political Economy of the Seventeenth Century Huro." In Maroney and Luxton, *Feminism and Political Economy*, 121–65.
- . "As Gentle as Little Lambs: Images of Huron and Montagnais-Naskapi Women in the Writings of the 17th Century Jesuits." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie* 25, no. 4 (November 1988): 560–76.
- . "Commodity Exchange and Subordination: Montagnais-Naskapi and Huron Women, 1600–1650." *Signs* 11, no. 1 (Autumn 1985): 48–62.
- Anderson, Karen L. *Chain Her by One Foot: The Subjugation of Native Women in Seventeenth-Century New France*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Anderson, Perry. "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci." *New Left Review*, no. 100 (December 1976): 5–78.
- Anderson, Scott P. "Privacy: An Issue for the '80s?" *The Advocate*, January 20, 1983.
- Andrews, Karen. "Ancient Affections: Gays, Lesbians and Family Status." In Arnup, *Lesbian Parenting*, 358–77.
- Andrews, Lynn, and Sandra Whitworth. "Hate, Injustice and Same-Sex Beliefs." *Globe & Mail*, June 23, 1994, A27.
- Anonymous. "Living with Homosexuality." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 86, no. 19 (May 12, 1962): 875–78.
- Anton. "Racism in the Gay Community: A Closer Look." *Pink Ink*, August 1983.
- Antonyshyn, Patricia, Carolyn Egan, Linda Lee Gardner, and Judy Vashti Persad. "The Politics of Transformation: Struggles with Race, Class, and Sexuality in the March 8th Coalition." In Cunningham, *Social Movements/Social Change*, 20–47.
- Antonyshyn, Patricia, B. Lee, and Alex Merrill. "Marching for Women's Lives: The Campaign for Free-Standing Abortion Clinics in Ontario." In Cunningham, *Social Movements/Social Change*, 129–56.
- APTN National News. "Canada Guilty of Cultural Genocide against Indigenous Peoples: TRC," *APTN News*, June 2, 2015, sec. National News, <https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/canada-guilty-cultural-genocide-indigenous-peoples-trc-2/>.

- Archbold, Rick. "Old but Not Alone: Interviews by Rick Archbold." *The Body Politic*, December 1982, 25–28.
- Ariès, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood*. Translated by Robert Baldick. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Arnup, Katherine. "Education for Motherhood: Government Health Publications, Mothers and the State." Presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association annual meeting, Winnipeg, June 1986.
- . "Finding Fathers: Artificial Insemination, Lesbians, and the Law." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 7, no. 1 (1994): 97–115.
- Arnup, Katherine. "Lesbian Mothers and Child Custody." Edited by Ian G. Lumsden. In "Sexuality and the State." Special issue, *Atkinson Review of Canadian Studies* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 35–40.
- Arnup, Katherine, ed. *Lesbian Parenting: Living with Pride and Prejudice*. Charlottetown, PE: Gynergy, 1995.
- . "'Mothers Just Like Others': Lesbians, Divorce, and Child Custody in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 3, no. 1 (1989): 18–32.
- . "'We Are Family!': Lesbian Mothers in Canada." *Resources for Feminist Research* 20, no. 3/4 (1991): 101–7.
- August 28 Gay Day Committee. "We Demand." In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 217.
- Augustine, Karen/Miranda. "Bizarre Women, Exotic Bodies and Outrageous Sex: Or If Annie Sprinkle Was a Black Ho She Wouldn't Be All That." *Border/Lines*, no. 32 (1994): 22–4.
- Austin, David. *Fear of a Black Nation: Race, Sexuality, and Security in Sixties Montreal*. Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 2013.
- Babuscio, Jack. "Camp and the Gay Sensibility." In *Gays and Film*, edited by Richard Dyer, 40–57. London: British Film Institute, 1977.
- Bacchi, Carol Lee. *Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English-Canadian Suffragists, 1877–1918*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.
- . "Race Regeneration and Social Purity: A Study of the Social Attitudes of Canada's English-Speaking Suffragists." *Social History/Histoire Sociale* 22, no. 11 (November 1978): 460–74.
- Backhouse, Constance. "Nineteenth Century Canadian Rape Law." In *Essays in the History of Canadian Law, Vol. 2*, edited by David H. Flaherty, 200–47. Toronto: University of Toronto Press for Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History, 1983.
- . "Nineteenth-Century Canadian Prostitution Law: Reflection of a Discriminatory Society." Unpublished manuscript, October 1982.
- . "Shifting Patterns in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Custody Law." In *Essays in the History of Canadian Law, Vol. 1*, edited by David H. Flaherty, P.C.S. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.
- Backhouse, Constance, and Leah Cohen. *The Secret Oppression: Sexual Harassment of Working Women*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1978.
- Backhouse, Constance and Osgoode Society. *Petticoats and Prejudice: Women and Law in Nineteenth Century Canada*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1991.
- Bad Object-Choices, ed. *How Do I Look?: Queer Film and Video*. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1992.
- Badgett, Mary Virginia Lee. *Money, Myths and Change: The Economic Lives of Lesbians and Gay Men*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Bailey, Sue. "Tory Bill Raises Age of Consent From 14 to 16." *Toronto Star*, June 23, 2006.
- Bain, Beverly. "Fire Passion and Politics: The Creation of Blockorama as Black Queer Diasporic Space in the Toronto Pride Festivities." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 81–97.
- Bain, Beverly, OmiSoore H. Dryden, and Rinaldo Walcott. "Coronavirus Discriminates against Black Lives through Surveillance, Policing and the Absence of Health Data." *Dalhousie*

- News, April 23, 2020. <https://www.dal.ca/news/2020/04/23/coronavirus-discriminates-against-black-lives-through-surveillance.html>.
- Baker, Alden. "Gays No Minority Group, Police Association Says." *Globe & Mail*, August 29, 1981.
- Bannerji, Himani. *The Dark Side of the Nation*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press and Women's Press, 2000.
- . *Demography and Democracy: Essays on Nationalism, Gender and Ideology*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2011.
- . *The Ideological Condition: Selected Essays on History, Race and Gender*. Boston: Brill, 2020.
- . "Interview with Himani Bannerji." In Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 95–118.
- . *Inventing Subjects: Studies in Hegemony, Patriarchy and Colonialism*. London: Anthem Press, 2001.
- , ed. *Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politic*. Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 1994.
- . *Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism*. Toronto: Women's Press, 2008.
- Barclay, Clare, and Elaine Carol. "Obscenity Chill: Artists in a Post-Butler Era." *Fuse* (Toronto), Summer 1993.
- Barghouti, Omar. *BDS: Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions: The Global Struggle for Palestinian Rights*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2011.
- Barker, D.L., and S. Allan. *Sexual Division and Society: Process and Changes*. London: Tavistock, 1976.
- Barnholden, Patrick. "A Different Drummer: Lesbians and Gays in the Region: An Activist's Overview." *New Maritimes* 11, no. 3 (February 1993): 6–15.
- . "A Gay Man's Guide to Erotic Safer Sex." *The Muse* (Memorial University), February 15, 1991, sec. Lesbian and Gay Supplement.
- . "Does the 'Straight' Jacket of the Family Fit You." *New Socialist*, July/August 1999. http://newsocialist.org/old_mag/magazine/20/article03.html.
- Barrett, Michèle. *Women's Oppression Today: The Marxist/Feminist Encounter*. London: Verso, 1980.
- Barrett, Michèle, and Mary McIntosh. *The Anti-Social Family*. London: Verso, 1982.
- Barrett, Michèle, and Mary McIntosh. "The 'Family Wage': Some Problems for Socialists and Feminists." *Capital & Class* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1980): 51–72.
- Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. London: Granada, 1982.
- Bartlett, Neil. *Who Was That Man?: A Present for Mr. Oscar Wilde*. London: Serpent's Tail, 1988.
- Battan, Jack. "The Homosexual Life in Canada: Will Trudeau's Change in the Law Make Any Difference?" *Saturday Night*, September 1969.
- Baxter, Betty. "Building Solidarity." *Pink Ink*, January 1984.
- Bayer, Ronald. *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
- Beall, Arthur W. *The Living Temple: A Manual on Eugenics for Parents and Teachers*. Whitby: A.B. Penhale, 1933.
- Bearchell, Chris, Rick Bebout, and Alexander Wilson. "Another Look." In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 166–74.
- Bebout, Rick. "Finding History—Making History." *The Body Politic*, September 1985, 30.
- Bedford, Judy. "Prostitution in Calgary, 1905–1914." *Alberta History* 29, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 1–11.
- Belcourt, Billy-Ray. *A History of My Brief Body*. Toronto: Hamish Hamilton, 2020.
- . *This Wound Is a World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019.
- Bell, A., ed. *Fighting the Traffic in Young Girls*. Ernest A. Bell, 1910.

- Bell, Alan P., Martin S. Weinberg, and Sue Kiefer Hammersmith. *Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981.
- Bell, David, and Gill Valentine, eds. *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Bell, Ernest A., and Coles Publishing Company. *War on the White Slave Trade*. Toronto: Coles, 1980.
- Berg, Heather. *Porn Work: Sex, Labor, and Late Capitalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2021.
- Bérubé, Alan. "No Red-Baiting! No Race-Baiting! No Queen-Baiting!: The Story of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union." *OutHistory*, April 12, 2016, video, 1:30:17. <https://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/no-baiting/red-race-queen>.
- Bérubé, Allan. "Coming Out Under Fire." *Mother Jones*, March 1983.
- . *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War Two*. New York: Free Press, 1990.
- . "How Gay Stays White and What Kind of White It Stays." In *The Making and UnMaking of Whiteness*, edited by Birgit Brander Rasmussen, 234–65. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.
- . "Marching to a Different Drummer: Lesbian and Gay G.I.s in World War II." *The Advocate*, October 15, 1981.
- . "Marching to a Different Drummer: Lesbian and Gay G.I.s in World War II." In Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson, *Powers of Desire*, 88–99.
- Bhandar, Brenna, and Rafeef Ziadah, eds. *Revolutionary Feminisms: Conversations on Collective Action and Radical Thought*. New York: Verso Books, 2020.
- Bhattacharya, Tithi, ed. *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. London: Pluto Press, 2017.
- Blachford, Gregg. "Male Dominance and the Gay World." In Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 184–210.
- Black, Debra. "Age of Consent Uproar: Will Law Protect Vulnerable Kids...or 'Criminalize' Teenage Sex?" *Toronto Star*. June 19, 2006, sec. News.
- Black, Les, and Veronica Ware. *Out of Whiteness: Color, Politics and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Blackbridge, Persimmon, and Sheila Gilhooly. *Still Sane*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, 1985.
- Blackwood, Evelyn. "Sexuality and Gender in Certain Native American Tribes: The Case of Cross-Gender Females." *Signs* 10, no. 1 (Autumn 1984): 27–42.
- Blanch, Michael. "Imperialism, Nationalism and Organized Youth." In *Working-Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory*, edited by John Clarke, Chas Critcher, and Richard Johnson, 102–20. London: Hutchinson, 1987.
- Bland, Lucy. "Guardians of the Race, or Vampires upon the Nation's Health?: Female Sexuality and Its Regulation in Early Twentieth Century Britain." In *The Changing Experience of Women*, edited by Elisabeth Whitelegg, 373–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- . "Marriage Laid Bare: Middle Class Women and Marital Sex, 1880s–1940." In *Labour and Love: Women's Experience of Home and Family, 1850–1940*, edited by Jane Lewis, 123–46. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Bland, Lucy, Trisha McCabe, and Frank Mort. "Sexuality and Reproduction: Three Official Instances." In *Ideology and Cultural Production*, edited by Michèle Barrett, Philip Richard D. Corrigan, Annette Kuhn, and Janet Wolff, 100–106. London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- Bland, Lucy, and Frank Mort. "Look Out for the 'Good Time' Girl: Dangerous Sexualities as a Threat to National Health." In *Formations of Nation and People*, edited by Tony Bennett, 131–51. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Bliss, Michael. "Pure Books on Avoided Subjects': Pre-Freudian Sexual Ideas in Canada." *Historical Papers* 5, no. 1 (1970): 80–108.

- Bloch, Ernst. *The Principle of Hope*. Vol. 7. Translated by Neville Plaice. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986.
- Boggs, Carl. *Gramsci's Marxism*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.
- Bohrer, Ashley J. *Marxism and Intersectionality: Race, Gender, Class and Sexuality Under Contemporary Capitalism*. Germany: transcript, 2020.
- Bologh, Roslyn Wallach. *Dialectical Phenomenology: Marx's Method*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Bornstein, Kate. *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women and the Rest of Us*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- . "Open Letter to LGBT Leaders Who Are Pushing Marriage Equality." In Conrad, *Against Equality*, 24–25.
- Bornstein, Kate, and S. Bear Bergman, eds. *Gender Outlaws: The Next Generation*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press, 2010.
- Boswell, John. "Revolutions, Universals, Categories." *Salmagundi*, no. 58/59 (Fall 1982/Winter 1983): 89–113.
- Bourgeault, Ron G. "The Indian, the Métis and the Fur Trade: Class, Sexism and Racism in the Transition from 'Communism' to Capitalism." *Studies in Political Economy* 12, no. 1 (Fall 1983): 45–80.
- Braithwaite, Lawrence. "Armed and Dangerous: A Gay Soldier on Misogyny, Homophobia and Racism in the Canadian Armed Forces." *Rites*, December 1991.
- Braganza, Neal. "Decolonial Struggle and History: Nandita Sharma's *Home Rule*." *Spectre*, June 12, 2021. <https://spectrejournal.com/decolonial-struggle-and-history/>.
- Brand, Dionne. "A Working Paper on Black Women in Toronto: Gender, Race and Class." In Bannerji, *Returning the Gaze*, 220–42.
- . *Bread Out of Stone*. Toronto: Coach House Press, 1994.
- . *No Burden to Carry: Narratives of Black Women in Ontario, 1920s to 1950s*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1991.
- Brandt, Allan M. *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States Since 1880*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Brant, Beth. "The Good Red Road: Journeys of Homecoming in Native Women's Writing." In Carty, *And Still We Rise*, 355–69.
- Bray, Alan. *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*. London: Gay Men's Press, 1982.
- Bray, Mark. *Antifa: The Anti-Fascist Handbook*. Brooklyn: Melville House, 2017.
- Breines, Wini, and Linda Gordon. "The New Scholarship on Family Violence." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 8, no. 3 (Spring 1983): 490–531.
- Breton, Raymond. "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 70, no. 2 (1964): 193–205.
- Briand, Jacques. "Sodomy in New France." *The Body Politic*, April 1978, 27.
- Bristow, Joseph, and Angelia R. Wilson, eds. *Activating Theory: Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Politics*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1993.
- Bristow, Peggy, ed. *We're Rooted Here and They Can't Pull Us Up: Essays in African Canadian History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- Britton, Andrew. "For Interpretation: Notes Against Camp." *Gay Left*, Winter 1978/1979, 11–14.
- Brock, Deborah R., ed. *Governing the Social in Neoliberal Times*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2019.
- . *Making Work, Making Trouble: The Social Regulation of Sexual Labour*. 2nd ed. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- . "'Unwholesome Truths': Reforming Turn of the Century Urban Ontario." Unpublished manuscript, April 1986.
- Brock, Deborah R., and Gary Kinsman. "Patriarchal Relations Ignored: An Analysis and Critique of the Badgley Report on Sexual Offences against Children and Youths." In Lowman et al., *Regulating Sex*, 107–25.

- Brock, Deborah R., Aryn E. Martin, Rebecca Raby, and Mark P. Thomas, eds. *Power and Everyday Practices*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019.
- Brodie, Janine, Shelley A.M. Gavigan, and Jane Jenson. *The Politics of Abortion*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Bronski, Michael. *Culture Clash: The Making of a Gay Sensitivity*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1984.
- Bronskill, Jim. "718 Victims of Canadian Government's Gay Purge Compensated in Settlement." *Global News*, July 13, 2019. <https://globalnews.ca/news/5491739/gay-purge-victims-canada/>.
- . "Punishment of First World War Soldiers for Sexual Orientation Detailed in New Study." *Canadian Press*, March 25, 2023. https://www.thecanadianpressnews.ca/politics/punishment-of-first-world-war-soldiers-for-sexual-orientation-detailed-in-new-study/article_28398aa2-f43b-5a50-aoae-76661c66c3c9.html.
- Brookes, Chris. *A Public Nuisance: A History of the Mummies Troupe*. Social and Economic Studies 36. St. John's, NL: University of Newfoundland, Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1988.
- Brookey, Robert Alan. *Reinventing the Male Homosexual: The Rhetoric and Power of the Gay Gene*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Brown, Eleanor. "Gay Sex Ruled Obscene: Court Rules Glad Days Porn Is Degrading and Harmful." *Xtra!*, July 24, 1992.
- Brown, Eleanor. "Have Sex, Go to Jail: Court Ruling That Teens Can Have Anal Sex May Be Appealed." *Capital Xtra!*, June 30, 1995.
- . "Hot Spots: Arrests for Public Sex Are on the Rise, Warns Lawyer." *Xtra!*, July 23, 1993.
- Brown, Michael P. *Replacing Citizenship: AIDS Activism and Radical Democracy*. New York: Guilford Press, 1997.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Pelican Books, 1986.
- Brym, Robert J., and Bonnie Fox. *From Culture to Power: The Sociology of English Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Buckley, Suzann. "Ladies or Midwives? Efforts to Reduce Infant and Maternal Mortality." In Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 131–50.
- Buckley, Suzann, and Janice Dickin McGinnis. "Venereal Disease and Public Health Reform in Canada." *The Canadian Historical Review* 63, no. 3 (1982): 337–54.
- Bullough, Vern L. *Sexual Variance in Society and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Bullough, Vern L., and Martha Voght. "Homosexuality and Its Confusion with the 'Secret Sin' in Pre-Freudian America." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 28, no. 2 (April 1973): 143–55.
- Bunch, Charlotte. "Not for Lesbians Only." *Quest* 11, no. 2 (Fall 1975).
- Burchell, Graham, Peter Miller, and Colin Gordon. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Burgis, Ben, and Matt McManus. "Why Jordan Peterson Is Always Wrong." *Jacobin*, April 24, 2020. <https://jacobinmag.com/2020/4/jordan-peterson-capitalism-postmodernism-ideology>.
- Burns, Robert. "'Queer Doings': Attitudes Towards Homosexuality in 19th Century Canada." *The Body Politic*, January 1977, 4–7.
- Burstow, Bonnie. "A History of Psychiatric Homophobia." *Phoenix Rising* 8, no. 3/4 (July 1990): S39.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Butler, Octavia E. *Lilith's Brood*. New York: Grand Central, 2007.
- . *Seed to Harvest*. New York: Grand Central, 2007.
- Callen, Michael. *Surviving AIDS*. New York: HarperCollins-Perennial, 1991.
- Callinicos, Alex. *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique*. Cambridge: Polity, 1990.

- Callwood, June. *Trial Without End: A Shocking Story of Women and Aids*. Toronto: Knopf Canada, 1996.
- Campbell, Marie. "Sexism in British Columbia Trade Unions, 1900–1920." In Latham and Kess, *In Her Own Right*, 167–86.
- Campbell, Marie, and Anne Manicom, eds. *Knowledge, Experience, and Ruling Relations: Studies in the Social Organization of Knowledge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Campey, John. "School Board Votes to Fight Discrimination with One Hand Tied Behind Its Back." *Rites*, May 1986, 4.
- Campey, John, Tim McCaskell, and Vanessa Russell. "Opening the Classroom Closet: Dealing with Sexual Orientation at the Toronto Board of Education." In Prentice, *Sex in Schools*, 82–100.
- Canada. House of Commons. Parliamentary Committee on Equality Rights. *Equality for All*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1985.
- Canada. Law Commission. *Beyond Conjuality, Recognizing and Supporting Close Personal Adult Relationships*. Ottawa: Law Commission of Canada, 2001.
- Canada. Ministry of Health and Welfare. *HIV and AIDS: Canada's Blueprint*. Ottawa: Ministry of Health and Welfare, Canada, 1990.
- Canaday, Margot. *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Canadian AIDS Society. *Homophobia, Heterosexism and AIDS*. Ottawa: Canadian AIDS Society, 1991.
- Canadian Gay Archives. *Lesbian and Gay Heritage of Toronto*. Canadian Gay Archives Publication 5. Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1982.
- Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network. *Privacy Protection and the Disclosure of Health Information: Legal Issues for People Living with HIV/AIDS in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, 2004. <http://www.hivlegalnetwork.ca/site/privacy-protection-and-the-disclosure-of-health-information-legal-issues-for-people-living-with-hiv-aids-in-canada/?lang=en>.
- Canadian Lesbian and Gay Rights Coalition. *Forum: News and Views of the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Rights Coalition* 4, no. 1 (Winter 1979).
- Cannon, Martin J. "The Regulation of First Nations Sexuality." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 18, no. 1 (1998): 1–18.
- Cannon, Martin John. *Men, Masculinity and the Indian Act*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2019.
- Cannon, Martin John, and Lina Sunseri. *Racism, Colonialism and Indigeneity in Canada: A Reader*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Cant, Bob. "A Grim Tale: The International Socialist Gay Group, 1972–1979." *Gay Left*, Autumn 1976, 7–10.
- Carby, Hazel V. "It Jus Be's Dat Way Sometime: The Sexual Politics of Women's Blues." *Radical America* 20, no. 4 (July 1986): 9–24.
- Carole, Jenny, Thomas A. Roesler, and Kimberly L. Poyer. "Are Children at Risk for Sexual Abuse by Homosexuals?" *Pediatrics* 94, no. 1 (July 1994): 41–44.
- Caron, Yves. "The Legal Enforcement of Morals and the So-Called Hart-Devlin Controversy." *McGill Law Journal* 15, no. 1 (1969): 9–47.
- Carpenter, Edward, and Noël Greig. *Edward Carpenter, Selected Writings*. Vol. 1, *Sex*. London: Gay Men's Press, 1984.
- Carter, David. *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2004.
- Carter, Vicki. "Abseil Makes the Heart Grow Fonder: Lesbian and Gay Campaigning Tactics and Section 28." In Plummer, *Modern Homosexualities*, 217–26.

- Carty, Linda E. *And Still We Rise: Feminist Political Mobilizing in Contemporary Canada*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1993.
- Casey, Leo. "Gay Rights: The Election and the Toronto Board." *Mudpie*, November 1980, 13.
- . "Sexual Politics and the Subversion of the Public Sphere: A Defense of Feminism and Gay Liberation." In *Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Liberation and Socialism*, edited by Itala Rutter, 8–16. New York: Gay and Lesbian Taskforce of DSA's Feminist Commission, 1984.
- Casey, Leo, and Gary Kinsman. "Whose Freedom and Whose Press?" In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 27.
- Cassel, Jay. "Love in the Time of War: Same-Sex Activity in New France." Paper presented at the "Out of the Archives" Conference, York University, Toronto, January 14, 1994.
- . *The Secret Plague: Venereal Disease in Canada, 1838–1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Cassidy, Walter T. "Canada's First Gay Bathhouse Raid: Windsor, 1964." *Active History*, March 3, 2021. <https://activehistory.ca/2021/03/29902/>.
- Cavanagh, Sheila L. *Queering Bathrooms: Gender, Sexuality, and the Hygienic Imagination*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- . *Sexing the Teacher: School Sex Scandals and Queer Pedagogies*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007.
- Cerullo, Margaret. "Hope and Terror: The Paradox of Gay and Lesbian Politics in the '90s." *Radical America* 24, no. 3 (1990): 10–16.
- Chamberland, Line. "Remembering Lesbian Bars: Montreal, 1955–1975." *Journal of Homosexuality* 25, no. 3 (1993): 231–69.
- . "Social Class and Integration in Lesbian Culture." In *Women Changing Academe: The Proceedings of the 1990 CWSA Conference/Les femmes changent l'académie*, edited by Sandra Kirby, Dayna Daniels, Kate McKenna, and Michele Pujol, 75–88. Winnipeg: Sororal, 1991.
- Chambers, Stephanie, Jane Farrow, Maureen FitzGerald, Edward Jackson, John Lorinc, Tim McCaskell, Rebecka Sheffield, Tatum Taylor, and Rahim Thawer, eds. *Any Other Way: How Toronto Got Queer*. Toronto: Coach House Books, 2017.
- Champagne, Robert. "Psychopaths and Perverts: The Canadian Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, 1954–58." *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, September 1986, 7–9.
- Chapman, Chris, and A.J. Withers. *A Violent History of Benevolence: Interlocking Oppression in the Moral Economies of Social Working*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019.
- Chapman, Terry L. "An Oscar Wilde Type: 'The Abominable Crime of Buggery' in Western Canada, 1890–1920." In *Criminal Justice History: An International Annual*, Vol. 4, 1983, 97–118. *Criminal Justice History* 4. New York: Crime and Justice History Group, 1984.
- . "The Anti-Drug Crusade in Western Canada, 1885–1925." In *Law and Society in Canada in Historical Perspective*, edited by Louis A. Knafla and David Jay Bercuson, 18–27. University of Calgary Studies in History 2. Calgary, AB: University of Calgary, 1979.
- . "Early Eugenics Movement in Western Canada." *Alberta History* 25, no. 4 (Autumn 1977): 9–17.
- . *Lesbian/Gay History Researchers Network Newsletter*, December 1981, 14.
- . "Male Homosexuality: Legal Restraints and Social Attitudes in Western Canada, 1890–1920." In *Law and Justice in a New Land: Essays in Western Canadian Legal History*, edited by Louis A. Knafla, 267–92. Toronto: Carswell, 1986.
- . "Sex Crimes in Western Canada, 1890–1920." PhD diss., University of Alberta, 1984.
- . "Sexual Deviation in Western Canada, 1890–1920." Paper presented at the Northern Great Plains Conference, Winnipeg, MB, 1979.

- Chase, Cheryl. "Hermaphrodites with Attitude: Mapping the Emergence of Intersex Political Activism." In LaFont, *Constructing Sexualities*, 172–87.
- Chauncey, George. "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion? Homosexual Identities and the Construction of Sexual Boundaries in the World War I Era." In Chauncey, Duberman, and Vicinus, *Hidden from History*, 294–317.
- . "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion? Homosexual Identities and the Construction of Sexual Boundaries in the World War One Era." *Journal of Social History* 19, no. 2 (Winter 1985): 189–211.
- . "From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: Medicine and the Changing Conceptualization of Female Deviance." *Salmagundi*, no. 58/59 (Fall 1982/Winter 1983): 114–46.
- . *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- . "The National Panic Over Child Abuse After World War II and the Emergence of Cold War Anti-Homosexual Politics." Paper presented at the "Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives" Lesbian/Gay History Conference, Toronto, July 1985.
- . *Why Marriage?: The History Shaping Today's Debate Over Gay Equality*. New York: Basic Books, 2004.
- Chen, Ching-In, Jai Dulani, and Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha, eds. *The Revolution Starts at Home: Confronting Intimate Violence Within Activist Communities*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2016.
- Chenier, Ele. "A Place Like the Continental." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 98–101.
- . "The Criminal Sexual Psychopath in Canada: Sex, Psychiatry and the Law at Mid-Century." *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 20, no. 1 (2003): 75–101.
- . "Liberating Marriage: Gay Liberation and Same-Sex Marriage in Early 1970s Canada." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 29–30.
- . "Love-Politics: Lesbian Wedding Practices in Canada and the United States from the 1920s to the 1970s." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 27, no. 2 (May 2018): 294–321.
- . "Rethinking Class in Lesbian Bar Culture." In *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*, edited by Mona Lee Gleason and Adele Perry, 5th ed. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- . "Rethinking Class in Lesbian Bar Culture: Living 'The Gay Life' in Toronto, 1955–1965." *Left History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Historical Inquiry and Debate* 9, no. 2 (2004): 85–118.
- . "Risks, Roles and Rounders: Lesbian Bar Culture in Toronto, 1950–65." Unpublished manuscript, York University, Toronto, January 1994.
- . *Strangers in Our Midst: Sexual Deviancy in Postwar Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- . "Tough Ladies and Troublemakers: Toronto's Public Lesbian Community, 1955–1965." Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1995.
- Chidley-Hall, John. "Police Chiefs Sorry for 1968 Fight Against Decriminalization Of Homosexuality." *HuffPost Canada*, December 10, 2020, sec. News. https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/police-apologize-decriminalization-homosexuality_ca_5fd2ac1bc5b61d81b33d3feb.
- Churchill, David Stewart. "Coming Out in a Cold Climate: A History of Gay Men in Toronto during the 1950s." Master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1993.
- . "Gay Sites and Public Space: Toronto in the 1950s." Paper presented at the "Out of the Archives" Conference, York University, Toronto, January 1994.
- . "Personal Ad Politics: Race, Sexuality and Power." *Left History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Historical Inquiry and Debate* 8, no. 2 (2003): 114–34.
- Clare, Eli. *Exile and Pride: Disability, Queerness and Liberation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015.

- Clark, C.S. *Of Toronto the Good: A Social Study, the Queen City of Canada As It Is*. Toronto Publishing Company, 1898.
- Clark, William Lund. *Our Sons*. Ontario: William Lund Clark, 1914. <https://www.canadiana.ca/view/oocihm.65014/177?r=0&s=1>.
- Clarke, John, Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson, and Brian Roberts. "Subcultures, Cultures and Class: A Theoretical Overview." In *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*, edited by Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, 9–74. London: Hutchinson, 1976.
- Claus, Ruth F. "Confronting Homosexuality: A Letter from Frances Wilder." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2, no. 4 (1977): 928–33.
- Cleaver, Harry. *Reading Capital Politically*. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2000.
- Coalition for Gay Rights in Ontario. *The Ontario Human Rights Omission: A Brief to the Members of the Ontario Legislature*. Toronto: Coalition for Gay Rights in Ontario, 1981.
- Coburn, Wendy, dir. *Slut Nation: Anatomy of a Protest*. Toronto: Vtape, 2014.
- Cohen, Derek, and Richard Dyer. "The Politics of Gay Culture." In *Gay Left Collective, Homosexuality*, 178.
- Cohen, Stanley. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and the Rockers*. London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1972.
- Cohen, Stanley, and Jock Young, eds. *The Manufacture of News: Deviance, Social Problems and the Mass Media*. London: Constable, 1973.
- Cole, Desmond. *The Skin We're In: A Year of Black Resistance and Power*. Toronto: Doubleday, 2020.
- Cole, Samantha. "Pornhub Just Purged All Unverified Content From the Platform." *Vice*, December 14, 2020. https://www.vice.com/amp/en/article/jgqjyy/pornhub-suspended-all-unverified-videos-content?__twitter_impression=true.
- Collins, Evan, and Gary Kinsman. "The Politics of AIDS." *Rites*, February 1985, 12–13, 17.
- Committee on Sexual Offences Against Children and Youths (Canada), and Robin F Badgley. *Sexual Offences Against Children and Youths: Report of the Committee on Sexual Offences against Children and Youths*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1984.
- Comstock, Gary David. *Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Connell, Raewyn. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- . *Which Way Is Up?: Essays on Sex, Class, and Culture*. Sydney: G. Allen & Unwin, 1983.
- Connor, Christopher T. "The Gay White Colonizers: NYE Circuit Parties In Mexico." *Washington Blade*, January 21, 2021. <https://www.washingtonblade.com/2021/01/21/the-gay-white-colonizers-nye-circuit-parties-in-mexico/>.
- Conrad, Ryan, ed. *Against Equality: Queer Revolution, Not Mere Inclusion*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2014.
- Cooper, Davina. *Sexing the City: Lesbian and Gay Politics within the Activist State*. London: Rivers Oram, 1994.
- Corrigan, Philip Richard D., ed. *Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory*. London; New York: Quartet Books, 1981.
- . "On Moral Regulation: Some Preliminary Remarks." *The Sociological Review* 29, no. 2 (May 1981): 313–37.
- . *Social Forms/Human Capacities: Essays on Authority and Difference*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- . "Towards a Celebration of Difference(s): Notes for a Sociology of a Possible Everyday Future." In *Rethinking Social Inequality*, edited by David Robbins, Lesley Caldwell, Graham Day, Karen Jones, and Hilary Rose. London: Gower, 1982.

- Corrigan, Philip Richard D., and Derek Sayer. *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1991.
- . “How the Law Rules.” In *Law, State and Society*, edited by Bob Fryer, Alan Hunt, and Doreen MacBarnet, 21–53. London: Croom Helm, 1981.
- Cory, Donald Webster. *The Homosexual in America: A Subjective Approach*. New York: Greenberg, 1951.
- Cossman, Brenda. “The 1969 Criminal Amendments: Constituting the Terms of Gay Resistance.” *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 245–62.
- . “Censor, Resist, Repeat: A History of Censorship of Gay and Lesbian Sexual Representation in Canada.” *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy* 21, no. 1 (Fall 2014): 45–66.
- . “Harm Is the New Indecency Test.” *Xtra Magazine*, January 4, 2006.
- “Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories: Thoughts on Moving Beside Our Debates.” LGBT Purge Fund, n.d. <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Monument-Briefing-Documents-EN-Brenda-Cossman.pdf>.
- . *The New Sex Wars: Sexual Harm in the #MeToo Era*. New York: NYU Press, 2021.
- . “No Sex Please: National Lobby Group Stands Up for Respectable Rights Only.” *Daily Xtra!*, February 25, 1999.
- Cossman, Brenda, Shannon Bell, Lise Gotell, and Becki L. Ross. *Bad Attitude/s on Trial: Pornography, Feminism, and the Butler Decision*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Cott, Nancy F. “Passionlessness: An Interpretation of Victorian Sexual Ideology, 1750–1850.” In *A Heritage of Her Own: Toward a New Social History of American Women*, edited by Nancy F. Cott and Elizabeth H. Pleck, 162–81. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. *Red Skins, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.
- Coussins, Jean, and Anna Coote. *The Family in the Firing Line: Discussion Document on Family Policy*. Poverty Pamphlet 51. London: Child Poverty Action Group/National Council for Civil Liberties, 1981.
- Coutere, Joseph. “Complaints Filed.” *Xtra!*, June 23, 1994.
- . “Complaints Filed.” *Xtra!*, September 23, 1994.
- . “The London Kiddie Porn Ring That Isn’t.” *Xtra!*, September 23, 1994.
- Cozijn, John. “Sydney 1981: A Community Taking Shape.” *Gay Information*, Autumn/Winter 1982, 4–10.
- Crane, Paul. *Gays and the Law*. London: Pluto Press, 1982.
- Crawford, William, and Alex Spence, eds. *Homosexuality in Canada: A Bibliography*. 2nd ed. Canadian Gay Archives Publication 9. Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1984.
- Creet, Julia. “A Test of Unity: Lesbian Visibility in the British Columbia Federation of Women.” In Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 183–97.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1, no. “Feminism in the Law: Theory, Practice and Criticism,” special issue (1989): 139–68.
- . “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6 (1991): 1241–99.
- Crichlow, Wesley E.A. *Buller Men and Batty Bwoys: Hidden Men in Toronto and Halifax Black Communities*. University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Crimp, Douglas. *AIDSDEMOGRAPHICS*. Seattle: Bay Press, 1990.
- . “How to Have Promiscuity in An Epidemic.” In *AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism*, edited by Douglas Crimp, 238–47. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988.
- Cummings, Ronald, and Nalini Mohabir, eds. *The Fire That Time: Transnational Black Radicalism and the Sir George Williams Occupation*. Montréal: Black Rose, 2021.

- Cunningham, Frank, ed. *Social Movements/Social Change: The Politics and Practice of Organizing*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1988.
- Curtis, Bruce. *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836–1871*. London, ON: Althouse Press, 1988.
- . “‘Illicit’ Sexuality and Public Education, 1840–1907.” In Prentice, *Sex in Schools*, 101–30.
- . “Preconditions of the Canadian State: Educational Reform and the Construction of a Public in Upper Canada, 1837–1846.” *Studies in Political Economy* 10, no. 1 (Winter 1983): 99–121.
- . “The Speller Expelled: Disciplining the Common Reader in Canada West.” *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie* 22, no. 3 (August 1985): 346–68.
- Da Costa, Jade Crimson Rosa. “Pride Parades in Queer Times: Disrupting Time, Norms, and nationhood in Canada.” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 434–58.
- Dale, Roger, Geoff Esland, Ross Fergusson, and Madeleine MacDonald, eds. *Education and the State*, Vol. 2, *Politics, Patriarchy and Practice*. 2 vols. Sussex: Falmer Press in association with the Open University Press, 1981.
- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, Harry Cleaver, and Camille Barbagallo. *Women and the Subversion of the Community: A Mariarosa Dalla Costa Reader*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2019.
- Davidoff, Leonore. “Class and Gender in Victorian England: The Diaries of Arthur J. Munby and Hannah Cullwick.” *Feminist Studies* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 87–141.
- Davies, Matilda. “Police Fine Men Cruising for Gay Sex on London’s Hampstead Heath for Breaking Coronavirus Restrictions.” *PinkNews* (blog), December 22, 2020. <https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2020/12/22/hampstead-heath-gay-cruising-police-fine-covid-19-regulations/>.
- Davin, Anna. “Imperialism and Motherhood.” *History Workshop* 5, no. 1 (1978): 9–65.
- Davis, Angela Yvonne. *Blues Legacies and Black Feminism: Gertrude “Ma” Rainey, Bessie Smith and Billie Holiday*. New York: Vintage, 1999.
- . *Women, Race & Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.
- Davis, Angela, Gina Dent, Erica Meiners, and Beth Richie. *Abolition. Feminism. Now*. Chicago: Haymarket, 2022.
- Davis, Bob. “Toronto’s Right-Wing Hate Campaign: Some Thoughts.” *Mudpie*, April 1981.
- Davis, Madeline, and Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy. “Oral History and the Study of Sexuality in the Lesbian Community: Buffalo, New York, 1940–1960.” *Feminist Studies* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 7–26.
- Dawson, Tyler. “Federal Court Rules a Gay Man and a Straight Woman Can Be In a ‘Conjugal Relationship.’” *National Post*, September 29, 2020. <https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/federal-court-rules-a-gay-man-and-straight-woman-can-be-in-a-conjugal-relationship>.
- Day, Dian. “Lesbian/Mother.” In Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 35–47.
- Day, Richard J.F. *Gramsci Is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006.
- Dean, James Joseph. *Straights: Heterosexuality in Post-Closeted Culture*. New York: New York University Press, 2014.
- Dean, Mitchell. “‘A Social Structure of Many Souls’: Moral Regulation, Government, and Self-Formation.” *The Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 19, no. 2 (1994): 145–68.
- . *The Constitution of Poverty: Toward a Genealogy of Liberal Governance*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Dean, Tim. *Unlimited Intimacy: Reflections on the Subculture of Barebacking*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Defoe, Chris. “Little Sister v. Big Brother.” *Globe & Mail*, October 8, 1994.
- DeGagne, Alexa. “‘Severely Queer’ in Western Canada: LGBT2Q Activism in Alberta.” In Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 163–83.

- D'Emilio, John. "Capitalism and Gay Identity." In Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson, *Powers of Desire*, 100–13.
- . "Gay Politics, Gay Community: San Francisco's Experience." *Socialist Review*, no. 55 (February 1981): 80–81.
- . "The Marriage Fight Is Setting Us Back." In Conrad, *Against Equality*, 51–56.
- . *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940–70*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Derbyshire, Philip. "Sects and Sexuality: Trotskyism and the Politics of Homosexuality." In Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 104–15.
- Deslandes, Paul, and Dan Healey. *Queer Lives, Queer Cultures: A Selected Bibliography of Lesbian and Gay History*. Toronto: The Lesbian and Gay History Discussion Group, University of Toronto, History Department and the Toronto Centre for Lesbian and Gay Studies, 1995.
- Devlin, Brenden. "Critical Infrastructure Protection: Dangerous Politics in Manitoba, Alberta and Beyond." *Canadian Dimension*, February 17, 2021. <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/critical-infrastructure-protection-dangerous-politics-in-manitoba-alberta-and-beyond>.
- Devlin, Patrick. *The Enforcement of Morals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- D.G. "The Cops Always Face Towards Us." *Midnight Sun*, March 3, 2022. <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/the-cops-always-face-towards-us/>.
- Diamond, Sara. "Lesbians against the BC Budget." *Pink Ink*, October 1983.
- Diaz, Kay. "Are Gay Men Born That Way?" *Z Magazine*, December 1992, 42–46.
- Dick, Lyle. "Heterohegemonic Discourse and Homosexual Acts: The Case of Saskatchewan in the Settlement Era." Paper presented at the "Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives" Lesbian/Gay History Conference, Toronto, July 1985.
- . "The Queer Frontier: Male Same-Sex Experience in Western Canada's Settlement Era." *Journal of Canadian Studies Journal of Canadian Studies* 48, no. 1 (Winter 2014): 15–52.
- . "Same-Sex Intersections of the Prairie Settlement Era: The 1895 Case of Regina's 'Oscar Wilde.'" *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 42, no. 1 (2009): 107–45.
- Dillon, Stephen. *Fugitive Life: The Queer Politics of the Prison State*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018.
- DiNovo, Cheri. *The Queer Evangelist: A Socialist Clergy's Radically Honest Tale*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2021.
- Diverlus, Rodney, Sandy Hudson, and Syrus Marcus Ware, eds. *Until We Are Free: Reflections on Black Lives Matter in Canada*. Regina, SK: University of Regina Press, 2020.
- Donzelot, Jacques. *The Policing of Families*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.
- Doll, Agnieszka, Laura Bisailon, and Kevin Walby, eds. *Political Activist Ethnography: Studies in the Social Relations of Struggle*. Athabasca: Athabasca University Press, 2023.
- Doucette, Joanne. "Redefining Difference: Disabled Lesbians Resist." In Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 61–72.
- Douglas, Debbie. "That Collective House on Dewson Street." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 176–77.
- Douglas, Mary. *Natural Symbols*. New York: Penguin Books, 1973.
- . *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Dover, Kenneth James. *Greek Homosexuality*. 1st ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1980.
- Doyle, Jude Ellison S. "How the Far-Right Is Turning Feminists into Fascists," *Xtra*, April 1, 2022. <https://xtramagazine.com/power/far-right-feminist-fascist-220810>.
- Driskill, Qwo-Li. *Asegi Stories: Cherokee Queer and Two-Spirit Memory*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2016.
- . "Stolen from Our Bodies: First Nations Two-Spirits/Queers and the Journey to a Sovereign Erotic." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 16, no. 2 (2004): 50–64.

