

Edited by Manon Tremblay

QUEER MOBILIZATIONS

**Social Movement Activism and
Canadian Public Policy**



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

© UBC Press 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978-0-7748-2907-6 (bound). – ISBN 978-0-7748-2909-9 (pdf). –

ISBN 978-0-7748-2910-6 (epub)

Cataloguing-in-publication data for this book is available from Library and Archives Canada.

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

A reasonable attempt has been made to secure permission to reproduce all material used. If there are errors or omissions they are wholly unintentional and the publisher would be grateful to learn of them.

Cover photos (left to right, from top): Cynthia Flood and daughters Isabel and Margaret, Vancouver, 1978?, courtesy of Don Hann; National Gay Conference, Winnipeg, 1974, courtesy of Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (CLGA), 1986-032/02P(09); Stop Police Violence, photo by Gerald Hannon, courtesy of CLGA, 1983-018/26P(04); York Gay Alliance at National Gay Conference, Ottawa, 1975, photo by Gerald Hannon, courtesy of CLGA, 1986-032/02P(40); Geoff Meggs, Mike Lombardi, and Ellen Woodsworth at Gay Pride Parade, Vancouver, 2009, photo by Tilo Driessen, courtesy of the City of Vancouver; National Gay Conference, Toronto, 1978, courtesy of CLGA, 1986-032/10P(38)

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z2

www.ubcpress.ca

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

Contents

Foreword / vii

Elise Chenier

Acknowledgments / x

Introduction / 3

Manon Tremblay

Part 1: The National Level

1 LGBTQ Activism: The Pan-Canadian Political Space / 45

Miriam Smith

2 LGBTQ Issues as Indigenous Politics: Two-Spirit
Mobilization in Canada / 64

Julie Depelteau and Dalie Giroux

Part 2: The Regional Level

3 Queer Advocacy in Ontario / 85

David Rayside

4 Quebec and Sexual Diversity: From Repression
to Citizenship? / 106

Manon Tremblay

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

- 5** Mobilization on the Periphery: LGBT Activism and Success in Atlantic Canada / 125

Joanna Everitt

- 6** LGBTQ Movements in Western Canada: British Columbia / 142

Brian Burtch, Aynsley Pescitelli, and Rebecca Haskell

- 7** “Severely Queer” in Western Canada: LGBT2Q Activism in Alberta / 163

Alexa DeGagne

Part 3: The Municipal Level

- 8** From Contestation to Incorporation: LGBT Activism and Urban Politics in Montreal / 187

Julie Podmore

- 9** Gay and Lesbian Political Mobilization in Urban Spaces: Toronto / 208

Catherine J. Nash

- 10** Building Queer Infrastructure: Trajectories of Activism and Organizational Development in Decolonizing Vancouver / 227

Gordon Brent Brochu-Ingram

- 11** “Punch[ing] More Than Its Weight”: LGBT Organizing in Halifax, Nova Scotia / 250

Nathaniel M. Lewis

Conclusion / 271

Manon Tremblay

List of Contributors / 297

Index / 300

Foreword

Canada has a long and rich history of queer organizing, and much of it has, until now, been untold and undocumented. Quebec and especially Ontario are well represented, but about the west and the east, much less is known. This comprehensive study of queer mobilization fills this gap by providing an overview of political activism from one end of the nation to the other. Focusing principally on the organizational and activist work of Canadians who identified with the gay liberation and subsequently gay equality movements that launched in the 1960s, this collection offers a valuable tool for understanding the similarities and the differences between regional organizations and politics. Seeing Canada as a series of regions stitched together rather than as a unified whole is an approach to Canadian history established in the early 1970s. *Queer Mobilizations* reminds us that this is as relevant today as ever. Only by making a concerted effort, as Manon Tremblay has here, to draw out the histories of the people and places east, west, and north of Ontario and Quebec (we shall have to wait for the history of the North) do we have the opportunity to see this period in its fullness.

Activism in Canada has been deeply influenced by events in the United States. The non-violent equal rights strategies adopted by the African American civil rights movement in the 1950s and '60s, the radical activism of the Yippies, anti-Vietnam war activists, the Black Panthers, and the New Left student movements of the 1960s helped shape the way Canadians and others responded to similar concerns on their own soil. Political and social organizations were formed on university campuses and in major cities, alternatives to the "bar

scene” were built, and political strategies to contest queer oppression in law and everyday life were vigorously pursued.

In Canada, as in the United States, sexism divided lesbian and gay communities. Driven away by their treatment as second-class citizens, women channelled much more of their energy into struggles against (and for) pornography, against violence against women, and for reproductive rights even as they struggled against homophobia in the women’s movement. In Canada Indigenous people and people of a heritage other than French and English contested the “two founding nations” myth and began organizing against state and social marginalization and oppression. Works by anti-colonial writers like Franz Fanon and Pierre Vallières were required reading. A good deal of early women’s and gay liberation writing addressed race-based oppression as an extension of gay and women’s oppression. As these movements became more and more focused on formal strategies to challenge laws and practices that targeted them as a group, attention to what we now call “intersectionality” waned.