- Driskill, Qwo-Li, Chris Finley, Joseph Gilley, and Scott Lauria Morgensen, eds. *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011.
- Drucker, Peter, ed. *Different Rainbows*. London; Chicago: Gay Men's Press, 2000.
- . "In the Tropics There Is No Sin': Sexuality and Gay-Lesbian Movements in the Third World." *New Left Review* 218, no. 1 (August 1996): 75–101.
- . "Kevin Floyd's Foundational Queer Marxism: A Tribute." *Mediations: Journal of the Marxist Literary Group* 34, no. 1 (Fall 2020): 41–45.
- . "#MeToo and Queer Experience." *Salvage* (blog), May 3, 2020. <https://salvage.zone/articles/metoo-and-queer-experience/>.
- . "Toward a Queer Marxism?" *Against the Current* 26, no. 1 (April 2011): 36–40.
- . *Warped: Gay Normality and Queer Anti-Capitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016.
- "Drug Cards and Welfare." *Xtra!*, June 17, 1994.
- Dryden, Joel. "Alberta Meat-Processing Plant Tied to Canada's Largest COVID-19 Outbreak to Re-Open Within Days." *CBC News*, April 29, 2020. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/cargill-high-river-jon-nash-meat-packing-plant-covid-19-1.5549774>.
- Dryden, OmiSoore H. "A Queer Too Far': Blackness, 'Gay Blood,' and Transgressive Possibilities." In Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 116–32.
- . "Black Queer Radical Thought in the Unjust Society." Presentation presented at the Anti-69 Forum, Carleton University, Ottawa, March 24, 2019. <https://anti-69.ca/vids/>.
- . "It's in Us to Give: Black Life and the Racial Profiling of Blood Donation." In Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 211–16.
- . "Ma-Ka Juk Yuh: A Genealogy of Black Queer Liveability in Toronto." In Haritaworn et al., *Queering Urban Justice*, 62–83.
- Dryden, OmiSoore H., and Suzanne Lenon, eds. *Disrupting Queer Inclusion: Canadian Homonationalism and the Politics of Belonging*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2015.
- Dryden, OmiSoore H., and Onye Nnorom. "Time to Dismantle Systemic Anti-Black Racism in Medicine in Canada." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 193, no. 2 (2021): E55–E57.
- Duberman, Martin B., ed. *About Time: Exploring the Gay Past*. New York: Gay Presses of New York, 1986.
- . *Andrea Dworkin: The Feminist as Revolutionary*. New York: New Press, 2020.
- . *Cures: A Gay Man's Odyssey*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1991.
- . "Gay in the Fifties." *Salmagundi*, no. 58/59 (Fall 1982/Winter 1983): 42–75.
- . *Has the Gay Movement Failed?* Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2018.
- Duberman, Martin B., Fred Eggan, and Richard Clemmers, eds. "Documents in Hopi Indian Sexuality: Imperialism, Culture and Resistance." *Radical History Review*, no. 20 (May 1979): 99–130.
- Duberman, Martin, George Chauncey, and Martha Vicinus, eds. *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. New York: Meridian, 1990.
- Dubinsky, Karen. *Improper Advances: Rape and Heterosexual Conflict in Ontario, 1880–1929*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- . "'Maidenly Girls' or 'Designing Women'? The Crime of Seduction in Turn-of-the-Century Ontario." In Valverde and Iacovetta, *Gender Conflicts*, 27–66.
- Dubrovsky, Ruth, and Lorna Niles. *Lesbian and Gay Exclusion: The Policy That Dare Not Speak Its Name*. New York: United Labor Press, 1982.
- Duder, Cameron. *Awfully Devoted Women: Lesbian Lives in Canada, 1900–1965*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010.
- Duggan, John. "RCMP Destroys Files...Maybe." *Rites*, October 1984, 7.
- Duggan, Lisa. "Queering the State." *Social Text*, no. 39 (Summer 1994): 1–14.

- . “The New Homonormativity: The Sexual Politics of Neoliberalism.” In *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*, edited by Russ Castronovo and Dana D. Nelson, 175–94. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.
- . “The Trials of Alice Mitchell: Sensationalism, Sexology, and the Lesbian Subject in Turn-of-the-Century America.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1993): 791–814.
- . *The Twilight of Equality?: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2003.
- Dummitt, Chris, and Christabelle Sethna, eds. *No Place for the State: The Origins and Legacies of the 1969 Omnibus Bill*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2020.
- Durisin, Elya M., Emily Van der Meulen, and Chris Bruckert, eds. *Red Light Labour: Sex Work Regulation, Agency, and Resistance*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2018.
- Dworkin, Ronald. *The Philosophy of Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- . “It’s Being So Camp as Keeps Us Going.” *The Body Politic*, September 1977, 11–13.
- Dyer-Witheford, Nick. *Cyber-Marx: Circuits and Cycles of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Ebert, Teresa L. *Ludic Feminism and After*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Edgar, Adrian. “Dr. Adrian Edgar on the Impending Closure of Clinic 554.” *NB Media Co-Op* (blog), October 10, 2019. <https://nbmediacoop.org/2019/10/10/dr-adrian-edgar-on-impending-closure-of-clinic-554/>.
- Edwards, Allen Louis. *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule*. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1953.
- Edwards, Kevin. “Canadian Banks and Economic Control in the Caribbean.” *NACLA*, March 15, 2012. <https://nacla.org/blog/2012/3/15/canadian-banks-and-economic-control-caribbean>.
- Edwards, Tim. *Erotics and Politics: Gay Male Sexuality, Masculinity, and Feminism*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Egale. *Just Society Report: Grossly Indecent: Confronting the Legacy of State Sponsored Discrimination Against Canada’s LGBTQ2SI Communities*. Toronto: Egale, 2016. <https://lgbtpurge.com/case-documents/>.
- Egale Canada. “Egale’s Submission to the UN Committee Against Torture (UN CAT) for Intersex Rights.” Egale, October 18, 2018. <https://egale.ca/egale-submission-to-the-un-committee-against-torture/>.
- Egan, Geoffrey. “These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species: Notes Toward a History of Homosexuality in Canada, 1890–1930.” Unpublished manuscript. Concordia University, Montreal, April 1980.
- Egan, James. “Civil Liberties and the Homosexual.” *Toronto Star*. October 23, 1963.
- Egan, Jim. “Canada’s Pioneer Gay Activist Jim Egan,” Interview and introduction by Robert Champagne. *Rites*, January 1986, 12–14.
- . *Challenging the Conspiracy of Silence: My Life as a Canadian Gay Activist*. Edited by Donald W. McLeod. Toronto: Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives/Homewood Books, 1998.
- . *Jim Egan: Canada’s Pioneer Gay Activist*. Edited and compiled by Robert Champagne. Toronto: Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Network, 1987.
- . “Parliamentary Legislative Committee Ignored This Letter from Homosexual Suggesting Changes in Criminal Code.” *Justice Weekly*. March 19, 1955.
- . “‘Toronto Fairy-Go-Round,’ So the Chief of Police Said to The Royal Commission.” *Justice Weekly*, November 7, 1959.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1984.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process, Volume One: The History of Manners*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

- . *The Civilizing Process, Volume Two: Power and Civility*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.
- Elliott, Doug. “Gay Rights Lawyer Doug Elliott on Pride Parade Disruption.” Radio. *Kelly Cutrara*. Global News Radio, 640 Toronto, July 4, 2016. <https://omny.fm/shows/kelly-cutrara/gay-rights-lawyer-doug-elliott-on-pride-parade-dis>.
- Emke, Ivan. “Speaking of AIDS in Canada: The Texts and Contexts of Official, Counter-Cultural and Mass Media Discourses Surrounding AIDS.” PhD diss., Carleton University, 1991.
- Emmerich, Roland, dir. *Stonewall*. Written by Jon Robin Baitz. United States: Roadside Attractions, 2015. 129 min.
- Engels, Friedrich. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, in Light of the Researches of Lewis H. Morgan*. New York: International Publishers, 1930s.
- Engler, Yves. “Toronto’s Jewish Defence League Is a Far Right Group with Powerful Friends.” *Rabble*, April 5, 2017. <https://rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/yves-englers-blog/2017/04/toronto-jewish-defence-league-far-right-group-powerful>.
- Epstein, Edward Jay. *News from Nowhere: Television and the News*. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Epstein, Rachel, ed. *Who’s Your Daddy?: And Other Writings on Queer Parenting*. 1st ed. Toronto: Sumach Press, 2009.
- Epstein, Steven. “Gay Politics and Ethnic Identity: The Limits of Social Constructionism.” *Socialist Review*, no. 93/94 (August 1987): 9–56.
- . “Governing Sexual Health: Bridging Biocitizenship and Sexual Citizenship.” In *Biocitizenship: The Politics of Bodies, Governance, and Power*, edited by Kelly Happe, Jenell Johnson, and Marina Levina, 21–50. New York: New York University Press, 2018.
- Epstein-Fine, Sadie, and Makeda Zook, eds. *Spawning Generations: Rants and Reflections on Growing Up with LGBTQ+ Parents*. Bradford, ON: Demeter Press, 2018.
- Erwin, Lorna. “Neoconservatism and the Canadian Pro-Family Movement.” *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie* 30, no. 3 (1993): 401–20.
- . “REAL Women: Anti-Feminism and the Welfare State.” *Resources for Feminist Research* 17, no. 3 (September 1988): 147–49.
- . “What Feminists Should Know about the Pro-Family Movement in Canada: A Report on a Recent Survey of Rank-and-File Members.” In *Feminist Perspectives: Prospect and Retrospect*, edited by Peta Tancred-Sheriff, 266–78. Kingston, ON: Published for the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women by McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1988.
- Estes, Nick. *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock Versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*. London: Verso Books, 2019.
- Ettorre, Elizabeth. *Lesbians, Women, and Society*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Evans, David. *Sexual Citizenship: The Material Construction of Sexualities*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Even the Dust: Anti-Police Publication* (Montreal). “Indesirables: Police Persecution of Men Who Have Sex with Men in the Greater Montreal Area (2010–Present).” 2018. <http://archive.org/details/Indesirables>.
- “Everett George Klippert and Her Majesty the Queen Case.” *Canada Law Reports* 1967 (1967): 822–36.
- Everett, Joanna. “Mobilization on the Periphery: LGBT Activism and Success in Atlantic Canada.” In Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 125–41.
- Ewen, Stuart. *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Ewen, Stuart, and Elizabeth Ewen. *Channels of Desire: Mass Images and the Shaping of American Consciousness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1982.

- Fadel, Alec. "Homosexual Offences in Ottawa 1950–1967: The Medicalization of the Legal Process." Master's thesis, Concordia University, 1994.
- Faderman, Lillian. *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- . *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love Between Women, from the Renaissance to the Present*. New York: William Morrow, 1981.
- Faraday, Annabel. "Liberating Lesbian Research." In Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 112–29.
- Farmer, Paul. *AIDS and Accusation: Haiti and the Geography of Name*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1992.
- Farrow, Kenyon. "Is Gay Marriage Anti-Black?" In Conrad, *Against Equality*, 33–44.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- . "The Five Sexes: Revisited." *The Sciences* 40, no. 4 (2000): 166–71.
- . "The Five Sexes: Why Male and Female Are Never Enough." In LaFont, *Constructing Sexualities*, 166–71.
- Feasby, W.R. *Official History of the Canadian Medical Services, 1939–1945*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Ottawa: E. Cloutier, Queen's Printer, 1956.
- Federici, Silvia. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia, 2004.
- . "Interview with Silvia Federici." In Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 151–52.
- . *Patriarchy of the Wage: Notes on Marx, Gender, and Feminism*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2021.
- . *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland, CA: PM Press/Autonomedia, 2012.
- Federici, Silvia, and Arlen Austin. *Wages for Housework: The New York Committee 1972–77: History, Theory, and Documents*. New York: Autonomedia, 2017.
- Feinberg, Leslie. *Trans Liberation: Beyond Pink or Blue*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1998.
- Ferber, Alana. "Judith Butler on the Culture Wars, J.K. Rowling, and Living in 'Anti-Intellectual Times,' Interview with Judith Butler." *New Statesman*, September 22, 2020. <https://www.newstatesman.com/international/2020/09/judith-butler-culture-wars-jk-rowling-and-living-anti-intellectual-times>.
- Ferguson, Ann. *Blood at the Root: Motherhood, Sexuality and Male Dominance*. London: Pandora, 1989.
- . "Patriarchy, Sexual Identity, and the Sexual Revolution." *Signs* 7, no. 1 (1981): 158–72.
- . "Sex War: The Debate Between Radical and Libertarian Feminists." *Signs* 10, no. 1 (1984): 106–12.
- . *Sexual Democracy: Women, Oppression and Revolution*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991.
- Ferguson, Roderick A. *Aberrations in Black: Towards a Queer of Colour Critique*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
- . *One Dimensional Queer*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press, 2018.
- Ferguson, Sue. "Engaging Federici on Marx, Capitalism, and Social Reproduction." *New Politics* (Winter 2022). <https://newpol.org/review/engaging-federici-on-marx-capitalism-and-social-reproduction/>.
- Ferguson, Susan. "Life-Making or Death-Making?," *Midnight Sun*, October 17, 2021. <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/life-making-or-death-making/>.
- . *Women and Work: Feminism, Labour, and Social Reproduction*. London: Pluto Press, 2019.
- Ferguson, T.J. "The Transition Problem: A Review of Transgender Marxism." *Spectre* 6 (Fall 2022): 68–77.

- Fernandez, Sharon. "Desh Pardesh: A Cultural Festival with Attitude." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 261–64.
- Field, Paul, Robin E.R. Bunce, Leila Hassan, Margaret Peacock, and Race Today Collective, eds. *Here to Stay, Here to Fight: A "Race Today" Anthology*. London: Pluto Press, 2019.
- Fields, Bill. "The Rise and Fall of the Fifty Per Cent Solution: Lesbians in the Canadian Gay Rights Movement." Unpublished manuscript. Faculty of Social Work, University of Regina, 1983.
- Filipenko, Cindy. "BC Grits Slam Adoption." *Xtra!*, May 20, 1995.
- . "Canada Customs Changes the Rules: Anal Sex Flip-Flop Appears Timed to Influence Court Challenge." *Xtra!*, October 14, 1994.
- Finch, Lynette. *The Clashing Gaze: Sexuality, Class and Surveillance*. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1993.
- Findlay, Barbara. "A Lesbian's Relationship Is Finally Recognized, but Only So the Government Can Deny Her a Welfare Cheque." *Xtra!*, September 2, 1994.
- Findlay, Dennis, and Philip McLeod. "Police Entrapment Fighting Back with Courtwatch, Interview with Dennis Findlay and Philip McLeod." By Gay Kinsman and Doug Wilson. *Rites*, November 1984, 9–11.
- Fishman, Mark. *Manufacturing the News*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980.
- Fitzpatrick, Peter, and Alan Hunt, eds. *Critical Legal Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- Flavelle, Dana. "Homosexuality Destroyed Decorated Soldier's Career." *Toronto Star*. March 15, 1986.
- Fleming, Thomas S. "Bawdy House 'Boys': Some Notes on Media, Sporadic Moral Crusades, and Selective Law Enforcement." *Canadian Criminology Forum* 3, no. 2 (1981): 101–17.
- Floyd, Kevin. *The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.
- Forbes, John. "Sarah Ellen Dunlop and the Music Room: A Memory." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 127–28.
- Ford, Clellan S. *Smoke from Their Fires: The Life of a Kwakiutl Chief*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1995.
- Ford, Clellan S., and Frank A. Beach. *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1972.
- Forester, Monica, and Chantalle Gallnat. "Organizing on the Corner: Trans Women of Colour and Sex Worker Activism in Toronto in the 1980s and 1990s: Interview with Monica Forester and Chantalle Gallnat." By Syrus Marcus Ware. In Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*, 23–33.
- Forgione, Steve, Kurt T. Hill, David Thorstad, and Socialist Workers Party. *No Apologies: The Unauthorized Publication of International Discussion Documents of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) Concerning Lesbian/Gay Male Liberation. Part 2*. New York: D. Thorstad, 1980.
- Fortin, Gérard, and Boyce Richardson. *Life of the Party*. Montréal: Vehicule Press, 1984.
- Foster, Marion, and Kent Murray. *A Not So Gay World: Homosexuality in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1972.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- . *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1, An Introduction*. 1st ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1980.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure*. 1st American ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- . "Sex, Power and the Politics of Identity: Interview with Michel Foucault." By Bob Gallagher and Alexander Wilson. *The Advocate*, August 7, 1984, 30.
- Foucault, Michel, Herculeine Barbin, and Oskar Panizza. *Herculeine Barbin: Being the Recently Discovered Memoirs of a Nineteenth-Century French Hermaphrodite*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

- Frampton, Caelie, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, and Kate Tilleczek, eds. *Sociology for Changing the World: Social Movements/Social Research*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood, 2006.
- Frampton, Caelie, Gary Kinsman, Andrew Thompson, and Kate Tilleczek. "New Directions for Activist Research." In Frampton, Kinsman, Thompson, and Tilleczek, *Sociology for Changing the World*, 247–57.
- Francescani, Chris. "The Rise and Fall of Kevin Spacey: A Timeline of Sexual Abuse Allegations." *ABC News*, June 3, 2019. <https://abcnews.go.com/US/rise-fall-kevin-spacey-timeline-sexual-assault-allegations/story?id=63420983>.
- Frank, Blye. "Hegemonic Heterosexual Masculinity." *Studies in Political Economy* 24, no. 1 (January 1, 1987): 159–70.
- . "Hegemonic Heterosexual Masculinity: Sports, Looks and a Woman, That's What Every Guy Needs to Be Masculine." In *Violence and Social Control in the Home, Workplace, Community and Institutions*, 273–303. ISER Conference Papers 3. St. John's: ISER Press, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1992.
- . "Queer Selves/Queer in Schools: Young Men and Sexualities." In Prentice, *Sex in Schools*, 44–59.
- Frankenberg, Ruth. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Fraser, James. "Piecing It Together: The 1950s." *Lesbian/Gay History Researchers Network Newsletter*, December 1981, 13.
- Fraser, Steven. *The Bell Curve Wars: Race, Intelligence, and the Future of America*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
- Freedman, Estelle. "Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870–1930." *Feminist Studies* 5, no. 3 (Fall 1979): 512–29.
- . "'Uncontrolled Desires': The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920–1960." In Peiss, Simmons, and Padgug, *Passion and Power*, 199–225.
- . "'Uncontrolled Desires': The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920–1960." *The Journal of American History* 74, no. 1 (1987): 83–106.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum, 1970.
- French, Maggie. "Loves, Sexualities, and Marriages: Strategies and Adjustments." In Plummer, *Modern Homosexualities*, 87–98.
- Friedman, Michael. "Yih and Kulldorff's 'Radical' Covid Strategy: A Recipe for Disaster." *Spectre Journal*, September 24, 2020. <https://spectrejournal.com/yih-and-kulldorffs-radical-covid-strategy/>.
- Fritz, John. "The Child as Legal Subject." In *Education and the State*, Vol. 2, *Politics, Patriarchy and Practice*, edited by Roger Dale, Geoff Esland, Ross Fergusson, and Madeleine MacDonald, 285–302. Sussex: Falmer Press in association with the Open University Press, 1981.
- Fuller, Janine, and Stuart Blackley. *Restricted Entry: Censorship on Trial*. Edited by Nancy Pollak. 2nd ed. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, 1996.
- Fung, Richard. "It Was a Heterotopia: Four Decades of Queer of Colour Art and Activism in Toronto: Interview with Richard Fung." By Jinthana Haritaworn. In Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*, 35–45.
- . "Looking for My Penis: The Eroticized Asian in Gay Video Porn." In *Bad Object-Choices, How Do I Look?*, 145–60.
- . "The Trouble with 'Asians.'" In *Negotiating Lesbian and Gay Subjects*, edited by Monica Dorenkamp and Richard Henke, 123–30. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Funk, Nanette, and Magda Mueller, eds. *Gender Politics and Post-Communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

- Gaber-Katz, Elaine. "A New Way of Lovin': Queer Toronto Gets Schooled by Jackie Shane." In *How Jackie Shane Helped 'Satisfy My Soul'*, edited by Stephanie Chambers, Jane Farrow, Maureen FitzGerald, Edward Jackson, John Lorinc, Tim McCaskell, Rebecka Sheffield, Tatum Taylor, and Rahim Thawer, 37–38. Toronto: Coach House Books, 2017.
- Gagnon, John H., and William Simon. *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1973.
- Gagnon, Marilou, and Christine Vezina. "HIV Criminalization as 'Risk Management': On the Importance of Structural Stigma." In Hindmarch, Orsini, and Gagnon, *Seeing Red*, 55–62.
- Gajdics, Peter. "Canada's Failed Plot to End Conversion Therapy." *Xtra*, September 2, 2020. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/canada-conversion-therapy-ban-bill-c-18-178588>.
- Gallant, Channelle. "20 Years Ago Women Fought the Police, and Won." *Xtra!*, September 14, 2020. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/queer-womens-bathroom-police-179581>.
- . "No-Cop Zone? Reflections on the Pussy Place Raid." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 215–18.
- Gallant, Paul. "Bathhouses Outlasted the AIDS Epidemic, But Will They Survive COVID-19?" *Xtra Magazine*, October 19, 2020. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/bathroom-lgbtq-community-business-183391>.
- Gane, Mike, and Terry Johnson. *Foucault's New Domains*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Garber, Eric. "A Spectacle in Color: The Lesbian and Gay Subculture of Jazz Age Harlem." In Chauncey, Duberman, and Vicinus, *Hidden from History*, 318–31.
- . "Gladys Bentley: The Bulldagger Sang the Blues." *Out/Look: National Lesbian and Gay Quarterly* 1 (1988): 52–61.
- . "'T'aint Nobody's Business: Homosexuality in Harlem in the 1920s." *The Advocate*, May 13, 1982, 35–39.
- Garber, Marjorie B. *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. New York: Harper-Perennial, 1993.
- Garfinkel, Harold. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Gay American Indians, and Will Roscoe, eds. *Living the Spirit: A Gay American Indian Anthology*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Gay and Lesbian Historians Group. "Another Flawed Bill: Gay and Lesbian Historians on C-75." *Radical Noise* (blog), June 12, 2018. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/06/12/another-flawed-bill-gay-and-lesbian-historians-on-bill-75/>.
- Gay Fathers of Toronto. *Gay Fathers: Some of Their Stories, Experience and Advice*. Toronto: Gay Fathers, 1981.
- Gay Left Collective. "Happy Families?" *Gay Left*, Winter 1978/1979.
- . "Happy Families? Pedophilia Examined." In Tsang, *The Age Taboo*, 53–64.
- , ed. *Homosexuality: Power and Politics*. London: Allison and Busby, 1980.
- Gay/Lesbian Caucus of In Struggle. "Our Resolution for In Struggle's 4th Congress." *In Struggle!*, May 4, 1982, 6–7.
- "Gays: A Major Force in the Marketplace." *Business Week*, September 3, 1979.
- Gays and Lesbians Together. "Here to Stay!": *Lesbians and Gays in Newfoundland and Labrador, Fighting for Our Rights*. St. John's, NL: Gays and Lesbians Together, 1991.
- Gentile, Patrizia. "'À bas la répression contre les homosexuels,' Resistance and Surveillance of Queers in Montreal, 1971–76." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 69–74.
- Gentile, Patrizia, and Gary Kinsman. *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010.
- Gentile, Patrizia, Tom Hooper, Gary Kinsman, and Steven Maynard. "Bill C-66: Historians Speak Out." *Active History*, December 12, 2017. <http://activehistory.ca/2017/12/c66/>.
- Gentile, Patrizia, and Gary Kinsman. "National Security and Homonationalism: The QUAIWA Wars and the Making of the Neoliberal Queer." In Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 133–49.

- Gentile, Patrizia, Gary Kinsman, and L. Pauline Rankin, eds. *We Still Demand!: Redefining Resistance in Sex and Gender Struggles*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2017.
- Gevisser, Mark. "Mandela's Stepchildren: Homosexual Identity in Post-Apartheid South Africa." In Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 11–36.
- Gevisser, Mark, and Edwin Cameron. *Defiant Desire: Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Gidlow, Elsa. "Casting a Net: Excerpts from an Autobiography." *The Body Politic*, May 1982, 27–30.
- . *Elsa: I Come with My Songs, The Autobiography of Elsa Gidlow*. San Francisco: Booklegger Press, 1986.
- Giese, Rachel. "Lesbian Chic: I Feel Pretty and Witty and Gay." In "Queer Licks." Special issue, *Border/Lines*, no. 32 (1994): 27–29.
- Gigeroff, A.K. "The Evolution of Canadian Legislation with Respect to Homosexuality, Pedophilia and Exhibitionism." *Criminal Law Quarterly* 8, no. 4 (1965/1966): 445–54.
- Gigeroff, Alex K. *Deviations in the Criminal Law: Homosexual, Exhibitionistic, and Pedophilic Offences in Canada*. Toronto: Published for the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry by University of Toronto Press, 1968.
- Gigeroff, Alex K., Johann Mohr, and R.E. Turner. "Sex Offenders on Probation: Homosexuality." *Federal Probation* 33, no. 1 (1969): 36–39.
- Gilbert, Arthur N. "Buggery and the British Navy, 1700–1861." *Journal of Social History* 10, no. 1 (Fall 1976): 72–98.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. "Abolition Feminism." In *Revolutionary Feminisms: Conversations on Collective Action and Radical Thought*, ed. Brenna Bhandar and Rafeef Ziadah. New York: Verso Books, 2020.
- . *Change Everything: Racial Capitalism and the Case for Abolition*. Chicago: Haymarket, 2023.
- Gilroy, Paul. *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000.
- . "Myth of Black Criminality." In *The Socialist Register, 1982*, edited by Martin Eve and David Musson, 47–56. London: Merlin Press, 1982.
- . "Police and Thieves." In *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain*, edited by Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, 143–82. London: Hutchinson, 1982.
- . *"There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack": The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Girard, Philip. "From Subversion to Liberation: Homosexuals and the Immigration Act, 1952–1977." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society/Revue Canadienne Droit et Société* 2 (1987): 1–27.
- . "Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945." Unpublished manuscript, 1985.
- Givirtz, A.M. "Considering Race and Class in the Regulation of Sexuality and the Prosecution of Sexual Assault in Hamilton, 1880–1929." Paper presented at the Canadian Historical Association meetings, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, June 1993.
- Gleeson, Jules Joanna, and Elle O'Rourke. *Transgender Marxism*. London: Pluto Press, 2021.
- Gluckman, Amy, and Betsy Reed, eds. *Homo Economics: Capitalism, Community and Lesbian and Gay Life*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. "Sodomy in the New World: Anthropologies Old and New." In Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet*, 3–18.
- Goldsby, Jackie. "What It Means to Be Coloured Me." *Out/Look: National Lesbian and Gay Quarterly*, no. 9 (Summer 1990): 817.
- Golsby, Jackie. "Queens of Language: Paris Is Burning." In *Queer Looks: Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Film and Video*, edited by Martha Cever, John Greyson, and Pratibha Parmar, 108–15. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1993.

- Goodleaf, Donna Kahenrakwas. "‘Under Military Occupation’: Indigenous Women, State Violence and Community Resistance." In Carty, *And Still We Rise*, 225–42.
- Gordon, Linda. *Women’s Body, Women’s Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America*. New York: Penguin Books, 1977.
- Gordon, Linda, and Ellen Dubois. "Seeking Ecstasy in the Battlefield: Danger and Pleasure in Nineteenth Century Feminist Sexual Thought." In Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, 31–49.
- Gordon, Linda, and Allen Hunter. *Sex, Family and the New Right*. Somerville, MA: New England Free Press, 1978.
- Gorham, Deborah. "Flora MacDonald Denison: Canadian Feminist." In Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 47–70.
- Gough, Jamie, and Mike Macnair. *Gay Liberation in the Eighties*. London: Pluto Press, 1985.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. *Ever Since Darwin: Reflections on Natural History*. London: Burnett Books, 1978.
- . *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton, 1980.
- Gouldhawke, Mike. "Land as a Social Relationship." *Briarpatch*, September 10, 2020. <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/land-as-a-social-relationship>.
- Graham, Peter, with Ian McKay. *Radical Ambition: The New Left in Toronto*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2019.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Gray, Kenneth G. "Sexual Deviation: Problem and Treatment." In Laskin, *Social Problems*, 408–11.
- Gray, Reta. *Queer Questions Quaintly Answered, or Creative Mysteries Made Plain to Children*. Toronto: J.L. Nichols, 1899.
- Green, James A. "Desire and Militancy: Lesbians, Gays, and the Brazilian Workers Party." In Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 57–70.
- Green, Nick. *Body Politic*. Toronto: Playwrights Canada Press, 2019.
- Greenberg, David F. *The Construction of Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Greenwood, Victoria, and Jock Young. *Abortion in Demand*. London: Pluto Press, 1976.
- . "Ghettoes of Freedom: An Examination of Permissiveness." In National Deviancy Conference, *Permissiveness and Control*, 149–174.
- Greer, Allan, and Ian Radforth, eds. *Colonial Leviathan: State Formation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Greig, Noël. "The Dear Love of Comrades." In *Two Gay Sweatshop Plays*, 71–142. London: Gay Men’s Press, 1981.
- Grey, Cornel, Ian Liujia Tian, and Daniel Grace. "Will You Take on the Challenge? Combatting Racism in Our Communities Will Require All Our Efforts." <https://www.engage-men.ca/will-you-take-on-the-challenge-combatting-racism-in-our-communities-will-require-all-our-efforts/>.
- Greyson, John, dir. *The Pink Pimpernel*. Toronto: Vtape, 1989. Video, 32 min.
- . *The World Is Sick (Sic)*. Toronto: Vtape, 1989. Video, 38 min.
- . *Zero Patience*. Toronto: Strand Releasing, 1993. 95 min.
- Gribowski, Lisa. "Reading Between the Lines: Exposing ‘Whiteness’ in Lesbian Coming-Out Narratives." Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association meetings, Montréal, QC, June 1995.
- Gross, Larry. *Contested Closets: The Politics and Ethics of Outing*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Gross, Wendy L. "Judging the Best Interests of the Child: Child Custody and the Homosexual Parent." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 1, no. 2 (1986 1985): 505–31.
- Grossman, Anita. "The New Woman and the Rationalization of Sexuality in Weimar Germany." In Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson, *Powers of Desire*, 153–71.

- Grube, John. "Queens and Flaming Virgins: Towards a Sense of Gay Community." *Rites*, March 1985, 14–7.
- "Guelph Sex Video Policing: Internal Cop Documents." *Rites*, June 1986, 7.
- Hacking, Ian. "How Should We Do the History of Statistics?" In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Peter Miller, and Colin Gordon, 181–96. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Hagi, Sarah. "Cancel Culture Is Not Real—At Least Not in the Way People Think." *Time*, November 21, 2019. <https://time.com/5735403/cancel-culture-is-not-real/>.
- Haiven, Max, and Alex Khasnabish. *The Radical Imagination: Social Movement Research in the Age of Austerity*. London: Zed Press, 2014.
- Hall, Laura. "In Place and Time: Indigenous Women's Re-Weaving and Resistances." In *The Clean Place: Honouring Indigenous Spiritual Roots of Turtle Island*, edited by Michael Hankard, 43–55. Vernon, BC: J. Charlton Publishing, 2019.
- . "Revisiting '69 Celebrations and Challenging Settler Homonationalism in the (Un)Just Society." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 228–44.
- . "White Settler Homonationalism and the Roots of Heterosexist Patriarchy." *Anti-69*, March 23, 2019. <https://anti-69.ca/vids/#LauraHall>.
- Hall, Stuart. "The Great Moving Right Show." *Socialist Review* 11, no. 1, 55 (February 1981).
- . "Reformism and the Legislation of Consent." In National Deviancy Conference, *Permissiveness and Control*, 1–43.
- Hall, Stuart, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
- Halperin, David M. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Halperin, David M., and Trevor Hoppe, eds. *The War on Sex*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.
- Hammonds, Evelyn. "Missing Persons, African American Women, AIDS and the History of Disease." *Radical America* 24, no. 2 (1990): 7–23.
- Hanhardt, Christina B. *Safe Space: Gay Neighborhood History and the Politics of Violence*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013.
- Hannan, Philip. "Anniversary Essay XIX: Homosexual Ottawa." *The Ottawa Citizen*. May 8, 1995, sec. News.
- Hannon, Gerald. "The London Kiddie Porn Ring That Wasn't." *Globe & Mail*, March 11, 1995.
- . "Making Gay Sex Dirty." *The Body Politic*, May 1981, 8–10.
- . "No Sorrow, No Pity." In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 64–72.
- . "Raids, Rage and Bawdy Houses." In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 273–76.
- Hannon, Philip. "Checkered Victory: No Pension for Spouse of 47 Years, Court Rules." *Xtra!*, June 9, 1995.
- . "Reason Prevails: Hate Crimes Bill Passes House of Commons." *Capital Xtra!*, June 30, 1995.
- Hanscombe, Gillian E., and Jackie Forster. *Rocking the Cradle: Lesbian Mothers: Challenge in Family Living*. Boston: Alyson Publications, 1982.
- Haraway, Donna J. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Haritaworn, Jinthana, Ghaida Moussa, and Syrus Marcus Ware, eds. *Marvellous Grounds: Queer of Colour Histories of Toronto*. Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 2018.
- Haritaworn, Jinthana, Ghaida Moussa, Syrus Marcus Ware, and Rio Rodríguez, eds. *Queering Urban Justice: Queer of Colour Formations in Toronto*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2018.
- Harrison, Rachel, and Frank Mort. "Patriarchal Aspects of Nineteenth-Century State Formation: Property Relations, Marriage and Divorce and Sexuality." In Corrigan, *Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory*, 79–109.

- Harry, Joseph. *Gay Children Grown Up: Gender Culture and Gender Deviance*. New York: Praeger, 1982.
- Harry, Joseph, and William B. De Vall. *The Social Organization of Gay Males*. New York: Praeger, 1978.
- Hart, H.L.A. *Law, Liberty and Morality*. Harry Camp Lectures at Stanford University. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- . *Punishment and the Elimination of Responsibility*. Hobhouse Memorial Trust Lecture 31. London: The Athlone Press, 1962.
- Hart, John, and Diane Richardson, eds. *The Theory and Practice of Homosexuality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Hartman, Saidiya. *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Social Upheaval*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2020.
- Hartman, Saidiya V. *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.
- Hartmann, Heidi. "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex." In *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, edited by Zillah R. Eisenstein, 204–47. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979.
- . "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism." In *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*, edited by Lydia Sargent, 109–34. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1981.
- Hasan, Hanaa. "Remembering the 2014 Israeli Offensive against Gaza." *Middle East Monitor*, July 8, 2018. <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20180708-remembering-the-2014-israeli-offensive-against-gaza/>.
- Haskell, Rebecca, and Brian E Burtch. *Get That Freak: Homophobia and Transphobia in High Schools*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 2010.
- Haug, Frigga. *Beyond Female Masochism: Memory-Work and Politics*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. London: Verso, 1992.
- Hausman, Bernice L. *Changing Sex: Transsexualism, Technology, and the Idea of Gender*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Hayes, Kelly, and Mariame Kaba, *Let This Radicalize You: Organizing and the Revolution of Reciprocal Care*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2023.
- Healey, Dan. *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia: The Regulation of Sexual and Gender Dissent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Health and Welfare Canada. *Building an Effective Partnership: The Federal Government's Commitment to Fighting AIDS*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada, 1990.
- Helen (Charles). "'Queer Nigger': Theorizing 'White' Activism." In Bristow and Wilson, *Activating Theory*, 97–106.
- Hemmings, Clare. "Resituating the Bisexual Body: From Identity to Difference." In Bristow and Wilson, *Activating Theory*, 118–38.
- Hemmings, Susan. "Horrible Practices: How Lesbians Were Presented in the Newspapers of 1978." In Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 162–67.
- Henderson, Kevin, and Joseph J. Fischel. "Four Ways to Escape a Sex Panic." *Boston Review*, August 25, 2020. <http://bostonreview.net/gender-sexuality/kevin-henderson-joseph-j-fischel-four-ways-escape-sex-panic>.
- Hennessy, Rosemary. *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Henriques, Julian, Wendy Hollway, Cathy Urwin, Couze Venn, and Valerie Walkerdine. *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity*. London: Methuen, 1984.
- Herbert, John. *Fortune in Men's Eyes*. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

- Herdt, Gilbert, ed. *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. New York: Zone Books, 1996.
- Herman, Didi. "Law and Morality Revisited: The Politics of Regulating Sado-Masochistic Porn and Practice." Paper presented at the Canadian and American Law and Society Association conferences, Calgary and Phoenix, June 1994.
- . *Rights of Passage: Struggles for Lesbian and Gay Legal Equality*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- Heron, Alastair, ed. *Toward A Quaker View of Sex: An Essay by a Group of Friends*. London: Friends Home Service Committee, 1963.
- Herrnstein, Richard J., and Charles Alan Murray. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press, 1994.
- Hester, Stephen K., and Peter Eglin. *A Sociology of Crime*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Hett, J.E. Heller. *The Sexual Organs: Their Use and Abuse: The Subject Upon Which Men and Women Know the Least, Yet Ought to Know the Most: Guide to Man*. Kitchener, ON: J.E.H. Hett, 1899.
- Higgins, Ross. *De la clandestiné à l'affirmation : pour une histoire de la communauté gaie montréalaise*. Montréal: Comeau & Nadeau, 1999.
- . "La Régulation Sociale de l'homosexualité: De la Répression Policière à la Normalisation." In *La Régulation Sociales des Minorités Sexuelle: L'inquiétude de la Différence*, edited by Patrice Corriveau and Valérie Daoust, 67–102. Quebec City: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2011.
- . "L'Association Nocturne: A Montreal Cruising Story from 1886." *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Network Newsletter*, December 1987, 5–7.
- . "The Linguistic Impasse: Gay Organizing in Montreal." *Rites*, October 1985, 8.
- . "Lives, Oral Narratives, and Writing the Past." Paper presented at the "Out of the Archives" Conference, York University, Toronto, January 1994.
- . "Montréal 1953." *Pink Ink*, January 1984, 31–32.
- . "Montreal Gays and Lesbians in the Yellow Press of the 50s." *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, September 1986, 9–11.
- . "Murder Will Out: Gay Identity and Media Discourse in Montreal." In *Beyond the Lavender Lexicon: Authenticity, Imagination, and Appropriation in Lesbian and Gay Languages*, edited by William L. Leap, 107–32. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . "Notes for a Gay History of Montreal." *Pink Ink*, August 1983, 24.
- . "The Quest for Queer Quebec: LGBTQ Studies in Montreal." In *Under the Rainbow: A Primer on Queer Issues in Canada*, edited by Jeanette A. Auger and Kate Krug, 32–53. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 2013.
- . "Sense of Belonging: Pre-Liberation Space, Symbolics, and Leadership in Gay Montreal." PhD diss., McGill University, 1997.
- Higgins, Ross, Line Chamberland, and Robert Champagne. "Mixed Messages: Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Yellow Press in Québec and Ontario During the 1950s–1960s." In *The Challenge of Modernity: A Reader on Post-Confederation Canada*, edited by Ian McKay, 421–38. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1992.
- Hill Collins, Patricia. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. London: Routledge, 2015.
- . *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019.
- Hindmarch, Suzanne, Michael Orsini, and Marilou Gagnon, eds. *Seeing Red: HIV/AIDS and Public Policy in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018.
- Hodges, Andrew, and David Hutter. *With Downcast Gays: Aspects of Homosexual Self-Oppression*. Toronto: Pink Triangle Press, 1977.
- Holder, Ann. "Fairies, and Normals, and Queers, Oh My!: Gay New York Before the Rise of the Closet." Review of *Gay New York*, by George Chauncey. *Radical America* 25, no. 3 (1991): 53–64.

- Hollibaugh, Amber. "Right to Rebel." In Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 207–15.
- . "Sexuality and the State." *Socialist Review*, no. 45 (June 1979): 55–72.
- Holloway, John. *Crack Capitalism*. 1st ed. London: Pluto Press, 2010.
- . *How to Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. New ed. London: Pluto Press, 2005.
- . *In, Against and Beyond Capitalism: The San Francisco Lectures*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2016.
- . "The State and Everyday Struggle." In *We Are the Crisis of Capital: A John Holloway Reader* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2019), 1–36.
- . *We Are the Crisis of Capital: A John Holloway Reader*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2019.
- Holmes, Morgan. *Critical Intersex*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
- . *Intersex: A Perilous Difference*. Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 2008.
- "Homo Purges Confirmed." *Rites*, April 1985, 7.
- "Homosexuality and the Law." *Globe & Mail*, July 8, 1967.
- hooks, bell. *All About Love: New Visions*. New York: William Morrow, 2018.
- . *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1992.
- Hooper, Tom. "1977, Killing of Toronto Shoeshine Boy, 40 Yrs Later, Emanuel Jaques," on *Global News, LGBT Canada In The Media*, video, September 3, 2017, 6:36, <https://youtu.be/YreFqA9iKNE>.
- . "Bathhouse Raids in Canada 1968–2004." Chart. *Anti-69*, April 2018. https://anti-69.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Chart_Bathhouse_raids_in_Canada_1968-200-3.pdf?189d8bo&189d8bo.
- . "Canada Is Releasing a Coin Commemorating a Myth That Homosexuality Was Decriminalized in 1969." *CBC News*, April 22, 2019, sec. Opinion. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/opinion/canada-coin-1.5100177>.
- . "Enough Is Enough": The Right to Privacy Committee and Bathhouse Raids in Toronto, 1978–1983." PhD diss., York University, 2016.
- . "'Friend of the Court': Legal Resistance at Old City Hall." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 188–90.
- . "'More Than Two Is a Crowd': Mononormativity and Gross Indecency in the Criminal Code, 1981–82." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études Canadiennes* 48, no. 1 (2014): 53–81.
- . "Pride Toronto's Planned Theme of '50 Years of Decriminalization of Homosexuality' Perpetuates the Mythology of the 1969 Criminal Code Reform." *Anti-69*, January 28, 2019. <https://anti-69.ca/prideto/>.
- . "Queering '69: The Recriminalization of Homosexuality in Canada." *Canadian Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (2019): 257–73.
- . "The State's Key in the Bedroom Door: Queer Perspectives on Pierre Elliot Trudeau's 'Just Society' in the Era of the Bathhouse Raids." In Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 101–20.
- . "Tom Hooper's Complaint to the Pride Toronto Board Regarding \$250,000 from Canadian Heritage for Celebrating the 69 Reform as the 'Decriminalization' of Homosexuality." *Radical Noise* (blog), January 14, 2020. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/01/14/tom-hoopers-complaint-to-the-pride-toronto-board-regarding-250000-from-canadian-heritage-for-celebrating-the-69-reform-as-the-decriminalization-of-homosexuality/>.
- . "Was Homosexuality Really Decriminalized in 1969?" *NOW Magazine*, November 21, 2019. <https://nowtoronto.com/news/homosexuality-canada-pride-1969>.
- Hope, Jayda. "Looking for Change after Black Lives Matter." *Briarpatch*, March 3, 2022. <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/looking-for-change-after-black-lives-matter>.
- Horsfall, Alan. "Battling for Wolfenden." In *Radical Records: Thirty Years of Lesbian and Gay History, 1957–1987*, edited by Bob Cant and Susan Hemmings, 15–33. London: Routledge, 1988.

- Houston, Susan E. "The 'Waifs and Strays' of a Late Victorian City: Juvenile Delinquents in Toronto." In *Childhood and Family in Canadian History*, edited by Joy Parr, 129–42. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.
- Hudson, Sandy, and Rodney Diverlus. "The Origin Story of Black Lives Matter Canada." In Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 3–16.
- Hughes, Nym, Yvonne Johnson, and Yvette Perreault. *Stepping Out of Line: A Workbook on Lesbianism and Feminism*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, 1984.
- Hugill, David. *Missing Women, Missing News: Covering Crisis in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside*. Halifax: Fernwood, 2010.
- Hull, Isabel. "The Bourgeoisie and Its Discontents: Reflections on 'Nationalism and Respectability.'" *Journal of Contemporary History* 17, no. 2 (April 1982): 247–68.
- Humphreys, Laud. *Tea Room Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1975.
- Hunt, Margaret. "The De-Eroticization of Women's Liberation: Social Purity Movements and the Revolutionary Feminism of Sheila Jeffreys." *Feminist Review* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 23–46.
- Hunter, Allen. "In the Wings: New Right Organization and Ideology." *Radical America* 15, no. 1/2 (Spring 1981): 113–38.
- Hunter, W.J. *Manhood Wrecked and Rescued*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1894.
- Huot, John. "Autonomist Marxism and Workplace Organizing in Canada in the 1970s." *Upping the Anti* 18 (2016): 91–105. <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/18-autonomist-marxism>.
- Hustak, Alan. *They Were Hanged*. Toronto: J. Lorimer, 1987.
- Hutchinson, Lorna. "Buggery Trials in Saint John, 1806: The Case of John M. Smith." *University of New Brunswick Law Journal* 40 (January 1991): 130–48.
- Hutt, James. "The Battle of Billings Bridge." *The Breach*, February 16, 2022. <https://breachmedia.ca/the-battle-of-billings-bridge/>.
- Ibbitson, John. "Gay-Pardon Decision Applauded but Still Faces Obstacles." *Globe & Mail*. February 29, 2016.
- . "In 1965, Everett Klippert Was Sentenced to a Life Behind Bars. His Crime? Being Gay." *Globe & Mail*. February 27, 2016.
- Ibrahim, Hadeel. "Clinic 554 and Abortion Access: 5 Key Questions Answered." *CBC News*, September 10, 2020. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/clinic-554-abortion-access-new-brunswick-election-1.5713098>.
- Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, ed. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Cambridge, MA: South End, 2007.
- Ingraham, Chrys. *White Weddings: Romancing Heterosexuality in Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Ingram, Gordon Brent, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter, eds. *Queers in Space: Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance*. Seattle, WA: Bay Press, 1997.
- Interrante, Joe. "From Homosexual to Gay to ?: Recent Work in Gay History." *Radical America* 16, no. 6 (December 1981): 79–86.
- . "The History of Masculinity." *Gay Community News*, April 26, 1980, 4, 6.
- Ireland, Kristin. "Sex Reassignment Surgery in Ontario: Adrift in a Political and Cultural Climate." In *New World Coming: The Sixties and the Shaping of Global Consciousness*, edited by Karen Dubinsky, Catherine Krull, Susan Lord, Sean Mills, and Scott Rutherford, 313–19. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2009.
- Irving, Dan. "Normalized Transgressions: Legitimizing the Transsexual Body as Productive." In "Queer Futures." Special issue, *Radical History Review*, no. 100 (Winter 2008): 38–60.

- . “Trans Politics and Anti-Capitalism: Interview with Dan Irving.” By Gary Kinsman. *Upping the Anti*, no. 4, October 26, 2009. <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/04-trans-politics-and-anti-capitalism>.
- Irving, Dan, and Rupert Raj, eds. *Trans Activism in Canada: A Reader*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2014.
- Jackson, Edward. “Close but Not Enough: The 1980 Toronto Municipal Election.” In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 265–66.
- . “Some Further Comments.” *The Body Politic*, January 1977, 7.
- Jackson, Edward, and Stan Persky, eds. *Flaunting It!: A Decade of Gay Journalism from The Body Politic: An Anthology*. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1982.
- Jackson, Paul Norman. *One of the Boys: Homosexuality in the Military During World War II*. 2nd ed. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.
- James, Selma. *Sex, Race and Class—The Perspective of Winning: A Selection of Writings, 1952–2011*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012.
- Janoff, Douglas. *Pink Blood: Homophobic Violence in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Jay, Karla, and Allen Young. *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation*. New York: Pyramid Books, 1974.
- Jefferis, B.G. *Search Lights on Health: Light on Dark Corners: A Complete Sexual Science and a Guide to Purity and Physical Manhood, Advice to Maiden, Wife, Mother Love, Courtship and Marriage*. Toronto: J. L. Nichols, 1896.
- Jefferson, James E. “Gay Rights and the Charter.” *University of Toronto Faculty of Law Review* 43, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 70–89.
- Jeffreys, Sheila. *Anticlimax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution*. London: Women's Press, 1990.
- . *The Spinster and Her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality, 1880–1930*. London: Pandora, 1985.
- Jjuuko, Adrian, and Monica Tabengwa. “Expanded Criminalization of Consensual Same-Sex Relations in Africa: Contextualizing Recent Developments.” In Nicol et al., *Envisioning Global LGBT Human Rights*, 97–127.
- Joaquin, Arvin. “Meghan Murphy and the Toronto Public Library: What's Next?” *Xtra! Weekly*, November 1, 2019. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/meghan-murphy-toronto-library-whats-next-164045>.
- Johnson, William. “The Gay World.” *Globe*, January 13, 1968.
- Johnstone, Rachael. “Is That Really Necessary?: The Regulation of Abortion in Canada and the Framework of Medical Necessity.” In Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 259–79.
- Johnstone, Robert. “New Bill of Rights, Obscenity Change Shelved by Lawyers.” *Toronto Daily Star*. September 7, 1968, 12.
- Jones, Burnley “Rocky” and James W. St. G. Walker. *Burnley “Rocky” Jones Revolutionary*. Halifax: Roseway/Fernwood, 2016.
- Jones, Chris, and Tony Novack. “The State and Social Policy.” In Corrigan, *Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory*, 143–70.
- Jones, Eileen. “The Labor Abuses of Ellen DeGeneres.” *Jacobin*, September 8, 2020. <https://jacobinmag.com/2020/09/ellen-degeneres-covid-19-labor-exploitation>.
- Jones, El. *Abolitionist Intimacies*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2022.
- . “The Coup at the Pride Meeting.” *Halifax Examiner*, October 6, 2016. <https://www.halifaxexaminer.ca/featured/the-coup-at-the-pride-meeting/>.
- Jones, Gareth Stedman. *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984.
- Jones, James Edward. *Pioneer Crimes and Punishments in Toronto and the Home District*. Toronto: George N. Morang, 1924.

- Jones, Ziya. "Rinaldo Walcott on How to Build a Better Queer Future," *Xtra*, October 28, 2021, <https://xtramagazine.com/health/rinaldo-walcott-211379>.
- Jordan-Young, Rebecca M. *Brain Storm: The Flaws in the Science of Sex Differences*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Joseph, Sherry, and Pawan Dhall. "No Silence Please, We're Indians!" In Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 157–77.
- Julien, Issac, dir. *Looking for Langston*. London: British Film Institute/Sankova Film and Video/Strand Releasing, 1989.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. *Why Indigenous Literatures Matter*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2018.
- Kaahumanu, Lani, and Loraine Hutchins. *Bi Any Other Name: Bisexual People Speak Out*. Boston: Alyson, 1991.
- Kaba, Mariame. *We Do This 'Til We Free Us: Abolitionist Organizing and Transforming Justice*. Chicago: Haymarket, 2021.
- Kaleta-Mae, Naila. "Black Lives Matter—Toronto Sit-in at Pride." In Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 263–75.
- Kaminer, Michael. "JDL Compares Gay People to Nazis." *The Forward*, April 15, 2011. <https://forward.com/schmooze/137077/jdl-compares-gay-people-to-nazis/>.
- Karasik, Daniel Sarah. "Suppress the Virus Now!" *Briarpatch Magazine*, November 8, 2020. <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/suppress-the-virus-now>.
- . "Uncontrollable." *Briarpatch*, March 18, 2021. <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/uncontainable>.
- Karlen, Arno. *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1971.
- Katz, Jonathan Ned. "Envisioning the World We Make: Social-Historical Construction, a Model, a Manifesto." *OutHistory*, February 2016. <https://www.outhistory.org/exhibits/show/katz-writing-work>.
- . *Gay American History*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976.
- . *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*. 1st Edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.
- . *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. New York: Dutton, 1995.
- . *Love Stories: Sex Between Men Before Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- . "The Invention of Heterosexuality." *Socialist Review* 20, no. 1 (1990): 4–34.
- Katz, Sidney. "Gentle George Klippert—Must He Serve LIFE?" *Toronto Daily Star*. November 18, 1967, B10.
- . "The Harsh Facts of Life in the 'Gay' World." *Maclean's*, March 7, 1964, 18, 34–38.
- . "The Homosexual Next Door." *Maclean's*, February 22, 1964, 10–11, 28–30.
- . "Homosexuals Shocked by Life Term Ruling." *Toronto Daily Star*. November 11, 1967, C5.
- . "The Truth About Sex Criminals." *Maclean's*, July 1, 1947, 12, 46–48.
- Kealey, Gregory, ed. *Canada Investigates Industrialism*. The Social History of Canada 13. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Kealey, Linda, ed. *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada 1880s–1920s*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1979.
- Keaney, Shailagh. "Women Resist, Police Repress: Gendered Police Violence at the Toronto G20." In *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*, edited by Tom Malleson and David Wachsmuth, 1st ed., 115–24. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011.
- Kelley, Robin D.G. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2002.
- . "Insecure: Policing Under Racial Capitalism: Challenging One of the Core Institutions of Racial Capitalism." *Spectre Journal* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2020): 12–37.
- . *Race Rebels: Culture Politics and the Black Working Class*. New York: Free Press, 1994.
- Kennedy, Elizabeth Lapovsky, and Madeline Davis. "The Reproduction of Butch-Fem Roles: A Social Constructionist Approach." In Peiss, Simmons, and Padgug, *Passion and Power*, 241–56.

- Kennedy, Elizabeth Lapovsky, and Madeline D. Davis. *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold: The History of a Lesbian Community*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Kennedy, Hubert. "J.B. Schweitzer: The Faggot Marx Loved to Hate." *FagRag*, Spring 1977, 6.
- . "Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate." *Journal of Homosexuality* 29, no. 2–3 (1995): 69–96.
- . "The Third Sex Theory of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs." In Licata and Petersen, *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*, 103–11.
- . *Ulrichs: The Life and Works of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: Pioneer of the Modern Gay Movement*. Boston: Alyson, 1988.
- Kerrigan, Charles. "'Gay Liberation and National Liberation,' Interview." *Rites*, June 1984, 15.
- Kessler, Suzanne J. *Lessons from the Intersexed*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
- Kessler, Suzanne J., and Wendy McKenna, eds. *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- . "Who Put the 'Trans' in Transgender? Gender Theory and Everyday Life." In LaFont, *Constructing Sexualities*, 223–26.
- Khan, Ummni. "Homosexuality and Prostitution: A Tale of Two Deviancies." *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 283–305.
- Khasnabish, Alex, and Max Haiven, eds. *What Moves Us: The Lives and Times of the Radical Imagination* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing/Upping the Anti/Radical Imagination, 2017).
- Khayatt, Madiha Didi. "Compulsory Heterosexuality: Schools and Lesbian Students." In Campbell and Manicom, *Knowledge, Experience, and Ruling Relations*, 149–63.
- . "Legalized Invisibility: The Effect of Bill 7 on Lesbian Teachers." *Women's Studies International Forum* 13, no. 3 (1990): 185–93.
- . *Lesbian Teachers: An Invisible Presence*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- . "The Place of Desire: The Exclusion of Women in the Third World in Theorizing Sexual Orientation." Paper presented at the Toronto Queer Sites Conference, Toronto, May 13, 1992.
- . "Terms of Desire: Are There Lesbians in Egypt?" In *Language and Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies*, edited by Robert Bayley and Sandra R. Schechter, 213–32. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2003.
- Khogali, Yusra. "From Sudan to 'Sijui' and All Black Lives In-Between." Master's thesis, Toronto: Social Justice Education Department, OISE, University of Toronto, 2018.
- King, Alan J.C., Richard Beazley, Wendy Warren, Catherine A. Hankins, Alan S. Robertson, and Joyce L. Radford. *Canada Youth and AIDS Study*. Kingston, ON: Queen's University at Kingston, Social Program Evaluation Group, 1988.
- King, Dave. "Gender Confusions: Psychological and Psychiatric Conceptions of Transvestism and Trans-Sexualism." In Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 155–83.
- "Kingston Board Controversy: Homophobia Got to Go!" *Rites*, March 1987, 5.
- Kinsey, Alfred C., Paul H. Gebhard, Clyde E. Martin, and Wardell Baxter Pomeroy. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1953.
- Kinsey, Alfred Charles, Wardell Baxter Pomeroy, and Clyde Eugene Martin. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948.
- Kinsman, Gary. "Against Fascism, For Abolition," *Radical Noise*, June 13, 2023. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2023/06/13/against-fascism-for-abolition-by-gary-kinsman/>.
- . "AIDS Activism: Remembering Resistance versus Socially Organized Forgetting." In Hindmarch, Orsini, and Gagnon, *Seeing Red*, 31–33.
- . "The Apology from 'Above and 'Below.' Expanded Version." *Radical Noise* (blog), December 5, 2017. <http://radicalnoise.ca/2017/12/05/the-apology-from-above-and-below-expanded-version/>.

- . “Contested Terrains: Of Terms of Reference, The Police, and Missing Persons.” *Radical Noise* (blog), August 22, 2018. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/08/22/contested-terrains-of-terms-of-reference-the-police-and-missing-persons/>.
- . “1984: The Police Are Still with Us.” *Rites*, May 1984.
- . “A Contribution to the History of the First Sudbury Pride March in 1997—Radical Noise.” *Radical Noise* (blog), November 7, 2017. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2017/11/04/a-contribution-to-the-history-of-the-first-sudbury-pride-march-in-1997/>.
- . “Brief Report on No Pride in Gentrification of Moss Park Community Meeting.” *Radical Noise* (blog), April 13, 2016. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2016/04/13/brief-report-on-no-pride-in-gentrification-of-moss-park-community-meeting/>.
- . “‘Character Weaknesses’ and ‘Fruit Machines’: Towards an Analysis of the Anti-Homosexual Security Campaign in the Canadian Civil Service.” *Labour/Le Travail* 35 (Spring 1995): 133–61.
- . “Constructing Sexual Problems: ‘These Things May Lead to the Tragedy of Our Species.’” In *Power and Resistance: Critical Thinking About Canadian Social Issues*, edited by Wayne Andrew Antony and Leslie Samuelson, 4th ed., 96–134. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 2007.
- . “Critical Reflections on Brenda Cossman’s ‘Memorializing LGBTQ2 Histories: Thoughts on Moving Beside Our Debates.’” *Radical Noise* (blog), January 16, 2020. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/01/16/critical-reflections-on-brenda-cossmans-memorializing-lgbtq2-histories-thoughts-on-moving-beside-our-debates/>.
- . “Direct Action as Political Activist Ethnography: Activist Research in the Sudbury Coalition Against Poverty.” In *Political Activist Ethnography: Studies in the Social Relations of Struggle*, edited by A. Bisailon, A. Doll, and K. Walby. Edmonton: Athabasca Press, forthcoming.
- . “Don’t Get Me to the Church on Time: Ending Social Discrimination Against Same-Sex and Other Relationships.” *Radical Noise* (blog), January 9, 2015. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2015/01/09/from-my-archives-dont-get-me-to-the-church-on-time-ending-social-discrimination-against-same-sex-and-other-relationships/>.
- . “Forgetting National Security in ‘Canada’: Towards Pedagogies of Resistance.” In *Activists and the Surveillance State: Learning from Repression*, edited by Aziz Choudry, 129–52. London, Toronto: Pluto/Between the Lines, 2019.
- . “From Resisting Police Raids to Charter Rights: Queer and AIDS Organizing in the 1980s.” In *A World to Win: Contemporary Social Movements and Counter-Hegemony*, edited by William K. Carroll and Kanchan Sarker, 209–32. Winnipeg, MB: ARP Books, 2016.
- . “Fundamentalist Problems.” *New Socialist*, July 1997, 20.
- . “‘Homosexuality’ Historically Reconsidered Challenges Heterosexual Hegemony.” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4, no. 2 (June 1991): 91–111.
- . “The Hughes Commission: Making Homosexuality the Problem Once Again.” *New Maritimes*, January/February 1993, 17–19.
- . “Interview with Gary Kinsman.” In Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 119–38.
- . “‘Inverts,’ ‘Psychopaths,’ and ‘Normal’ Men: Historical Sociological Perspectives on Gay and Heterosexual Masculinities.” In *Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology*, edited by Tony Haddad, 3–35. Toronto: Canadian Scholars’ Press, 1993.
- . “Learning from AIDS Activism for Surviving the COVID-19 Pandemic.” In *Sick of the System*, edited by Between the Lines Editorial Committee. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2020.
- . “Letter of Complaint to the Halifax Pride Committee Regarding Booth Promoting Tourism to Tel Aviv.” *Radical Noise* (blog), July 25, 2014. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2014/07/27/letter-of-complaint-to-the-halifax-pride-committee-regarding-booth-promoting-tourism-to-tel-aviv/>.

- . “LGBT Loonie: No Equality in 1969, Still No Equality in 2019.” *Radical Noise* (blog), April 18, 2019. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/04/18/lgbt-loonie-no-equality-in-1969-still-no-equality-in-2019/>.
- . “Managing AIDS Organizing: ‘Consultation,’ ‘Partnership,’ and ‘Responsibility’ As Strategies of Regulation.” In *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice: Studies in the Politics of Counter-Hegemony*, edited by William K. Carroll, second ed., 213–39. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1997.
- . “Mapping Social Relations of Struggle.” In Frampton, Kinsman, Thompson, and Tilleczek, *Sociology for Changing the World*, 133–59.
- . “The Metro Toronto Police Department and the Gay Community.” In “Sexuality and the State.” Special issue, *Atkinson Review of Canadian Studies* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 28–33.
- . “The Mount Cashel Orphanage Inquiry: The Inscription of Child Abuse.” In *Constructing Danger: The Mis/Representation of Crime in the News*, edited by Christopher Ray McCormick, 76–93. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 1995.
- . “No Return to ‘Normal’ LGBT Politics!” *Canadian Dimension*, February 14, 2022, <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/no-return-to-normal-lgbt-politics>.
- . “Not a Gift from Above: The Mythology of Homosexual Law Reform and the Making of Neoliberal Queer Histories.” In Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 74–97.
- . “Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation: The Social Organization of the Sexual Policing of Gay Men.” PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1989.
- . “Outing and the Dismantling of the Closet, Review of Contested Closets, by Larry Cross.” *Lesbian and Gay Studies Newsletter*, July 1994, 37–38.
- . “Policing Borders and Sexual/Gender Identities: Queer Refugees In the Years of Canadian Neoliberalism and Homonationalism.” In Nicol et al., *Envisioning Global LGBT Human Rights*, 97–127.
- . “The Politics of Revolution: Learning from Autonomist Marxism.” *Upping the Anti*, October 8, 2009. <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/01-the-politics-of-revolution/UTA>.
- . “The Porn Debate.” *Fuse*, Summer 1984, 37–84.
- . “Porn/Censor Wars and the Battlefields of Sex.” In *Issues of Censorship*, edited by A Space (Art gallery), 31–39. Toronto: A Space, 1985.
- . “Queer Progress? Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer Review Essays, # 2. Review of Queer Progress: From Homophobia to Homonationalism, by Tim McCaskell.” *Radical Noise* (blog), December 2, 2018. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2018/12/03/queer-progress-queered-marxism-and-the-making-of-the-neo-liberal-queer-review-essays-2/>.
- . “Queer Resistance and Regulation in the 1970s: From Liberation to Rights.” In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 137–62.
- . “Queered Marxism and the Making of the Neo-Liberal Queer Reviews # 1. Review of Warped: Gay Normality and Queer Anti-Capitalism, by Peter Drucker.” *Radical Noise* (blog), April 22, 2017. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2017/04/22/queered-marxism-and-the-making-of-the-neo-liberal-queer-reviews-1/>.
- . “Queerness Is Not in Our Genes: Biological Determinism Versus Social Liberation.” In *Making Normal: Social Regulation in Canada*, edited by Deborah R. Brock, 262–84. Toronto: Nelson Thomson Learning, 2003.
- . “Quelques Leçons Du Militantisme Anti-SIDA Pour s’organiser Dans Le Contexte de La Pandémie Du Coronavirus (COVID-19).” Ouvrage, May 11, 2020. <http://www.revue-ouvrage.org/quelques-lecons-du-militantisme-anti-sida-pour-sorganiser-dans-le-contexte-de-la-pandemie-du-coronavirus-covid-19/>.
- . *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities*. Second ed. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1996.

- . “Remember This: A Brief Statement on Memorializing Resistance to the Canadian War on Queers.” *Radical Noise*, October 15, 2019. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/10/15/gary-kinsman-remember-this-a-brief-statement-on-memorializing-resistance-to-the-canadian-war-on-queers/>
- . “‘Responsibility’ as a Strategy of Governance: Regulating People Living with AIDS and Lesbians and Gay Men in Ontario.” *Economy and Society* 25, no. 3 (1996): 393–409.
- . “‘Restoring Confidence in the Criminal Justice System’—The Hughes Commission and Mass Media Coverage: Making Homosexuality A Problem.” In *Violence and Social Control in the Home, Workplace, Community and Institutions*, 211–69. ISER Conference Papers 3. St. John’s: ISER Press, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1992.
- . Review of *The Construction of Homosexuality*, by David F. Greenberg. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 15, no. 1 (1990): 112–15.
- . Review of *The Spirit and the Flesh*, by Walter L. Williams. *Rites*, February 1988, 15.
- . “SILENCE=DEATH, ACTION=LIFE: New Relevance in COVID Pandemic Times,” *Radical Noise*, April 6, 2021. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2021/04/06/silencedeath-action-life-new-relevance-in-covid-pandemic-times/>.
- . “Solidarity And Responsibility: Developing Anti-Oppression Politics.” *New Socialist* 32, accessed May 17, 2022, https://newsocialist.org/old_mag/magazine/32/article04.html.
- . “Some Critical Reflections on Watching ‘Sex, Sin and 69’ the New Film from Sandbay and EGALE.” *Radical Noise* (blog), July 2, 2019. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/07/02/some-critical-reflections-on-watching-sex-sin-and-69-the-new-film-from-sandbay-and-egale/>.
- . “Some Notes on Learning from AIDS Activism For Our Responses to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic.” *Radical Noise* (blog), March 18, 2020. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/03/18/some-notes-on-learning-from-aids-activism-for-our-responses-to-the-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic/>.
- . “Some Notes on the Uprisings Against Anti-Black Racist Capitalism and the Possibilities For Hope: Resisting Both Repression and Liberal Containment.” *Radical Noise* (blog), June 11, 2020. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2020/06/11/some-notes-on-the-uprisings-against-anti-black-racist-capitalism-and-the-possibilities-for-hope-resisting-both-repression-and-liberal-containment/>.
- . “Stop the Crackdown on Consensual Queer Sex: Toronto Police at It Again With Project Marie.” *Radical Noise* (blog), November 14, 2016. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2016/11/14/stop-the-crackdown-on-consensual-queer-sex-toronto-police-at-it-again-with-project-marie/>.
- . “The Textual Practices of Sexual Rule: Sexual Policing and Gay Men.” In Campbell and Manicom, *Knowledge, Experience, and Ruling Relations*, 80–95.
- . “Their Silence, Our Deaths: What Can the Social Sciences Offer to AIDS Research?” In *Talking AIDS: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*, edited by Diane E. Goldstein, 39–60. ISER Research and Policy Papers 12. Newfoundland: Institute of Social & Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1991.
- . “Towards a Source List for Doing English-Canadian Lesbian/Gay Histories.” *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, December 1985.
- . “Which Public, Whose Health?” *Rites*, May 1986, 16–17.
- . “Whitewash: The Moral Panic.” *Pink Ink*, October 1983, 12–13.
- . “Why I Could Not Sign the Contract and Confidentiality Agreements to Be on the Advisory Council For the Apology.” *Radical Noise* (blog), September 17, 2017. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2017/09/27/why-i-could-not-sign-the-contract-and-confidentiality-agreements-to-be-on-the-advisory-council-for-an-apology/>.
- . “Within, Against and Beyond: Urgency and Patience in Queer and Anti-Capitalist Struggles.” In *What Moves Us: The Lives and Times of the Radical Imagination*, edited by Alex Khasnabish and Max Haiven, 131–52. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 2017.

- . “Wolfenden in Canada: Within and Beyond Official Discourse in Law Reform Struggles.” In *Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the Commonwealth: Struggles for Decriminalisation and Change*, edited by Corinne Lennox and Matthew Waites, 183–205. London: Human Rights Consortium, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2013.
- . “‘Workers of the World Caress’: An Interview with Gary Kinsman on Gay and Lesbian Organizing in the 1970’s Toronto Left.” By Deborah R. Brock. *Left History*. http://www.yorku.ca/lefthist/online/brock_kinsman.html.
- Kinsman, Gary, and Margaret F. Gibson. “Towards a Collective and Materialist Approach to Queer Parenthood.” In *Queering Motherhood: Narrative and Theoretical Perspectives*, edited by Margaret F. Gibson, 245–63. Bradford, ON: Demeter Press, 2014.
- Kinsman, Gary, and Amy Gottleib. “Black Lives Matter Toronto Recaptures Pride’s Activist Roots.” *CBC News*, July 6, 2016. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/black-lives-matter-toronto-pride-kinsman-1.3665829>.
- Kinsman, Gary, Y.C. Lee, Freddie S.E. Arps, Nick Mulé, Jocelyn Piercey, and Sasha. “Regarding Safety from Violence and Hate During Last Weekend’s Pride Festivities in Toronto.” Accessed March 3, 2021. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2019/06/29/regarding-safety-from-violence-and-hate-during-last-weekends-pride-festivities-in-toronto/>.
- Kinsman, Gary, Becki L. Ross, Tim McCaskell, Eli Langer, Matthew McGowen, Lynne Fernie, Arif Noorani, and Nancy Nicol. “Keep Your Fucking Laws Off Our Bodies: Organizing to Repeal the Youth Porn Law.” *Parallogramme* 20, no. 1 (Summer 1994): 13–14.
- Kinsman, Gary, Pamela Walker, and Kerry Burke. “Sex and the State: Conference.” *Rites*, September 1985, 8–9. <https://archive.org/details/ritesmagazineo204onta/>.
- Kirkby, Gareth. “Conservatives First Battle: Age of Consent Legislation.” *Xtra!*, February 7, 2006. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/conservatives-first-battle-age-of-consent-legislation-39306>.
- Kirkby, Gareth, and Krishna Rau. “Age of Consent.” *Xtra Magazine*, March 22, 2006. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/age-of-consent-22037>.
- Kirkup, Kyle. “The Gross Indecency of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure.” *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 263–82.
- Kiss and Tell (Collective). *Drawing the Line: Lesbian Sexual Politics on the Wall*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, 1991.
- . *Her Tongue on My Theory: Images, Essays and Fantasies*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, 1994.
- Kitchen, Brigitte. “Women’s Dependence.” In “Sexuality and the State.” Special issue, *Atkinson Review of Canadian Studies* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 11–16.
- Klein, Alice, and Wayne Roberts. “Besieged Innocence: The ‘Problem’ and Problems of Working Women—Toronto, 1896–1914.” In Acton, Goldsmith, and Shepard, *Women at Feminism and Political EconomyWork*, 211–60.
- Klein, Naomi. *No Is Not Enough: Resisting the New Shock Politics and Winning the World We Need*. Toronto: Knopf, 2017.
- . *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. Toronto: Knopf, 2007.
- . *This Changes Everything, Capitalism Versus the Climate*. Toronto: Knopf, 2014.
- Knabe, Susan, and Wendy Gay Pearson. *Zero Patience: A Queer Film Classic*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2011.
- Korinek, Valerie J. *Prairie Fairies: A History of Queer Communities and People in Western Canada, 1930–1985*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018.
- Kouri-Towe, Natalie. “Textured Activism: Affect Theory and Transformational Politics in Transnational Queer Palestine-Solidarity Activism.” In “Intimacies/Affect and Transgressing Borders/Boundaries: Gendering Space and Place.” Special issue, *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice* 37, no. 1 (September 2015): 23–34.

- Krafft-Ebing, Richard von. *Psychopathia Sexualis; A Medico-Forensic Study*. With an Introd. by Ernest Van Den Haag. Translated by Harry E. Wedeck. 1st Unexpurgated ed. New York: Putnam, 1965.
- Kramar, Kirsten Johnson. *Undressing the Canadian State: The Politics of Pornography from Hicklin to Butler*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 1995.
- Kuhn, Annette. "Covering Up Sex." *New Statesman* (1957), February 24, 1984.
- . "Public Versus Private: The Case of Indecency and Obscenity." *Leisure Studies* 3, no. 1 (1984): 53–65.
- Kur, Elle Ada, and Jenny Duffy, on behalf of Maggie's Toronto Sex Workers Action Project. "Sex Worker Justice—By Us, For Us, Toronto Sex Workers Resisting Carceral Violence." In Pasternak, Walby, and Stadnyk, *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle*, 98–112.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Translated by Winston Moore. London: Verso, 1985.
- Lacombe, Dany. *Blue Politics: Pornography and the Law in the Age of Feminism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- Laferté, Boston. "Secwepemc Set Up New Camp in Hopes of Halting TMX Construction, Leads To Five Arrests." *Martlet*, October 23, 2020, sec. News. <https://www.martlet.ca/news-secwepemc-new-camp-halts-tmx/>.
- LaFont, Suzanne, ed. *Constructing Sexualities, Readings in Sexuality, Gender, and Culture*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Lahey, Kathleen Ann, and Kevin Alderson. *Same-Sex Marriage: The Personal and the Political*. Toronto: Insomniac Press, 2004.
- Lang, Sabine. "Lesbians, Men-Women and Two-Spirits: Homosexuality and Gender in Native American Cultures." In LaFont, *Constructing Sexualities*, 202–18.
- Latham, Barbara, and Cathy Kess, eds. *In Her Own Right: Selected Essays on Women's History in B.C.* Victoria, BC: Camosun College, 1980.
- Larocque, Sylvain. *Gay Marriage: The Story of a Canadian Social Revolution*. Toronto: J. Lorimer, 2006.
- Lascaris, Dimitri. "Leftists Must Oppose the Suppression of Dissent—Even When We Disagree with the Dissenters." *Canadian Dimension*, February 16, 2022. <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/leftists-must-oppose-the-suppression-of-dissent-even-when-we-disagree-with-the-dissenters>.
- Laskin, Richard, ed. *Social Problems: A Canadian Profile*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill of Canada, 1964.
- Lauritsen, John, and David Thorstad. *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement, 1864–1935*. New York: Times Change Press, 1974.
- Lavoie, Joanna. "Toronto Group Calls on Government to Do Much More to Prevent Overdose Deaths, COVID-19 Pandemic Has Exacerbated the Problem, Says Toronto Overdose Prevention Society." *Toronto.com*, June 22, 2020. <https://www.toronto.com/news-story/10039612-toronto-group-calls-on-government-to-do-more-to-prevent-drug-overdose-deaths/>.
- "Law on Homosexuals Will Be Amended." *Toronto Daily Star*. November 8, 1967.
- Lawrence, Bonita. "Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview." *Hypatia* 18, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 3–31.
- Laycock, S.R. "Homosexuality." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 63, no. 3 (September 1950): 245–50.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. *The Left Hand of Darkness*. New York: Ace Books, 1969.
- . *The Dispossessed*. Harper and Row, 1974.
- Leckey, Robert. "'Repugnant': Homosexuality and Criminal Family Law." *University of Toronto Law Journal* 70, no. 3 (Summer 2020): 225–44.
- Lehr, Valerie. *Queer Family Values: Debunking the Myth of the Nuclear Family*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999.

- Lenon, Suzanne. "Making It Right,' Keeping It White: Race and the Demand for Queer Redress." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 30, no. 3 (2018): 543–66.
- . "Marrying Citizens! Raced Subjects? Re-thinking the Terrain of Equal Marriage Discourse." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 17, no. 2 (2005): 405–21.
- . "The Governmentality of Gay Rights: Queer Love in Neoliberal Times." In Brock, *Governing the Social in Neoliberal Times*, 63–82.
- . "What's So Civil about Marriage? The Racial Pedagogy of Same-Sex Marriage in Canada." *Darkmatter*, no. 3 (2008): 26–36.
- . "Why Is Our Love an Issue?: Same-Sex Marriage and the Racial Politics of the Ordinary." *Social Identities* 17, no. 3 (2011): 351–72.
- Levensky, Helen Jefferson. "Waving A Rainbow Flag Over Poor Communities." *NOW Magazine*, October 26, 2015. <https://nowtoronto.com/waving-a-rainbow-flag-over-poor-communities>.
- Lepp, AnnaLee. "Collateral Damage,' Anti-Trafficking Campaigns, Border Security, and Sex Worker Rights Struggles in Canada." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 222–49.
- Lesbian and Gay History Group of Toronto. *A History of the Relationship Between the Gay Community and the Metropolitan Police: A Brief Presented to Arnold Bruner for His Study of Relations Between the Homosexual Community and the Police*. Toronto: The Group, 1981.
- Lesbians Making History in Toronto. "People Think This Didn't Happen in Canada." *Fireweed: A Feminist Quarterly*, no. 28 (Spring 1989): 81–86, 142.
- "Lesbians of Colour. Loving and Struggling: A Conversation between Three Lesbians of Color." In "Women of Color." Special issue, *Fireweed: A Feminist Quarterly* 2 (Spring 1983): 66–72.
- Letson, Robyn. "Coming Out? Against Apartheid: A Roundtable About Queer Solidarity and Palestine." *Upping the Anti*, no. 13 (March 20, 2012): 137–51.
- LeVay, Simon. *The Sexual Brain*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.
- Lewin, Miriam, ed. *In the Shadow of the Past: Psychology Portrays the Sexes: A Social and Intellectual History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- . "Psychology Measures Femininity and Masculinity." In Lewin, *In the Shadow of the Past*, 155–78.
- Lewis, Holly. *The Politics of Everybody: Feminism, Queer Theory, and Marxism at the Intersection*. London: Zed Books, 2016.
- Lewis, Nathaniel M. "Punch[Ing] More Than Its Weight': LGBT Organizing in Halifax, Nova Scotia." In Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 250–70.
- Leznoff, Maurice. "Interviewing Homosexuals." *American Journal of Sociology* 62, no. 2 (September 1956): 202–4.
- . "The Homosexual in Urban Society." Master's thesis, McGill University, 1954.
- Leznoff, Maurice, and William A Westley. "The Homosexual Community." *Social Problems* 3, no. 4 (April 1956): 257–63.
- Li, Alan. "Power in Community, Queer Asian Activism from the 1980s to the 2000s." In Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*, 47–60.
- Licata, Salvatore J., and Robert P. Petersen, eds. *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*. Research on Homosexuality 2. New York: Haworth Press, 1981.
- Light, Beth, and Joy Parr, eds. *Canadian Women on the Move, 1867–1920*. Documents in Canadian Women's History 2. Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1983.
- Light, Beth, and Alison L. Prentice, eds. *Pioneer and Gentlewomen of British North America, 1713–1867*. Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1980.
- Lim, Pei. "Racism and Gay Male Porn: Taking Control of the Images, Interview with Pei Lim." By Gary Kinsman. *Rites*, February 1987, 14–15.
- Lind, Earl. *Autobiography of an Androgyne*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- . *The Female Impersonators*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

- Linden, Robin Ruth. *Against Sodomasochism: A Radical Feminist Analysis*. East Palo Alto, CA: Frog in the Well, 1982.
- Lindstrom, Jeff. "Limited Adoption Rights Granted." *Xtra!*, May 26, 1995.
- . "Limited Adoption Rights Granted, But Appeal Could Still Be Filed after Election." *Xtra!*, May 26, 1995.
- Ling, Justin. *Missing from the Village: The Story of Serial Killer Bruce McArthur, The Search for Justice, and the System That Failed Toronto's Queer Community*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2020.
- Little, Margaret Hillyard. "Manhunts and Bingo Blabs': The Moral Regulation of Ontario Single Mothers." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 19, no. 2 (1994): 233–47.
- Livingston, Jennie, dir. and prod. *Paris Is Burning*. Toronto: CFP Video, 1990.
- Loeser, Lewis H. "The Sexual Psychopath in the Military Service: A Study of 270 Cases." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 102, no. 1 (July 1945): 92–101.
- Longfellow, Brenda, Scott MacKenzie, and Thomas Waugh. *The Perils of Pedagogy: The Works of John Greyson*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013.
- Lord, R. Cassandra. "We Have Always Been Here: Pelau MasQUEERade Disturbing Toronto Pride History." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 360–94.
- Lorde, Audre. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. New York: Crossing Press, 1984; repr. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press, 2007.
- . *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1982.
- Loreto, Nora. *Spin Doctors: How Media and Politicians Misdiagnosed the COVID-19 Pandemic*. Halifax: Fernwood, 2021.
- Los Angeles Research Group. "Towards a Scientific Analysis of the Gay Question." In *Pink Triangles: Radical Perspectives on Gay Liberation*, edited by Pam Mitchell, 117–35. Boston: Alyson Publications, 1980.
- Lowman, John. "Geography, Crime and Social Control." PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1983.
- . "You Can Do It, but Don't Do It Here: Some Comments on Proposals for the Reform of Canadian Prostitution Law." In Lowman et al., *Regulating Sex*, 193–213.
- Lowman, John, Margaret A. Jackson, Ted S. Palys, and Shelley A.M. Gavigan, eds. *Regulating Sex: An Anthology of Commentaries on the Findings and Recommendations of the Badgley and Fraser Reports*. Burnaby, BC: School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University, 1986.
- Lukács, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. London: Merlin Press, 1971.
- Luksic, Nicola. "BDSM in Canada Is 50 Shades of Legal Grey." *CBC News*, February 26, 2015. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/bdsm-in-canada-is-50-shades-of-legal-grey-1.2969194>.
- Lumsden, Ian G. *Homosexuality, Society and the State in Mexico*. Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1991.
- Lutes, Abram. "'Band by Band': Russel Diabo on Efforts to 'Terminate' Indigenous Rights." *NB Media Co-Op*, July 27, 2019. <https://nbmediacoop.org/2019/07/26/band-by-band-russell-diabo-on-efforts-to-terminate-indigenous-rights/>.
- Lynch, Michael. "The Lover of His Fellows and the Hot Little Prophets: Walt Whitman in Ontario." *The Body Politic*, October 1980, 29–31.
- . "The Rise of Gay Capitalism." *The Body Politic*, October 1976, 3.
- . "Walt Whitman in Ontario." In *The Continuing Presence of Walt Whitman: The Life after the Life*, edited by Robert K Martin, 141–51. Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1992.
- MacDonald, Ingrid. "We'll Deconstruct When They Deconstruct." *Resources for Feminist Research* 19, no. 3/4 (December 1990): 89–90.
- MacDonald, Ingrid, and Kate Lazier. "The Politics of Lesbian Sexual Imagination: Good Girls with Bad Attitudes." *Rites*, September 1985, 11–15.