The failure to sustain a critique of race has been rightfully characterized as an extension of white privilege. This critique is about much more than including people of colour and Indigenous people in an organization, which is tokenism at its best. It is about recognizing that racism actually changes the way oppression exerts itself, and the need to develop theories that take this into account. For example, when white gay liberationists launched a critique of the nuclear family and the church as sources of oppression, they did not see that for many people of colour, these very institutions were their source of strength in resisting racism. When white feminists defined sexual violence against women as a feminist issue, African American and Canadian feminists explained that any discussion about sexual violence had to address the way men in their community were targeted as sexual predators. As readers dive into this collection to learn about the remarkable achievements of lesbian, gay, and queer activists during the past forty years, we must take care not to simply acknowledge this critique and move on with business as usual, but to keep it in the forefront of our minds as we proceed.

These pages document a time when a large number of people experienced becoming part of the lesbian, gay, and queer community as finding “home” and “family.” The profound stigma attached to same-sex and queer desire and to gender non-conformity – let’s not forget that many early participants in pride marches wore paper bags over their heads to hide their identities – made finding a place where you could “be yourself” a deeply liberating experience. Most lesbians, gays, trans* people, and queers were delighted to partake in the

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

expansion of spaces to hang out, dance, share a few drinks, and meet new lovers. Others made the political battle against oppression a centrepiece of their lives. Their activism was, in many ways, their primary lover. It is a cliché, to be sure, but no less true that to them – those who are known to us and those whose actions are unrecorded – much is owed.

One thing I hope readers will gain from this book is a sense of just how essential grassroots activism is in creating a robust, dynamic, and progressive society. Shouting down the police and marching against unjust laws is one kind of activism, but there is so much more that it takes to create change. There are people who answer phones, people who support those struggling with familial, religious, and other conflicts, including depression. There are those who help others find housing and access services, and the artists who speak our truths and who challenge them at the same time, those who lay out and type up newsletters, and those who archive it all.

Although it is still the case that queer lives are stigmatized, we live in different times. We enjoy full legal rights, but more than that, everyday people are not as terrified or mystified by who we are, and we are less likely to be treated as monstrous or a threat to others. The public face of the lesbian, gay, and queer community has become moderate, even placid. Pride Day, organizers declare, is not about activism, it is about celebration. Rather than use our newly gained legitimacy to contest the multiple sites and forms of oppression that persist, we have used it to court corporate sponsors and political favour. We are now on the inside, not wanting, it seems, to look out.

This book can function as a road map, as a lesson plan in activism. History does not repeat itself, not exactly. Means of communication have changed, when and where people congregate are different. The way public officials respond, or don't respond, to its citizens has become hostile and militarized. New times require new measures. Nevertheless, we have a rich past we can draw upon for inspiration and insight into queer mobilizations.

– Elise Chenier, Director, Archives of Lesbian Oral
Testimony (ALOT) and Associate Professor,
Department of History, Simon Fraser University

Introduction

MANON TREMBLAY

In January 2013, Kathleen Wynne was elected leader of the Ontario Liberal Party, thus becoming premier of Ontario. This victory made history in two ways: first, Wynne became the first female premier of Ontario; second, and more significant to this book, as a lesbian she was the first openly LGBTQ person in Canada to take the reins of a (federal or provincial) government,¹ and she was one of the first in the world to do so (along with Jóhanna Sigurðardóttir, prime minister of Iceland from 2009 to May 2013; Elio Di Rupo, prime minister of Belgium since December 2011; and Xavier Bettel, prime minister of Luxembourg since December 2013; on LGBTQ politicians in Canada, see Everitt and Camp 2014). It would be no exaggeration to say that queers in Canada have come a long way since the time when homosexuality was a criminal offence. That said, even though Wynne's acceding to the Ontario premiership is important – if only in terms of being a role model – it does not solve the numerous injustices to which LGBTQ people in Canada are subjected regarding, for instance, acts of indecency, age of consent, and state censorship practices. In other words, that a lesbian is a premier should not be the tree that hides the forest: non-heteronormative sexualities are always the target of regulation, not to mention repression, in Canada. In fact, there are always a wide range of ideological and practical mechanisms the deployment of which has the consequence of (over)valuing heterosexuality and making LGBTQ sexualities less desirable – unless they become respectable by homonormalizing. Examples of such mechanisms are heteronormative hegemony (Ludwig 2011) and the public policy decision-making process.