- MacDonald, Stephen. "Diggers." *The Body Politic*, November 1984, 35–36.
- McDougall, Brian. "Building on the Battle of Billings Bridge." *Midnight Sun*, February 24, 2022. <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/building-on-the-battle-of-billings-bridge/>.
- McDougall, Heather. "Public Health in Toronto's Municipal Politics: The Cardiff Years, 1833–1890." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 55, no. 2 (Summer 1981): 186–202.
- MacLeod, R.C. "The Shaping of Canadian Criminal Law, 1892 to 1902." *Historical Papers/Communications Historiques* 13, no. 1 (1978): 64–75.
- Macnair, Mike. "The Contradictory Politics of SM." In Shepherd and Wallis, *Coming on Strong*, 147–62.
- "Mad, Angry, Gay and Proud: A Lesbian and Gay Supplement." *Phoenix Rising* 8, no. 3/4 (1990): 31–40.
- Madison, Stephen. "A Queered Pitch." *Red Pepper* (London), February 1995, 27.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia: An Ethnographic Account of Courtship, Marriage, and Family Life Among the Natives of the Trobriand Islands, British New Guinea*. Third ed. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.
- Mann, Arshy. "Why Black Lives Matter Is Toronto's Most Effective LGBT Movement." *Daily Xtra*, January 18, 2017. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/why-black-lives-matter-is-torontos-most-effective-lgbt-movement-70830>.
- Mann, W.E., ed. *Social Deviance in Canada*. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1971.
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente, Luis Hernández Navarro, and Zapatistas. *The Other Campaign: The Zapatista Call for Change from Below/La otra compana*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights, 2006.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Maroney, Heather Jon, and Meg Luxton, eds. *Feminism and Political Economy: Women's Work, Women's Struggles*. Toronto: Methuen, 1987.
- Marshall, Bill. "Gays and Marxism." In Shepherd and Wallis, *Coming on Strong*, 258–74.
- Marshall, John. "Pansies, Perverts and Macho Men: Changing Conceptions of Male Homosexuality." In Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 133–54.
- Martens, Kathleen, and Brittany Guyot. "200 Students Died at 46 Day Schools in Canada, Federal Documents Reveal." *APTN National News*, October 6, 2021. <https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/federal-day-schools-indigenous-students-deaths-canada/>.
- Martin, Biddy. "Sexual Practice and Changing Lesbian Identities." In *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, edited by Michèle Barrett and Anne Phillips, 93–119. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Martin, Robert K. *The Homosexual Tradition in American Poetry*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.
- Martindale, Kathleen. "What Makes Lesbianism Thinkable? Theorizing Lesbianism From Adrienne Rich to Queer Theory." In *Feminist Issues: Race, Class and Sexuality*, edited by Nancy Mandell, 67–94. Scarborough: Prentice Hall, 1995.
- Martis, Eternity. "Pride Toronto Members Vote to Keep the Police Out of the Pride Parade." *Xtra*, January 18, 2017. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/pride-toronto-members-vote-to-keep-police-out-of-the-pride-parade-72858>.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy: Volume 1: The Process of Capitalist Production*. New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- . *Early Writings*. New York: Vintage Books, 1975.
- . *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- . *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. Edited by Martin Nicolaus. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Writings on the Paris Commune*. Edited by Hal Draper. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.

- Masoumi, Azar. "'Come Out and Be Free!' Coming Out and the (International) Government of Sexualities." In Brock, *Governing the Social in Neoliberal Times*, 283–98.
- Massad, Joseph A. *Desiring Arabs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Masters, Philinda and the Broadside Collective. *Inside Broadside: A Decade of Feminist Journalism*. Toronto: Second Story Press, 2019.
- Matte, Nicholas. "Rupert Raj, Transmen and Sexuality, The Politics of Transnormativity in *Metamorphosis Magazine* during the 1980s." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 117–36.
- Matters, Indiana. "Unfit for Publication: Notes Towards a Lavender History of British Columbia." Paper presented at the "Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives" Lesbian/Gay History Conference, Toronto, July 1985.
- Maynard, Robyn. *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood, 2017.
- Maynard, Robyn, and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. *Rehearsals for Living*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2022.
- . "Towards Black and Indigenous Futures on Turtle Island: A Conversation." In Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 75–84.
- Maynard, Steven. "'A New Way of Lovin': Queer Toronto Gets Schooled by Jackie Shane." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 11–18.
- . "'Boys and Their Men: The Homosexual World of Working-Class Youth in Urban Ontario.'" Paper presented at the "Out of the Archives" Conference, York University, Toronto, January 1994.
- . "'Hell Witches in Toronto': Notes on Lesbian Visibility in Early-Twentieth-Century Canada." *Left History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Historical Inquiry and Debate* 9, no. 2 (Summer 2004): 191–205.
- . "'Horrible Temptations': Sex, Men, and Working-Class Male Youth in Urban Ontario, 1890–1935." *Canadian Historical Review Canadian Historical Review* 78, no. 2 (June 1997): 191–235.
- . "In Search of 'Sodom North': The Writing of Lesbian and Gay History in English Canada, 1970–1990." *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 21, no. 1/2 (June 1994): 117–32.
- . "Modernization or Liberation?" *Capital Xtra!*, March 17, 2000.
- . "On the Case of the Case: The Emergence of the Homosexual as a Case History in Early-Twentieth Century Ontario." In *On the Case: Explorations in Social History*, edited by Franca Iacovetta and Wendy Mitchinson, 65–87. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- . "'The Party with God': Michel Foucault, the Gay Left and the Work of Theory." *Cultural History* 5, no. 2 (2016): 122–52.
- . "Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History." *Labour/Le Travail* 23 (Spring 1989): 159–69.
- . "Through a Hole in the Lavatory Wall: Homosexual Subcultures, Police Surveillance, and the Dialectics of Discovery, Toronto, 1890–1930." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5, no. 2 (October 1994): 207–42.
- . "To Forgive and Forget? Homonationalism, Hegemony, and History in the Gay Apology." *Active History*, November 24, 2017. <http://activehistory.ca/papers/to-forgive-and-forget-homonationalism-hegemony-and-history-in-the-gay-apology/>.
- . "What Color Is Your Underwear?: Class, Whiteness and Advertising." In "Queer Licks Issue." Special issue, *Border/Lines*, no. 32 (1994): 4–9.
- . "When Queer Is Not Enough: Identity and Politics (Queer Nation)." *Fuse*, Fall 1991, 14–18.

- Maynard, Steven, Gary Kinsman, Patrizia Gentile, and Tom Hooper, "Sex Workers Are Left Out in the Cold by Ottawa's Unjust Conviction Amendments." *The Conversation*, March 20, 2023. <https://theconversation.com/sex-workers-are-left-out-in-the-cold-by-ottawas-unjust-conviction-amendments-201810>.
- Mayne, Xavier. *The Intersexes: A History of Simisexualism as a Problem in Social Life*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- McCann, Marcus. *Park Cruising: What Happens When We Wander Off the Path*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2023.
- McCann, Marcus. "Yes, People Still Meet for Sex in the Parks. No It's Not a Problem." *Medium*, October 15, 2020. <https://marcusmccann.medium.com/yes-people-still-meet-for-sex-in-parks-no-its-not-a-problem-3db910d30c61>.
- McCaskell, Tim. *Queer Progress: From Homophobia to Homonationalism*. Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 2016.
- . "The Bath Raids and Gay Politics." In Cunningham, *Social Movements/Social Change*, 169–88.
- McClelland, Alexander. *The Criminalization of HIV in Canada: Experiences of People Living with HIV*. Montreal: Alexander McClelland, 2019. <https://www.alexandermcclelland.ca/blog-1/2019/11/21/the-criminalization-of-hiv-in-canada-experiences-of-people-living-with-hiv>.
- McCormack, Thelma. "Keeping Our Sex 'Safe': Anti-Censorship Strategies vs. the Politics of Protection." In "Sex and Sexuality." Special issue, *Fireweed* 1 (Winter 1993): 25–34.
- McCreary, John K. "Psychopathia Homosexualis." *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie* 4, no. 2 (June 1950): 63–74.
- McDonnell, Kathleen. "Claim No Easy Victories: The Fight for Reproductive Rights." In *Still Ain't Satisfied!: Canadian Feminism Today*, edited by Maureen FitzGerald, Connie Guberman, and Margie Wolfe, 32–42. Toronto: Women's Press, 1982.
- . *Not an Easy Choice: A Feminist Re-Examines Abortion*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1984.
- McFarlane, Courtney. "Censorship, Passion and Identity." *Border/Lines*, no. 32 (1994): 34–35.
- McIntosh, Mary. "The Homosexual Role." *Social Problems* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1968): 182–92.
- . "Queer Theory and the War of the Sexes." In Wilson and Bristow, *Activating Theory*, 30–52.
- . "The State and the Oppression of Women." In *Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production*, edited by Annette Kuhn and AnnMarie Wolpe, 254–89. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- McIntosh, Mary, and Jeffrey Weeks. "Postscript: The Homosexual Role Revisited." In Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 44–49.
- McKinnon, Catherine A. "A Feminist Defence of Transgender Sex Equality Rights." *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 34, no. 2 (2023): 88–96.
- McLaren, Angus. "Birth Control and Abortion in Canada, 1870–1920." *Canadian Historical Review* 59, no. 3 (September 1978): 319–40.
- . *Our Own Master Race: The Eugenic Crusade in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990.
- . "Sex Radicalism in the Canadian Pacific Northwest, 1890–1920." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2, no. 4 (April 1992): 527–46.
- McLaren, Angus, and Arlene Tigar McLaren. *The Bedroom and the State: The Changing Practices and Politics of Contraception and Abortion in Canada, 1880–1980*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1986.
- McLeod, Albert. "Two-Spirit/Indigenous LGBTQ People and the Purge." *LGBT Purge*, n.d. <https://lgbtpurgefund.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Monument-Briefing-Documents-EN-Albert-McLeod.pdf>.

- McLeod, Donald W. *A Brief History of GAY: Canada's First Gay Tabloid, 1964–1966*. Toronto: Homewood Books, 2003.
- . “Jim Egan, Gay Warrior.” In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 108–10.
- . *Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada: A Selected Annotated Chronology, 1964–1975*. Toronto: ECW Press/Homewood Books, 1996.
- . *Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada: A Selected Annotated Chronology 1976–1981*. Toronto: Homewood, 2017.
- McLeod, Philip. “Remarks.” *Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Newsletter*, December 1985, 5.
- McNally, David. *Another World Is Possible: Globalization and Anti-Capitalism*. 2nd ed. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring/Merlin Press, 2006.
- . *Blood and Money: War, Slavery and the State*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2020.
- . *Bodies of Meaning: Studies on Language, Labor, and Liberation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- McNally, David, and Charles Post. “Beyond Electoralism: Mass Action and the Remaking of the Working Class.” *Spectre* 3 (Spring 2021). <https://spectrejournal.com/beyond-electoralism/>.
- Mecca, Tommi Avicoli. *Smash the Church, Smash the State! The Early Years of Gay Liberation*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2009.
- Mejia, Max. “Mexican Pink.” In Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 43–55.
- Mercer, Kobena. “Skin Head Sex Thing: Racial Differences and the Homoerotic Imaginary.” In *How Do I Look?*, 169–222.
- Mercer, Kobena, and Issac Julien. “Race, Sexual Politics and Black Masculinity. A Dossier.” In *Male Order: Unwrapping Masculinity*, edited by Rowena Chapman and Jonathan Rutherford, 97–164. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1988.
- Metcalf, Robin and Khyber Centre for the Arts. *OUT: Queer Looking, Queer Acting Revisited*. Halifax, NS: Khyber Centre for the Arts, 2014.
- Mewett, Alan W. “Morality and the Criminal Law.” *University of Toronto Law Journal* 14, no. 2 (1961/1962): 213–28.
- . “Sexual Offences in Canada.” *Criminal Law Quarterly* 2, no. 1 (1959/1960): 21–36.
- Meyer, Doug. *Violence Against Queer People: Race, Class, Gender and the Persistence of Anti-LGBT Discrimination*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015.
- Meyer, Leisa D. “Creating G.I. Jane: The Regulation of Sexuality and Sexual Behavior in the Women’s Army Corps during World War II.” *Feminist Studies* 18, no. 3 (Fall 1992): 581–601.
- Michell, Adrianna, and Hannah Walters-Vida. “One Month Later.” *The Silhouette*, July 18, 2019. <https://www.thesil.ca/one-month-later>.
- Mieli, Mario. *Towards a Gay Communism: Elements of a Homosexual Critique*. London: Pluto Press, 2018.
- Mies, Maria, and Vandana Shiva. *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books, Ltd., 2014.
- Migala, Jessica. “Sex During the Coronavirus Pandemic: What’s Safe, and What Experts Don’t Want You to Do.” *Health*, June 16, 2020, <https://www.health.com/condition/infectious-diseases/coronavirus/sex-during-coronavirus-pandemic>.
- Miller, Alan. “Beefcake with No Labels Attached.” *The Body Politic*, January 1983, 33.
- Miller, James. “African Immigrant Damnation Syndrome: The Case of Charles Senyonga.” *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 2, no. 2 (June 2005): 31–50.
- Millward, Liz. *Making a Scene: Lesbians and Community Across Canada, 1964–1984*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2016.
- Minson, Jeff. “The Assertion of Homosexuality.” *M/F*, no. 5/6 (1981): 19–39.
- Mitchinson, Wendy. “Gynecological Operations on Insane Women: London, Ontario, 1895–1901.” *Journal of Social History* 15, no. 3 (Spring 1982): 467–84.
- . “Historical Attitudes toward Women and Childbirth.” *Atlantis* 4, no. 2, pt. 2 (Spring 1979): 13–34.

- . *The Nature of Their Bodies: Women and Their Doctors in Victorian Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- . “The WCTU: ‘For God, Home and the Native Land’: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism.” In Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 151–68.
- Mitropoulos, Angela. “‘Herd Immunity’ Was Originally About Vaccination. Now It Is Neoliberal Violence. Interview with Angela Mitropoulos.” By Max Haiven. *Truthout*, October 21, 2020. <https://truthout.org/articles/herd-immunity-was-originally-about-vaccination-now-it-is-neoliberal-violence/>.
- Mogrovejo, Norma. “Lesbian Visibility in Latin America: Reclaiming Our History.” In Drucker, *Different Rainbows*, 71–90.
- Mohabir, Nalini, and Ronald Cummings, eds. “Special Issue: Legacies of the Sir George Williams Student Protests.” *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies* 44 (March 2022).
- Mohr, Johann. “The Pedophilias: Their Clinical, Social and Legal Implications.” *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal* 7, no. 5 (October 1962): 255–60.
- Mohr, Johann, and R.E. Turner. “Sexual Deviations.” In *Social Deviance in Canada*, edited by W.E. Mann, 350–65. Toronto: Copp, 1971.
- . “Sexual Deviations, Part IV: Paedophilia.” *Applied Therapeutics* 9, no. 4 (April 1967): 362–65.
- Mohr, Johann, R.E. Turner, and M.B. Jerry. *Pedophilia and Exhibitionism: A Handbook*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.
- Mojtehdzadeh, Sara, and Jennifer Yang. “More Than 180 Workers At This Toronto Bakery Got COVID-19—But the Public Wasn’t Informed. Why Aren’t We Being Told About Workplace Outbreaks?” *Toronto Star*, August 10, 2020. <https://www.thestar.com/business/2020/08/10/more-than-180-workers-at-this-toronto-bakery-got-covid-19-but-the-public-wasnt-informed-why-arent-we-being-told-about-workplace-outbreaks.html>.
- Money, John, and Patricia Tucker. *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman*. 1st ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1975.
- Moran, L.J. “The Uses of Homosexuality: Homosexuality for National Security.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 19 (1991): 149–70.
- Morgan, David H. *Discovering Men*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Morgan, Jas M. *Nitisānak*. Montréal: Metonymy Press, 2018.
- Morgensen, Scott Lauria. *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- . “Unsettling Queer Politics: What Can Non-Natives Learn from Two-Spirit Politics.” In Driskill et al., *Queer Indigenous Studies*, 132–52.
- Morrison, T.R. “Their Proper Sphere: Feminism, the Family and Child-Centred Social Reform in Ontario, 1875–1900, Part 2.” *Ontario History* 68, no. 2 (1976): 65–74.
- Mort, Frank. *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-Moral Politics in England Since 1830*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- . “Sexuality: Regulation and Contestation.” In Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality: Power and Politics*, chapter 3.
- Morton, Donald E. “Changing the Terms: (Virtual) Desire and (Actual) Reality.” In *The Material Queer: A LesBiGay Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Donald E Morton, 1–33. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996.
- . “Pataphysics of the Closet: Queer Theory as the Art of Imaginary Solutions for Unimaginary Problems.” In *Transformations: Marxist Boundary Work in Theory, Economics, Politics and Culture*, 1–70. Syracuse, NY: The Red Factory, 2001.
- Morton, Orde. “Joining a Minority.” In *Winnipeg Made Me: A Memoir of Growing Up*. Orde Morton, 2022.
- Mosse, George L. *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1985.

- . *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism*. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1978.
- Mossop, Brian. "Gay and Socialist, or Some Reflections of a Commie Fag." *Canadian Dimension*, June 1980, 49–51.
- Mouffe, Chantal, ed. *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Mulé, Nick, dir. *Queer Edge: From Gay to Queer Liberation*. Toronto: Dissident Voices Productions, 2019. Video.
- Mungal, Kurt. "Ball Culture." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 251–53.
- Murdock, Graham. "Political Deviance: The Press Presentation of a Militant Mass Demonstration." In Cohen and Young, *The Manufacture of News*, 156–75.
- Murray, David A.B. *Real Queer?: Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities in the Canadian Refugee Apparatus*. London: Rowan and Littlefield, 2016.
- Murray, Stephen O. "The Institutional Elaboration of a Quasi-Ethnic Community in Canada." In *Homosexuality in International Perspective*, edited by Man Singh Das and J. Harry, 31–43. New Delhi: Vikas, 1980.
- Mykhalovskiy, Eric. "The Problem of 'Significant Risk': Exploring the Public Health Impact of Criminalizing HIV Non-Disclosure." *Social Science & Medicine* 73, no. 5 (2011): 668–75.
- . "The Public Health Implications of HIV Criminalization: Past, Current and Future Research Implications." *Critical Public Health* 25, no. 4 (2015): 373–85.
- Mykhalovskiy, Eric, and Glenn Betteridge. "Who? What? Where? When? And with What Consequences? An Analysis of Criminal Cases of HIV Non-Disclosure in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society/Revue Canadienne Droit et Société* 27, no. 1 (2012): 31–53.
- Mykhalovskiy, Eric, Colin Hastings, Chris Sanders, Michelle Hayman, and Laura Bisailon. "'Callous, Cold and Deliberately Duplicitous': Racialization, Immigration and the Representation of HIV Criminalization in Canadian Mainstream Newspapers." SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, November 22, 2016.
- Mykhalovskiy, Eric, and George W. Smith. *Hooking Up to Social Services: A Report on the Barriers People Living With HIV/AIDS Face Assessing Social Services*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/Community AIDS Treatment Information Exchange, 1994.
- Namaste, Ki. "Too Queer for Middle America." *Fuse*, Summer 1995, 27–28.
- Namaste, Viviane K. "Changes of Name and Sex for Transsexuals in Quebec: Understanding the Arbitrary Nature of Institutions." In Frampton, Kinsman, Thompson, and Tilleczek, *Sociology for Changing the World*, 160–73.
- . *Invisible Lives: The Erasure of Transsexual and Transgendered People*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- . *Sex Change, Social Change: Reflections on Identity, Institutions, and Imperialism*. Toronto: Women's Press, 2005.
- Nasereddin, Yasmine. "The Struggle Against Canadian Repression At 1492 Land Back Lane." *The Strand* 63, no. 2 (September 15, 2020). <https://thestrand.ca/the-struggle-against-canadian-repression-at-1492-land-back-lane/>.
- Nash, Catherine J. "Consuming Sexual Liberation: Gay Business, Politics, and Toronto's Barracks Bathroom Raids." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études Canadiennes* 48, no. 1 (2014): 82–105.
- Nash, Catherine Jean. "Contesting Identity: Politics of Gays and Lesbians in Toronto in the 1970s: Identidad En Conflicto: Políticas de Gays y Lesbianas En Toronto En Los Años 1970." *Gender, Place & Culture* 12, no. 1 (March 1, 2005): 113–35.
- . "Toronto's Gay Village, 1969–1982: Plotting the Politics of Gay Identity." *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien* 50, no. 1 (2006): 1–16.
- National Deviancy Conference, ed. *Permissiveness and Control: The Fate of the Sixties Legislation*. London: Macmillan, 1980.

- National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, *Reclaiming Power and Place: The Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls*. June 2019. <https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/final-report/>.
- Nestle, Joan. *A Restricted Country*. Ithaca, NY: Firebrand Books, 1987.
- . “Butch-Femme Relationships: Sexual Courage in the 1950s.” *Heresies*, no. 12 (1981): 21–24.
- . “Excerpts from the Oral History of Mabel Hampton.” *Signs* 18, no. 4 (Summer 1993): 925–35.
- . “The Femme Question.” In Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, 232–41.
- , ed. *The Persistent Desire: A Femme/Butch Reader*. Boston: Alyson, 1992.
- Nestle, Joan, Clare Howell, and Riki Wilchins. *GenderQueer: Voices from Beyond the Sexual Binary*. Los Angeles: Alyson, 2002.
- New Brunswick Coalition for Human Rights Reform. *Discrimination and Violence Encountered by Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual New Brunswickers*. Fredericton, NB: New Brunswick Coalition for Human Rights Reform, 1990.
- Newman, Zoe. “The Spectacle of Public Sex(uality): Media and State Surveillance of Gay Men in Toronto in the 1970s.” In *Expanding the Gaze: Gender and the Politics of Surveillance*, edited by Emily Van der Meulen and Robert Heynen, 213–39. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.
- Newsom, Janice. “‘Backlash’ against Feminism: A Disempowering Metaphor.” *Resources for Feminist Research* 20, no. 3/4 (September 1991): 93–97.
- Newton, Esther. *Mother Camp: Female Impersonators in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- . “The Mythic Mannish Lesbian: Radclyffe Hall and the New Woman.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 9, no. 4 (1984): 577–75.
- Ng, Roxana. “Constituting Ethnic Phenomenon: An Account from the Perspective of Immigrant Women.” *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Etudes Ethniques au Canada* 13, no. 1 (January 1981): 97–108.
- . “Immigrant Women and the State: A Study in the Social Organization of Knowledge.” PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1984.
- . “Immigrant Women in Canada: A Socially Constructed Category.” *Resources for Feminist Research* 15, no. 1 (March 1986): 13–15.
- . “Multiculturalism as Ideology: A Textual Analysis.” In Campbell and Manicom, *Knowledge, Experience, and Ruling Relations*, 35–48.
- . *The Politics of Community Services: Immigrant Women, Class and the State*. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1988.
- . “Sex, Ethnicity or Class: Some Methodological Considerations.” Paper presented at the British Sociological Society meeting, April 1982.
- Ng, Roxana, Gillian Walker, and Jake Muller, eds. *Community Organization and the Canadian State*. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1990.
- . “Sexism, Racism, and Canadian Nationalism.” In Bannerji, *Returning the Gaze*, 197–211.
- Ng, Yvonne Chi-Ying. “Ideology, Media and Moral Panics: An Analysis of the Jacques Murder.” Master’s thesis, University of Toronto, 1981.
- Nguyen, Andrew. “15,000 People Marched in Brooklyn for Black Trans Lives.” *The Cut*, June 15, 2020. <https://www.thecut.com/2020/06/fifteen-thousand-marched-in-brooklyn-for-black-trans-lives.html>.
- Nicholson, Linda J. *Feminism/Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Nickel, Sarah. “Reconsidering 1969: The White Paper and the Making of the Modern Indigenous Rights Movement.” *Canadian Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (2019): 223–38.
- Nicol, Nancy, dir. *Gay Pride and Prejudice*. Toronto: Intervention Video, 1994. Two-channel video, 62 min.

- . *Stand Together*. Toronto: Vtape, 2002. DVD, 124 min.
- Nancy Nicol, Adrian Jjuuko, Richard Lusimbo, Nick Mulé, Susan Ursel, Amar Wahab, and Phyllis Waugh, eds. *Envisioning Global LGBT Human Rights: (Neo)Colonialism, Neoliberalism, Resistance and Hope*. London: University of London, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, 2018.
- Nilson, Deborah. "The Social Evil: Prostitution in Vancouver, 1900–1920." In Latham and Kess, *In Her Own Right*, 205–28.
- Noble, Bobby. "Trans-Ing the Canadian Passport: On the Biopolitical Storying of Race, Gender and Borders." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 270–84.
- Noble, Joey. "'Class-Ifying' The Poor: Toronto Charities 1850–1880." *Studies in Political Economy* 2, no. 1 (1979): 109–28.
- Normandeau, Dani. "Disability, Politics, and Collectively Reimagining Justice: Challenging the Ableist Contours of the 1969 Canadian Criminal Code Reform." In *Disability (In)Justice: Examining Criminalization in Canada*, edited by Emily Van der Meulen, Jeffrey Monaghan, and Kelly Fritsch. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, forthcoming.
- "Not Parliament's Intention." *Globe & Mail*. November 11, 1967, 6.
- Nungesser, Lon G. *Homosexual Acts, Actors, and Identities*. New York: Praeger, 1984.
- Oakes, Shawn S. "Another Look at 'The Ideology of Fag': The Social Organization of High Schools and the Gay Student Experience." Fourth year honours essay, Laurentian University, 2011.
- Obomsawin, Alanis, dir. and writer. *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance*. Montreal: National Film Board of Canada, 1993. NFB, 119 min. https://www.nfb.ca/film/kanehsatake_270_years_of_resistance_mohawk.
- O'Brien, Carol-Anne. "The Social Organization of the Treatment of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Youth in Group Homes and Youth Shelters." *Canadian Review of Social Policies*, no. 34 (Winter 1994): 37–57.
- O'Brien, Carol-Anne, Robb Travers, Laurie Bell, and Central Toronto Youth Services. *No Safe Bed: Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Youth in Residential Services*. Toronto: Central Toronto Youth Services, 1993.
- O'Brien, Carol-Anne, and Lorna Weir. "Lesbians and Gay Men Inside and Outside Families." In *Canadian Families: Diversity, Conflict, and Change*, edited by Nancy Mandell and Ann Duffy, 111–40. Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1995.
- O'Brien, Kevin. *Oscar Wilde in Canada: An Apostle for the Arts*. Toronto: Personal Library, 1982.
- O'Brien, Mary. "The Comatization of Women: Patriarchal Fetishism in the Sociology of Education." Presented at the British Sociological Association Conference, Manchester, UK, 1982.
- . *The Politics of Reproduction*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- O'Brien, M.E. *Family Abolition, Capitalism and the Communizing of Care*. London: Pluto Press, 2023.
- O'Carroll, Tom. *Paedophilia: The Radical Case*. Boston: Alyson Publications, 1982.
- Oikawa, Mona, Dionne Falconer, and Ann Decter, eds. *Resist: Essays Against A Homophobic Culture*. 1st ed. Toronto: Women's Press, 1994.
- Olson, Axel Otto. "1956: The Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths." Edited by Robert Champagne. *Rites*, November 1986, 8–9.
- Omosupe, Erma. "Black/Lesbian/Bulldagger." In "Queer Theory, Lesbian and Gay Sexualities." Special issue, *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 101–11.
- Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC). "OHRC Policy Statement on COVID-19 Vaccine Mandates and Proof of Vaccine Certificates." September 22, 2021. https://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/news_centre/ohrc-policy-statement-covid-19-vaccine-mandates-and-proof-vaccine-certificates.

- Oudshoorn, Nelly. *Beyond the Natural Body: An Archeology of Sex Hormones*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Oulton, Randal. "Gay Marketing Is in the Pink." *Globe & Mail*. August 15, 1992, sec. Focus.
- OUT! Spoken. *The "OUT! Spoken" Styleguide: A Guide for the Media on Lesbian, Bisexual, Gay and HIV/AIDS Issues*. Toronto: OUT! Spoken, 1995.
- Padgug, R.A. "Sexual Matters: On Conceptualizing Sexuality in History." *Radical History Review* 1979, no. 20 (Spring/Summer 1979): 3–23.
- Palmater, Pat. "Mi'kmaq Treaty Rights, Reconciliation, and the 'Rule of Law'." *Canadian Dimension*, September 22, 2020. <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/mikmaq-treaty-rights-reconciliation-and-the-rule-of-law>.
- Palmer, Bryan D. *Cultures of Darkness: Night Travels in the Histories of Transgression*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000.
- . "Discordant Music: Charivaris and Whitecapping in Nineteenth-Century North America." *Labour/Le Travail* 3 (1978): 5–62.
- . *Working Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstruction of Canadian Labour 1800–1980*. Toronto: Butterworth, 1983.
- Palmer, Bryan D., and Gaétan Héroux. *Toronto's Poor: A Rebellious History*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2016.
- Parker, Andrew. "Unthinking Sex: Marx, Engels and the Scene of Writing." In Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet*, 19–41.
- Parker, Andrew, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer, and Patricia Yaeger, eds. *Nationalisms and Sexualities*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Parker, Graham. "The Origins of the Canadian Criminal Code." In *Essays in the History of Canadian Law. Vol. 1*, edited by David H. Flaherty, 249–77. Toronto: University of Toronto Press for Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History, 1981.
- Parr, Joy. *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men and Change in Two Industrial Towns, 1880–1950*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Parr, Suzanne. "Community Organizing and the Religious Right: Lessons from the Measure 9 Campaign: Interview with Suzanne Parr." *Radical America* 24, no. 2 (1997): 67–75.
- . "Up against Hate: Lessons from Oregon's Measure Nine Campaign: Interview with Suzanne Parr." *Gay Community News*, April 1993.
- Pascoe, Herbert. "Deviant Sexual Behaviour and the Sex Criminal." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 84, no. 4 (1961): 206–11.
- . "Deviant Sexual Behaviour and the Sex Criminal." In Laskin, *Social*, 413–14.
- Pasternak, Shiri, Abby Stadnyk, and Kevin Walby, eds., *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle: Police Abolition in Canada*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2022.
- Patton, Cindy. *Fatal Advice: How Safe-Sex Education Went Wrong*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996.
- . *Inventing AIDS*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- . *Last Served?: Gendering the HIV Pandemic*. Taylor & Francis, 1994.
- . "Resistance and the Erotic: Reclaiming History, Setting Strategy as We Face AIDS." In *AIDS: Social Representations, Social Practices*, edited by Peter Aggleton, Graham Hart, and Peter M. Davies, 237–51. London: Falmer, 1989.
- . *Sex and Germs: The Politics of AIDS*. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1986.
- . "Tremble, Hetero Swine!" In Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet*, 143–61.
- Paynter, Martha. *Abortion to Abolition: Reproductive Health and Justice in Canada*. Halifax and New York: Fernwood Publishing/Columbia University Press, 2022.
- Pazdro, Roberta J. "Agnes Deans Cameron." In Latham and Kess, *In Her Own Right*, 101–23.
- Pearce, Frank. "How to Be Immoral and Ill, Pathetic and Dangerous, All at the Same Time: Mass Media and the Homosexual." In Cohen and Young, *The Manufacture of News*, 284–301.

- Pearlston, Karen. "Avoiding the Vulva: Judicial Interpretations of Lesbian Sex Under the Divorce Act, 1968." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society/Revue Canadienne Droit et Société* 32, no. 1 (2017): 37–53.
- . "‘Something More’: The State’s Place in the Bedrooms of Lesbian Nation." In Dummit and Sethna, *No Place for the State*, 200–222.
- Peiss, Kathy Lee. "Charity Girls’ and City Pleasures: Historical Notes on Working Class Sexuality, 1880–1920." In Peiss, Simmons, and Padgug, *Passion and Power*, 57–69.
- . *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.
- Peiss, Kathy Lee, Christina Simmons, and Robert A. Padgug, eds. *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.
- Pelrine, Eleanor Wright. *Abortion in Canada*. Toronto: New Press, 1972.
- Perry, Taylor. "From West End to Eastside: The Vancouver HIV/AIDS Epidemic, 1983–2013." *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History/Bulletin Canadien d’histoire de La Medecine* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2016): 103–30.
- Petchesky, Rosalind P. *Abortion and Women’s Choice: The State, Sexuality, and Reproductive Freedom*. Revised ed. The Northeastern Series in Feminist Theory. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1990.
- . "Reproductive Freedom: Beyond a Woman’s Right to Choose." In Stimpson and Person *Women: Sex and Sexuality*, 62–91.
- Philip, Don. "The Philosophy of Law." *Gay* 1, no. 8 (July 30, 1964): 9.
- Philipson, Ilene. "The Repression of History and Gender: A Critical Perspective on the Feminist Sexuality Debate." *Signs* 10, no. 1 (Autumn 1984): 113–18.
- Phillips, Anne, and Barbara Taylor. "Sex and Skill: Notes towards a Feminist Economics." *Feminist Review Feminist Review* 6, no. 1 (1980): 79–88.
- Piercy, Marge. *Woman on the Edge of Time*. New York: Fawcett Crest, 1976.
- Pierson, Ruth Roach. *Canadian Women and the Second World War*. Historical Booklet, Canadian Historical Association 37. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1983.
- . "The Double Bind of the Double Standard: VD Control and the CWAC in World War II." *Canadian Historical Review* 62, no. 1 (March 1981): 31–58.
- . "Ladies or Loose Women: The Canadian Women’s Army Corps in World War II." *Atlantis: A Women’s Studies Journal* 4, no. 2 (Spring 1979): 235–66.
- . "They’re Still Women After All”: *The Second World War and Canadian Womanhood*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990.
- . "Women’s Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women into the Labour Force in World War II." In Trofimenkoff and Prentice, *The Neglected Majority*, 144–45.
- Pierson, Ruth Roach, Marjorie Griffin Cohen, Paula Bourne, and Philinda Masters. *Canadian Women’s Issues*. Vol. 1, *Strong Voices*. 2 vols. Toronto: Lorimer, 1993.
- Pivar, David J. *Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868–1900*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973.
- Pleck, Joseph H. "The Theory of Male Sex Role Identity: Its Rise and Fall, 1936 to the Present." In Lewin, *In the Shadow of the Past*, 205–25.
- Plested, James. "How the Rich Plan to Rule a Burning Planet." *The Bullet*, December 23, 2019. <https://socialistproject.ca/2019/12/how-the-rich-plan-to-rule-a-burning-planet/>.
- Plummer, Kenneth. "Going Gay: Identities, Life Cycles and Lifestyles in the Male Gay World." In Richardson and Hart, *The Theory and Practice of Homosexuality*, 94–110.
- . "Homosexual Problems: Some Research Problems in the Labelling Perspective of Homosexuality." In Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 53–75.
- , ed. *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*. London: Hutchinson, 1981.
- , ed. *Modern Homosexualities: Fragments of Lesbian and Gay Experience*. London: Routledge, 1992.

- . *Sexual Stigma: An Interactionist Account*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Plummer, Louisa. *A Two-Spirit Journey: The Autobiography of a Lesbian Ojibwa-Cree Elder*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2016.
- Podolsky, Robin. "Sacrificing Queers and Other 'Proletarian' Artifacts." *Radical America* 25, no. 1 (March 1991): 53–60.
- Popert, Ken. "Race, Moustaches and Sexual Prejudice." *The Body Politic*, June 1983, 34.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso, 1980.
- Power, Lisa. *No Bath but Plenty of Bubbles: An Oral History of the Gay Liberation Front, 1970–1973*. London: Cassell, 1995.
- Prentice, Alison. *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.
- Prentice, Susan, ed. *Sex in Schools: Canadian Education and Regulation*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation, 1994.
- Puar, Jasbir. "In the Wake of It Gets Better." *The Guardian*, November 16, 2010, sec. Opinion. <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/nov/16/wake-it-gets-better-campaign>.
- . "Rethinking Homonationalism." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 45, no. 2 (2013): 336–39.
- . *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. 10th Anniversary ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.
- Public Safety Canada. "Government of Canada Working with Pride Toronto to Improve Safety of LGBTQ2 Communities." News Releases. Government of Canada, November 24, 2018. <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-safety-canada/news/2018/11/government-of-canada-working-with-pride-toronto-to-improve-safety-of-lgbtq2-communities.html>.
- Pyrreskina, Julia. "A Remarkably Dense Historical and Political Juncture": Anita Bryant, *The Body Politic*, and the Canadian Gay and Lesbian Community in January 1978." *Canadian Journal of History* 53, no. 1 (2018): 58–85.
- Queer Trans Community Defence. "Moss Park: Whose Park? Whose 'Redevelopment'?" *Radical Noise* (blog), June 3, 2016. <https://radicalnoise.ca/2016/06/03/moss-park-whose-park-whose-redevelopment/>.
- Raffoul, Nicholas. "A Response to RuPaul's Transphobic, Sexist Comments, and His Empty Apology." *The McGill Tribune*, March 20, 2018. <https://www.mcgilltribune.com/a-e/a-response-to-rupauls-transphobic-sexist-comments-and-his-empty-apology-031918/>.
- Rancourt, Réjeanne, and Thérèse Limoges. "Homosexuality Among Women." *Canadian Nurse*, December 1967.
- Ransby, Barbara. *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement: A Radical Democratic Vision*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Rao, Rahul. "Global Homocapitalism." *Radical Philosophy* 194 (November/December 2015): 38–49.
- . *Out of Time: The Queer Politics of Postcoloniality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Rasmussen, Birgit Brander, Eric Klinenberg, Irene J. Nexica, and Matt Wray. *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness: Color, Politics, and Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Rausch, A. In *Partial Payment: Class Struggle, Sexuality and the Gay Movement*. Chicago: Sojourner Truth Organization, 1981. <https://www.marxists.org/history/usa/pubs/sojournertruth/ipp.html>.
- Rayside, David. *On the Fringe: Gays and Lesbians in Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Rayside, David M, and Evert A Lindquist. "AIDS Activism and the State in Canada." *Studies in Political Economy* 39, no. 1 (Autumn 1992): 37–76.

- . “Canada: Community Activism, Federalism and the New Politics of Disease.” In *AIDS in the Industrialized Democracies: Passions, Politics and Policies*, edited by David L. Kirp and Ronald Bayer, 49–98. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1992.
- “RCMP: No Queers Please.” *Rites*, August 1985, 4.
- Reardon, Sara. “Massive Study Finds No Single Genetic Cause of Same-Sex Sexual Behavior.” *Scientific American*, August 29, 2019. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/massive-study-finds-no-single-genetic-cause-of-same-sex-sexual-behavior/>.
- Rebeck, Judy. *Ten Thousand Roses: The Making of a Feminist Revolution*. Toronto: Penguin Canada, 2005.
- Rechy, John. *City of Night*. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
- Red Collective. *The Politics of Sexuality in Capitalism*. Red Collective Pamphlet 1. London: Red Collective and Publications Distributors Cooperative, 1978.
- Reich, Wilhelm. *The Sexual Revolution: Toward a Self-Governing Character Structure*. Translated by Theodore P. Wolfe. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1962.
- Revolutionary Marxist Group. “Contribution to the Discussion on Perspectives for the Gay Movement.” *Left History*, Documentary Collection: Gay and Lesbian Activism in the 1970s, 1975. https://www.yorku.ca/lefthist/online/doc_pages/contrib1.html.
- Rich, Adrienne. “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence.” In Stimpson and Person, *Women: Sex and Sexuality*, 62–91.
- . “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence.” *Signs* 5, no. 4 (Summer 1980): 631–60.
- Richardson, Diane. “Theoretical Perspectives on Homosexuality.” In Hart and Richardson, *The Theory and Practice of Homosexuality*, 5–37.
- Richer, Stephen, and Lorna Weir, eds. *Beyond Political Correctness: Toward the Inclusive University*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Ricklefs, Roger. “New Sales Target: Campaigns to Sell to Homosexual Market Are Being Launched by More Big Firms.” *Wall Street Journal*. May 13, 1975, sec. 1.
- Riddiough, Christine R. “Culture and Politics.” In *Working Papers on Gay/Lesbian Liberation and Socialism*, edited by New American Movement, 14. Chicago: New American Movement, 1979.
- Riordan, Michael. “Blessed Are the Deviates: A Post-Therapy Check-Up On My Ex-Psychiatrist.” In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 14–20.
- . “Close but Not Enough: The Toronto Municipal Elections.” In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 100–101.
- . *Out Our Way: Gay and Lesbian Life in the Country*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1996.
- . *The First Stone: Homosexuality and the United Church*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990.
- Roberts, Barbara. “Ladies, Women and the State: Managing Female Immigration, 1880-1920.” In Ng, Walker, and Muller, *Community Organization and the Canadian State*, 108–30.
- Roberts, David J., and John Paul Catungal. “Neoliberalizing Social Justice in Infrastructure Revitalization Planning: Analyzing Toronto’s More Moss Park Project in Its Early Stages.” *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108, no. 2 (2018): 454–62.
- Roberts, Wayne. “Rocking the Cradle for the World’: The New Woman and Maternal Feminism, Toronto, 1877–1914.” In Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 15–47.
- Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Robinson, Daniel J., and David Kimmel. “The Queer Career of Homosexual Security Vetting in Cold War Canada.” *Canadian Historical Review* 75, no. 3 (September 1994): 319–45.
- Robinson, Lucy. *Gay Men and the Left in Post-War Britain: How the Personal Got Political*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2007.