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

The objective of *Queer Mobilizations: Social Movement Activism and Canadian Public Policy* is to explore the numerous and diverse relationships between LGBTQ activism and the federal, provincial, and local governments in Canada. More specifically, the authors herein explore how these governments regulate (and even repress) and influence LGBTQ movements, and how these movements have mobilized to shape public policy across political spectrums from the urban to the pan-Canadian level. In this introduction, I first situate this book at the theoretical level. To do this, I present several ideas taken from social movement theory, identity politics, and public policy analysis in order to provide a background against which to highlight the context of the mechanisms used to regulate and repress queer sexualities in Canada. These theoretical elements also provide a framework for appreciating each of the chapters in this collection. Second, I give a brief description – necessarily incomplete and biased – of queer activism in Canada in order to provide a historical background that is complemented and enriched by the following chapters. Third, I review the state of knowledge about LGBTQ activism in Canada, with the aim of shedding light on the contribution and originality of this book to this field of research. Finally, I outline the content of *Queer Mobilizations*.

Some Theoretical Elements

Queer Mobilizations is situated within the context of social movement theory (notably the notion of identity politics) and public policy analysis. To begin with, identity politics is a fairly controversial notion, with both defenders and critics. The former use identity as a discursive strategy for claiming liberal citizenship rights, in a fashion similar to cultural, ethnic, or racial minorities: how one is born cannot justify discrimination and second-class citizenship. The latter argue that it entails the dangers of essentialism and the consequent reification of fixed categories (such as heterosexuality versus homosexuality). The objective of this book is not to take a position in favour of either of these sides but, rather, to consider the notion of identity politics as having something to contribute to the study of LGBTQ activism and its interactions with governments in Canada, notably in bridging the two analytic axes at the heart of its *raison d'être*: (1) how the government regulates (or represses) queer activism and (2) how LGBTQ activism mobilizes to shape public decisions and policies.

Herein, I identify two main readings of identity politics that are inter-related and complementary. One might be called socio-psychological in that it refers to a process in which certain social characteristics are emphasized as

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

signposts for collective action – for instance, the *Aboriginal* movement, the *black* movement, the *disabled* movement, the *women's* movement, the *youth* movement, and the *lesbian and gay* movement. These movements are based on the idea that certain social characteristics are not neutral (i.e., “natural”) but, rather, are evidence (and the result) of historical and socio-political relations of appropriation and exploitation, even oppression – relations that cut across the lines between inclusion in and exclusion from civil, social, and political citizenship. To be lesbian or heterosexual cannot be reduced to a genetic lottery; performing a non-heteronormative sexuality brings into daily life a series of experiences that leaves no doubt with regard to the second-class citizenship of non-heterosexual individuals. For instance, being gay means being invisible in the public space (e.g., in the arts and the media, which depict mainly manifestations of heterosexuality); sometimes being rejected by one's family because of one's sexual orientation (what girl is rejected by her parents because she is heterosexual?); being the target of jeering and teasing, prejudice, intimidation, harassment, and even physical violence in school; and being subjected to discrimination, subtle or overt, on the job (e.g., when it comes to career progression) and in state-provided services (such as health care provision). Although the body is biological, it is also social in that the codes it carries and the way it is perceived orchestrate the relations within which it is inscribed; for example, gays are beaten because their ways of expressing themselves, or even moving, are suspect to their assaulters (what heterosexual man is assaulted because his way of speaking or walking is considered too masculine?). When social characteristics are the cause of inequality, injustice, marginalization, or oppression, they may inspire in the people who bear them a sense of belonging to a minority or of being a second-class citizen. This sense of being deprived is conducive to voicing grievances and claims, which are the raw materials for social movement activism (Gurney and Tierney 1982).

The other reading of identity politics is political. This reading conveys the idea that identity is a radical political act, and it is a major component of the LGBTQ movement: its collective identity and action processes; its aims, claims, tactics, and strategies; its resources and networks; and so on (see Melucci 1996). LGBTQ people express this aspect of identity in various ways. First, declaring one's queer identity publicly in an environment defined by the exclusion of that identity constitutes an act of confrontation. In effect, openly saying that one is LGBTQ in a society in which heterosexuality is the norm means not only exposing this exclusion but also revealing the completely artificial nature of a “heterosexually homogeneous” societal order. Second, publicly declaring one's non-heteronormative identity is an act of resistance

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

against invisibility – and thus against denial of existence. This resistance becomes even more empowering (and provocative) when it is combined with pride in being lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, transgender, or queer. Third, identity orients the exchanges between the LGBTQ movement and governments in Canada (similar to the orientation provided by language or region) by constituting, for example, an argument for claiming protection against discrimination or a canvas for formulating public policies. In these exchanges, such a declaration – that is, the act of naming and of naming oneself – is a radical political act. In effect – and fourth – the act of naming, and thus of defining, the other is political in nature, and it is an act that may make a difference between disgrace and pride. On the one hand, medicine and psychiatry have designated “homosexuality” as a disease, even a scourge; religions have called it a moral sin; and legislatures have declared it a crime. Although the label “queer” is largely accepted today, it remains painful to an older generation for which it was an insult. On the other hand, by insisting on being “out” and shouting “Gay is good” and “Out of the closet and into the street,” the gay liberation movement has turned the insult on its head and reinterpreted it as pride. In this perspective – and fifth – naming oneself is a political act that activates a process of framing and public coming into existence. Indeed, the capacity to name oneself not only brings oneself into existence but also does so in the desired light. For example, homosexuality (or, at least, homoerotic acts) existed before the word “homosexual” was coined in the last third of the nineteenth century (Katz 1995, 83–112), but naming it brought it – for better or worse – into the world of social comprehension, of what exists. Nevertheless, many LGBTQ people reject the word “homosexual” not only because medicine and psychiatry have defined it as an illness or disease but also because it was created by those outside of the queer community. For example, many in that community prefer the names “lesbian,” “gay,” or “queer,” which are considered more positive and empowering than “homosexual.”

Naming oneself is a radical political act not only because it mobilizes a process of defining the LGBTQ movement in relation to society as a whole but also because it challenges the power relations within the LGBTQ movement itself. The evolution of labels to designate activism around sexual preferences and desires shows that words are not neutral but convey identities that reveal inclusions and exclusions (for a discussion, see Stein 2012, 5–9). Just as the word “homosexual” was not unanimously acceptable, so the word “homophile,” used in the 1950s and 1960s, was not appealing to the more radical sexual activists, notably because it dwelt on the notion of love (*philia* in ancient Greek) rather than on the notion of sex. The term gradually fell from favour,

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

and it died away in the 1970s with the advent of the gay liberation movement, which insisted not only on liberating sexualities (and not only same-sex sex) from their normative straitjackets but also on reinterpreting gender and sexual identities and acts of resistance in a positive light. However, the gay liberation movement provided little visibility to lesbians, who were present in large numbers and active in its ranks; this explains, at least in part (along with the activism of lesbian feminists), the adoption of the label “lesbian and gay movement” in the 1980s. In the 1990s it became common to speak of the “LGBT movement” and the “queer movement,” among other descriptors, to convey a concern with inclusion and the unity of non-heteronormative sexualities and identities. Yet, as a number of authors in this book show, it is possible that this unity exists only on the discursive level and that, in fact, there are tensions among “L,” “G,” “B,” “T,” and “Q” people. Despite this, but keeping this comment in mind, in the introduction and conclusion of *Queer Mobilizations* I use the initialism “LGBTQ.”²

In sum, albeit controversial, the notion of identity politics should not be discarded as it offers tools for studying LGBTQ activism and its interactions with governments in Canada – at least when interpreted through a socio-psychological reading (which refers to a sense of belonging to a minority and being a second-class citizen as a consequence of a negatively charged identity marker) and a political reading (which refers to the idea that identity is a radical political act that constitutes a major component of LGBTQ activism). In this regard, identity politics conveys the political nature of relations between the LGBTQ movement and governments in Canada: for one thing, it challenges *politics* through the identity-based power relations that the LGBTQ movement bears and embodies; for another thing, it challenges *policy* in that it forms a communication vector between the movement and governments in Canada, notably via public policies.

Although today lesbians and gays enjoy “virtual equality” (Vaid 1995) with heterosexuals,³ non-heteronormative sex is regulated, or even repressed, by various ideological and practical mechanisms based on the premise that heterosexuality is the norm and that LGBTQ desires and sexualities are acceptable only when they ape heterosexual ones. One of these mechanisms is heteronormative hegemony (Ludwig 2011); another is the process of making public policy decisions.

It was in the late 1960s, during the turbulence of the sexual revolution, that the conjuncture allowed for a challenging of what Gary Kinsman (1996, 39–40) then described as heterosexual hegemony. This notion brings to mind the writings of feminist lesbian authors such as Charlotte Bunch ([1976] 2010),

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

who argue that, in male-supremacist societies, heterosexuality is a political institution; Adrienne Rich (1980), who develops the idea of “compulsory heterosexuality”; and Monique Wittig (1989), in whose view heterosexuality, more than an institution, is a political regime. Heterosexual hegemony is now better known as heterosexism,⁴ which Knecht (2011, 8) defines as “the social system that favours opposite-sex sexuality and relationships, including the presumption that everyone is heterosexual or that heterosexual attraction and relationships are ‘normal’ and therefore superior.” As a hegemonic mechanism, heterosexuality is subtly forced on people not by state coercion and violence but by consent and adherence to the values underlying civil society institutions and promoted by the state – values allegedly embodied in such institutions as the family, the school system, the labour and leisure markets, the media, and the consumer regime. Its strength lies in its invisibility as it is cloaked in the idea of being simply “common sense” (Ludwig 2011, 55), as being a fact stemming from nature. Thus, heterosexual hegemony is naturalized through sex and gender roles, which are portrayed as opposed and mutually exclusive, and it is imposed on people by what can be called “daily habitus,” public discourses, and state policies. As revealed by the authors in this book, in both the past and the present queer activists – especially liberationist ones – have challenged the heterosexist fabric of Canadian society and sought to broaden the range of possibilities with regard to sexualities. And this is precisely the objective of *Queer Mobilizations*: to explore the power relations between LGBTQ movements and governments in Canada on the terrain of regulation of non-heteronormative sexualities.