- Robinson, Nadijah, and Amalia M. Duncan-Rapheal. "The Mourning Dress: Creating Spaces of Healing for Black Freedom." In Haritaworn, Moussa, and Ware, *Marvellous Grounds*, 213.
- Robinson, Paul A. *The Freudian Left: Wilhelm Reich, Geza Roheim, Herbert Marcuse*. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1969.
- Rodgers, Raymond Spencer. *Sex and the Law in Canada: Text, Cases and Comment*. Ottawa: Policy, 1962.
- Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture, 1972.
- Roe, Clifford G. *The Great War on White Slavery*. Clifford G. Roe and B.C. Steadwell, 1911.
- Roediger, David R. *Colored White: Transcending the Racial Past*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- . *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. Revised ed. London: Verso, 2000.
- Rollmann, Rhea. *A Queer History of Newfoundland*. Chapel Arm, NL: Engen Books, 2023.
- . "Why St. John's Pride Banned Uniformed Police Officers," *Independent* (St John's), June 7, 2021. <https://theindependent.ca/journalism/why-st-johns-pride-banned-uniformed-police/>.
- Romney, Paul. "...Horrible Indecent Liberties: The Trial of a Dancing Master, Toronto, 1840." *The Body Politic*, February 1977, 24.
- Rondeau, Frédéric, and Karim Larose, eds. *La contre-culture au Québec*. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2016.
- Rooney, Frances. "Edith G. Watson, Photographer, and Victoria Hayward, Writer." In "Lesbianics." Special issue, *Fireweed: A Feminist Quarterly*, no. 13 (1982): 60–68.
- . "Loring and Wyle, Sculptors." *Pink Ink*, July 1983, 18–20.
- Roscoe, Will. "Berdache: Alternative Genders and Gays, Interview with Will Roscoe." By Gary Kinsman. *Rites*, February 1988.
- . *Changing Ones: Third and Fourth Genders in Native North America*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1998.
- . "The Zuni Man-Woman." *Out/Look: National Lesbian and Gay Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1988): 56–67.
- . *The Zuni Man-Woman*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991.
- Rose, Fabien. "'A History of That Which Was Never Supposed to Be Possible': Rethinking Gender Passing in History." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 165–84.
- Rose, Nikolas S. "Beyond the Public/Private Division: Law, Power and the Family." In *Critical Legal Studies*, edited by Peter Fitzpatrick and Alan Hunt. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- . "The Psychological Complex: Mental Measurement and Social Administration." *Ideology and Consciousness*, no. 5 (Spring 1979): 5–68.
- . *The Psychological Complex: Psychology, Politics and Society in England, 1869–1939*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.
- Rose, Rebecca. *Before the Parade: A History of Halifax's Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Communities, 1972–1984*. Halifax, NS: Nimbus Publishing, 2019.
- Ross, Becki L. "Destaining the (Tattooed) Delinquent Body: The Practices of Moral Regulation at Toronto's Street Haven, 1965–1969." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7, no. 4 (April 1997): 561–95.
- . "Heterosexuals Only Need Apply: The Secretary of State's Regulation of Lesbian Existence." *Resources for Feminist Research* 17, no. 3 (September 1988): 35–38.
- . *The House That Jill Built: A Lesbian Nation in Formation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- . "Sex, Lives and Archives: Pleasure/Danger Add Debates in 1970s Lesbian Feminism." In *Women Challenging Academe*, edited by Sandray Kirby, Michele Pujol, Kate McKenna, Michele Valiquette, and Dayna Daniels, 74–91. Winnipeg: Sororal Publishing, 1991.

- . “Sexual Dis/Orientation, or Playing House: To Be or Not Be Coded Human.” In Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 133–45.
- . “The House That Jill Built: Lesbian Feminist Organizing in Toronto, 1976–1980.” *Feminist Review*, no. 35 (Summer 1990): 75–91.
- . “The House That Jill Built: Reconstructing the Lesbian Organization of Toronto, 1976–1980.” PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1992.
- . “Whorganizers and Gay Activists: Histories of Convergence, Contemporary Currents of Divergence, and the Promise of Non-Normative Futures.” In Durisin, Van der Meulen, and Bruckert, *Red Light Labour*, 256–71.
- . “Wunna His Fantasies’: The State/d Indefensibility of Lesbian Smut.” *Fireweed: A Feminist Quarterly of Writing, Politics, Art and Culture, Sex & Sexuality* 2, no. 38 (Spring 1993): 38–47.
- Ross, Becki L., and R. Sullivan. “Tracing Lines of Horizontal Hostility: How Sex Workers and Gay Activists Battled for Space, Voice and Belonging in Vancouver, 1975–1985.” *Sexualities* 15, no. 5/6 (2012): 604–21.
- Ross, Ellen, and Rayna Rapp. “Sex and Society: A Research Note from Social History and Anthropology.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23, no. 1 (1981): 51–72.
- . “Sex and Society: A Research Note from Social History and Anthropology.” In Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson, *Powers of Desire*, 51–73.
- Ross, Kristin. *Communal Luxury: The Political Imaginary of the Paris Commune*. London: Verso, 2015.
- Rotenberg, Lori. “The Wayward Worker: Toronto’s Prostitutes at the Turn of the Century.” In Acton, Goldsmith, and Shepard, *Women at Work*, 33–69.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. *Dreams and Dilemmas*. London: Virago, 1983.
- . *Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love*. London: Verso Books, 2009.
- . “The Women’s Movement and Organizing for Socialism.” In *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*, edited by Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright. London: Merlin Press, 1979.
- Rowbotham, Sheila, Lynne Segal, and Hilary Wainwright, eds. *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*. London: Merlin Press, 1979.
- Rowbotham, Sheila, and Jeffrey Weeks, ed. *Socialism and the New Life: The Personal and Sexual Politics of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis*. London: Pluto, 1977.
- Rubin, Gayle. “Sexual Politics, the New Right and the Sexual Fringe.” In Tsang, *The Age Taboo*, 53–64.
- . “The Traffic in Women.” In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna R. Reiter, 157–210. New York: Monthly Review, 1997.
- . “Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality.” In Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, 267–319.
- Rubin, Isaak Il’ich. *Essays on Marx’s Theory of Value*. Edited by Milos Samardzija and Fredy Perlman. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1982.
- Ruehl, Sonja. “Inverts and Experts: Radclyffe Hall and the Lesbian Identity.” In *Feminism, Culture and Politics*, edited by Rosalind Brunt and Caroline Rowan, 15–36. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982.
- Ruiter, Zach. “Last Shvitz at the Oak Leaf?” *NOW Magazine*, June 3, 2015. <https://nowtoronto.com/last-shvitz-at-the-oak-leaf>.
- Russell, J. Stuart. “Offence of Keeping a Common Bawdy-House in Canadian Criminal Law.” *Ottawa Law Review* 14, no. 2 (1982): 270–313.
- S., Kat. “The TERFs to Dissident Right Pipeline,” *Radix*, August 21, 2020, <https://archive.ph/DaiiO>.
- Sabatier, Renée. *Blaming Others: Prejudice, Race and Worldwide AIDS*. Edited by Jon Tinker. Philadelphia: New Society, 1988.

- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Sam-Agudu, Nadia A. et al. "The Pandemic Is Following a Very Predictable and Depressing Pattern." *The Atlantic*, March 4, 2022. <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2022/03/pandemic-global-south-disease-health-crisis/624179/>.
- Samois. *What Color Is Your Handkerchief? A Lesbian S/M Reader*. Berkeley, CA: Samois, 1979.
- Samuel, Christopher. *Conform, Fail, Repeat: How Power Distorts Collective Action*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2017.
- Sand, Cy Thea. "Lesbian Writing: Adventure into Autonomy." In "Lesbiantics." Special issue, *Fireweed: A Feminist Quarterly*, no. 13 (1982): 24–38.
- Sanders, Douglas. "Constructing Lesbian and Gay Rights." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society/Revue Canadienne Droit et Société* 9, no. 2 (Fall 1994): 99–143.
- Saunders [Sanders], D.E. "Sentencing of Homosexual Offenders: Notes and Comments." *Criminal Law Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1967/1968): 25–29.
- Sawatsky, John. *For Services Rendered: Leslie James Bennett and the RCMP Security Service*. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1983.
- . *Men in the Shadows: The RCMP Security Service*. Toronto: Totem Books, 1983.
- Sayer, Derek. *Capitalism and Modernity: An Excursus on Marx and Weber*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- . *Marx's Method: Ideology Science, and Critique in Capital*. 2nd ed. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1983.
- . *The Violence of Abstraction: The Analytic Foundations of Historical Materialism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Sayers, Naomi. "The (Un) Constitutionality of PCEPA." In *Sex Work Activism in Canada: Speaking Out, Standing Up*, edited by Amy Lebovitch and Shawna Ferris, 20–30. Winnipeg, MB: ARP Press, 2019.
- Scheier, Ivan H, and Raymond B Cattell. *Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire (NSQ): Handbook*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1961.
- Schenwar, Maya, Joe Macaré, and Alana Yu-lan Price, eds. *Who Do You Serve, Who Do You Protect?: Police Violence and Resistance in the United States*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016.
- Scher, Len. *The Un-Canadians: Stories of the Blacklist Era*. Toronto: Lester Publishing, 1992.
- Schmidt, Samantha. "Conservatives Find Unlikely Ally in Fighting Transgender Rights: Radical Feminists." *Washington Post*, February 7, 2020. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-wa/2020/02/07/radical-feminists-conservatives-transgender-rights/>.
- Schulman, Sarah. *My American History: Lesbian and Gay Life During the Reagan/Bush Years*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Schwartzwald, Robert. "Le Front de libération homosexuel du Québec et les limites de la contre-culture." In *La contre-culture au Québec*, edited by Frédéric Rondeau and Karim Larose, 453–90. Montreal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2016.
- Scott, Valerie. "Valerie Scott of CORP on Empowering Prostitutes: Whores Fight Back!" *Rites*, May 1986, 8–9, 19.
- Scruton, Phil. *The State of the Police*. London: Pluto, 1985.
- Sears, Alan. "AIDS and the Health of Nations: Public Health and the Politics of HIV Testing." Paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association meetings, Victoria, BC, 1990.
- . "Before the Welfare State: Public Health and Social Policy." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 32, no. 2 (May 1995): 169–88.
- . "Body Politics: The Social Reproduction of Sexualities." In *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*, edited by Sudipto Bhattacharya, 171–91. London: Pluto Press, 2017.
- . "Can Marriage Be Queer?" *New Socialist*, March/April 2001.

- . “Health from Below in a Global Pandemic.” *New Socialist*, April 24, 2020. <https://newsocialist.org/health-from-below-in-a-global-pandemic/>.
- . “Is There Sex After Marriage?” *New Socialist*, October 2005.
- . “Queer Anti-Capitalism: What’s Left of Lesbian and Gay Liberation?” *Science & Society* 69, no. 5 (January 2005): 92–112.
- . “‘To Teach Them How to Live’: The Politics of Public Health from Tuberculosis to AIDS.” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 5, no. 1 (1992): 61–83.
- Secombe, Wally. *A Millennium of Family Change: Feudalism to Capitalism in Western Europe*. London: Verso, 1992.
- . *Weathering the Storm: Working Class Families from the Industrial Revolution to the Fertility Decline*. London: Verso, 1993.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *The Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Segal, Lynne. *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London: Virago Press, 1990.
- . *Straight Sex: The Politics of Pleasure*. London: Virago, 1994.
- Segal, Lynne, and Mary McIntosh, eds. *Sex Exposed: Sexuality and the Pornography Debate*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1993.
- Segal, Lynne and Socialist Society. *What Is to Be Done about the Family?* Harmondsworth: Penguin in association with the Socialist Society, 1983.
- Séguin, Robert-Lionel. *La vie libertine en nouvelle-France au XVIIe siècle*. Ottawa: Lemeac, 1972.
- Seidler, Victor J. *Recreating Sexual Politics: Men, Feminism and Politics*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Seitz, David K. “‘Missing’ Racialized Violence, Disturbing Continuities: Countertopographies of Violence in the Bruce McArthur Murders.” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 459–82.
- Self, Helen J. *Prostitution, Women and Misuse of the Law: The Fallen Daughters of Eve*. 1st edition. London: Routledge, 2003.
- . “Wolfenden and Prostitution: An Historical Review.” Paper presentation presented at the Wolfenden 50 Conference, London, UK, June 2007.
- Setliff, Eric. “Between the Scandal Sheets (1949).” *Centre/Fold*, no. 8 (Spring 1995): 30–31.
- . “Sex Fiends or Swish Kids, Gay Men in the Toronto Tabloids, 1946–1956.” Master’s thesis, University of Toronto, 1994.
- . “Swish Kids and Sex Fiends.” In *Gendered Pasts: Historical Essays in Femininity and Masculinity in Canada*, edited by Kathryn Mae MacPherson, Cecilia Louise Morgan, and Nancy M. Forestell, 158–78. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Sewell, John. “Speaking up for the Gay Community, 1979.” In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 194–96.
- “Sex Tory Style.” *Rites*, August 1986, 3.
- Shanin, Teodor, ed. *Late Marx and the Russian Road: Marx and the Peripheries of Capitalism*. London: Verso Books, 2018.
- Sharma, Nandita. *Home Rule: National Sovereignty and the Separation of Natives and Migrants*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020.
- Shearing, C.D. “Subterranean Processes in the Maintenance of Power: An Examination of the Mechanisms Coordinating Police Action.” *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 18, no. 3 (August 1981): 283–98.
- Shebib, Maureen. “The Long Lobby for Legal Protection.” *Rites*, September 1989, 8–9.
- Sheehan, Nancy M. “Women Helping Women: The WCTU and the Foreign Population in the West, 1905–1930.” *International Journal of Women’s Studies* 6, no. 5 (December 1983): 395–411.
- Shepherd, Simon, and Mick Wallis, eds. *Coming on Strong: Gay Politics and Culture*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

- Shilts, Randy. *And the Band Played On: Politics, People and the AIDS Epidemic*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- . *The Mayor of Castro Street: The Life and Times of Harvey Milk*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.
- Shotwell, Alexis. *Knowing Otherwise: Race, Gender, and Implicit Understanding*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011.
- Shraya, Vivek. *What I Love About Being Queer*. Edited by Trish Yeo. Toronto: Vivek Shraya, George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology, 2013.
- Silvera, Makeda. "From St. Helens Avenue to Dewson Street." In Chambers et al., *Any Other Way*, 178–80.
- . "Man Royals and Sodomites: Some Thoughts on the Invisibility of Afro-Caribbean Lesbians." In Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 48–60.
- , ed. *Piece of My Heart: A Lesbian of Colour Anthology*. Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 1991.
- . "Proud Life: Sherona Hall, April 25, 1948–Dec 30, 2006." *Xtra!*, February 14, 2007. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/proud-life-sherona-hall-19633>.
- . *Silenced: Talks with Working Class West Indian Women about Their Lives and Struggles as Domestic Workers in Canada*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Williams-Wallace, 1984.
- . "Sister Outsider: Rage and Vision, Review of Sister Outsider, by Audre Lorde." *Rites*, September 1984, 22.
- Simmons, Christina. "Companionate Marriage and the Lesbian Threat." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 4, no. 3, Lesbian History Issue (Fall 1979): 54–59.
- Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014.
- . "The State is a Man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the Gender of Settler Sovereignty." *Theory & Event* 19, no. 4 (2016). <https://nycstandswithstandingrock.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/simpson-2016.pdf>.
- Simpson, Audra, and Andrea Smith. *Theorizing Native Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- . *Dancing on our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2011.
- . "Interview with Leanne Betasamosake Simpson." In Bhandar and Ziadah, *Revolutionary Feminisms*, 139–48.
- . *Islands of Decolonial Love: Stories & Songs*. Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2013.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake, and Robyn Maynard. "Towards Black and Indigenous Futures on Turtle Island: A Conversation." In Diverlus, Hudson, and Ware, *Until We Are Free*, 75–84.
- Small, Raia. "Why Has the Left De-prioritized COVID?," *Midnight Sun*, August 14, 2022. <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/why-has-the-left-deprioritized-covid/>.
- Smart, Carol. "Law and the Control of Women's Sexuality: The Case of the 1950s." In *Controlling Women: The Normal and the Deviant*, edited by Gillian Williams and Bridget M. Hutter, 40–60. London: Croom Helm, 1984.
- Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005.
- . "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing." In *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology*, edited by INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, 66–73. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2006.
- Smith, Carolyn Gibson and Nova Scotia Public Interest Research Group. "Proud but Cautious": *Homophobic Abuse and Discrimination in Nova Scotia*. Halifax: Nova Scotia Public Interest Research Group, 1993.

- Smith, Christopher G. "Where U From, Who U Wit?! Black Pride Festivals as Itinerant Hospitality." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 395–414.
- Smith, Dorothy E. "A Sociology for Women." In *The Prism of Sex: Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by Julie Ann Sherman and Evelyn Torton Beck, 135–87. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1979.
- . *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- . *The Everyday World as Problematic: Towards a Feminist Sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- . "The Experienced World as Problematic: A Feminist Method." Paper presented at the Twelfth Annual Soroken Lecture, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, January 28, 1981.
- . "Feminist Reflections on Political Economy." *Studies in Political Economy Studies in Political Economy* 30, no. 1 (1989): 37–59.
- . "Feminist Reflections on Political Economy." In *Feminism in Action: Studies in Political Economy*, edited by M. Patricia Connelly and Pat Armstrong, 1–21. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1992.
- . "'Politically Correct': An Ideological Code." In Richer and Weir, *Beyond Political Correctness*, 23–50.
- . "The Social Construction of Documentary Reality." *Sociological Inquiry* 44, no. 4 (October 1974): 257–68.
- . *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- . "Women, Class and Family." In *Socialist Register, 1983*, 1–44. Manchester: Merlin Press, 1983.
- . "Women's Inequality and the Family." In *Inequality: Essays on the Political Economy of Social Welfare*, edited by Allan Moscovitch and Glenn Drover, 156–95. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.
- . *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory, and Investigations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Smith, Dorothy E., and Alison I. Griffith. *Simply Institutional Ethnography: Creating a Sociology for People*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2022.
- Smith, Dorothy E., and G. Malnairch. "Where Are the Women? A Critique of Communist and Socialist Political Organization." Paper presented at the Marxism: The Next Two Decades Conference, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, 1983.
- Smith, Dorothy E., and George W. Smith. "Re-Organizing the Job Skills Training Relation: From 'Human Capital' to 'Human Resources.'" In *Education for Work, Education as Work: Canada's Changing Community Colleges*, edited by Jacob Muller, 171–86. Toronto: Garamond, 1990.
- Smith, George W. "Accessing Treatments: Managing the AIDS Epidemic in Ontario." In Campbell and Manicom, *Knowledge, Experience, and Ruling Relations*, 18–34.
- . "AIDS Treatment Deficits: An Ethnographic Inquiry into the Management of the AIDS Epidemic, the Ontario Case." Paper presented at the Fifth International AIDS Conference, Montreal, June 1989. <https://calisphere.org/item/83fdb390-e5f8-44c9-a018-d7e507c4edd3/>.
- . "The Ideology of 'Fag': The School Experience of Gay Students." *Sociological Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (1998): 309–35.
- . "In Defence of Privacy: Or Bluntly Put, No More Shit." *Action!*, 1983.
- . "Media Frames: How Accounts Are Produced and Read." *Fuse*, February 1983.
- . "Overturning State's Evidence: From Social Constructionism to Historical Materialism." Unpublished paper presented at the "Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives" Lesbian/Gay History Conference, Toronto, ON, July 1985.
- . "Political Activist as Ethnographer." In Frampton, Kinsman, Thompson, and Tilleczek, *Sociology for Changing the World*, 44–70.

- . “Sexual Preference: Their Statistics, Our Lives.” *The Body Politic*, December 1981, 29.
- . “Telling Stories: CBS Woos Viewers with Sex, Violence, and Drama in Their Made-for-TV Special Gay Power Politics.” *Fuse*, March/April 1981, 62–64.
- . “Policing the Gay Community: An Inquiry into Textually-Mediated Social Relations.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 16, no. 2 (May 1988): 163–83.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 2008.
- Smith, Miriam C. “Homophobia and Homonationalism: LGBTQ Law Reform in Canada.” *Social & Legal Studies* 29, no. 1 (2020): 65–84.
- . *Lesbian and Gay Rights in Canada: Social Movements and Equality Seeking, 1971–1995*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- . “LGBTQ Activism: The Pan-Canadian Political Space.” In Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 45–63.
- Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America*. New York: Knopf, 1985.
- Snell, James G. *In the Shadow of the Law: Divorce in Canada, 1900–1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- . “The White Life for Two: The Defence of Marriage and Sexual Morality in Canada, 1890–1914.” *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 16, no. 31 (May 1983): 111–129.
- Snell, James G., and Cynthia Comacchio Abeele. “Regulating Nuptiality: Restricting Access to Marriage in Early Twentieth-Century English-Speaking Canada.” *The Canadian Historical Review* 69, no. 4 (1988): 466–89.
- Snitow, Ann, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson, eds. *Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983.
- Social Survey Commission, Toronto. *Report of the Social Survey Commission, Toronto: Presented to the City Council October 4th, 1915*. Gerritsen Collection of Women’s History 2852. Toronto: The Carswell Co., 1915.
- Sorfleet, Andrew, and Chris Bearchell. “The Sex Police in a Moral Panic: How The ‘Youth Porn’ Law Is Being Used to Censor Artists and Persecute Youth Sexuality.” *Parallogramme* 20, no. 1 (1994): 8–21.
- Spade, Dean. *Mutual Aid: Building Solidarity During This Crisis (and the Next)*. London: Verso, 2020.
- . *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. Brooklyn, NY: South End Press, 2011.
- Special Committee on Pornography and Prostitution, and Paul Fraser. *Pornography and Prostitution in Canada: Report*. Ottawa: The Committee, 1985.
- Specter, Emma. “Elliot Page Comes Out as Transgender In a Moving Open Letter.” *Vogue*, December 1, 2020. <https://www.vogue.com/article/elliott-page-trans-open-letter>.
- Spelman, Elizabeth V. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988.
- Spencer, William. “Canada’s Leading Homosexual Speaks Out.” *Weekend Magazine*, September 13, 1969.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Other Asias*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008.
- Stafford, Ezra Hurlburt. “Perversion.” *Canadian Journal of Medicine and Surgery, Toronto* 3, no. 4 (April 1898): 179–85.
- Stanley, Eric A., and Nat Smith, eds. *Captive Genders: Trans Embodiment and the Prison Industrial Complex*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2011.
- Stansell, Christine. *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789–1869*. New York: Knopf, 1986.
- Steakley, James D. *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

- , ed. *The Writings of Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld: A Biography*. Canadian Gay Archives Publication 11. Toronto: Canadian Gay Archives, 1985.
- Steele, Lisa, and Kim Tomczak, dirs. *Legal Memory*. Toronto: Vtape, 1992. 80 min.
- Stein, Marc, ed. *The Stonewall Riots: A Documentary History*. New York: New York University Press, 2019.
- Stenning, Philip C. *Legal Status of Police: A Study Paper Prepared for the Law Reform Commission of Canada*. Ottawa: Law Reform Commission of Canada, 1981.
- Stettner, Shannon. *Without Apology: Writings on Abortion in Canada*. Edmonton, AB: Athabasca University Press, 2016.
- Stettner, Shannon, Kristin Burnett, and Travis Hay, eds. *Abortion, History, Politics, and Reproductive Justice After Morgentaler*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2017.
- Stevens, Patricia E., and Joanne M. Hall. "A Critical Historical Analysis of the Medical Construction of Lesbianism." *International Journal of Health Services* 21, no. 2 (April 1, 1991): 291–307.
- Stimpson, Catharine R., and Ethel Spector Person, eds. *Women: Sex and Sexuality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Stoler, Ann. "Carnal Knowledge: Gender, Race and Morality in Colonial Asia," in *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*, ed. Micaela Di Leonardo. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Stone, Sharon Dale, ed. *Lesbians in Canada*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1990.
- . "Lesbian Mothers Organizing." In Stone, *Lesbians in Canada*, 198–208.
- . "Lesbians Against the Right." In *Women and Social Change: Feminist Activism in Canada*, edited by Jeri Dawn Wine and Janice L. Ristock, 236–53. Toronto: J. Lorimer, 1991.
- Strange, Carolyn. "From Modern Babylon to a City upon a Hill: The Toronto Survey Commission of 1915 and the Search for Sexual Order in the City." In *Patterns of the Past: Interpreting Ontario's History*, edited by Roger Hall, William Westfall, and Laurel Sefton MacDowall, 102–15. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1988.
- . *Toronto's Girl Problem: The Perils and Pleasures of the City, 1880–1930*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- Strong-Boag, Veronica. "Canada's Women Doctors: Feminism Constrained." In Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*, 109–29.
- Stryker, Susan. *Transgender History: The Roots of Today's Revolution*. New York: Seal Press, 2017.
- Styles, Joseph. "Outside/Insider: Researching Gay Baths." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 8, no. 2 (July 1979): 135–52.
- Subcommandante Insurgente Moisés, and EZLN. "Zapatista Communique—Part Six: A Mountain on the High Seas." *Love and Rage Media*, October 5, 2020. <https://loveandragemedia.org/2020/10/09/zapatista-communique-part-six-a-mountain-on-the-high-seas/>.
- "Supreme Court Ruling Makes Homosexual Liable for Life." *Toronto Daily Star*. November 7, 1967.
- Sutcliffe, H.F. "Frederick Sutcliffe, MBE, CD: An Autobiography." Unpublished manuscript. Toronto, 1981.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. "The Diffusion of Sexual Psychopath Laws." *American Journal of Sociology* 56, no. 2 (1950): 142–48.
- Sutherland, Harry, dir. *Track Two*. Produced by Gord Keith, Jack Lemmon, and Harry Sutherland. Toronto: Keith, Lemmon, Sutherland Communications Corp., 1982.
- Sycamore, Mattilda a.k.a. Matt Bernstein, ed. *Nobody Passes: Rejecting the Rules of Gender Conformity*. Emeryville, CA: Seal Press, 2006.
- Sycamore, Mattilda a.k.a. Matt Bernstein. *That's Revolting!: Queer Strategies for Resisting Assimilation*. Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press, 2004.
- Sycamore, Mattilda a.k.a. Matt Bernstein, Marlon M. Bailey, Priya Kandaswamy, and Mattie Undora Richardson. "Is Gay Marriage Racist?" In *That's Revolting! Queer Strategies for Resisting Assimilation*, 91–92. Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press, 2004.

- Sylvestre, Paul-François. *Bougrerie en Nouvelle-France*. Hull, QC: Editions Asticou, 1983.
- . *Les homosexuels s'organisent: au Québec et ailleurs*. Montréal: Éditions Homeoureux, 1979.
- Symonds, John Addington. *Male Love: A Problem in Greek Ethics and Other Writings*. Edited by John Lauritsen. New York: Pagan Press, 1983.
- Szasz, Thomas. *Sex by Prescription: The Startling Truth About Today's Sex Therapy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981.
- Szegheo-Lang, Naomi de. "Disruptive Desires: Reframing Sexual Space at the Feminist Porn Awards." In Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 66–81.
- Tallbear, Kim. "Failed Settler Kinship, Truth and Reconciliation, and Science." *Indigenous STS* (blog). March 16, 2016. <https://indigenousts.com/failed-settler-kinship-truth-and-reconciliation-and-science/>.
- . "Making Love and Relations Beyond Settler Sex and Family." In *Making Kin Not Population*, edited by Adele E. Clarke and Donna Jeanne Haraway, 145–64. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2018.
- . *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.
- Taylor, Barbara. *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Virago, 1983.
- Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta. *From #BlackLivesmatter to Black Liberation*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016.
- , ed. *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2017.
- Taylor, Verta, and Nancy E. Whittier. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller, 104–29. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Teal, Donn. *The Gay Militants*. New York: Stein and Day, 1971.
- Technical Support. "Beyond Same-Sex Marriage: A New Strategic Vision for All Our Families & Relationships." *MR Online*, August 8, 2006. <https://mronline.org/2006/08/08/beyond-same-sex-marriage-a-new-strategic-vision-for-all-our-families-relationships/>.
- Terry, Jennifer. *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine and Homosexuality in Modern Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- . "Theorizing Deviant Historiography." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1991): 55–74.
- "The Day Ottawa Got Out of Our Bedrooms." *Globe & Mail*. March 1, 2016, sec. Editorial.
- Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Thomson, P.G. "Sexual Deviation." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 80, no. 5 (March 1, 1959): 381–89.
- Thorborn, Elise, and Gary Kinsman. "Navigating Contemporary Struggles: Class Composition and Social Reproduction." In *Challenging the Right, Augmenting the Left: Recasting Leftist Imagination*, edited by Robert Latham, A.T. Kingsmith, Julian von Barga, and Niko Block, 86–97. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2020.
- Thorstad, David and Socialist Workers Party. *Gay Liberation and Socialism: Documents from the Discussions Inside the Socialist Workers Party (1970–1973)*. New York: Thorstad, 1976.
- Tolson, Andrew. *The Limits of Masculinity*. London: Tavistock, 1977.
- Tompkins, Andrew. "'Driving Wedges' and 'Hijacking' Pride: Disrupting Narratives of Black Inclusion in LGBT Politics and the Canadian National Imaginary." *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 10, no. 6 (2020): 1214–41.
- Tompkins, Avery. "Asterisk." *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly* 1, no. 1–2 (2014): 26–27.
- Torrealba, José, dir. *Open Secrets*. Produced by Germaine Ying Gee Wong. Montréal: National Film Board of Canada, 2003. 52 min.

- Toupin, Louise, and Käthe Roth. *Wages for Housework: The History of the International Feminist Movement, 1972–77*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2018.
- Treisman, Rachel. “As Monkeypox Spreads, Know the Difference Between Warning and Stigmatizing People.” *NPR*, July 26, 2022. <https://www.npr.org/2022/07/26/1113713684/monkeypox-stigma-gay-community>.
- Tremblay, Manon. “Mouvements Sociaux et Opportunités Politiques : Les lesbiennes et Les Gais et l’ajout de l’orientation Sexuelle à La Charte Québécoise Des Droits et Libertés.” *Revue Canadienne de Science Politique* 46, no. 2 (2013): 295–322.
- . “Quebec and Sexual Diversity: From Repression to Citizenship?” In Tremblay, *Queer Mobilizations*, 108–21.
- , ed. *Queer Mobilizations: Social Movement Activism and Canadian Public Policy*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2015.
- Tremblay, Manon, David Paternotte, and Carol Johnson, eds. *The Lesbian and Gay Movement and the State: Comparative Insights into a Transformed Relationship*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2011.
- Trevenen, Kathryn, and Alexa DeGagne. “Homonalism at the Borders and in the Streets: Organizing Against Exclusion and Incorporation.” In Dryden and Lenon, *Disrupting Queer Inclusion*, 102–7.
- Trvisan, João Silvério. *Perverts in Paradise*. London: GMP, 1986.
- Trimberger, Ellen Kay. “Feminism, Men, and Modern Love: Greenwich Village, 1900–1925.” In Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson, *Powers of Desire*, 131–52.
- Trofimenkoff, Susan. “One Hundred and Two Muffled Voices: Canada’s Industrial Women in the 1880s.” In *Canada’s Age of Industry, 1849–1896*, edited by Michael S. Cross and Gregory S. Kealey. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.
- Trofimenkoff, Susan, and Alison L. Prentice, eds. *The Neglected Majority*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.
- Trollope, Paul. “Bath Workers Vote Down Union: Organizer to Make Second Try.” *The Body Politic*, May 1979, 14.
- Tronto, Mario. “Lenin In England.” *Marxists.org*, 1964. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/it/tronti.htm>.
- Trotsky, Leon. “The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International—The Transitional Program (1938).” *Marxists.org*, 2006. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1938/tp/>.
- Trudeau, Justin. “Remarks by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau to Apologize to LGBTQ2 Canadians.” Prime Minister of Canada, November 28, 2017. <https://pm.gc.ca/en/news/speeches/2017/11/28/remarks-prime-minister-justin-trudeau-apologize-lgbtq2-canadians>.
- Trumbach, Randolph. “The Birth of the Queen: Sodomy and the Emergence of Gender Equality in Modern Culture, 1660–1750.” In Chauncey, Duberman, and Vicinus, *Hidden from History*, 129–40.
- . “Gender and the Homosexual Role in Modern Western Culture: The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries Compared.” In Altman, *Homosexuality, Which Homosexuality?*, 149–64.
- . “London’s Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the 18th Century.” *Journal of Social History* 11, no. 1 (Fall 1977): 1–33.
- Tsang, Daniel. *The Age Taboo: Gay Male Sexuality, Power and Consent*. London: Gay Men’s Press, 1981.
- Tuchman, Gaye. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press, 1978.
- Tucker, Scott. “Our Right to the World, Sex, Public Space, and Community.” *The Body Politic*, August 1982, 29–33.
- Twist, Arielle. *Disintegrate/Dissociate*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2019.

- Tyndall, Mark, and Zoë Dodd. "How Structural Violence, Prohibition, and Stigma Have Paralyzed North American Responses to Opioid Overdose." *AMA Journal of Ethics* 22, no. 8 (August 2020): 723–28.
- United States of America. Department of Labor. Office of Policy Planning and Research, and Daniel P. Moynihan. *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- Ursel, Jane. *Private Lives, Public Policy: 100 Years of State Intervention in the Family*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1992.
- Ursel, Susan. "Bill 167 and Full Human Rights." In Arnup, *Lesbian Parenting*, 341–451.
- Valverde, Mariana. *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885–1925*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1991.
- . "Feminism Meets Fist-Fucking: Getting Lost in Lesbian s&M." *The Body Politic*, February 1980, 43.
- . *Radically Rethinking Regulation: Workshop Report*. Toronto: Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, 1994.
- . "The Religion of the 'Race' of Women: A Critique of Mary Daly." *Rites*, October 1985, 14–15.
- . *Sex, Power and Pleasure*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1985.
- . "Sex Versus Purity: Conflicts in the First Wave of Feminism Review of The Spinster and Her Enemies, by Sheila Jeffreys." *Rites*, June 1986, 10–11.
- . "When the Mother of the Race is Free': Race, Reproduction, and Sexuality in First-Wave Feminism." In Valverde and Iacovetta, *Gender Conflicts*, 3–26.
- Valverde, Mariana, and Franca Iacovetta. *Gender Conflicts: New Essays in Women's History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Valverde, Mariana, and Lorna Weir. "Thrills, Chills and the 'Lesbian Threat,' or The Media, the State and Women's Sexuality." In *Women Against Censorship*, edited by Varda Burstyn, 99–106. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1985.
- Van der Meulen, Emily, and Elya M. Durisin. "Sex Work Policy, Tracing Historical and Contemporary Developments." In Durisin, Van der Meulen, and Bruckert, *Red Light Labour*, 34–38.
- van der Meulen, Emily, Elya M. Durisin, and Victoria Love, eds. *Selling Sex: Experience, Advocacy, and Research on Sex Work in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2013.
- Van Kirk, Sylvia. *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670–1870*. Winnipeg: Watson & Dwyer, 1980.
- Vance, Carole S. "Negotiating Sex and Gender in the Attorney General's Commission on Pornography." In Segal and McIntosh, *Sex Exposed*, 29–49.
- . ed. *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.
- . "Pleasure and Danger: Toward a Politics of Sexuality." In Vance, *Pleasure and Danger*, 1–27.
- Varghese, Ricky, ed. *RAW, PREP, Pedagogy, and the Politics of Barebacking*. Regina, SK: University of Regina Press, 2019.
- Varghese, Ricky and Benjamin J. F. Weil. "Privilege, Race and Imagined Immunities in the time of COVID," Centre for Ethics, University of Toronto, March 5, 2021. <https://ethics.utoronto.ca/events/ricky-varghese-benjamin-weil-privilege-race-imagined-immunities-in-the-time-of-covid-race-ethics-power-flash-event/>.
- Vassilas, Yanni. "Guelph Fights Police Busts." *Rites*, September 1985, 4.
- Vicinus, Martha. "Lesbian History: All Theory and No Facts or All Facts and No Theory?" *Radical History Review* 1994, no. 60 (Fall 1994): 57–75.
- . "Sexuality and Power: A Review of Current Work in the History of Sexuality." *Feminist Studies* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1982): 133–56.

- . “‘They Wonder to Which Sex I Belong’: The Historical Roots of the Modern Lesbian Identity.” In Altman, *Homosexuality, Which Homosexuality?*, 171–98.
- Vidal, John. “Destruction of Habitat and Loss of Biodiversity Are Creating the Perfect Conditions for Diseases Like COVID-19 to Emerge.” *Ensisia*, March 17, 2020. <https://ensia.com/features/covid-19-coronavirus-biodiversity-planetary-health-zoonoses/>.
- Vines, Gail. *Raging Hormones: Do They Rule Our Lives?* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Vipond, Mary. “The Image of Women in Mass Circulation Magazines in the 1920s.” In Trofimenkoff and Prentice, *The Neglected Majority*, 117–22.
- Visano, Livy A. “Tramps, Tricks and Troubles: Street Transients and Their Controls.” In *Deviant Designations: Crime, Law, and Deviance in Canada*, edited by Livy A. Visano and Thomas Fleming, 215–53. Toronto: Butterworths, 1983.
- Vowel, Chelsea. *Indigenous Writes: A Guide to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Issues in Canada*. Winnipeg: HighWater Press, 2016.
- Waite, Brian. “A Strategy for Gay Liberation.” In Jackson and Persky, *Flaunting It!*, 221–23.
- Walcott, Rinaldo. “Black Cumjoy: Pleasure and a Racist Virus.” In Varghese, *RAW, PREP, Pedagogy, and the Politics of Barebacking*, 71–89.
- . “The Black 1960s: Black Life after Sir George Williams & Other Stories of the Nation.” Anti-69 ‘Just Society’ Plenary, March 2019. <https://anti-69.ca/justsociety/>.
- . *Black Like Who?: Writing, Black, Canada*. London, ON: Insomniac Press, 2018.
- . “The End of Diversity.” *Popular Culture* 31, no. 2 (2019): 393–408.
- . *The Long Emancipation: Moving Toward Black Freedom*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2021.
- . *On Property*. Windsor, ON: Biblioasis, 2021.
- . *Queer Returns: Essays on Multiculturalism, Diaspora, and Black Studies*. London, ON: Insomniac Press, 2016.
- . “White Lies: Race, Power, and the Future.” In *Gendering Globalization, Gendering Gender: Postcolonial Perspectives*, edited by Gul Caliskan, 61–74. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Walcott, Rinaldo, and Idil Abdillahi. *BlackLife: Post-BLM and the Struggle for Freedom*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: ARP Books, 2019.
- Waldeck, R.C. “The International Homosexual Conspiracy.” In *About Time: Exploring the Gay Past*, edited by Martin B. Duberman, 199–202. New York: Gay Presses of New York, 1986.
- Walia, Harsha. *Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and the Rise of Racist Nationalism*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2021.
- . “Slutwalk: To March or Not to March.” *Rabble*, May 18, 2011. <https://rabble.ca/news/2011/05/slutwalk-march-or-not-march>.
- Walker, Gillian A. *Family Violence and the Women’s Movement: The Conceptual Politics of Struggle*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990.
- Walkowitz, Judith R. *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London*. Women in Culture and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . “The Politics of Prostitution.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 6, no. 1 (1980): 123–35.
- . *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Wallace, Belinda Demeen. “Our Lives: Scribal Activism, Intimacy, and Black Lesbian Visibility in 1980s Canada,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 54, no. 2/3 (Spring/Fall 2020): 334–59.
- Wallace, Rob. “Competing with Nature: COVID-19 as a Capitalist Virus, Interview with Rob Wallace.” By Ashley Smith. *Spectre Journal*, October 16, 2020. <https://spectrejournal.com/competing-with-nature/>.

- Walter, Aubrey, ed. *Come Together: The Years of Gay Liberation, 1970–73*. London: Gay Men's Press, 1980.
- Ware, Syrus Marcus. "QueersXCops." Facebook live video, uploaded by the Canadian Students for Sensible Drug Policy, Ryerson University, Toronto, February 25, 2020. <https://www.facebook.com/CSSDPryerson/videos/293038195520341/>.
- Ware, Vron. *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History*. London: Verso, 1992.
- Warner, Michael, ed. *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- . *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Warner, Tom. "Fifteen Years of Struggle, Interview with Tom Warner." By John Wilson. *Rites*, March 1987, 12.
- . "Fighting the Anti-Queer Right-Wing." *New Socialist*, February 2004, 32–34.
- . *Losing Control: Canada's Social Conservatives in the Age of Rights*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2010.
- . *Never Going Back: A History of Queer Activism in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Watch, C.W. "Social Purity Work in Canada." In *The National Purity Congress: Its Papers, Addresses, Portraits*, edited by Aaron M. Powell, 272–79. New York: Arno Press, 1976.
- Watkins, John. *Moscow Dispatches: Inside Cold War Russia*. Edited by Dean Beeby and William Kaplan. Toronto: James Lorimer, 1987.
- Watney, Simon. *Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS and the Media*. Media and Society. London: Comedia, 1987.
- . *Practices of Freedom: Selected Writings on HIV/AIDS*. 1st US ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994.
- . "The Ideology of GLF." In Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, 64–76.
- Watt, D.A. "The Canadian Law for the Protection of Women and Girls, with Suggestions for Its Amendment and for a General Code." In *The National Purity Congress: Its Papers, Addresses, Portraits*, edited by Aaron M. Powell, 437–51. New York: Arno Press, 1976.
- Waugh, Tom. "A Heritage of Pornography." *The Body Politic*, January 1983, 29–33.
- . "Gay Male Visual Culture in North America During the Fifties: Emerging from the Underground." *Parallogramme* 12, no. 1 (Fall 1986): 63–67.
- . "Men's Pornography: Gay vs. Straight." *The Body Politic*, March 1985, 30–35.
- . "Photography Passion & Power." *The Body Politic*, March 1984, 29–33.
- Weber, Tom. "Ottawa Tables Bill to Raise Age of Consent to 16." *Globe & Mail*, June 23, 2006.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. *Against Nature: Essays on History, Sexuality, and Identity*. London: Rivers Oram, 1991.
- . "Capitalism and the Organization of Sex." In Gay Left Collective, *Homosexuality*, chapter 1.
- . *Coming Out*. London: Quartet Books, 1977.
- . "The Development of Sexual Theory and Sexual Politics." In *Human Sexual Relations: Towards a Redefinition of Sexual Politics*, edited by Mike Brake, 293–309. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.
- . "Discourse, Desire and Sexual Deviance." In Plummer, *The Making of the Modern Homosexual*, 76–112.
- . "Exploring the Myths and Makings of a Sexual Minority." *The Advocate*, April 28, 1983.
- . "Foucault for Historians." *History Workshop Journal* 14, no. 1 (Autumn 1982): 106–19.
- . "Inverts, Perverts, and Mary Annes: Male Prostitution and the Regulation of Homosexuality in England in the 19th and Early 20th Centuries." In Licata and Petersen, *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*, 115–30.