The process of public decision making is another mechanism used to regulate and repress queer sexualities. Many of the authors in this book choose to explore this process via a liberal pluralist approach, while others have adopted more critical perspectives. Although the liberal pluralist approach is not faultless – far from it! – it has been, and still is, one of the mainstream approaches used for studying states, governments, and public policies in Canada as well as their outcomes and their impacts on political actors and civil society. Of course, other approaches can be used to study the interrelations between governments and LGBTQ activism in Canada, notably critical approaches such as neo-Marxism, postcolonialism, and 1970s liberationist analysis. For instance, the postcolonialist approach suggests that Canada is a colonial settler state project, based on the colonization of Indigenous peoples; the subordination of Québécoises and Québécois, Acadians, and the waves of non-white immigrants and migrant workers brought into the country; and other factors. Nevertheless, those who prefer these critical approaches will not be totally

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

unsatisfied with *Queer Mobilizations* since they are manifested (albeit timidly) in some chapters; indeed, I would posit that some of the authors have, at least in part, made use of these critical approaches by examining certain minority groups in Canada, such as Aboriginals, Quebec francophones, and trans activists. That said, there are three reasons that the liberal pluralist approach serves as the underlying theme of this book.

The first reason is that the liberal pluralist approach is based on the assumption that Canada is a pluralist political society in the sense that its operating economy feeds on the setting in confrontation of a plurality of actors that are profoundly unequal with regard to their respective capital resources. Some of these actors are political-institutional bodies such as parliaments, governments, the courts, and the police, and others are societal bodies such as social movements, community milieus, and alternative media. The LGBTQ movement and governments in Canada are part of, and contribute to, this dynamic. The second reason is that the liberal pluralist approach dissects what *is* rather than pleading in favour of what could – or should – be. The objective of liberal pluralism certainly is not to challenge formal government institutions or the rules and practices of the political game (although some might see this as problematic); rather, it is to understand not only their basic principles, structures, standard operating procedures, strategies for enduring or transforming in space and time, limitations, and outcomes (especially in civil society) but also any reforms that might be made. The last reason that the liberal pluralist approach is preferred is that it is easily combined with the institutionalist perspective. In the view of March and Olsen (2006, 3),

an institution is a relatively enduring collection of rules and organized practices, embedded in structures of meaning and resources that are relatively invariant in the face of turnover of individuals and relatively resilient to the idiosyncratic preferences and expectations of individuals and changing external circumstances ... There are constitutive rules and practices prescribing appropriate behavior for specific actors in specific situations. There are structures of meaning, embedded in identities and belongings: common purposes and accounts that give direction and meaning to behavior, and explain, justify, and legitimate behavioral codes. There are structures of resources that create capabilities for acting. Institutions empower and constrain actors differently and make them more or less capable of acting according to prescriptive rules of appropriateness. Institutions are also reinforced by third parties in enforcing rules and sanctioning non-compliance.

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

According to this reading, the LGBTQ movement and governments in Canada are institutions in that they have identities, structures, rules, and resources that are relatively stable and stand up to particular situations and in that they deploy actors whose practices are coded and whose actions are more or less successful. Each of the numerous case studies cited by the authors in this book offers a field of analysis for decoding and revealing LGBTQ activism and governments as institutions of Canadian political society.

This short discussion of the ideological and practical mechanisms designed to regulate and repress non-heteronormative sexualities cannot conclude without addressing the question of policing. In fact, one may conceptualize policing mechanisms on a range from the more subtle to the more overt. As mentioned above, heteronormative hegemony is a subtle yet powerful mechanism in promoting the heterosexual lifestyle. Higgins (2011) notes that (homo) normalization has replaced police repression as a means of regulating and repressing queer sexualities. Governments have at their disposal an arsenal of means to subtly control non-heteronormative sex. For example, the federal government can count on statutes dealing with citizenship and immigration; provincial governments may frame LGBTQ activism via health care, social services, and education policies; and municipalities may use regulations to keep the peace and order and ensure good government, health, and general well-being – the last manifested in regulations on public posting and public manifestations such as parades.