- . “Sex and the State: Their Laws, Our Lives.” *History Workshop Journal*, no. 21 (Spring 1986): 206–9.
- . *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800*. London: Longman, 1981.
- . *Sexuality and Discontents: Meaning, Myths, and Modern Sexualities*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.
- . *The World We Have Won: The Remaking of Erotic and Intimate Life*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Weinberg, George H. *Society and the Healthy Homosexual*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1973.
- Weir, Lorna. “Limitations of New Social Movement Analysis.” *Studies in Political Economy Studies in Political Economy* 40, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 73–102.
- . “PC Then and Now: Resignifying Political Correctness.” In Richer and Weir, *Beyond Political Correctness*, 50–87.
- . “Socialist Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality.” In Maroney and Luxton, *Feminism and Political Economy*, 69–83.
- . “Studies in the Medicalization of Sexual Danger: Sexual Rule, Sexual Politics 1830–1930.” PhD diss., York University, 1986.
- Weir, Lorna, and Leo Casey. “Subverting Power in Sexuality.” *Socialist Review* 14, no. 3/4 (August 1984): 139–57.
- Weir, Lorna, and Eve Zaremba. “Boys and Girls Together: Feminism and Gay Liberation.” *The Broadside* 4, no. 1 (October 1982): 6–7, 9.
- Weissman, Aerlyn, and Lynne Fernie, dirs. *Fiction and Other Truths: A Film About Jane Rule*. Toronto: Great Jane Productions, 2017. 57 min.
- , dirs. *Forbidden Love: The Unashamed Stories of Lesbian Lives*. Montreal: National Film Board of Canada, 1992.
- Weisstub, David N. *Law and Psychiatry in the Canadian Context*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1981.
- Toronto Star. “What Is Chief Saunders Thinking, Adding Insult To Gay Community’s Injury?,” February 27, 2018. <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/star-columnists/2018/02/27/chief-saunders-what-did-you-really-mean.html>.
- Wheeler, Glen. “Tackling Abuse and Other Taboos.” *NOW Magazine*, March 19, 1987, 29–32.
- Wheeler, Glenn. “Marc Hall’s Legal Jam.” *NOW Magazine*, May 16, 2002. <https://nowtoronto.com/news/marc-halls-legal-jam>.
- . “Unfit for Service.” *The Body Politic*, March 1983, 29–32.
- Whiffen, Glen. “Sex Case Details Outlined for Court.” *The Evening Telegram*. May 21, 1993.
- Whitaker, Reginald. *Double Standard: The Secret History of Canadian Immigration*. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1987.
- . “Origins of the Canadian Government’s Internal Security System, 1946–1952.” *The Canadian Historical Review* 65, no. 2 (June 1984): 154–83.
- Whitaker, Reginald, and Gary Marcuse. *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945–1957*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- White, David, and Pat Sheppard. *Report on the Police Raids on Gay Steambaths*. Toronto: Toronto City Council, 1981.
- Whitehead, Harriet. “The Bow and the Burden Strap: A New Look at Institutionalized Homosexuality in Native North America.” In *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*, edited by Sherry B. Ortner and Harriet Whitehead, 80–115. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Whitehead, Joshua. *Full-metal Indigiqueer: Poems*. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 2017.
- . *Jonny Appleseed*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2018.
- “Why One Gay Activist Isn’t Happy with Toronto Police’s Apology.” *Xtra!*, June 28, 2016. <https://www.dailyxtra.com/why-one-gay-activist-isnt-happy-with-toronto-polices-apology-71381>.

- Whynacht, Ardath. *Insurgent Love: Abolition and Domestic Homicide*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2021.
- Williams, Kristian. *Our Enemies in Blue: Police and Power in America*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2007.
- Williams, Walter Lee. *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.
- Willis, Paul. "Cultural Production Is Different from Cultural Reproduction Is Different from Social Reproduction Is Different from Reproduction." *Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education* 12, no. 2/3 (1981): 48–67.
- . *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. Farnborough, UK: Saxon House, 1977.
- Wilson, Alex. "How We Find Ourselves: Identity Development and Two Spirit People." *Harvard Educational Review* 66, no. 2 (July 1996): 303–18.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. *Only Halfway to Paradise: Women in Postwar Britain, 1945–1968*. London: Tavistock, 1980.
- . *What Is to Be Done About Violence Against Women?* London: Penguin Books, 1983.
- . *Women and the Welfare State*. London: Tavistock, 1987.
- . "Spousal Benefits Conference: On Our Own Terms?" *Rites*, September 1989, 4, 18.
- Wilson, Renate. "What Turns Women to Lesbianism." *Chatelaine*, October 1966, 33, 130–34.
- Withers, A.J. *Disability Politics and Theory*. Halifax: Fernwood, 2012.
- . *Fight to Win: Inside Poor People's Organizing*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2021.
- Withers, A.J., and Amie Tsang. "Where There's Smoke, There's No Fire." *Briarpatch*, April 30, 2022. <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/where-theres-smoke-theres-no-fire>.
- Wolfe, George C., dir. *Ma Rainey's Black Bottom*, based on a play by August Wilson, produced by Denzel Washington. Culver City, CA: Escape Artists, 2020.
- Wood-Allen, Mary, and Sylvanus Stall. *What a Young Woman Ought to Know*. Philadelphia: Vir Publishing Company, 1898.
- World Health Organization. *Mental Disorders: Glossary and Guide to Their Classification in Accordance with the Ninth Revision of the International Classification of Diseases*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1988.
- Worth, Heather, Cindy Patton, and Margaret T. McGehee. "Legislating the Pandemic: A Global Survey of HIV/AIDS in Criminal Law." *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 2, no. 2 (June 1, 2005): 15–22.
- Wright, Cynthia. "'Feminine Trifles of Vast Importance': Writing Gender into the History of Consumption." In Valverde and Iacovetta, *Gender Conflicts*, 229–60.
- . "Nationalism, Sexuality and the Politics of Anti-Citizenship." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand*, 250–69.
- Wyland, Francie. *Motherhood, Lesbianism and Child Custody*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press, 1977.
- Young, Ian. "Alienation." *The Body Politic*, August 1979, 26.
- Young, Jim, Doug Wilson, and John Foster. "1984: James Bond Comes to Ottawa." *Rites*, August 1984, 14–15.
- Zanin, Andrea. "In Healthy, Consensual BDSM, Saying 'Yes' Is Just the Beginning." *Globe & Mail*, October 28, 2014. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/relationships/in-healthy-consensual-bdsm-saying-yes-is-just-the-beginning/article21352358/>.
- . "'Your Cuntry Needs You': The Politics of Early 1990s Canadian s/m Dyke Porn." In Gentile, Kinsman, and Rankin, *We Still Demand!*, 185–202.

- 519 Community Centre, 290, 357, 364
 1969 Criminal Code Reform. *See* Criminal Code reform (1969)
 2SLGBTQ+ xxxviii. *See* queer
- AAN! (AIDS ACTION NOW!). *See* AIDS ACTION NOW! (AAN!)
- abnormal sexuality, classification of, lxiii, 9, 80–82, 85, 100, 101–107, 122, 125, 129, 133, 134, 158, 163, 178, 191, 211, 277, 337, 368, 395
- Abolish the Police rally and teach-in, xxviii–xxix. *See also* police, defunding/abolition of
- abolitionism, xiv, xx, xxviii, xxxii, 344, 346–48, 383, 390–91, 394–96, 401, 404–406, 417. *See also* liberation/liberatory politics
- abortion,
 access to, 30, 36, 217, 299;
 anti-choice groups, 208, 249, 299, *see also* right-wing, discourse;
 legislation on, 77, 181, 205–210, 213, 299, 334, 376;
 moral-conservative views on, 213–14, 248–49, 299, 353
- activism,
 anti-colonial, *see* Indigenous peoples, activism;
 anti-fascist, xxvi, 338–39, 388;
 anti-poverty, xlix, 290, 330, 398, 401, 406;
 anti-racist, xx, xxvi, xxxviii–xxix, xliv, xlix, lii, liv–lv, lxiv, lxxi, 45, 48, 230, 247, 280, 282, 285–86, 293, 297, 340, 344, 346, 362, 367, 373–74, 376, 380, 383–85, 387–88, 390, 394–96, 398, 401–404, 410, 412;
 anti-racist, and Pride Toronto, xxix;
 educational, xxii, xxiv, xxv, lviii, 189, 196, 202, 243, 265–67, 283, 293, 305, 306, 331, 347, 355, 372, 377–78, 382, 396, 399, 401, 404, 406;
 moral-conservative opposition to, 280, 387–88, 405;
- Palestinian solidarity, *see* Palestinian solidarity activism.
See also Association for Social Knowledge (ASK); gay liberation movement; homophobic groups
- ACT UP (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power). *See* AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACT UP)
- adolescence, formation of, 35, 99, 145. *See also* children, and innocence
- adoption rights, for homosexual couples, lviii, lxi, 231, 243–44, 298. *See also* family-recognition rights
- advertising, 41–42, 98, 160, 217, 226, 233–34, 302, 313, 391
- advice literature, 42, 47, 49, 81–83, 99
- Advocate, The*, 224, 226
- age of consent, 78, 81, 92, 182, 196, 202–203, 205, 209, 214, 220, 230, 273, 275, 289, 306, 309–10, 333, 384–86, 391
- AIDS,
 activism, xxiii–xxiv, xxx, lvii–lviii, lxix, 265–72, 346, 377, 382, 399–400;
 and bathhouses, lvii–lviii, 378;
 community-based groups, xxii, lxii, 228, 231, 265–68, 270–71, 274, 287, 310, 383, 400;
 criminalization of, 310–12, 335, 382;
 media coverage of, lviii, lx, 240, 251–53, 265–67, 282, 335, 378;
 misinformation, 268;
 moral-conservative mobilization around, lx;
 people living with, lviii, 240–41, 245, 265–71, 311, 384, 399;
 and public health, xiii, xxiv, 265–66;
 and racism, xiii, xxiii, xlv, 265–67, 271–72, 310–11, 334–36, 348, 377–78;
 re-medicalization of homosexuality, xxiii, 19, 240, 245–46, 265–72;
 and sex workers, xxiii, xlv, 365, 310–11;

- sexual practices, impact on, 240, 249,
267–68, 273, 377–78, 310;
treatments for, lvii, 231, 245, 267, 268–72, 282;
and youths, 273.
See also COVID-19, and AIDS crisis; public
health
- AIDS ACTION NOW! (AAN!), xxiv, lviii, 268,
288, 296, 400
- AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACT UP),
xxiv, 268, 270, 400
- AIDS Committee of Toronto, 266
- AIDS Service Organizations (ASOs), 287, 311,
400
- Altman, Dennis, 237, 265
- American Psychiatric Association (APA), 219
- ancient world, same-gender sexual practices.
See Greece, ancient, same-gender sexual
practices
- Andrews, Karen, 241
- Andrews, Lynn, 242–43
- Anglican Church, 171, 177–78, 190
- anthropology, 9–10, 37, 52
- Anti-69 Network, xxx–xxxi, xl, 362–64, 376, 392,
411, 416
- anti-Catholicism, 85
- anti-Semitism, 68, 120, 188, 239
- anti-trans activism. See trans people, anti-
trans politics
- Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA),
337–38. See also treatments to “cure”
homosexuality
- archives, of homosexuals, 47–48, 360, 415
- aristocracy, sexual practices of, 25, 28–29
- armed forces. See military
- army, homosexuals in. See military
- Army Act (1955), 156–57
- Association for Social Knowledge (ASK),
170–76, 178–82, 185–90, 199, 203–204;
educational activities 171–74, 176, 178–81,
186.
See also homophile groups
- ASK Newsletter, 171–72, 173–74, 176, 178–80, 185,
187, 189, 199, 203. See also newsletters, gay
organizations
- autonomist Marxism, lii–liv, 298
- aversion therapy, 11, 113, 131, 150, 183, 219, 336. See
also conversion therapy; treatments to
“cure” homosexuality
- Aya, 348
- AZT (anti-viral drug). See AIDS, treatments for
- bachelors, as social problem, 68
- Bad Attitude, lx, 263–64. See also magazines,
homosexual
- Badgley Committee on Sexual Offences
against Children and Youth, 273
- Bain, Beverly, lii, 348, 416
- Bannerji, Himani, li, 239, 327, 347, 370–71,
393–94
- barebacking, 377
- bars. See establishments, commercial, for gay
community
- bathhouses, for sex. See gay sites, for sexual
activities, bathhouses
- bathhouse raids,
community response, lvii–lviii, 224, 227–28,
257–59, 261, 279, 289, 363, 381, 410–12;
and Criminal Code reform, 258–59, 409–10,
414;
and gross indecency, 168, 256–58, 310;
heterosexual hegemony, construction of,
lxiii;
media coverage of, 256;
in Montréal, 168, 256, 257;
and organized crime, 257;
and Pride Toronto, 312–14, 357, 381, 416;
and public/private distinction, 260, 310, 363,
376, 390;
Pussy Palace/Pleasure Palace, 289–89, 412;
and sex work allegations, 417;
in Toronto, lx, 168, 227–28, 256–58, 262,
288–89, 292;
Toronto Police, apology by, 360–61, 411–13.
See also bawdy houses, legislation; gay sites,
for sexual activities, bathhouses
- bawdy houses,
legislation, lix, 168, 256–58, 289, 316–18,
333–34, 384, 409, 410, 413–17;
raids, lvii, lx, 26, 89, 257–58, 289, 410
- Bay Theatre (Toronto), 100, 165. See also gay
sites, for sexual activities, Toronto
- BDSM (Bondage, Discipline/Dominance,
Submission/Sado-Masochism), 236, 246,
279, 309–10, 379, 385
- Beall, Arthur W., 82–83
- Beeby, Dean, 127, 324
- Bédard, Paul, 185, 189
- Belcourt, Billy-Ray, xli, 55, 326
- Benkert, Karoly Maria, 34–35, 37
- Bentham, Jeremy, 155
- berdache, xlvi, 52. See also Two-Spirit
- Bérubé, Allan, 300, 349

- bestiality, 33, 46, 67, 121, 219. *See also* classification of sexuality
- bicycles, moral concerns, 74
- Biden, Joe, xxx, xlv, 322, 338, 355
- Bill C-23, 294–95
- Bill C-31, 308, 321–23
- Bill C-49, 250, 278
- Bill C-66, 411, 413–17
- Bill C-75, 333–34, 411, 415–17
- Bill C-150 (1969), 206–216
- Bill 167 (1994). *See* family-recognition rights
- binary concepts of gender. *See* gender binary
- biological determinism, xlvii, 7–8, 12–13, 239, 353–54, 403. *See also* essentialism
- biopolitics, xliii. *See also* Foucault, Michel
- birth control, 30, 36, 75, 77, 160, 206–207, 217, 299. *See also* abortion
- bisexuality, I, lxii, lxvii–lxviii, lxix, 17, 239, 240, 295
- Blachford, Gregg, 231–32
- Black Action Defence Committee, 359
- Black activism, 348–49, 359–62, 372–73, 380
- Black civil rights movement, 169, 187. *See also* civil rights movement
- Black Lives Matter,
 - history of, 359–62;
 - police, mobilizations against, 313, 345, 359, 392;
 - and Pride celebrations, xix, xxviii, xxxv–xxxvii, 308, 313, 376, 381, 411–12, 416–17;
 - protests, xxi, xxviii, 339, 377, 411;
 - queer community response, xxxvi, xlix, 349–50, 353;
 - Toronto, xxxv–xxxvi, 308, 345, 359–62, 381
- blackmail, of homosexuals, 19, 89–90, 123–25, 126, 131, 133, 138–43, 186, 277, 329, 392. *See also* purge campaigns of homosexuals from government employment
- Black Panther Party, 123, 218, 406
- Black people,
 - and AIDS crisis, xxiii, 335;
 - anti-miscegenation laws, 300–301;
 - queer communities, exclusion from, xxix–xxx, xxxv, xlvii, 236, 260, 291, 300–301, 326, 361;
 - slave trade of, xiv, xlix, 27, 60, 77, 300–301;
 - social resistance by, xxviii, lii, 79, 258, 348, 359, 372–73, 406;
 - in Victorian era, 30;
 - women, 30, 77, 79, 386, 408.*See also* racism, anti-black; Black Lives Matter; police, killing of Black people
- Black Power movements, 169, 218, 260, 285
- Black Women’s Collective, 348, 359
- Bland, Lucy, 83, 156
- BLM. *See* Black Lives Matter
- BLM-TO. *See* Black Lives Matter, Toronto
- Blockorama, 348
- blood donation, xiii, 271–72, 334–36, 384
- Body Politic, The*, 220–21, 225, 256, 262, 314, 360, 387, 396. *See also* magazines, homosexual
- Boissonnault, Randy, xl, 332, 416
- Boisvert/Lupien case, 182, 183–85
- Bornstein, Kate, 304
- Bourgeault, Ron, 52, 56, 57
- bourgeois cultural revolution, 17, 27, 24, 32–33
- Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) campaign, 358–59
- Brancale, Ralph (State Diagnostic Center, New Jersey), 148–49. *See also* Toronto Star, Citizens Forum on Sex Deviates
- Bray, Alan, 25–26
- Brigden, Beatrice, 82–83
- Bristol Myers (corporation), lviii
- Broadside*, 221. *See also* magazines, homosexual
- Brown, Michael, 359–60. *See also* police, killing of Black people
- Bruner Report, 259–60
- Bucke, Maurice, 82, 86–87
- Buena Vista Park. *See* gay sites, for sexual activities, parks
- buggery, 26–27, 46, 63;
 - community regulation of, 28, 65–66;
 - decriminalization of, 200–202, 205, 206–207, 211, 214, 276, 299, 409, 413–16;
 - depictions of, 263;
 - legal usage of, 46, 67, 77, 92, 94, 121–23, 135–36, 158, 162;
 - in military, 26–27, 133;
 - in New France, 63–64;
 - punishment for, 63–65, 67, 68, 91, 128, 134, 158
- bullying, 318–20, 340
- Bunch, Charlotte, lxvi, 407
- Burke, Tamara, 355. *See also* MeToo movement
- businesses, gay owned. *See* establishments, commercial, for gay community
- Butler decision. *See* Supreme Court of Canada, *R. v. Butler* (1992)
- Callwood, June, 311
- Campaign for Equal Families (Toronto), lix, 228, 243, 288, 296

- camp sensibility, and gay culture, 166–67, 232
- Canada Day, xviii–xix
- Canada,
 settler-colonial character, xvii, xxvii, xxxix–
 xlv, 48–49, 57–58, 62, 71–72;
 state formation, xviii, xix–xx, xlv, liv, 57–58,
 66, 71–72, 343, 373
- Canada Customs and Excise, lx, 119–20,
 262–64, 278, 389. *See also* censorship;
 obscenity legislation
- Canadian AIDS Society, 268, 270
- Canadian Alliance for Sex Work Law Reform,
 317–18
- Canadian Auto Workers (CAW), 318, 349
- Canadian Blood Services, xiii, 335–36
- Canadian Border Service Agency (CBSA),
 344, 382
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC),
 124, 190–91, 212, 264, 413
- Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,
 xxi, lx, lxvii, 277–82, 289
- Canadian Council on Religion and the Homo-
 sexual (CCRH), 177–79, 181
- Canadian Heritage, Department of, xxxiv, 416
- Canadian Medical Association, 72, 191
- Canadian Theosophical Society, 87
- Canadian Union of Public Employees
 (CUPE), 241, 349
- Canadian War on Queers, The*, li, 307, 324–25,
 328–29. *See also* purge campaigns of
 homosexuals from government
 employment
- Canadians for Equal Marriage (CEM), 300,
 306
- Caouette, Réal, 189, 212
- capitalism,
 abolition of, xv, xx, xxxii, l, liv, lxxi, 62, 380,
 390, 394–95, 401–408;
 activism against/anti-capitalist activism,
 xiv, xxv, xxx, xlv, lv, lxxi, 4, 282, 285,
 343–46, 366, 376, 385–86, 397–404;
 consumer, *see* consumer culture;
 corporate, 41, 97, 110, 204;
 development of, 17, 22–23, 27;
 and exploitation, relations of, xxi, xxiii,
 xxiv–xxv, xxxiii–xxxiv, liii, 4, 21, 27, 32, 34,
 52, 66, 349, 376, 394, 398, 403, 407;
 global, xxxiii–xxxiv, xlv, 308, 315, 340,
 364–66;
 and imperialism, xxv–xxvii, 35–36, 365, 400;
 industrial, 71–74, 90;
 managed, 35–36, 41;
 and marriage/family, 24, 28–29, 41, 72, 96, 99,
 117, 217, 248, 297–98, 302, 306, 340;
 Marxist analysis of, xx, 1–lii, lvi, lxiii, 4, 27,
 124, 341, 343;
 mercantile, 56;
 productivity, xxiii–xxiv, xxxiv, liii, 23–24, 30,
 57, 124, 340, 313, 315, 351–52, 366, 407–408;
 queer support of, xiii, xxvii, xxxii–xxxiii,
 xxxiv, xxxvii, lv, 229, 233, 283–84, 285–87,
 302, 339, 344, 366, 376, 392–93, 410;
 racial character of, xx, xxvi, xxx, xxxvi, xxxix,
 liii, liv, 41, 69, 217, 247, 285, 287–88, 327, 338,
 344, 352, 359, 372, 379–80, 404–406, 407;
 social relations of, xx–xxi, xxvi, xxxix, xli,
 xlix, liii–liv, liii, 4–5, 7, 14–15, 21–22, 23–25,
 27–28, 340, 343, 367–68, 402;
 state formation, xxxii, xxxiii, xl, xlv, 17–18,
 44, 71–72, 351–52.
See also homocapitalism; neoliberalism;
 private property; resource extraction;
 settler colonialism
- carceral abolition. *See* prisons, abolition of
 carceral relations. *See* disciplinary relations;
 prisons, jurisdiction over offenders
- Carleton University, 130, 137, 178, 362, 411, 416
- Carpenter, Edward, 37–38, 40, 87–88, 120
- categorization of sexuality. *See* classification
 of sexuality
- Catholic church, 80, 177, 214, 243, 305
- Catholic School Board, 318–20
- Catholics, in Canada, 74, 85, 206, 208, 305
- CeleBrAsian, 348
- censorship, lx, 100, 188, 262–64, 274–75, 278,
 289, 292, 300, 314, 385–91, 396. *See also* free
 speech; pornography
- Center for Disease Control (CDC), 266
- Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation,
 165, 183
- Chamberland, Line, 118
- Champagne, Robert, 141
- Chapman, Terry, 46, 66–67, 69
- character weakness, homosexuality as, 124–27,
 276, 329. *See also* national-security cam-
 paigns against homosexuality
- Charlton, John, 77, 93
- Charter, the. *See* Canadian Charter of Rights
 and Freedoms
- Chauncey, George, 16, 30–31, 39–40, 86, 98, 111,
 117, 126
- Chenier, El, 118, 303
- Chicago, Vice Commission of. *See* Vice
 Commission of Chicago

- Chrétien, Jean, lxi, 280
- child molesters, homosexuals as, 19, 110,
144–49, 212, 254–55. *See also* classification
of sexuality; social-purity movement;
youths, corruption of
- Chisholm, John, 142, 167. *See also* Toronto,
police force
- Choudry, Ejaz Ahmed. *See* police, killing of
Black people
- Christianity,
homophile groups, involvement with, 171,
173, 175–79;
homosexuality, attitudes toward, 22, 36,
81–83, 162–63, 175–80, 211;
and immigration, 68, 73, 75, 79, 81;
Indigenous peoples, role in colonization of,
xli, 53, 57, 60;
marriage, views on, 57, 68, 75–78, 102, 176–77,
213–14;
and women, 80.
See also social-purity movement
- Churchill, David, 119
- Church, relationship to state, xlii, 13, 22, 36,
56–57, 63–66
- Church support, of homosexuality. *See* Chris-
tianity, homosexuality, attitudes toward
- Church Street. *See also* Toronto, Church
Street; gay neighbourhoods/villages/
ghettoes
- Citizen's United for Responsible Educa-
tion (CURE), 249. *See also* right-wing,
organizations
- City of Night*, 16, 173
- Civil Marriage Act, 306. *See also* same-sex
marriage, struggle
- civil rights movement, 123, 169–70, 187, 218, 285,
406. *See also* Black civil rights movement
- civil service, homosexual purge. *See* purge
campaigns of homosexuals from govern-
ment employment
- Clark, C.S., 89–90
- Clark, William Lund, 46–47, 82–83, 89–90
- Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, 149, 151, 186
- class, social. *See* capitalism, Marxist analysis
of; middle class; women, working-class;
working class; youth, working-class
- classification of sexuality, lxiii, lxv, lxvii, lxix–
lxx, 11–12;
activism, impact on, lxx, 368–74, 376, 377,
380;
and colonization, 10–11, 39;
Criminal Code, 90, 92, 94;
historical basis of, 5–6, 16, 21–22, 46–47, 86,
222, 369, 371–72;
before homosexual/development of homo-
sexual, 26, 29, 31, 34–35, 38–39, 41;
for legal purposes, 36, 90, 96, 138–39, 143,
155–56, 160–62, 199–200, 205, 215, 352, 392;
by military, 103–107, 133;
scientific, 41, 85, 96, 104, 110–11, 113, 138,
149–52, 219, 368–69.
See also identification, sexual
- CLGRO. *See* Coalition for Lesbian and Gay
Rights in Ontario (CLGRO)
- climate crisis, xxxix–xlv, 60–62, 330, 343–44,
347, 350, 401, 404
- climate denial, xliv–xlv
- closet, social relations of the, lxiv, 39–40, 98,
112, 117, 134, 158, 217–18, 222
- clubs. *See* establishments, commercial, for gay
community
- Coalition for Family Values, 249. *See also*
right-wing, organizations
- Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in On-
tario (CLGRO), lix, 241–43, 275, 295–96.
See also homophile groups
- Coastal GasLink pipeline, xvii, xix, xl, 51–52,
62, 363
- Cold War, 19, 112, 122–31, 153, 157, 185. *See also*
national-security campaigns against
homosexuality
- colonialism. *See* settler colonialism
- Combahee River Collective, 326. *See also*
intersectionality
- coming out, I, lxiv, 103, 108, 172, 238–39, 369. *See
also* closet, social relations of the
- Committee for Accessible AIDS Treatment
(CAAT), 312. *See also* AIDS crisis, activism
- commodity fetishism. *See* fetishism, of
commodities
- Communist Manifesto, The*, lv–lvi, lxiii
- Communist Party (Québec), 66
- communist witch hunts. *See* national-security
campaigns against homosexuality
- Community Homophile Association of
Newfoundland (CHAN), 220. *See also*
homophile groups
- communities, homosexual,
class/race divisions in, xv, xxix, xxxi–xxxvii,
xl, lxii, 89–91, 115–16, 228–29, 287–88, 290,
312–13, 316, 333, 347–49, 373, 376, 382;
expansion of, 155–56, 160–61, 164–69, 217–18,
220–28, 236–40, 260, 283, 287, 357, 369–70;

- formation of, lxii, 23–26, 35, 37–38, 48, 85–89, 107–109, 128;
- lesbian, 42, 82, 103, 107, 118–119, 128, 132–33, 164–69, 233, 259;
- media representation of, 251–53, 256;
- military, 64–65, 100, 102–103, 107–109, 126;
- oppression within, 229–31, 234, 236, 298, 378;
- racism in, 239, 271, 292, 347–49, 359, 361, 378–79;
- transformations, xxxvi, 128, 282–83, 313–14, 378–83;
- working-class, 38, 40, 90–91, 115–17.
- See also homophile groups
- community centres, homosexual, 173–74, 220–21, 228, 290, 357, 364
- community-based practices, care/support groups, xx, xxi, xxvi, liv–lv, 310, 324, 345, 347, 382, 383, 390–91, 395–96, 398; organizing, xxi–xxiv, xxvi, xxx, 48, 202, 252, 271, 324, 347, 381–82, 388; regulation/policing, 36, 65–66, 67–69, 71–72, 226–27, 260, 405.
- See also AIDS, community-based groups
- consent, age of, see age of consent; and AIDS, 312; codes of/cultural practices of, 310; in homosexual acts, 128, 157, 161, 163, 178, 181, 183, 187, 195, 199–200, 208, 216–17, 276, 281; legal definition of, li, 19, 77, 205, 261, 264; in military, 156–57; and sexual-education curriculum, 319; and sexual practices, xlvi, 309–10, 356, 393, 395–96
- consumer culture, 42, 72, 98–99, 160, 217, 222, 224–26, 233–34, 285–86, 302, 340; heterosexual, 98, 114, 232
- Continental (hotel bar), 118–19, 121, 165, 168. See also lesbians, establishments
- conversion therapy, 11, 219, 320, 334, 336–39, 384, 397. See also aversion therapy; treatments to “cure” homosexuality
- Conservative Party, abortion, opposition to, 206–10, 211–16, 299; child pornography, opposition to, 274–75; COVID-19, support for protests against safety measures, xxv; on divorces, 76; elections of, lix, 306, 338; family values, support for, 147, 213–14, 277, 295, 309; homosexuality, opposition to, lxi, 206–10, 211–16, 249–50, 261, 295, 306, 392; law and order, support for, 254; and nationalism, 314–15, 323
- conservative opposition to trans people. See right-wing, opposition to gay rights
- contraception. See birth control
- corporate capitalism. See capitalism, corporate
- Cosman, Brenda, 275, 300, 363–64
- Coulthard, Glen, xlii
- Council on Religion and the Homosexual, 172, 177–79, 181, 211. See also Christianity, views on sexual relations
- courts. See obscenity legislation; Supreme Court, of Canada
- covert homosexuals. See overt and covert homosexuals
- COVID-19, and AIDS crisis, xxii–xxiv, xlv, 343, 346–47, 377–78, 382–83, 399–400, 406–407; complications from, xxii, xxiii, xxiv–xxv, 343, 399; global context, xxiii–xxvi, 322, 343, 347, 364, 400; and neoliberal policies, xvii, xxiv–xxvi, 310, 343, 346–47, 377, 392, 405; “post-pandemic” transition, xvii–xviii, xxii–xxv, 343, 346–47, 399–400, 405; protests against safety measures, xvii, xxv–xxvi, xviii, 338, 344, 377, 388; and racism, xxiii, xxix–xxx, xlv, 378, 399; safety measures, xxii, xxviii, xxix–xxx, 310, 343, 346–47, 355, 377–78; and science, xlv; and sexual activity, 377–78; sex workers, impact on, xlv, 317; vaccines, xxv, 343, 347, 405
- Créditistes (Québec political party), 206–208, 213
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé, lii, 326. See also intersectionality
- Criminal Code of Canada (1892), 67, 69, 75, 77, 90–93, 95–96
- Criminal Code, revisions (1953–54), 110, 120–22, 135–37, 192–93, 195, 197, 199. See also gross indecency; psychopaths, sexual
- Criminal Code reform (1969), and AIDS, 310–12, 383; changes since, 220, 308–10, 333, 351–52, 415; fiftieth-anniversary celebrations, xiii, xxx–xxxii, xxxiv, lxvii, 302, 308, 362–64, 376, 416;

- and homophile organizing, 171, 173, 175,
177–78, 179–83, 185, 190–91, 201, 202–204,
215–16, 220;
- impact of, xxxi–xxxii, lxvii, 215, 262, 277, 325,
362–64, 376, 411, 416;
- lesbians, 191;
- obscurity, 263, 281, 389;
- parliamentary debates about, 178, 181,
191–92, 205–211, 213–14;
- police enforcement of, 169, 202, 211, 215,
256–59, 275, 276, 280, 316, 345, 409–10, 414;
- Wolfenden Report* (1957), influence on, 144,
153, 163–64, 190–91, 192, 195–96, 200–201,
202, 203, 206, 215.
- See also Anti-69 Network; *Wolfenden
Report* (1957)
- criminalization of homosexuality,
age of consent laws, lx, 78, 158, 182, 202, 256,
272–76, 281, 309, 384;
- and AIDS crisis, xxxviii, 245, 310–12, 377,
383–85, 391;
- in Canadian territories, 66;
- continuing problems with, lxii;
- as moral danger, 77–78, 211;
- in “public” places, xxxvi, 156–57, 160, 195–97,
211, 244, 255–56, 258–60, 262, 275–76,
279–82, 288, 409–10, 413–14, 416–17;
- and RCMP 127–29, 197, 204, 214, 276, 345;
- as security risk, 110, 120, 124, 127, 129, 140, 153,
156–57;
- and sex work, 77–78, 80, 230, 250, 260, 274,
316–17, 383;
- as sexual abnormality/psychological dis-
ease, 134, 143–44, 164, 180, 211–14, 345;
- as social danger 137, 157, 200, 212, 215, 245, 249,
264, 310, 355, 416.
- See also bathhouse raids; Criminal Code
reform (1969); gross indecency; medical-
ization of homosexuality; psychopaths,
sexual; Royal Commission on Criminal
Sexual Psychopaths (1954); *Wolfenden
Report* (1957)
- criminal sexual psychopaths. See psychopaths,
sexual
- Criminal Law Amendment Act (1968–69).
See Criminal Code reform (1969);
decriminalization
- Crombie, David, 254–55
- cross-dressing,
European-defined gender practice, 7, 25,
53–55, 57, 65–66;
- in Indigenous culture, 53–55, 57;
Montréal, 185, 234;
in rituals, 7, 65–66;
twentieth-century, 183–84, 189;
in Victorian period, 25, 66–67, 81, 85–86, 88;
by women, 86.
- See also drag
- cruising. See gay sites, for sexual activities
- Crying Game, The* (film), 284
- cultural productions, gay, 231–33
- “cures” for homosexuality. See treatments to
“cure” homosexuality
- Curtis, Bruce, 71
- dancing, 64, 66, 83, 107, 108, 165, 168, 174, 188–89,
329
- dangerous sexual offender, 110, 137–39, 143, 153,
196–201, 212, 334. See also Criminal Code
reform (1969); criminalization of homo-
sexuality; psychopaths, sexual
- Daughters of Bilitis (DOB), 119, 123, 172, 174. See
also homophile groups
- death camps. See residential school system
- decolonization, 53, 406, 410. See also Land
Back movement; No Pride in Genocide
- decriminalization of homosexuality. See also
Criminal Code reform (1969)
- defund the police, movement. See police,
defunding/abolition of
- DeGagne, Alexa, 322–23
- degeneracy, medical theories of, 36–37
- delinquents. See juvenile delinquency
- Denison, Flora MacDonald, 79, 87
- Department of National Defense. See
National Defense, Department of
- Desh Pardesh, 348
- desire, erotic. See eroticism, forms of
- detection of homosexuals, psychological,
129–33, 178. See also psychiatry, for detec-
tion of homosexuals
- deviants/deviates, sexual,
and activism, 380, 395;
- colonial imposition of category, 55;
- criminality of, 26, 47, 104, 134, 137, 146, 202,
272, 275, 279, 354;
- family/social life, 15, 25, 33, 43, 67, 99, 114, 137,
145, 249;
- gender characteristics, 22–23, 104, 234, 368;
- heterosexual hegemony, relation to, lxiii,
lxv, 19–20, 28, 43, 145, 249, 395, 398;
- in military, 103, 129, 133–35;

- pathologization, by psychology/sex sciences, 32, 34, 104, 113, 122, 146–51;
- pornography, 385–86, 389;
- and privacy/law reform, 139–41, 160, 192, 395;
- and responsibility, 240, 244, 266;
- typology, by psychiatry/psychology, 9, 11;
- women, 36, 11–12.
- See also classification of sexuality, psychology; criminalization of homosexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners; psychiatry; *Toronto Star*, Citizens Forum on Sex Deviates
- Devlin, Lord Patrick, 162–64, 211
- Dewson Street collective house, 348
- Diefenbaker, John, 213
- difference, celebration of. See multiculturalism, official policies in Canada
- Dignity Initiative, 358
- disabilities, people with,
- access to social institutions, 231;
 - and consent, 205;
 - and COVID-19, xviii, xxii–xxiv, 346;
 - oppression of, xxxiv, 227, 290, 304, 320, 341, 348, 367, 368, 401, 410;
 - and police 345;
 - and political correctness, 387;
 - queer, xxxviii, xlix, 368, 401;
 - and sexually transmitted infections, 83–94;
 - sterilization of, 299
- disciplinary relations, xxxii, xxxix, 11, 285–87, 339–40, 354, 394, 409
- Diverlus, Rodney, 360
- diversity. See Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) policies; multiculturalism, official policies in Canada
- divorce laws, 76–77, 181, 205, 208, 398
- doctors. See medical authority
- Doctrine of Discovery, 60. See settler colonialism
- domestic science, 76. See also domestic sphere; motherhood, training for
- domestic sphere, 24, 34, 36, 66–67, 144, 255, 354, 399;
- privatization of, 24, 30, 34, 36, 255, 354;
 - and women, 24, 36, 86
- domestic labour, 1, 24–25, 30, 160, 204, 298, 398.
- See also labour
- domestic violence, xxii, 135, 137, 144–45, 159, 255, 354
- Douglas, Mary, 8–9
- drag, xxix, xlvi, 166–67, 217, 234, 338, 368, 388
- Driskill, Qwo-Li, xli–xlii, 326, 384
- Drucker, Peter, xxxii, xvii, lii, 286, 287, 298, 304, 340, 347, 356, 365, 370
- drugs, xxvi
- Dryden, OmiSoore, xxxvii, xxxviii, lii, 285, 292, 300–301, 307, 335–36, 347
- Dubinsky, Karen, lxv, 69, 77
- Duggan, Lisa, 369–70, 371–72
- Dunlop, Sara Ellen, 165
- economism, 21
- EDI. See Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) policies
- education,
- AIDS, 240, 249, 267–68, 278, 385;
 - children, role in protecting, 71, 73, 78, 99, 113, 143, 145, 150, 158–59, 204, 214, 231, 248, 281;
 - and colonialism, 53, 58;
 - sex, lx, 31, 176, 178, 249, 273–74, 278, 309, 318–20, 385
 - and social purity campaigns, 74, 78–83, 84, 97;
- educational relationships, erotic, between men, 7, 107
- effeminacy, 11, 16, 33–34, 38, 86, 116, 127–28, 151, 231–32, 233–34, 251, 337. See also gender binary; masculinity, cultural formations of
- efficiency, 35, 83, 99, 277, 366
- Egale, xviii, xxvii–xxviii, xxx–xxxii, xxxv, xxxvi, xl–xli, 288, 291–93, 300–301, 305–306, 312, 314, 319, 322–23, 325–27, 330–36, 339–40, 344, 347, 363, 373, 382, 392–93, 402, 413, 415
- Egan, Geoffrey, 45
- Egan, Jim, lxi, 119–21, 142–43, 165, 170, 188, 190, 241, 279, 292
- Elliot, Douglas, xxviii–xxix, xxxv, 314, 412
- Ellis, Havelock, 34, 37–38, 88, 114
- Emergency Drug Release Program (EDRP), 268–70
- employment in public sector, exclusion from. See purge campaigns of homosexuals from government employment
- encampments, xvii, xxi–xxii, xxvi, 405, 407. See also unhoused people
- English legal system. See Great Britain, legal system in
- epithets for same-gender sex practitioners, xlvi, 17, 22, 26, 29, 46–47, 89–90, 91–97, 131
- Epp, Jake, lviii, 267

- Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) policies, xiv, 348
- erectons, legal value of, 184–85, 193–94
- eroticism,
 - forms of, xxxviii–xxxix, xli–xlii, xlvi–xlvii, xlix–l, liv, lxx, 3, 6–7, 17, 19, 30, 34, 42–41–43, 47, 51, 53, 64, 80–81, 84, 88, 100, 107, 140, 150, 158, 227, 232, 236, 287, 291, 298, 305, 309–10, 319, 321, 356, 365, 367–68, 376–77, 383–84, 386, 388, 395–96, 403–404, 407–408, 410;
 - in young people, 391, 399
- essentialism, xxxii, xlvii–xlviii, 237, 354, 369–75, 386
- establishments, commercial, for gay
 - community,
 - bars, 43, 118, 126–27, 164–67, 168, 173, 190, 222–25, 227, 230, 235, 240, 256, 260–61, 310, 346, 384, 414;
 - bathhouses, 166, 222, 227, 257;
 - bookstores, lx, 188, 222, 227, 263, 264, 416;
 - clubs, 43, 165, 167–68, 173–74, 187–88, 189–90, 222, 227, 257.
 - See also gay neighbourhoods/villages/ghettoes; gay sites, for sexual activities
- Estes, Nick, xliii–xliv, lii
- eugenics, xxii, 19, 29, 31, 37, 75, 214. See also immigration policy, and racism
- Eurocentrism, 10, 38, 59
- evolutionary theories of sexuality and gender. See biological determinism
- “expendable” populations, xxii–xxiii, xxvi, xxx, xlv, 316, 346, 384, 399. See also AIDS; COVID-19
- expert authority, 11, 13, 42, 112, 138, 146–49, 169, 171, 174, 190–92, 199, 203, 206, 209, 228, 251–52, 269, 311, 331, 346–47, 371. See also medical authority; psychiatry, authority of; scientific authority
- exploitation, of labour. See capitalism, and relations of exploitation
- exploitation, of sex. See pornography; sex work
- External Affairs, Department of, 124, 331
- extramarital sex. See marriage, sexual relations outside of
- fag, 230, 275, 318, 340. See also classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- fairies, 29, 38, 40, 86, 91, 95, 166, 233. See also classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- family,
 - alternate forms, 224, 242, 296–98, 304–305, 374, 389–90, 398;
 - children, regulation of relationships, 77;
 - in class and state relations, lviii–lix, 43, 97, 110, 145, 204, 217, 245, 340, 397–98;
 - and community, 98, 107, 144, 156, 298, 320;
 - heterosexual, lix, 43, 97, 101, 110, 117, 137, 145, 153, 204, 235, 245, 340, 397–98;
 - historical, 7–8, 23–25, 29–30, 35–36, 42, 101–102, 109–10, 144, 217, 223;
 - homosexuals, oppression/exclusion of, 5, 19, 110, 117, 231, 235, 240, 275–76;
 - Indigenous, 43, 56, 59–60;
 - labour, division of, 19, 23–25, 29–30, 33, 35–36, 42–43, 56, 63, 68, 74, 75–76, 78, 98–99, 144, 147, 160, 204;
 - and morality/moral order, 11, 28, 32, 33, 40, 68, 73, 76–77, 148, 153–54, 156–57, 177, 204, 211, 213–14, 243, 248–50, 252, 273, 277, 286, 340, 345, 398, 399;
 - as safe, lxvi, 137, 144–47, 255;
 - and welfare, 97.
 - See also marriage; motherhood
- family-recognition rights, xxxiii, lviii–lix, lxi, lxii, lxiii, lxiv, lxvii, 206, 228, 241–43, 241–46, 276, 278–80, 289, 292–96, 304, 314, 381, 383, 390, 392, 397
- fascism, xvii, xxv–xxvi, xlviii, 338–39, 387–88, 397–99, 405
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne, xlvii, 371. See also essentialism
- feble-mindedness, 80–81, 83, 97. See also social-purity discourse
- feminist movement,
 - anti-porn, 263–64, 384–90;
 - Black, xlviii–xlix, li–lii, 79, 326, 359, 408;
 - conservative response/backlash to, lx, 78, 247–49, 280, 299, 384–85, 399;
 - and gay liberation/gay activism, 174–75, 218–22, 241, 243, 259, 285, 298, 381;
 - and gender, xlvii–xlviii, 12–13, 371, 374, 376, 383–84;
 - and health, xxiv, 265;
 - and heterosexuality, lxiii–lxiv, lxvi, 132, 235–36, 295, 297, 340;
 - and history, writing, lxv, 45, 48;
 - historical struggles, xlv1, 25, 42–43, 75, 78–79, 87;
 - Indigenous, xli–xlii, li–lii, 60, 79;
 - and labour, l, lii–liv, lxiv, 6, 75, 78, 83, 298, 329, 350;

- lesbian, lxvi, lxviii–lxix, 132, 166, 221–22, 231, 235–36, 356, 363, 374;
 maternal, 79;
 against patriarchal power, xlv–xlvi;
 radical, lxviii, 78–79, 87, 389, 406–407;
 and reproductive rights, 299;
 sexual violence, concern with, 354–57, 385;
 sex work, 316–18;
 and social purity groups, 79;
 trans-exclusionary radical (TERF), lxviii, 353–54;
 and white racism, xlvi, 79, 393–94.
 See also family-recognition rights; suffrage movement
- fetishism,
 of commodities, 4, 8 14–15;
 sexual, xxxix, 8, 236, 393
- feudalism, 23, 28
- film, representation of homosexuality in, 98, 131, 166–67, 227, 252, 263–64, 284, 363
- financial institutions, international, xxxiii–xxxiv
- Finley, Chris, 59
- First World War. See World War I
- Fleming, Thomas S., 257, 258
- flogging, 67, 87, 94. See gross indecency, punishment for
- Floyd, George, xv, xxviii. See also police, killing of Black people
- Ford, Doug, 319, 338
- Ford Hotel, 108, 164
- forensic psychiatry, 31, 34, 37, 85, 103. See also psychiatry; science and sexuality
- fossil fuel industries, xlv, 338, 344, 347
- Foucault, Michel, xxxix, l–li, 9–10, 29, 32, 236–37
- Fraser, James, 147
- Fraser Committee Report on Pornography and Prostitution, 273
- Freedman, Estelle, 103, 136
- “Freedom Convoy.” See COVID-19, safety measures, protests against
- free speech, debates around, 356, 358, 360, 387–89, 391
- Freud, Sigmund, lxviii, 34, 88, 99, 112–13, 114, 177, 188, 305. See also sex psychology
- friendship,
 female, 4, 24, 32, 42–43, 82, 86, 101, 128–29, 175;
 male, 26, 32, 46, 53, 64, 82, 87, 88, 101, 108–109, 116, 128–29, 184, 407, 417;
 with police, lvii;
 and sexuality, 7
- Front de libération du Québec (FLQ), 220
- frontier, in Canada, 68, 72. See also settler colonialism
- fruit machine. See psychiatry, for detection of homosexuals
- fur trade, 48, 52, 53, 56–57, 59, 65
- Fulton, Ron, 188
- Fung, Richard, 372
- Garner, Eric, 359. See also police, killing of Black people
- Gay (magazine), 133, 173, 187–89. See also magazines, homosexual
- gay, term, historical, lxvii. See also epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- Gay Alliance Towards Equality (GATE), 221, 329, 349
- Gay Asians of Toronto, 348
- gay capitalism. See gay market
- gay community formation. See communities, gay, formation of
- Gay and Lesbian Historians Group, 414, 417
- Gay Liberation Against the Right Everywhere (GLARE), 259, 357
- Gay Liberation Front (GLF), 217–18, 220, 222
- gay liberation groups, 220–21
- gay liberation movement. See liberation movement, gay and lesbian
- gay magazines. See magazines, homosexual
- gay market, 224–28. See also gay neighbourhoods/villages/ghettoes
- gay neighbourhoods/villages/ghettoes, lxvi, 222–24, 225–226, 231, 233, 238–40, 255, 380, 381
- “Gay Power, Gay Politics” (CBS Reports episode), 251–53
- gay purge. See purges, of homosexuals from government employment
- gay sites, for sexual activities,
 bathhouses, 16, 24, 108, 164–65, 168, 215, 222, 227, 235, 240, 256–57, 260;
 clubs, 24, 26, 107, 125, 131, 188, 257, 288, 309;
 and community formation, 115–17, 227–28;
 hotels, 23, 89, 91, 108, 118, 164–65, 184;
 lavatories, lix, lxiii, 16, 24, 90–91, 94–95, 99, 119, 157, 162, 164, 169, 182, 189, 210, 215, 227, 239, 260–62, 278–79, 282, 310, 334, 379, 384;
 in Montréal, 85–86, 114–16, 165;

- parks, 90–91, 94, 115, 119, 127, 142–43, 169, 182, 239, 252–53, 260, 278, 310, 323, 379, 384; police surveillance of, *see* police surveillance of homosexuals; public/private debates about, 23–25, 162, 164–65, 170, 227, 231, 245–46, 261, 378; racism in, 227; restaurants, 23, 115, 117, 125, 131, 168, 222, 227, 346; theatres, 95, 100, 119, 120, 165; in Toronto, 107–109, 119, 164–66, 168, 170, 187–89, 223, 225. *See also* communities, homosexual; establishments, commercial, for gay community; public/private regulatory strategy
- Gay Straight Alliances, 319–20, 339, 384
- gay villages. *See* gay neighbourhoods/villages/ghettos
- gender binary, xxvii, xxxii, xxxiii, xli–xlii, xlvi–xlviii, li, 4–5, 11–12, 22–23, 29, 40, 43, 45, 47–48, 51, 54–55, 295, 318, 321, 345, 350–54, 364–69, 371, 373–74, 376, 379–80, 383, 391–92, 397–99, 402–404, 407, 410. *See also* essentialism; heterosexual hegemony; masculinity
- gender essentialism. *See* essentialism
- gender, and queer theory, 233–35
- gender, and gay male politics, 233–35, 298; social organization of, *see* gender binary
- gender inversion, 11, 34, 88, 98, 111–14, 126–27, 129, 130, 132, 134, 151, 183, 217, 233–35. *See also* classification of sexuality; epithets, for homosexuals; gender binary
- Georgia Straight* (Vancouver newspaper), 175
- Gentile, Patrizia, li, 120, 307, 324–25, 410, 414
- gentrification, xxxvi, 222–23, 226, 287, 290, 316, 359, 379, 381, 410
- Germany, homosexuality in, 34, 37–38, 218, 239
- ghettos, gay. *See* gay neighbourhoods/villages/ghettos
- Gidlow, Elsa, 38, 87–88
- Gigeroff, Alex K., 92, 186, 192–93, 200, 211
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson, xx
- Girard, Philip, 127, 136
- Glad Day Bookshop (Toronto), lx, 262–64, 292, 416. *See also* establishments, commercial, for gay community
- Global Affairs Canada, xxxvi, 340
- Global North, xxxvii, l, 285, 307, 347, 364–65, 369–70, 400
- Global South, xxxiii–xxxiv, xliii, l, 364–66; erotic practices in, lxxviii
- globalization, xxxiii–xxxiv, 340, 364–66
- Globe and Mail*, 146, 168, 201, 224, 255, 328. *See also* newspapers, coverage of homosexuality
- Goldberg, Jonathan, 53
- Gouldhawke, Mike, xlii
- Gradual Enfranchisement Act (1869). *See* Indian Act
- Gramsci, Antonio, li, 18
- grassroots activism, xxxiii, xxx, lxii, 202, 306, 324, 355, 382, 385, 389, 401–402
- Gray, Kenneth, 147–49, 192
- Great Britain, cultural influence in Canada, 48–49, 77–79, 86, 89–90, 92, 153; gay culture in, 25–26, 40–41, 107, 120, 156; legal system, 22–23, 25, 253, in comparison to Canada, 65, 91–92, 94, 96, 122, 124, 138–39, 153, 159–63, 179–80, 192, 195–96, 200–203, 209, 260
- Greece, ancient and same-gender sexual practices, lxxvii, 38, 85, 87–88, 213; influence on homosexual identity, 35, 38, 85, 87–88, 155
- Green Party, 401, 414
- Greer, Rev. Francis Howard Kelly, 138–39
- gross indecency, court cases about, 182–83, 184–85, 193–97, 199, 334; in Criminal Code, addition to, 67, 77, 91–97, 135–36, 195, 200, 383; decriminalization of, partial, 128, 134, 181, 201–202, 205–209, 215, 220, 276, 278, 299, 333–34, 409, 413–17; in legal discourse, interpretations of, 37, 94, 121–22, 143, 182–83, 188, 193–95, 200, 215, 261, 310; police response to/arrests, lix, 94, 168–69, 184–85, 188, 193–94, 256–58; punishment for, 64, 67, 81, 87, 92–94, 143, 149, 156–57, 197, 199–200. *See also* criminalization of homosexuality
- Gutmacher, Alan Frank, 148–49
- Haitians, and AIDS epidemic, xxxiii, xlv, 265, 266, 334–35,
- Halifax, xvii, xxi, lxi, 68, 86, 123, 138, 220, 221, 240–41, 313, 358, 362, 405

- Hall, Radclyffe, 43, 100. *See also* lesbians, literature
- Hall, Stuart, 161
- Harper government, 306–308, 314–15, 321, 323, 338
- Harris, Mike, 313
- Harrison, Rachel, 19–20, 22
- Hart, H.L.A., 162–64, 211. *See also* *Wolfenden Report* (1957)
- Health Canada, 336
- Health, Department of, lviii, 84, 97
- hegemony, li, lv, 18–19. *See also* heterosexual hegemony
- Hennessy, Rosemary, xxxix, 284, 305, 406–407
- hermaphrodites, 53, 86, 88. *See* epithets for same-gender sex practitioners; intersex people
- heteropatriarchy, xlii–xliii, xlvii–xlviii, li, 368. *See also* heterosexual hegemony; settler colonialism
- heterosexism,
 - and activism, 218, 303, 401–403;
 - and AIDS response, 272, 399;
 - and capitalism, xxxiii;
 - challenges to, 280, 352, 372, 398, 401–403;
 - and education, 172, 230, 268, 306, 318;
 - family organization, 109–10, 235;
 - in history (discipline), 45;
 - ideology of, lxiii–lxiv, 13, 19, 45, 59, 157, 159;
 - in museums, 332;
 - institutionalized, lxiii, 157, 176, 214, 217, 235, 244–45, 275–76, 296, 304–305, 340, 392, 397–98;
 - protests against, xxix;
 - and racism, 159, 166, 218, 230, 292, 336, 348, 352;
 - and social-purity campaigns, 33–34.*See also* gender binary
- heterosexual consumer culture. *See* consumer culture, heterosexual
- heterosexuality, history of term, lxvii, 22
- heterosexual hegemony, xxxiv, xliii, li, lxiii–lxvi, lxix, 5, 9–10, 12–13, 15–20, 22, 30, 34, 40–43, 47, 91, 97–100, 109, 145, 156, 159, 199, 204, 219, 222, 227, 230, 236–40, 244, 251, 261–63, 278–82, 301–302, 348, 366–69, 374, 376, 379–80, 402–403, 407
- heteronormativity. *See* heterosexual hegemony
- Higgins, Ross, 116, 415
- high-risk groups, in epidemiology, xxiii, 266, 273, 334, 336
- Hirschfeld, Magnus, 11, 37–38
- Hislop, George, 223, 257
- historical materialism, xxxvii, li, 3–9, 17–18, 21, 370–73, 375
- HIV+. *See* AIDS
- Holloway, John, xx, xxxix, liv–lv, 368–70
- Holmes, Morgan, 354
- homeless people. *See* unhoused people
- homocapitalism, xv, xxxiii–xxxiv, 315, 366. *See also* gay market
- homonationalism, xv, xxvii, xxxi–xxxii, xxxvii, 247, 287, 297–98, 307–308, 314–15, 327, 332, 340, 356, 358–59, 362, 364, 370, 380, 392, 403, 410. *See also* homonormativity
- homonormativity, xxxii, xxxvii, 59, 247, 287, 295, 297, 302–303, 308, 313, 365, 370–71, 392, 403, 410. *See also* homonationalism
- homophile groups, 112, 119, 121, 141, 152, 159, 169–70, 171–72, 173, 174, 177, 179–81, 186–87, 189, 191, 196, 202–204, 218–21, 275, 380, 392. *See also* Association for Social Knowledge (ASK); liberation movement, gay and lesbian; Mattachine Society; North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO)
- Homophile Reform Society, 181
- homophobia,
 - and activism, lv, 13, 229–30, 332–33;
 - in education, 230;
 - and Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) practices, xiv;
 - and gender analysis, 234;
 - and international development, xxxiii–xxxiv, 307–308;
 - in museums, 332;
 - and oppression, 13;
 - and racism, 292, 299–300, 307–308, 335–36
- Homosexual Law Reform Society, 180
- homosexuality, historical terms for, lxvii–lxviii, 42–44, 46, 104. *See also* classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- Hooker, Evelyn, 115, 120, 130, 172, 185
- hooks, bell, 263, 406
- Hooper, Tom, xxxi, xxxviii, 333, 362–63, 409
- Housefather, Anthony, 415–16
- household economy, 23–25, 28, 30, 41, 63, 98. *See also* domestic labour; domestic sphere
- House of Commons. *See* Parliament, Canada
- housewives. *See* domestic labour
- Hudson's Bay Company, 56

- Human Rights Act, Canada, lxi, 276, 352
- human-rights strategy, by gay liberation movement. See rights-based approach, to gay liberation
- human trafficking, and sex work, 77, 317–18, 385
- hustlers. See sex work, male
- identification, sexual, 27–28, 38–41, 87, 96–97, 107, 150, 237–40, 370–75, 393, 404
- identity, as basis for organizing, 378–83; See also identity politics
- identity politics, liv–lvi, lxvi–lxviii, 28, 38–39, 87–88, 229–30, 298, 326, 368–72, 387, 397, 402
- Idle No More, xlvi, 51
- illness, homosexuality as. See medicalization of homosexuality
- Immigration Act (1952), 122–23
- Immigration and Refugee Board (IRB), 291, 321
- immigration, and settler colonialism, 68, 72; and urban poverty, 72–76, 79–80
- immigration policy, in Canada, xxxiv, 75, 122–23, 205, 238, 286, 291, 321–22; and homosexuality, 122–23, 322; and racism, 205, 286, 345, 361, 365, 398. See also refugee status, and sexuality
- immigration rights, for homosexual couples. See family-recognition rights
- imperialism, and sexual relations, xli, 10, 35–36, 37, 159. See also settler colonialism, and sexual relations
- incest, 135, 148. See also perverts/perversion; social-purity movement
- indecency. See criminalization of homosexuality; gross indecency
- Indian Act, xliii, 51, 58–59
- Indigeneity, xxi, 55, 332
- Indigenous peoples, activism, xvii, xviii–xix, xxi, xxviii, xl, xlv, xlviii, liv, lvi, 51–52, 62, 230, 308, 329–30, 366, 373, 404; colonization of, xl, xliii, 48–49, 52, 56–62, 68, 71–72; diversity within nations and cultures, 54–55; erotic practices, xl, xli, 7, 51–56; gender diversity of, xviii, xxi, xli–xliii, xlvii–xlviii, xlix, 7, 10, 22–23, 39, 51–55; genocide of, xviii–xix, xxi, xli, lxx, 48–49, 51, 53, 56–57, 61–62, 317, 326–27, 332, 367, 404–405, 407; and *Just Society Report*, 323, 326–28; kinship relations, xxiii, 19, 28, 43, 55–62, 98, 144, 305–306; legal status and colonial control, 58–59; memorialization of, 332; scholarship by, xxxviii, xxxix, xli–xlii, xlv, lii, lvi, 51, 52–53, 54–55, 59–61, 326, 384; women, xliii, 53, 56–59, 75, 77, 79, 317, 385. See also Two-Spirit
- Indigiqueer. See Two-Spirit
- individualism, xxiv, xxv, 27–28, 59–61, 406
- Ingraham, Chrys, 301–302
- infant mortality, 75–76, 80, 265
- International AIDS Conference, xiii, xxiv, lviii
- International AIDS Society, xiii
- International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), 219
- International Sex Equality Anonymous, 189. See also homophile groups
- internationalism, xxvii, xlv, 347, 364–66
- InterPride, 358
- intersectionality, 238–39, 284, 292, 323, 326–27, 335, 339, 393–94, 396–99, 410
- intersex people, xlvi, 53, 354, 384
- inverts, lviii, 11, 29, 35, 37, 88, 114, 130, 134, 140, 183. See also classification of sexuality; criminalization of homosexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners; medicalization of homosexuality
- Irving, Dan, 350
- Islamic Cultural Centre (Québec City), 307, 361
- Islamophobia, 361
- Israeli state, xxxiii, xxxvi, 356–59
- Jack Canuck, 79, 96. See also *Police Gazette*
- Jackson, Ed, 64, 360
- Jacques, Emanuel, 253–56
- job loss, due to homosexuality. See purge campaigns of homosexuals from government employment
- John Howard Society, 179, 187
- Johnson, Boris, xlv, 338
- Jorgensen, Christine, 151
- Justice Weekly*, 120–21. See also newspapers, coverage of homosexuality
- Just Society Report* (2016), xxxviii, xli, 291, 325–28, 333, 339, 393, 412, 415. See also *Egale*
- “Just Society” (Liberal political project), xxxiv, 205, 291, 363

- juvenile delinquency, 73, 102, 145
 juvenile, legal definition of, 158, 205. *See also*
 youth
- Kaan, Heinrich, 31, 104
 Kaba, Mariame, lii, 405
 Kamp Publishing, 187–89
 Karaian, Lara, 362, 416
 Katz, Jonathan Ned, lxxvii, 28, 42, 47, 57, 370,
 375–76
 Katz, Sidney, 104, 168, 181, 188, 190, 201
 Kenney, Jason, 322, 338
 Kerr, Richard, 165, 188
 Kessler, Suzanne J., xlvi, 354
 Keynesianism, 204, 247, 285, 286, 340
 Khogali, Yusra, 361–62. *See also* Black Lives
 Matter, Toronto
 Khosla, Prabha, 349
 King, Mackenzie, 98
 Kinsey, Alfred, 110
 Kinsey studies, 16, 110–12, 114, 120, 130, 173, 180,
 185, 187, 194, 239
 Kinsey scale, 11, 149
 kinship relations, Indigenous. *See* Indigenous
 peoples, kinship relations
 Kirkup, Kyle, 311
 Klein, Alice, 74
 Klippert case, 176, 183, 185, 196–202, 205, 209,
 211, 306
 Korchinski-Paquet, Regis, xxviii
 Krafft-Ebing, Richard von, 10–11, 37, 84–85, 104,
 114, 235–36
 Krever Commission of Inquiry, 271, 335
- Labouchere Amendment, 82
 Labour Congress Pride and Solidarity confer-
 ence, 349
 Ladder, *The*, 119–20, 172, 177. *See also* news-
 letters, gay organizations
 Land Back movement, xviii, xix, xxi, xl, xlii, liv,
 52, 62, 339, 343, 347, 376, 404
 land ownership, and colonization of indigen-
 ous lands, 60–61
 language, and oppression, xlix
 La Presse (Montréal newspaper), 85–86
 Laprise, Gérard, 212
 lavatories, used for sexual activities. *See* gay
 sites, for sexual activities, lavatories
 law and order, strategies of, xxxii, 146, 202, 248,
 254, 285–86, 323, 339, 409
 Lawson, Michael Wade, 359. *See also* police,
 killing of Black people
- legal categories, for homosexuality. *See* classi-
 fication of sexuality
 leisure, 42, 98, 144, 226
 Lenon, Suzanne, xxxvii, 285, 294, 300, 301–303,
 307, 325–27, 329, 347, 362, 406, 416
 Lesbian and Gay Pride Day, Toronto, lix
 Lesbian Avengers, lviii
 lesbians,
 activism, lviii, 220–21, 232, 252;
 bathhouse nights, 289;
 butch/femme culture, xxxii, 118–19, 164, 167,
 174–75, 189, 222, 232, 235;
 community formation, 164, 167, 230;
 culture, and class and race, 38, 189;
 culture, historical, 24, 86, 96–98, 118–19,
 167–68, 175;
 establishments, 164–65, 222–23, 226;
 feminist movement, 132, 166, 218, 221, 222, 329,
 356, 363, 374, 381;
 feminist theory, lxix, 235;
 gay capitalism, exclusion from, 225, 226;
 gay men, comparison with, lxix, 24;
 and gender identity, 235;
 and gender inversion, 233;
 identities, 96;
 law-reform discussions, 189–90;
 literature, 43, 100, 119, 173, 221;
 media representation of, 100, 190, 191, 221,
 233, 250–51;
 in military, 133;
 in Montréal, 38, *see also* Gidlow, Elsa;
 and motherhood, 231, 243, 251;
 neighborhoods, 223;
 and the police, 127–28, 150, 168, 256;
 in scientific/medical discourse, 43;
 sexism within gay liberation movement,
 220–21;
 term, historical use of, lxxvii–lxviii, lxix, 38,
 86, 123;
 in Toronto, 118–19, 121, 164–65;
 two-gender binary, 43.
See also feminism; women
 Lesbians Against the Right, 259
 Lesbians of Colour, 348
 Lesbians Making History Collective, 121, 128
 Levi, Rodney, xxviii
 Lewis, Holly, xxxviii
 Leznoff, Maurice, 108, 114–18, 130, 237–38
 LGBT Purge Fund. *See* Purge Fund
 liberalism, liv, 286, 300, 388–91, 393, 394, 402.
See also neoliberalism

- Liberal Party, xxxv, lviii, 202, 205–207, 242, 249–50, 281, 305, 309, 325, 340, 391
 Light, Beth, 65, 66, 76
 liberation movement, gay and lesbian, lxiv, lxx, 132, 164, 204, 216, 217–22, 226, 240, 279, 295, 407. *See also* homophile groups
 liberation/liberatory politics, xiv, xv, xxi, xxii, xxvii, xxxix, xliv, xlvi, liv–lv, lvii, lxiii–lxvi, lxviii–lxix, lxxi, 4, 295–96, 301, 308, 316, 339–41, 343–44, 346–47, 352–53, 366–68, 372–74, 376, 380–82, 394–401, 403–406. *See also* abolitionism; liberation movement, gay and lesbian
 literature, homosexual, 89, 100, 119, 120, 169, 173, 188, 263. *See also* lesbians, literature
 Little Sister's Book and Art Emporium (Vancouver), lx, 263. *See also* establishments, commercial, for gay community
 logging and mining communities, 66–68
 Loku, Andrew, 359–60. *See also* police, killing of Black people
 London (Ontario), lx, 145, 153, 274–75, 307
 London (UK), 25, 107–109
 Lord, Cassandra, 362
 Lorde, Audre, lvi, 406, 408
 Lombroso, Cesare, 37, 85, 88
 love, politically transformative, 406–408
 Lower Canada, 63, 65, 71
 Lupien, Jean, 183–85. *See also* Boisvert/Lupien case

Maclean's (magazine), 104, 181, 188, 190
 Macdonald, John A., 68
 macho homosexuality, 234–35. *See also* masculinity
 MacInnes, Grace, 206, 208
 MacMurchy, Helen, 97
 magazines, homosexual, 87, 119–21, 133, 165, 167, 187–89, 220, 360;
 censorship of, lx, 262–64;
 lesbian, lx, 175, 263–64;
 physique, 131, 166–67
 magazines, mainstream,
 coverage of homosexuality, 104, 110, 112, 181, 189, 191, 225;
 for women, 98–99, 302
 Malinowski, Bronislaw, 10
 Maloney, Peter, 225, 277
 managed capitalism. *See* capitalism, managed
 Mantha, Leo, 125–26
 Marcuse, Herbert, 305, 407–408
 market economy, impact on sexual relations, 59, 72
 Markland, George Herchmer, 64–65
 marriage,
 companionate, 42–43, 98, 153;
 and consumerism, 98;
 heterosexual character of, xxxii–xxxiii, xli, 43, 98–100, 176–77, 295;
 and household economy/inheritance, 24, 28;
 and immigration, 75–76;
 and motherhood, 75–76, 99;
 and race, 75–76, 293, 299–301;
 and settler-colonial relations, 53, 56–57, 59–60, 306;
 sexual relations outside of, xli, 10, 76–77, 79, 81, 102, 133, 150;
 social recognition and privileges, 303–304;
 and women in work force, 75–76, 98–99, 133. *See also* motherhood; same-sex marriage struggle
 Marshall, George, 133–34
 Marshall, John, 234
 Marx, Karl, l, lv–lvi
 Marxist method, xx, l–liv, lxiii, 4–6, 8, 14–15, 17–18, 27, 37, 298, 371, 375, 403
 Marxism, politics, 124, 387. *See also* autonomist Marxism
 Mary Annes, 40. *See also* classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners; sex work, male
 masculinity,
 colonial imposition of, 36, 57, 373;
 cultural formations of, 33–34, 41–42, 232–34, 391;
 and heterosexuality, 29, 34, 101, 104, 204, 373, 391;
 and labour, 33–34, 36, 41, 298;
 and lesbian culture, 34, 118–19, 232;
 military ideals of, 27, 101–102, 104, 107;
 patriarchal relations, lxix, 33;
 puberty and, 7, 36;
 public/private, 30;
 and RCMP, 134, 276;
 sexual harassment, 391;
 and sexuality, 16, 33–34, 36, 98, 126–27, 134, 204, 231–32.
 See also effeminacy, and patriarchal hegemony; gender binary
 Massad, Joseph, l, 347, 364–65
 masturbation,
 and COVID-19, 377;

- as crime, 67, 168;
and homosexuality, 46–47, 67, 78, 79, 81, 82,
168–69;
as sexual aberration, 10;
and social-purity campaigns, 33, 35, 47, 79,
81–82;
and youth, 31–33, 35, 78, 81–82, 87, 110, 145, 150.
See also social-purity movement
- Mattachine Society, 112, 119–20, 123, 169, 170,
172–73, 176–77, 187, 189. See also homo-
phile groups
- Mattachine Review*, 119, 120, 176. See also news-
letters, gay organizations
- Matters, *Indiana*, 69
- Maynard, Steven, xi, xii, lii, 68–69, 86, 91,
94–96, 225, 295, 414
- Mayne, Xavier, 84
- McAfee, Les, 291. See also *Egale*
- McArthur murders (Toronto), xxxvi, 316, 323,
384
- McCabe, Trisha, 156
- McCarthyism, 19, 123, 128, 169. See also
national-security campaigns against
homosexuality
- McCaskell, Tim, lii, 285–86, 288, 289–90,
291–93, 296, 306, 308, 311, 313–15, 320, 347,
356, 361
- McDade, Tony, xxviii
- McRuer Commission (1954). See Royal
Commission on Criminal Sexual
Psychopaths (1954)
- McRuer, James Chalmers, 137, 139, 141
- media, mainstream, coverage of,
AIDS, see AIDS, media coverage of;
anti-Black racism, xxxv, 311, 361;
crimes, 86, 95, 135, 137, 140, 145–46, 187,
199–201, 253–56, 255–56, 257, 360;
heterosexual hegemony, lxiii, 9, 12–14, 19, 32,
41–42, 98–99, 112, 214, 248–51, 322, 384, 404;
homosexuality, 37, 88, 100, 115, 144–47, 150,
153, 174, 177, 187–88, 189–91, 201–202, 205,
224–27, 233, 250–53, 272, 282, 328, 330,
370–71, 388–90, 413;
police activities, 79, 96, 255–59, 261–62,
360–61, 41;
same-sex marriage, lviii–lix.
See also magazines, mainstream, coverage
of homosexuality
- media literacy, 252
- medical authority, xxiv, 11, 46, 49, 71–72, 79,
82, 84, 94, 96, 101, 105, 112, 122, 134, 137, 146,
148–49, 154, 156, 169, 190–91, 199, 202, 204,
209, 346–47, 351, 383, 399–400, 404. See
also classification of sexuality; expert
authority
- medicalization of homosexuality, xlvi, xlviij,
7, 16, 19, 29, 31–32, 34–36, 39, 41, 43, 47, 53,
79, 84–85, 94, 101, 105–106, 112, 114, 134–35,
138, 148–50, 154, 156, 158–59, 163–64, 180,
182, 190, 202–206, 209–15, 217, 219, 277,
336–37, 345;
and AIDS, 240–41, 245, 265–72, 311, 383
- Medicare, 205, 241
- Melody Room (Toronto), 165, 168, 187–88,
225–36. See also establishments, commer-
cial, for gay community
- Memorial University of Newfoundland, xii,
xxxvi
- mental illness, approach to homosexuality. See
medicalization of homosexuality
- mercantile capitalism. See capitalism
- Methodist Church/Methodism, Canadian, 26,
73–74, 81–83
- Métis, 52, 56–58, 68
- MeToo movement, 354–56. See also sexual
harassment
- Mewett, Alan, 191–92, 206
- middle class. See responsibilizing strategy;
neoliberalism
- Mi'Kmaq, 52, 58
- Mi'kma'ki, fishery struggle, xix
- military,
buggery in, 26–27, 63–64, 65, 95;
and Criminal Code reform (1969), 134,
156–57, 185–86, 204;
discrimination against homosexuals, xxxiii,
19, 88, 101–102, 103, 133–35, 276–77, 304, 329;
homosexual networks, created in, 32, 64–65,
85, 88, 101, 107–109, 126;
imperialist wars, and sex and gender rela-
tions, 35–36;
lesbians in, 103, 127, 133;
and LGBT Purge Fund, 328;
masculinity, see masculinity, military
ideals of;
medical discharge due to sexuality, 101–104,
106, 125–26, 133–35;
and nationalism, 35–36;
psychiatric testing, 101–102, 103–107, 126,
129–33;
punishments for homosexual activity,
133–35, 156–57;

- purge campaign within, xviii, xxxi, 125,
 127–29, 133–35, 186, 277, 327–28, 330–31,
 382, 412;
 security risk, homosexuals as, 19, 123–29;
 sexual orientation protection in, lxi, 276–77;
 and sex work, 65, 102–103;
 United States, comparison with Canada,
 125;
 United States, and homosexuality, 103, 106;
 venereal disease, campaign against, 102–103;
 women in, 101, 103, 133;
 youth organizations, 36
- Milk, Harvey, 224, 252
- Mill, John Stuart, 155, 162
- Mills, Roswell George, 88
- minority identity, xxxii, xli, xlvi, lxvi, 12, 46,
 112, 121, 124, 140, 142, 174, 199, 224, 236–41,
 248, 251, 259, 295, 326, 369, 372–76. *See also*
 essentialism; identification, sexual
- Mitchell, Norma, 175, 186. *See also* Association
 for Social Knowledge (ASK)
- Mohamed, Lali, 360
- Mohr, Johann, 113, 150
- mollies, 25–26, 29, 38. *See also* classification of
 sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex
 practitioners
- monkeypox, 378
- monogamy, xli, 59–60, 156, 268, 304–305,
 306. *See also* heterosexual hegemony;
 marriage
- Montagu-Wildebloode trial (1954), 153–54
- Montréal,
 activism in, lviii, 220;
 gay life in, 85–86, 114–18, 121, 165, 168, 173, 189,
 222–23, 237–38, 289;
 gay village, 222–23, 323;
 lesbian culture in, 87–88, 118, 121, 221;
 Pride Committee, 313, 381;
 New France, 63;
 police actions against homosexuals, xxxvi,
 lx–lxi, 86–87, 115, 140, 168–69, 170, 189, 224,
 256–57, 289, 323, 381, 384
- Moore, Chantel, xxviii
- moral conservatism,
 AIDS mobilization, lx, lxx, 249, 377;
 and family-recognition rights for homosex-
 uals, lviii, 275–76, 293;
 and feminism, xlvi, 248, 353–54, 384–85, 389;
 and nationalism, xlvi, 314, 378–79;
 and neoliberalism, 285–87, 338–39, 340, 377,
 373, 387, 382, 405;
- pro-family ideology, 249–50, 285–86,
 318–19, 398;
 and racism, 248–49, 285, 300, 388, 405;
 and religion, 160, 163, 214, 243, 248, 318–19;
 and respectability, 33, 245, 275–76, 279,
 379, 392;
 and same-sex marriage, 300, 303, 305–306;
 and sex work, xlvi, 249–50, 316;
 and youth protection, 281.
- See also* neoliberalism, and moral con-
 servatism; responsabilizing strategy;
 social-purity movement
- moral panics, 12, 19, 135–36, 153, 253–56, 259
- moral reformers. *See* social-purity movement
- Morality Department (Toronto), 94–95
- Morality Squad (Toronto), 168, 210. *See also*
 social-purity movement
- Morgensen, Scott (anthropologist), xlii–xliii,
 326
- Mort, Frank, 19–20, 22, 156, 161
- Moss Park (Toronto), 290. *See also*
 gentrification
- motherhood,
 and AIDS, 268;
 homosexuality, cause of, 12, 99, 112, 145,
 147–48, 188, 235;
 institutionalized, 35–36, 43, 75–76, 78–81,
 144, 297–98;
 as natural instinct, 80–81, 97, 99;
 and patriotism, 97;
 queer, lxi, 231, 243–44, 249, 296–98, 398, *see*
 also family-recognition rights;
 training for, 75–76, 97, 99, 147–48.
- See also* parenthood
- Motion Picture Production Code (1934), 98
- Mount Cashel Orphanage, lx, 272–73
- Mulrone, Brian, 250, 324
- multiculturalism, official policies in Canada,
 xiv–xv, xiii, xxx–xxxi, xxxiv, 205, 238, 293,
 300, 302, 306, 322, 326–27, 330, 339, 348,
 393–94
- mummery/mumming, 66
- Murphy, Meghan, xxxvi–xxxvii, 387
- Murray, Stephen O., 238
- Music Room (Toronto), 165–66, 168, 170, 187,
 188, 222, 225–26. *See also* establishments,
 commercial, for gay community
- Muskrat Falls dam project, struggle against,
 52, 62
- Mykhalovskiy, Eric, 271

- NACHO. See North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO)
- National Defense, Department of, 102, 104, 128, 130, 134, 186, 277
- National Film Board (NFB), 124
- national-security campaigns against homosexuality, 112, 120, 122, 123–34, 140, 157, 179, 185–86, 213, 276–77, 308, 324–25, 328–31
- national-security policing. See war on terror
- Native American Gay and Lesbian Gathering, Third Annual (1990), 52, 54. See also Two-Spirit
- naturalism, critique of, lxxv, 3–4, 8, 14
- navy, homosexuals in, 16, 26–27, 124, 125–26. See also military, homosexuality in
- NDP. See New Democratic Party (NDP)
- neoliberalism, xxxii, 338–40;
 - capitalism, xxxii, xxxii, xxxvii, 287, 291, 306, 339–40, 362, 392;
 - emergence of, 285–86, 409;
 - fiscal policies, 280;
 - forms of sexual regulation, 383–84;
 - in Global South, 285;
 - moral conservatism, 285–87, 338–40, 377, 373, 387, 382, 398, 405;
 - opposition to, xxxii, 344;
 - privatization, policy of, 245, 293–95, 297, 310, 336, 339, 378, 384, 389, 392, 399;
 - privatization, of queer sexualities, xxxii, 164, 218, 286–87, 363–64, 384, 388–89, 392, 399
- neoliberal queer, xv, xxxiii–xxxiv, xxxviii, 344, 393, 409
- Nesbitt, Jack, lxi, 241
- networks, social. See communities
- New Democratic Party (NDP), xl, xl, lxiv, 178, 181, 201, 207–208, 210–11, 242–43, 281, 309, 325, 339, 351, 401–402, 415. See also Svend Robinson
- Newfoundland, lix, 66, 220, 223, 262, 272, 280, 293
- New France, 63–64. See also Québec
- newsletters, gay organizations, 119–21, 172–173, 176–77, 221
- newspapers, coverage of homosexuality, lix, 47, 64, 86, 95–96, 112, 115, 119, 120–21, 128, 146, 160, 169, 173, 181, 201, 253, 255, 414–16. See also media, mainstream, coverage of homosexuality
- Newton, Esther, 164, 166, 369
- New York, gay communities in, xxxi, lviii, lxiv, 86, 102, 117, 166–67, 187, 217–18, 224, 400, 406
- Ng, Yvonne Chi-Ying, 254–55
- Ng, Roxana, lxxv
- Nichols, Gary, 177–78, 181
- Noble, Bobby, 352–53
- No Conversion Canada, 337
- No More Silence Pride Day rally, xix–xx, xlvi
- No One is Illegal (NOII), 322
- No Pride in Genocide organizing, xviii–xxi, xxvi, xxix, lvi, 52, 62, 339, 344, 346, 376, 384
- No Pride in Policing Coalition (NPPC), xix–xx, xxviii, xlix, 324, 344–45, 349, 361–62, 392, 411, 417
- non-binary people, xxxv, xlvi, xlvi, lii, 12, 294, 318, 350–51, 365, 368, 371, 407. See also essentialism; gender binary; trans people
- normalization of homosexuality. See responsabilizing strategy
- North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO), 172, 189, 203
- North American Conference on Church and the Family, 177
- Nova Scotia, xxxiv, lviii, lix, lx, lxii, 86, 123, 271, 280, 283, 337, 358
- NPPC. See No Pride in Policing Coalition (NPPC)
- obscenity legislation, lx, 119, 167, 188, 230, 262–64, 309, 383, 385, 389, 409. See also pornography
- offences against morality, 92, 93, 121. See also buggery
- Olson, Axel Otto, 139–41, 143, 392
- One (magazine), 119–21, 167, 170, 172, 177, 187. See also magazines, homosexual
- Ontario Mental Hospitals Act, 149
- Ontario Ministry of Education, 318
- Operation Soap. See bathhouse raids
- opioid crisis, xxvi
- Oscar Wilde type, 46, 89–90. See also epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- organizing, gay and lesbian. See activism; homophile groups; liberation movement, gay and lesbian
- orientalism, xxvii, xxxii, xxxvi, 307–308, 358–59. See also homonationalism
- Ottawa,
 - gay sites, 127–28, 132, 256;
 - homosexual groups in, 221, 319;
 - memorial, 332
- Our Sons (1914), 46–47
- outcast status, of homosexuals, 25, 36