Policing LGBTQ communities is an overt yet unstable means of regulating and repressing queer sexualities. Indeed, although police violence was commonly used from the 1970s to the late 1990s (including raids on bars, saunas, and other LGBTQ social sites), today these acts have little legitimacy. This type of policing of non-heteronormative sexualities certainly has not disappeared, however, as evidenced in the recent police raids on men's bathhouses in Calgary and Hamilton (Knecht 2011, 57). In fact, many of the traditional mechanisms are still in place, including section 210 of the Criminal Code on bawdy houses, censorship of LGBTQ art, and attacks on particular queer sexual practices. Policing is also chameleon-like in that it adapts to the situations in which it is deployed, perhaps to be in tune with community standards of tolerance – for example, depending on whether it occurs in a large city, a small town, or a rural area. Nevertheless, police zeal in this area has been tempered by at least two factors. The first is the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which, by offering legal guarantees, has cooled the homophobic ardour of some police officers. The other is the dialogue that has been established over time between queer communities and the police, which has been extensive enough that

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

today policing of LGBTQ communities is much too subtle to involve the use of billy clubs, fists, and pepper spray; instead, it takes the form of dialogue and cooperation between police departments and LGBTQ communities in order to define the line between licit and illicit. Examples are committees for liaison between the police and LGBTQ communities (such as the Ottawa Police Liaison Committee), training sessions on LGBTQ issues prepared and led by LGBTQ people for police officers, proactive recruitment of LGBTQ people into police forces, the presence of LGBTQ patrol officers in the queer neighbourhoods of Canadian cities, and participation by a contingent of LGBTQ police officers in many queer pride parades across the country (see Warner 2002, 289–301).

In any event, the history of queer activism in Canada reveals that policing has far from broken the back of the movement. LGBTQ people have responded by deploying a wide variety of resistance strategies to secure equality rights and protection against discrimination; to compensate for government indifference and shortfalls, even hostility, in the struggle against HIV/AIDS; to counter governments' colonizing intentions regarding Aboriginal people; to destabilize heteronormative hegemony regarding intimate unions and extending parental and family rights to LGBTQ relationships; to react to homophobic and transphobic violence in schools and elsewhere; to combat state censorship on gender diversity, trans identities, and non-heteronormative sexualities; and more. It is these bilateral power relations between queer activism and public policy in Canada that *Queer Mobilizations* examines.

A few words should be said about the other basic theme underlying the issues discussed in this book: social movement theories. Basically, analyses of social movements are guided by four principal theoretical approaches. The first is collective behaviour theory, which suggests that collective protests outside of political institutions or within civil society result from the anger and grievances of people who feel deprived and discriminated against (see, for example, Blumer 1951; Gurney and Tierney 1982). The second is resource mobilization theory, which puts the emphasis on resources, organization, and opportunities to mobilize a social movement and to deploy collective action (see, among others, Gamson 1990; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977, 2002). The third is political process theory, which focuses both on the relationships between social movement actors and states and governments and on the role of opportunities (political, social, cultural, economic, discursive, or other) in collective actions and outcomes achieved by social movements (see, for instance, Meyer 2004; Tarrow 1994). The fourth is new social movement theory, so called because it pays particular attention to movements that

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

flourished from the 1960s on and that are based on identity politics (see, among others, Habermas 1981; Melucci 1980, 1996). The authors in this book borrow less from collective behaviour theory and more from the last three approaches. That said, as Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) show, social movements are extremely complex entities, and understanding them requires a multifaceted approach based on several theoretical perspectives.

A Brief Look at Queer Activism in Canada

Kees Waaldijk (2000) suggests an interpretive framework for understanding the evolution of the rights of LGBTQ people in the West organized around three occurrences that were oriented towards seeking equality: first, homosexual acts were decriminalized; then, laws forbidding discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation were adopted; finally, lesbians and gays obtained various rights (e.g., with regard to employment, health care, civil union and marriage, and reproduction and parenting). I use this framework to orient my look at queer activism in Canada, notably because it is consistent with the liberal pluralist approach favoured in this book. Of course, the LGBTQ movement in Canada cannot be reduced to such a rights-seeking and human rights frameworks model, notably because it disappears lesbian and gay liberation narratives. Yet, as Warner (2002) demonstrates, since as far back as the 1960s queer activism in Canada has been torn between two orientations: (1) equality-seeking assimilationism and (2) liberationism. Warner's analysis suggests that followers of these two trends, although opposed, have occasionally collaborated; for instance, the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario (CLGRO), a liberationist group, was involved in struggles to secure legal recognition of same-sex relationships in Ontario – an obviously equality-seeking assimilationist issue (Warner 2002, 219–34).

In Canada, homosexuality came out of the closet in 1969, when Pierre Elliott Trudeau's Liberal government decriminalized buggery and gross indecency when engaged in by two consenting adults (twenty-one years of age and over) in private (Kinsman 2013), although other provisions in the Criminal Code related to policing gay sexuality (including sections dealing with bawdy houses and obscene material sent through the mail) were maintained.⁵ The federal government took its lead from Britain's Wolfenden Report, which, in 1957, recommended that sex between men be partially decriminalized based on the principle that what people do in the privacy of their homes is not the state's business (Chambers 2010; Kollman and Waites 2011).

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

This is not to say that homosexuality was non-existent in Canada before 1969. In fact, the lesbian and gay activism that emerged in Canada following the 1969 reform of the Criminal Code had its roots in the development of gay cultures and communities in the 1950s and 1960s, which, in turn, made possible limited but important homophile activities and organizing in the second half of the 1960s (see Kinsman 1996, 161–69, 224–57; Kinsman 2013; Warner 2002, 42–60). Although the historical span of *Queer Mobilizations* focuses on the 1970s and beyond, it is worthwhile to write a few words on the decades before the 1969 reform of the Criminal Code because this is the period that set the stage for the emergence of queer activism in the 1970s.

The Second World War had a significant impact on the regime of heterosexual hegemony: by encouraging migration of people from rural to urban settings in order to work in war production it loosened the traditional heterosexual family ties, and by separating women and men it made possible same-sex relationships in both the army and in industry (Bérubé 1990; D’Emilio [1983] 1998). In the 1950s, several events took place that favoured public visibility of same-sex sex and raised questions about its nature: Was it a moral sin, a criminal offence, a mental and sexual disease, or something else? Which institution – the church, the social services and health care system, or the police – was best suited to handle these sexual deviants? In the United States, Alfred Kinsey published his studies on female and male sexual behaviour, showing that same-sex sex was much more prevalent than had been thought in 1948 and 1953. Kinsey’s studies were important because they provided a scientific rationale for homophile groups arguing for the legitimization of their existence. In Great Britain, the Montagu-Wildeblood trial (a case involving several men accused of homosexual “offences”) in 1954 received huge media coverage, and three years later the Wolfenden Report recommended a private/public regime of same-sex sex regulation under which homosexual acts would not lead to criminal prosecution unless committed in public or involving young people.

The period following the end of the Second World War also saw the creation of networks within which gay men (and, to a lesser extent, lesbians) appropriated spaces (basically bars and baths) where they could meet in Canada’s larger cities. Although some women chose to live as lesbians in secret (Duder 2010), as early as the 1950s there was a vibrant working-class lesbian bar culture in some Canadian cities (Chamberland 1996a, 1996b; Chenier 2004), and lesbian and gay physique magazines, homoerotic novels, and “yellow press” newspapers were circulated (Fortier 1998; Waugh 1998). These materials were key to germinating a sense of belonging – of not being the only

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

one of their kind – among lesbians and gays. In the 1950s, gay activist James Egan was writing columns in high-circulation newspapers denouncing what today is called heterosexism and pleading for recognition of the humanity of homosexual people (see Egan 1998; Kinsman 1996, 167–69). In 1954, Maurice Leznoff defended his doctoral dissertation, “The Homosexual in Urban Society.” His research – now considered the first sociological survey of gay men in Canada – revealed the existence of a homosexual culture and gay networks in Montreal in the years following the end of the Second World War. Some gay men, whom Leznoff (1954) calls “overts” because they lived almost exclusively in gay networks, were in a way precursors of queer activism. Just as they “struggled for social space in the 1950s, so did working-class lesbian butch/femme cultures struggle for lesbian space and to affirm dyke identities” (Kinsman 1996, 165).

As the list of events compiled by Donald W. McLeod (1996, 1–39) shows, in the 1960s what was to become the gay liberation movement was well along in the gestational process: lesbian and gay themes appeared in literature, theatre, and film, and the number of bars and other gay meeting spaces, such as saunas, grew. The Association for Social Knowledge (ASK) was the most significant homophile activist group in the 1960s (on ASK, see Kinsman 1996, 230–48; Warner 2002, 59). Created in Vancouver in April 1964 and inspired by the Mattachine Society in the United States, ASK was the first and most enduring Canadian homophile group in Canada. It was established “to help society to understand and accept variations from the sexual norm” (quoted in McLeod 1996, 7). More specifically, ASK’s purposes were to inform and educate about homosexuality (which was depicted as sharing several similarities with heterosexuality), to build and maintain a community centre, to encourage studies on homosexuality, to advocate and lobby for reforming criminal laws related to homosexuality, and to collaborate with similar homophile groups inside and outside of Canada (Kinsman 1996, 230–35). ASK was a mixed organization with a balanced number of lesbians and gay men not only as members but also in positions of leadership: for instance, Jaye Haris was the first executive advisor (McLeod 1996, 10) and Norma K. Mitchell was the president when ASK terminated its activities (Kinsman 1996, 235). The organization published *ASK Newsletter* from April 1964 to April 1965, and from December 1966 to May 1968; among other things, the newsletter informed members about events and issues relevant to homosexuality (Kinsman 1996, 233). It also sponsored public discussions on topics that were quite progressive – if not provocative – such as “Homosexual Marriages,” “Drag and Transvestism,” and “Sadism, Masochism, and Fetishism” during the summer of 1964 (McLeod 1996, 10).