- overt and covert homosexuals, xxxii, 114–17, 130, 188, 190. *See also* classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- Padgug, Robert A., 6
- PAL. *See* Parents' Action League
- Palestinian solidarity activism, xxxiii, 308, 356–59, 364. *See also* Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QUAIA)
- Palmer, Bryan, 72
- pandemic. *See* AIDS; COVID-19
- parenting. *See* family
- parental rights, for homosexuals. *See* family-recognition rights
- Paris Accords, xlv
- Parents' Action League (PAL), 145–49, 179, 192
- Parker, Andrew, 3
- parks. *See* gay sites, for sexual activities, parks
- Parliament, Canada, lix, 77, 93–94, 123, 178, 181, 185, 201, 205–206, 257, 274, 303, 305, 306, 333, 413–15
- Parr, Joy, 66, 76
- patriarchy. *See* family, heterosexual; hetero-patriarchy; heterosexual hegemony; masculinity
- Patton, Cindy, 268
- PCEPA (Protection of Communities and Exploited Person Act), 317–18, 385
- Pearce, Frank, 9, 253
- Pearlston, Karen, xxxi, 362, 416
- Pearson, Lester B., 127, 205
- pedagogy, xlii, xlvi, 61–62, 128, 248, 302, 372, 403
- pedophiles/pedophilia, accusations against homosexuals, 136, 148, 150–51, 235. *See also* classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- personal life, 29, 40, 42
- perverts/perversion,
 - in AIDS crisis, 240;
 - criminalization of, 11, 15, 17, 46, 64, 68, 81, 91, 95, 103, 113, 122, 124, 163, 190, 209;
 - and heterosexual norms, 29, 32;
 - medical classification, 31–32, 34, 82, 84–85;
 - psychiatric classification, 10, 20, 32, 34, 85, 106, 113, 122, 148, 226;
 - and racism, 68, 77, 85, 365;
 - sexual deviation, replacement by, 134, 143, 148–49, 154, 190–92, 209–10, 219;
 - and social decay, 33, 36–37, 42–43, 47, 76–77, 79–82, 85, 148, 159, 168, 212–13.
- See also* classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- Peters, Arnold, xxxi, 177–78, 181, 211
- Peterson, Jordan, 387
- pharmaceutical industry, xxii, xxiv–xxvi, lviii, 269–70, 272, 347, 399–400
- Philips, Nathan, 148
- physique magazines, 131, 134, 166–67. *See also* magazines, homosexual
- Piercy, Marge, 309
- pink market, 285–86. *See also* gay market; gay neighbourhoods/villages/ghettoes
- pinkwashing, by Israeli state, xxxiii–xxxvi, 357–59
- pipelines, activism against, 52, 62, 308, 347
- Pleasure Palace/Pussy Palace (Toronto), 288–89
- pluralism, 239, 326, 393–96
- PLWAs (People Living With AIDS). *See* AIDS, people living with
- Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia (PCP). *See* AIDS, treatments for
- Police Gazette, 79
- police,
 - brutality, xxi;
 - defunding/abolition of, xiv–xv, xxviii, xxx, xxxix, liv–lvi, 282, 324, 343–48, 376, 384, 392, 385, 396, 405, 404–406, 417;
 - development of, 65–66;
 - encampments, campaigns against, xxi–xxii, xxvi, xxxvi, 290;
 - as expert source, 13, 36, 91, 94, 135, 138, 141, 143, 154, 183, 193–94, 197, 214, 263–64, 383;
 - and health, xxii, xxiv, xxix;
 - harassment of homosexuals, xxxvi, lvii–lviii, lix–lx, lxiv, 37, 85–86, 89–90, 117–19, 120, 123, 138, 140–43, 162, 170, 186–89, 197, 215, 221, 225, 262–63, 288, 323–24, 357;
 - and informants, homosexual, 128–29, 197, 275;
 - killing of Black people, xiv–xv, xvii–xxviii, xxxii, xxxvi, 258, 314, 343–45, 359–61;
 - and racism, xxix–xxx, 69, 253–55, 288, 323–24, 328, 359;
 - records/reports, 5, 11, 47, 90, 142–43, 184–85, 193, 197;
 - reform, 260, 345–46, 382;
 - and the right wing/conservatives, 29, 238, 240, 248–49, 253–54, 279, 281, 287, 338, 389;
 - and sex work, xlvi, 80, 114, 159, 184, 254–58, 274–75, 290, 316–17, 334, 384, 417;

- surveillance, 90, 94–96, 115, 157, 167–69, 180, 193–94, 257, 274–75, 278;
- and Toronto Pride, xix–xx, xxviii–xxix, xxxiv–xxxvii, 313–14, 328, 332, 340, 345–46, 361, 411, 417.
- See also bathhouse raids; Criminal Code of Canada, reform (1969), police enforcement of; sexual policing
- political candidates, gay, 223–24
- political correctness, 280, 387
- polyamory, 304–305, 306, 310, 398–99
- polymorphous perversity, 305
- popular culture, 40, 166–67, 205, 226, 231–34, 248, 283–84, 291, 302, 371
- pornography, lx, 230, 246, 249–50, 262–64, 273–75, 278, 289, 384–86, 388–91
- postmodernism, xxxviii–xxxix
- post-structuralism, xxxviii, lxix–lxx
- poverty,
- and AIDS, 271, 296, 400–401;
 - and queer rights, 287, 295–97, 351;
 - and race, xxx, 287, 345, 359;
 - urban, 72–73, 80, 148;
 - and welfare, 43, 205, 314, 344, 351, 355, 397;
 - working-class, l, liii.
- See also activism, anti-poverty; capitalism, and relations of exploitation
- Prentice, Alison, 65, 71
- PREP, 336, 377
- Pride Coalition for Free Speech (PCFS), 358
- Pride Toronto, xix–xx, xxii, xxviii–xxxi, xxxiv–xxxvi, 259, 308, 312–14, 321, 324, 340, 345, 350, 356–59, 361, 381, 387, 411–12, 416–17;
- corporate funding/sponsorship of, xl, 306–307, 313–14, 321, 344, 350, 356–57, 392, 402.
- See also Black Lives Matter, and Pride celebrations; Egale; neoliberal queer; police, and Toronto Pride
- prisons,
- abolition of, xix–xx, xxxix, xlvi, lv, 344, 346, 352, 383, 390–92, 394–96, 401, 404–406, 409, 417;
 - and COVID-19, xxii, xxx;
 - homosexual activity in, 16, 96, 158, 177;
 - jurisdiction over offenders, 135, 138, 176, 179, 209, 214, 354–55;
 - and neoliberalism, xxxii, 285–87, 338–39;
 - punishment for homosexuality, 63–65, 67, 68, 93–94, 135, 138, 196–97, 209;
 - racism in, liv, 308;
 - and trans people, xx, xxxii, xlvi, 352.
- See also criminalization of homosexuality
- private property, xxxii, xlii, 59–60, 155, 160, 162, 244–45, 287, 290, 359, 389, 409
- privatization. See neoliberalism; public/private regulatory strategy
- proletarianization, l–li
- productivity. See capitalism, and productivity
- propaganda, 256, 352
- Protection of Communities and Exploited Person Act (PCEPA), 317–18, 385
- protests. See activism
- psychiatry,
- authority of, 11, 13, 31, 36, 94, 104, 105, 135–36, 138, 146–49, 156, 169–70, 190, 199, 214, 219, 345, 404;
 - categorization of sexualities/sexual practices, 10–11, 19, 31–32, 34–35, 36–37, 39, 41, 84–85, 103–106, 113, 149–52, 171, 219;
 - and Catholicism, 85;
 - for detection of homosexuals, 102, 105–106, 113, 129–33, 178;
 - and gay liberation movement, 217, 219, 245;
 - heterosexual hegemony, role in, 101, lxiii, 19;
 - and legal institutions, 36–37, 104, 122, 135–36, 138, 141, 143–44, 156, 158, 163, 178, 180–83, 192, 196–98, 202, 204, 209, 214, 376;
 - and the media, 146–49, 190, 201;
 - medical field, conflict with, 134.
- See also classifications of sexuality; science and sexuality; treatments to “cure” homosexuality
- psychoanalysis, 177
- psychopaths, sexual,
- criminalization of, 122–23, 135–39;
 - immigration, 122–23;
 - media coverage of, 104, 145–46, 148, 190;
 - military classification of, 103–107, 129, 133;
 - police classification of, 136–38, 139, 143–44, 153;
 - psychiatric classification of, 103–104, 105–106, 122, 130–31, 138, 150;
 - in United States, 104, 106–107, 110, 135, 136.
- See also classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners; Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths (1954)
- Puar, Jasbir, xxvii, xxxi, 307–308, 347
- public decency, 154–55
- public health, xiii, xvii, xxii–xxv, xxix, 84, 91, 212, 219, 240, 265–69, 271, 310, 345–47, 377–78,

- 382, 400. See also AIDS; COVID-19, safety measures; sex hygiene; social-purity movement
- public opinion, media creation of, 137–38, 149, 187, 191, 252–53. See also media, mainstream
- public/private regulatory strategy, 36, 73, 110, 154–63, 182, 195, 203–204, 207, 209, 211–12, 214–15, 244, 255, 260–61, 279–81, 297, 354, 363–64, 378, 385–86, 389–91, 395
- Public Safety Canada, xxxiv
- public sex. See gay sites, for sexual activities
- public sphere, 36, 73, 98, 144, 161, 245, 281
- publications, homosexual. See magazines, homosexual; newsletters, gay organizations
- Punch Up collective, xxvi
- purge campaigns of homosexuals from government employment, xviii, xxxi, 123–125, 127, 140, 177, 179, 186, 276–77, 308, 324–31, 332, 339–40, 362, 382, 412–13
- Purge Fund, LGBT, xviii, xli, 328, 331–33, 344, 392, 402, 413
- purity movement. See social-purity movement
- Putin, Vladimir, 338
- Quakers, 170, 175, 187
- Québec, history, lxx, 45, 48, 127, 220–21
- Queen's Park (Toronto), lix, 91, 94, 99–100, 165, 243, 411. See also gay sites, for sexual activities, parks; Toronto, gay community
- queer theory, xxxviii, li, lxix–lxx, 3, 13, 233–35, 237, 370–71, 375
- queer, use of term, xxxviii, lvii, lxix
- Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* (TV series), xl
- Queer Nation groups, lviii, lxii, 13, 226, 229
- queer nationalism, xxxviii, lviii, lxii, 13, 226, 229, 235. See also homonationalism
- queer neoliberalism. See neoliberal queer
- Queer Trans Community Defence, 290
- Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QUAIA), xxxvi, 292, 308, 356–59, 381, 387, 392
- Queers Crash the Beat, xxxvi
- racial capitalism, 286, 327, 372. See also capitalism, racial character of
- racism,
 - anti-Asian, xxiii, 32, 69, 75, 372;
 - anti-Black, xiii–xviii, xx, xxxiv, xlix, li–lii, lvi, 12, 258, 300–301, 334–36, 343, 359–60, 372–73, 381;
- in Canada, xx, xxvii–xviii, xxxiv, xxxix–xlv, lxx, lxix, 75, 291, 300–301, 332, 344–45; and climate crisis, xxxix–xlv; and drag, 166–67; and Egale, xxix, xli, 291–93, 300–301, 327–28, 340; in feminism, 79, 353; and immigration, 87, 205, 298, 323; anti-Indigenous, xiii, xl–xli, xlix, 37, 52, 260, 317, 327, 338, 343, 345, 361, 373, 376, 390, 404, 405; and Marxism, xx, lvi; and the police, lvi, 258, 260, 288, 343–44, 359–60, 376, 412; and Pride Toronto, xviii, xxviii, xxix, xxxv–xxxvii, 308, 340, 350, 381, 412; protests against, xxviii, xxxvii, 260, 292, 339, 343–46, 349–50, 361, 404–405, 411; in the queer community, xiii, xv, xxix–xxx, xxxv, lxii, lxviii–lxix, 88, 218, 228, 230, 233, 236, 239, 291–93, 300–301, 327, 339, 346, 348–49, 360, 376–77, 381–82, 387, 396–97, 410; and sex-related offenses, 68–69. See also AIDS, and racism; anti-racism; settler colonialism; white supremacy
- Rae, Kyle, 223, 288–89, 357
- railway expansion, Canada, 66, 72
- Raj, Rupert, 294
- Rankin, Murray, 333, 415–16
- Rao, Rahul, xxxiii–xxxiv, 1, 285, 315, 347, 366, 407
- rape, 69, 136, 145, 181, 355. See also sexual violence
- RCMP,
 - anti-homosexuality, 123, 125–127, 196–98, 276–77;
 - and hiring, 276–77;
 - and informants, homosexual, 127–29, 133;
 - internal investigations, 123, 127–29, 134, 138, 186, 214, 329, 331;
 - and Klippert, Everett George, 196–98; and lesbians, 128, 133;
 - military, investigation of homosexuals in, 133–34, 186, 276–77;
 - national-security investigations, 125–29, 130–34, 276–77;
 - surveillance of homosexuals, 127–30, 134, 329;
 - testing, for homosexuals, 130–33;
 - and Warkins, John, 127;
 - Wet'suwet'en land, invasion of, xvii, xviii, xix, xliv, 363, 411.

- See also criminalization of homosexuality, and RCMP; national-security campaigns against homosexuality; purge campaigns of homosexuals from government employment
- Reagan, Ronald, 248, 286
- Rechy, John, 16, 173
- recreational spaces. See gay sites
- Reformation, England, impact on justice system/Church courts, 22
- Reform Party, 224, 249–50, 279
- refugees,
 - right-wing attacks against, 338, 339, 361;
 - sexuality and status, xxiii, 1, 291, 320–23, 329, 352, 365–66.
 See also immigration policy, in Canada
- regulation, by communities. See communities, homosexual, oppression within
- reification, 15. See also fetishism, of commodities
- reservation system, in Canada, xliii, 56, 58, 68
- residential school system, xiv, xviii, xlii–xliii, 51, 56–58, 404
- resource extraction, xlii, xlv, xlv, 60, 62, 327, 344, 347
- respectability, notions of. See social-purity movement
- responsibilizing strategy, xxxii, 244–45, 247, 253, 280–82, 289–291, 301–302, 309, 378–79, 381, 384, 388, 392, 397. See also neoliberal queer
- restaurants. See gay sites, for sexual activities, restaurants
- revolutionary social transformation. See abolitionism; liberation/liberatory politics
- right-to-life groups. See abortion, anti-choice groups.
- Right to Privacy Committee (RTPC), 228, 258–59, 288, 363–64, 390, 410
- rights-based approach, to gay liberation, xx, xlvi, 221, 294, 351–53, 363–64. See also abolitionism; liberation/liberatory politics; neoliberal queer
- right-wing,
 - discourse, 123, 158, 256, 387–88, 391–92;
 - governments, lxi–lxii, xlv, 286, 338–39, 388;
 - opposition to gay rights, xlviii, 236, 239–40, 247–48, 280, 353–54, 373, 392, 399;
 - organizations, xlviii, 29, 249–50, 252, 356, 388;
 - protests, Canada (2022–23), xvii, xxv–xxvi, xlviii, 338–39, 405.
- See also Conservative party; moral conservatives
- Roberts, Wayne, 74
- Robinson, Svend, 223–24, 329, 331
- Roe v. Wade*, 299
- Roman Catholic Church. See Catholic church
- Roosevelt, Theodore, 36
- Rose, Rebecca, 147, 337
- Rosenes, Ron, 414–17
- Ross, Becki, 119
- Rossi, River, 306, 362
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police. See RCMP
- Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths (1954), 135–39, 141, 143–44, 163, 167–68, 198, 206, 392
- Royal Commission on Security (1968), 129, 185
- RTPC. See Right to Privacy Committee (RTPC)
- Rubin, Gayle, 235
- Russian revolution, 305
- Russo, Vito, 98
- Ryerson University. See Toronto Metropolitan University
- sadomasochism, 236, 252, 253. See also BDSM (Bondage, Discipline/Dominance, Submission/Sado-Masochism)
- safe-sex education, 273–74, 309, 377–78
- safe-sex organizing, xxiii, 267–68, 310, 316, 377
- Safe Third Country Agreement, 321–22
- Salah, Trish, 350
- Salvation Army, 74, 80
- Sambia of Papua, erotic practices, 7
- same-sex marriage,
 - Egale, 292–93, 300–301, 306, 314, 322;
 - and essentialism, 371;
 - legalization in Canada, xxxiv, 304–306, 308, 314, 330;
 - and moral conservatives, 305–306;
 - and neoliberalism, xxxvii–xxxviii, lv, 301–302, 320, 327, 350, 380, 389–90, 406, 409;
 - and queer relationships, 295, 300–306, 309–10, 320, 379, 380, 386, 397, 399;
 - and race, 299–303, 307, 335, 380;
 - and radical politics, 303–305.
 See also family-recognition rights; responsibilizing strategy
- Samuel, Christopher, 302
- Sanders, Doug, xxxi, 169–76, 179–86, 189, 191–92, 196, 198–99, 202–203, 278–79
- Saunders, Mark, 324, 360, 411–12

- San Francisco, gay community, 102, 170, 172, 189, 224, 251–53
- sapphism, 42
- Saskatchewan, lx, lxii, 67, 196, 220, 280, 291. See also Klippert case
- Saskatchewan Gay Coalition, lxii, 222
- Savage, Dan, 319
- Sawatsky, John, 130, 133
- school system. See education system
- scientific authority, xiii, xxiv–xxv, xliv–xlv, 110, 129, 147, 269 371. See also essentialism; expert authority
- scientific management, 97
- science and sexuality, xlvi, 10–11, 12, 13, 28, 29, 31–32, 34, 36–38, 40–41, 43, 46, 49, 76, 84–85, 88, 96–97, 104, 110–13, 122, 129–33, 141, 147, 150–51, 155, 160, 169, 171, 172, 194, 209–210, 233, 235–36, 268, 312, 335, 368
- Sears, Alan, xxxix, 285, 301
- Second World War. See World War II
- Secwepemc land defenders, liv, 52
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, lxix, 13
- seduction, legislation against, 77, 158, 239. See also criminalization of homosexuality, age of consent laws; social-purity movement; youth, corruption of
- Segal, Lynne, lxvi
- self-abuse. See masturbation
- Self and Sex* (book series), 81–82
- self-oppression, by lesbians and gay men. See communities, homosexual, oppression within
- settler colonialism,
 - character of Canada, xiv, xv, xvii–xviii, xix, xxvii, xxxix–xli, lxv, lxviii, 21, 45, 72, 306–307, 326–27, 329, 373;
 - European practices, 37;
 - government/administration, 59–61, 63, 66, 72;
 - language, 52–54, 56;
 - monuments, xviii;
 - power relations, 51–52, 58–59, 71, 298, 386, 407;
 - and sexual relations, xliii, 35–36, 39, 51–52, 54, 57–60, 384
- sex deviates. See deviants/deviates, sexual
- sex education. See education, sex
- sexology. See science and sexuality
- sex perversion. See perverts/perversion
- sex perverts, 37, 81, 122, 168. See also epithets for same-gender sex practitioners; perverts/perversion
- sex positivity, 396, 402
- sex psychology. See psychiatry; science and sexuality
- sex sciences. See science and sexuality
- sex wars, 390
- sex work,
 - activism, xlix, 289–90 316–18, 333, 355, 362, 373, 384, 386, 394, 414–17;
 - and AIDS crisis, xxiii, xlv, 365, 268, 310–11, 336;
 - campaigns against, by gay men, xxxvi, 225, 316;
 - and Criminal Code of Canada reform, xxxiv, 153, 158–59, 205, 332–34, 410;
 - and disease transmission, 80, 84, 103, 265, 265, 268, 310;
 - and feminism, 87, 386, 389;
 - and gentrification, 226, 290–91, 316, 359;
 - heterosexual marriage, threat to, 76–77, 85, 153–54, 159, 256, 264;
 - historical, 26, 30;
 - and lesbians, 118, 119, 167–68;
 - male, lx, 16, 40–41, 158, 184, 230, 256, 274–75, 278;
 - and the military, 95, 103;
 - and moral conservatives, xlviii, 249–50, 353–55, 316, 353, 386, 389;
 - and perversion, 84–85;
 - and social-purity campaigns, 31, 33, 35–36, 47, 73–74, 77–81, 84, 89–90, 95;
 - violence against sex workers, xxxvi, 260, 290, 316–18, 323–24, 384–86.
 See also police, and sex work; trans people, and sex work
- sexual abuse, lx, 272–74, 309, 318, 356
- sexual assault. See sexual violence
- sexual classifications. See classifications of sexuality
- sexual harassment. See sexual violence
- sexual libertarianism, 386–88
- sexual migration. See gay neighbourhoods/villages/ghettos
- sexual orientation, 114, 151, 217, 226, 229, 233–36, 239;
- definition of concept, 126, 151;
 - legal protection against discrimination, lix–lxi, 121, 206, 221, 241, 243, 250, 277–82, 290, 293–94, 337, 349, 371;
 - as mental disorder, 219;
 - and race, 290–93;
 - and refugee status, 321
- sexual pathologies. See also deviants/deviates, sexual

- sexual policing, xxxii, lix–lx, lxvii, 19, 32, 38, 95
107, 169, 193, 200, 204, 216, 261, 275, 277–82,
363, 380, 383, 385, 394. *See also* police
- sexual psychopath. *See* psychopaths, sexual
- sexual sciences. *See* science and sexuality
- sexual violence, 30, 78–79, 135, 137, 144–45,
159, 255, 272, 319, 340, 354–56, 377, 384–87,
391–92, 395. *See also* rape
- sexually transmitted infections (STIs), 36, 81,
83–84, 102–103, 265, 36, 83–84, 102–103
- Sewell, John, 257
- Sheppard, Dorothy, 170–71
- Shearer, Reverend, J.C., 79, 81. *See also* social-
purity movement
- Showing Up for Racial Justice (SURJ), 349
- sickness, mental, model of homosexuality. *See*
medicalization of homosexuality
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake, xli–xlii, lii,
lvi, 51, 165, 406
- sin, homosexuality as, 19, 26, 46, 67, 89, 155,
162, 212
- sissies, 86, 95, 98. *See also* classification of
sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex
practitioners
- Sister Vision Press, 348
- Six Nations Land Back. *See* Land Back
movement
- slang, 40, 88, 114, 117, 231–32
- slave trade, of Black people. *See* Black people,
slave trade of
- slavery, analogy for sex work, 77
- Slut Walks, 355
- Smith, Dorothy E., xxxviii–xxxix, li, 6, 13, 14–15,
23, 41, 371
- Smith, George, li, 205, 215, 230, 271, 363
- Smith, Miriam, 314–15, 330, 340–41
- Smitherman, George, 315
- Smoke, Roseanne, lix, lxi–lxii, 249
- Social and Moral Reform Council of Canada,
79
- social constructivism, xxxiv, lxv, 7, 12, 22,
47, 236–37, 267, 270, 370–76. *See also*
essentialism
- social Darwinism, 81
- social evil. *See* sex work; social-purity
movement
- social-media platforms, xxviii–xix, 283, 318, 320,
328, 336, 355, 377, 387
- social-purity movement, 30–31, 33–35, 41, 72–73,
76, 78–83, 90, 95;
and feminism 78–79;
- international ties, 49;
- literature, 47, 77, 81;
- racism in, 7, 33, 77, 81–82;
- and repression of women, 78–81, 92, 95;
- and respectability, 33–35, 76–78;
- and sex education, 81–82;
- and sex work, 31, 46–47, 75–76, 78, 79–80,
84, 95;
- and the working class, 33, 35;
- and venereal disease, 83–84.
- See also* moral conservatism; right-wing,
organizations
- social relations, as basis of inquiry, 14–17
- Social Reproduction Theory, liii–liv
- social services, xxx, lxiii, 147, 205, 217, 242, 271,
405. *See also* welfare state
- social surveillance. *See* surveillance, of homo-
sexual activity, social
- Social Survey Commission, Toronto (1913), 95
- socialist politics, problems with, lv–lvi
- Society for Individual Rights (SIR), 172. *See*
also homophile groups
- Society for the Protection of Women and
Children, 77, 92. *See also* Watt, D.A.
- Society for the Reformation of Manners
(London), 25–26
- sociology, lxv–lxvi, 6, 9, 14–15, 19, 114, 156, 309
studies of homosexuality, 17, 19, 114–15, 233,
237, 258
- sodomy, lxvii–lxviii, 22, 25–29, 37, 46, 53, 55, 57,
63–64, 68–69, 94, 133, 136, 163, 136, 163, 182,
213, 248, 263. *See also* classification of
sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex
practitioners
- Somers, Bruce, xxxi, 126, 169–70, 172, 176–78,
181. *See also* Association for Social Know-
ledge (ASK)
- South Africa, apartheid, 327, 357
- Soviet Union. *See* Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics (USSR)
- Spade, Dean, xlvi, 352, 406
- sports, 167, 310, 353
- spousal benefits, for homosexuals. *See*
family-recognition rights
- Stafford, Ezra Hurlburt, 84–85. *See also* sci-
ence and sexuality
- Stalinism, and homosexuality, lxiii
- Stanley Park, 169, 182. *See also* gay sites, for
sexual activities, parks
- Star Forum. *See* Toronto Star, Citizens Forum
on Sex Deviates

- “stay at home” orders. See COVID-19, safety measures
- St. Charles Tavern, 121, 165. See also gay sites, bars; Toronto, gay community
- St. John’s Pride, 361
- Stead, W.J., 92
- Stonewall riots, xxviii, xxix, xxxi, lxiv, 186, 217, 220, 224, 228–29, 357, 363, 381
- Strange, Carolyn, 94
- Street Offenses Act (1959), 159
- structuralism, limitations of method, liii
- subversives, 122. See also classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- Sudbury, xix, xxxvi, xlix, lix, lxii, 283, 305, 313, 349–50, 361
- Sudbury Coalition Against Poverty, xlix
- suffrage movement, 75, 78–79, 87
- Sunak, Rishi, xlv, 338
- Supreme Court of Canada, lix, lx–lxi, 66, 176, 198–201, 208, 209, 241, 263–64, 279, 293–94, 299, 305–306, 309, 311–12, 316, 385;
R. v. Butler (1992), 263–64, 292, 309, 385, 388
- Supreme Court, United States, 248, 299
- surveillance, of homosexual activity, police, see police surveillance of homosexuals;
 social, 32, 95, 246, 265, 287, 384;
 state, 97, 287, 324
- Sutcliffe, Bert, 107–108, 134, 164
- swingers, 309–10
- taboos, 8–9, 84, 102, 246
- Tallbear, Kim, xli, lii, 59–61, 326
- Taylor, Breonna, xxviii
- Telegram* (Toronto), 120, 146, 188. See also newspapers, coverage of homosexuality
- terminology. See classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- tests, for homosexuality. See detection of homosexuals, psychological
- Thatcher, Margaret, 248
- thingification, xxxix, 15
- third sex, 46. See also classification of sexuality; epithets for same-gender sex practitioners
- Third World erotic practices. See Global South
- Thompson, E.P., li
- Thompson, Sir John, 92–94
- Thomson, Peter, 149
- TMX pipeline, xix, 52, 62
- Todd, Zoe, 60–61
- Toronto/Tkaronto, xvii
- Toronto City Council, 95, 254
- Toronto Daily Star*. See *Toronto Star*
- Toronto Gay Action, 220
- Toronto,
 Church Street, xl, 187, 222, 290, 361, 416;
 encampments, xvii, xxi, xxxvi;
 ethnic communities, 64, 68, 258;
 gay community, 99–100, 119–21, 164–66, 238, 253, 253–56, 260, 323;
 police force, xxxvi–xxxvii, lix–lx, 118, 142, 167, 170, 192, 202, 253–58, 261–62, 264, 274, 288–89, 323–24, 328, 340, 344–45, 359–61, 409–13;
 protests in, xvii, xix, xxxvi–xxxvii, xlv, lviii–lix, lxii, 243, 268, 357, 359–61, 381, 388.
 See also gay sites, Toronto
- Toronto Metropolitan University, xix
- Toronto Psychiatric Hospital, 148–49
- Toronto Social Survey Commission, 80, 95
- Toronto Star*, 120, 121, 149, 179, 201, 255, 266;
 Citizens Forum on Sex Deviates, 146–49.
 See also media, mainstream, coverage of, homosexuality
- trade. See fur trade; slave trade
- traditionalist ideology, 248
- Trans Exclusionary Radical Feminists (TERFs), xlviii, 353
- transhistorical sexuality, and gender, xlvi, 6–7
- translation, as colonial tool, 53
- transsexualism, 151–52, 219, 233–35, 368, 374. See also trans people
- trans people,
 activism, xxvii–xxviii, xlvi–xlvii, 283–84, 290, 298, 337–38, 339, 350–54, 380, 387, 402, 406–407;
 anti-trans politics, xxxvi–xxxvii, xlviii, li, 318, 320, 345, 353, 387–89, 99;
 and Blood Services, xiii–xiv, 334, 336;
 and gender binary, xlviii, 166, 217, 234–35, 298, 318, 345, 351, 354, 364–65, 368, 370–72, 386, 399;
 health care for, 338;
 historical use of term, xlvi, 151, 368;
 and immigration, 307–308, 321–23;
 marginalization of, within queer community, xxxii, 217, 218, 344, 292, 300, 306;
 and neoliberal queer, xxxiv, 283–84, 351, 397;
 in prisons, xx, xxxii, xlvi, 352;
 and race, 307–308, 364–65;
 rights, 293–94, 298–99, 333, 337–38, 384;

- and sex work, xlvi, 316–17, 333, 351, 353, 386, 389;
and sports, 353;
as threat to young people, 279;
youths, 319–20, 338;
and washrooms, 353, 354.
See also conversion therapy
- transvestism, 149–52, 175, 219, 233–35, 284, 368
- treatments to “cure” homosexuality, 11, 106,
112–13, 126, 137, 140, 146–47, 150, 163, 176–77,
219, 336–38;
as alternate to carceral punishment, 149, 154,
158–59, 179–83, 195–96, 198, 209–12, 214.
See also aversion therapy; conversion therapy; medicalization of homosexuality
- Trevenen, Kathryn, 322–23
- Tronti, Mario. See autonomist Marxism
- Trudeau, Justin, xlv, 308, 325, 328–30, 339, 361,
404, 411, 413–14
- Trudeau, Pierre Elliot, 128, 185–86, 189, 192,
201–203, 205, 325–26, 404, 409
- Trump, Donald, xxx, xlv, 321, 338, 355, 361, 388
- Truss, Liz, xlv
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of
Canada Report, 61
- Tuel, Latjor, xvii. See also police, killing of
Black people
- Turner, R.E., 113, 150, 173, 179,
- Turner, John, 206–211
- Turtle Island, xviii, xl, 7, 51–54, 62, 368. See also
Indigenous peoples; settler colonialism,
character of Canada
- Two (magazine), 133, 165, 167, 173, 182, 187–89.
See also magazines, homosexual
- two-gender binary. See gender binary
- Two-Spirit,
activism, xix, xxxv, xxxviii, xli–xliv, xlvi, lxii,
52, 62, 230, 348, 366–67, 373, 382, 407, 417;
historical specificity of term, xviii–xix,
xxxviii, xl, xlii, xlvii–xlviii, 52–55,
326–27, 368;
and homosexual activism, xix, xxi, xl–xli,
301, 326–27, 332, 347, 369, 373;
and settler-colonial practices, xl–xliv, 51, 57,
58–59, 307, 317, 384.
See also Indigenous people, gender diversity of
- Uganda, 315–15, 322, 364
- Ukraine, xxxvi, 322, 338, 340
- Ulrichs, Karl Heinrich, 37
- unhoused people, xv, xvii, xxi–xxii, xxvi, xxx,
xxxvi, 73, 89, 260, 285, 290–91, 312, 323,
332–33, 345, 347, 359, 370, 379, 381, 394, 405,
407. See also police, campaigns against
encampments
- Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR),
123, 127, 286
- unions,
autonomy from, in activism, lii, 401;
COVID-19, strategy against, xxiii, xxv;
and domestic labour, 298;
family benefits, activism for, 242–43, 280,
350, 383, 397;
gay businesses, hostility to, 226;
and government, 98, 248, 313, 318;
and masculinity, 41;
and national-security purges, 123, 329;
pride parades, support for, 313, 350;
for public-service-sector workers,
Canadian, 349;
queer organizing in, 313, 349–50, 397–98, 401;
and sexual-orientation protection, activism
for, lx, 97, 241, 259, 313, 349;
and welfare benefits, 97–98;
and women workers, 33, 41, 74
- Unitarian Church, 171, 173, 175, 187, 188. See also
United Church of Canada
- unitary homosexual character, xxxiii, xxxviii,
lxv, lxix, 8, 229–30, 236, 287, 372, 378–79.
See also identity politics
- United Church of Canada, 102, 160, 163, 171, 173,
176–78, 280. See also Unitarian Church
- United Nations, 219, 291
- United Nations High Commission for Refu-
gees (UNHCR), 291, 321
- United States,
homosexual culture, 120, 123, 166–67, 187–88,
217–18, 220, 251, 268, 269, 285, 304, 319;
influence on Canada, 48–49, 124, 179,
187–88, 292;
lesbian experience in, 43, 128, 174, 187, 218;
medical discourse in, 30–31, 84, 104, 106,
113, 131;
moral-conservative right, 248, 249, 261;
politics in, xxx, xlv, 321–22, 338, 355;
racism in, 300–301, 321–22, 359, 378;
regulation, compared to Canada, 103,
124–25, 127, 170, 179, 180, 200;
settler colonialism in, xliii, 49;
sexual propriety, 30–32, 37, 77, 79;
in World War II, 101, 103.
See also military, United States

- University of Toronto, 149, 165, 192, 220, 349, 387
 Upper Canada, 64–65, 72
 urbanization, 23, 34, 42, 46, 69, 71–76, 85, 89–91, 96–97, 114, 117, 144
 urban poverty, and welfare, 72–73, 89
- Valverde, Mariana, xi, 386
- Vancouver,
 activism, lviii, xxxvi, lviii, 220, 308, 316, 329, 337;
 buggery cases in, 67, 69;
 city council, homosexuals on, 223;
 gay community, 164–165, 169, 175, 182, 221, 263, 381;
 gentrification, xxxvi;
 lesbian community/culture, lx, 164–65, 175, 191, 221, 223, 329;
 police activity, xxxvi, 169, 170, 182, 186, 316, 329, 384;
 Pride committee, 313, 361, 381;
 unhoused people, xvii, xxxvi;
 West End, 222–23.
 See also Association for Social Knowledge (ASK); Boisvert/Lupien case
- Vancouver Gay Liberation Front, 220
- Vancouver Sun, 173, 190–91, 255. See also newspapers, coverage of homosexuality
- Van Nostrand, Fred, 148–49
- venereal disease, campaigns against, 36, 83–84, 102–103. See also moral reformers; sexually transmitted infections (STIs); social-purity movement
- Vice Commission (Chicago), 80–81
- Victorian social system. See social-purity movement
- Vietnam War, 170
- Vigilance Committee (Toronto), 79–80, 95
- volunteer welfare work. See social-purity movement
- Vowel, Chelsea, 52–53, 60
- wage labour, xx, xxiii, lii, 23–24, 33, 36, 41, 71, 73–74, 78, 80, 88, 91, 98–99, 102, 118, 144–45, 156, 160, 164, 298, 397, 402
- Wake, F.R., 130–32, 137, 178. See also Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths (1954)
- Walcott, Rinaldo, lii, lv, 311, 360, 416
- Walia, Harsha, 347
- Ware, Syrus Marcus, 360
- Warkins, John, 127
- war on terror, xxvii, 283, 307–308, 359. See also homonationalism
- washrooms. See gay sites, for sexual activities, lavatories
- Watt, D.A., 77, 79, 92
- We Demand an Apology Network (WDAN), 215–16, 325, 328–30, 412–13
- wedding-industrial complex, 302
- Weeks, Jeffrey, 5, 31, 40–41, 78, 393
- Weinstein, Harvey, 355
- welfare state, 43, 73, 97–100, 204, 247, 339, 409
- Westley, William, 237–38
- Wet'suwet'en territories, xlv, liv, 52, 62, 363, 411. See also RCMP, Wet'suwet'en land, invasion of
- White Paper. See "Just Society" (Liberal political project)
- white racism, xxix, 79
- whiteness, in gay and lesbian organizing. See racism, queer community, within the whiteness, and social purity. See social-purity movement, racism in
- white slave trade, 77, 79–80, 95. See also social-purity movement, and sex work
- white supremacy, xiv–xv, xvii, xxv–xxvii, xxxiv, 41, 49, 248, 287, 302, 326, 338, 348, 353, 357, 361, 373, 388, 394
- Whitman, Walt, 38, 86–87, 120
- Whitworth, Sandra, 242–43
- Wilde, Oscar, trial, 35, 37, 43, 86, 88–90
- Wilson, Alex, 54
- Wilson, Renate, 191
- Wolfenden Report* (1957),
 and Association for Social Knowledge (ASK), 173, 176, 179–182, 202–203;
 Church support for law reform, 177–79;
 Hart/Devlin debates about, in Canada, 162–64;
 history of, in Great Britain, 153–54, 200;
 and law reform in Canada, 182, 190–95, 200, 201, 205–207, 209–11, 215;
 and Klippert Case, 196–202;
 McRuere Commission, exclusion of, 137–39, 144;
 media coverage of, 176, 188, 190–91;
 medical/professional support for, 191;
 police action, impact on, 162;
 privatization, strategy of, 19, 110, 141, 154–62, 164, 182, 188, 200, 204, 215, 244, 273, 275–76, 280, 354, 388.
 See also Criminal Code reform (1969)

- women,
 activism, 288–89, 348, 353–56, 359–60, 412;
 biological determinism, xxxvii, xlvii–xlviii,
 12, 353–54;
 domestic sphere, 24–25, 30, 36, 42, 109–10,
 160, 204, 235, 298;
 erotic friendships, 23–24, 32, 42–43, 82,
 98, 232;
 family relations, 23, 43, 63, 75–78, 83, 96–99,
 144–45, 230, 304, 354;
 and gender binary, xlviii;
 heterosexuality, lxvi–lxvii, 42–43, 113;
 Indigenous, 51–52, 55–59, 62, 73, 299, 317;
 in military, 101–103, 106, 133;
 oppression of, xli, xlvii, lxv, lxix, 14–15, 17,
 24–25, 30, 65, 69, 144, 180, 389, 393–94, 398;
 orgasms, 111;
 sexualization of, 42, 233–34, 386;
 and social-purity campaigns, 30–31, 33–34,
 35, 37, 73–81, 92, 95;
 in wage-labour force, lxiii, 36, 41, 63, 73–75,
 80, 84–85, 88, 97–99, 102, 109, 118, 145, 156,
 160, 217, 223;
 working-class, 25, 30, 36, 43, 73–74, 76, 80,
 97–98, 99, 189.
 See also lesbians
- Women's Army Corps (Canada), 103
- Women's Christian Temperance Union
 (WCTU), 75, 82–83
- Women's Legal, Education, and Action Fund
 (LEAF), 263, 385
- women's movement. See feminist movement;
 suffrage movement
- Worker's Organizing Rainbow Coalition, 350
- working class,
 culture, 98;
 discrimination against, in gay community,
 226, 228–29, 285, 287;
 family relations, 23, 32, 90, 97–99;
 middle-class, threat to, 30;
 in military, 36, 65;
 and race, lxiv, 33;
 same-gender sex, 23–25, 30, 32–36, 38–41, 86,
 89–91, 189, 236, 349;
 sexualization of, 30;
 and social purity, 33, 35;
 struggles, I, lii, lv–lvi, lxiii, 33, 41, 73, 83, 97,
 228–29, 282, 349, 395, 410.
 See also wage labour; women, working-class
- World Bank, 315
- World Health Organization (WHO), 219
- World War I, 76, 83–84, 88, 95–97
- World War II, xlv, 88, 101–103, 108–109, 113, 156;
 family life, impact on, 102, 144;
 homosexuals, experiences of, 106–109;
 women's sexual lives, regulation of, 103, 144
- writing, as methodology, xlix, 55–56, 408
- writings, by homosexuals, 3, 38, 88, 115, 120, 190,
 227, 386
- Wynne, Kathleen, 315, 319
- Xtra (magazine), 225, 300
- YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association),
 80, 91, 173. See also gay sites
- youth,
 activism, xxxv, xlv, 229, 314, 353;
 corruption of, 35, 46–47, 77, 79–80, 82–83, 89,
 120, 142, 144–45, 148–51, 154–56, 157–59, 162,
 168, 202, 210–214, 246, 248, 272–73, 279, 391,
 see also social-purity movement;
 culture, 145, 156;
 education of, 36, 71, 73, 82, 143, 149–50, 156,
 158, 178, 231, 240, 274, 281, 309, 318–20, 377,
 384–85, 391, 397;
 family relations, lix, 24, 102, 107–108, 255,
 320, 399;
 and labour, 24, 64–65, 102;
 organizations, 36, 140;
 queer and trans, xxii, 5, 165, 230–31, 219, 223,
 230, 239–40, 299, 304, 318–20, 338, 355, 384,
 395, 397, 399;
 regulation of, sex with adults, 89, 138, 148,
 150–51, 157–58, 161–63, 181, 191–92, 200, 203,
 213, 230, 256, 273–75, 281, 309, 384–85, 388,
 391, 395;
 sexually active, 273, 309, 379, 387, 391, 399;
 sexual violence against, 137, 274–75, 309, 385;
 and sex work, 16, 73, 89–90, 183, 230, 274–75,
 278;
 trans, xlviii;
 and urbanization, 24, 73, 89–90;
 women, protection of, 75, 77, 80, 82–83, 88,
 92, 98, 145, 386;
 working-class, 30, 35, 64–65, 85, 89–90, 91, 231
- youth pornography legislation, lx, 230, 250,
 274–75, 276, 278, 289, 292, 316, 384–86,
 389, 391
- Zami, 348
- Zanin, Andrea, 310
- Zapatistas, li, liv, lv, 408