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

ASK (or ASK members) also engaged in political and legal lobbying, such as submitting a brief to the Royal Commission on Security (McLeod 1996, 36, 37). Apparently, the organization disbanded in 1968.

Although it was the most significant and enduring group, ASK was not the only homophile group organizing in Canada in the 1960s. For instance, in 1963, the Committee on Social Hygiene was formed “to investigate the extent of homosexuality in eastern Canada and to quietly lobby for reforms to the Canadian Criminal Code” (McLeod 1996, 5). In May 1965, the committee was disbanded and the Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual was founded; it “urged Wolfenden-type reforms in Canada” (Warner 2002, 45). The short-lived Homophile Reform Society (HRS) was set up in August 1964 (Kinsman 2013). International Sex Equality Anonymous (ISEA), a homophile organization focusing on information and education, was formed in Montreal in August 1967 (Kimmel and Robinson 2001; Kinsman 1996, 250; McLeod 1996, 31). Two homophile magazines, *Gay* and *Two*, began to publish in Toronto in 1964.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the 1960s saw significant enough changes in social attitudes regarding homosexuality that the Liberal government could count on a good deal of public support when it announced its intention to decriminalize certain homosexual acts in private between consenting adults. This liberalization of attitudes towards same-sex sex had something to do with the fact that homosexuality had become a public issue increasingly (and positively) covered by the mass media, debated by different religious faiths and churches, and commented on by professionals such as lawyers, physicians, psychologists, and psychiatrists. In addition, the *Klippert* case spurred the impetus (already well under way) towards reforming the Criminal Code in the mid-1960s.⁶ This public support, it should be noted, had been preceded by sweeping national security campaigns against queers that had been initiated in the late 1950s and early 1960s and that were epitomized by attempts to develop the famous “fruit machine” (Kinsman 1995; 1996, 177–81; Kinsman and Gentile 2010, 168–90).

Bill C-150, which decriminalized certain sexual acts (“gross indecency” and “buggery”) committed in private between two consenting adults twenty-one years of age or older, was a liberal approach to sexual regulation, although it was oppressive in that it used the “sickness model” to regulate same-sex sex: in the spirit of the private/public regime of sex regulation advocated by the Wolfenden Report, there was the implication that, whereas what two adults did behind locked bedroom doors (thus defining “private” in very narrow terms) was not a crime, it could still be a sickness needing to be addressed by

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

counsellors, doctors, psychiatrists, and psychologists. Quite paradoxically, although the 1969 reform was an attempt to confine queer sexualities to the private realm, people used it to become more public and visible (which led to police clampdowns due to the vagueness of the law with regard to the definition of “the public”) (see Kinsman 2013). In fact, the adoption of Bill C-150 contributed to the emergence of LGBTQ activism, consciousness, and community building – that is, to the advent of the gay liberation movement. In ensuing years, LGBTQ people became political actors who took to the street to demand their rights; such demands were often rejected, of course, but the actors did sometimes make gains.

The 1970s were marked by a dynamic that swung between repression of homosexuality and construction of queer identities and communities. As mentioned above, Bill C-150 only partially decriminalized homosexual acts in Canada, and the Criminal Code still contained provisions allowing police forces and courts to repress homosexuality (Kinsman and Gentile 2010, 221–335; MacDougall 2000; Warner 2002, 99–118), as evidenced by the many police raids that took place in spaces of gay sociability (bars and saunas) and the existence of section 159 of the Criminal Code – which is still in effect (Knecht 2011, 52). It is in this spirit that, in August 1971, a brief was addressed to the federal government (see below) demanding, among other things, that the notions “gross indecency” and “indecent act” be removed from the Criminal Code. That said, in the 1970s LGBTQ people tackled the construction of a politicized sexual identity, defined as an essential precondition for the emergence and constitution of a “gay” community and of equality-seeking and rights-claiming political strategies (Smith 1999, 8–9). The first gay liberation groups started up in Canadian cities very soon after homosexuality was partially decriminalized. Without a doubt, they were influenced by the Stonewall Riots in New York City in June 1969 (Warner 2002, 62–95), even though “modern gay liberation was not born alone at the Stonewall Inn,” as Altman (2013, 53) notes. These groups, with a wide array of missions, included the University of Toronto Homophile Association (October 1969); the Vancouver Gay Liberation Front (November 1970, the first gay liberation – non-homophile – group in Canada [Kinsman and Gentile 2010, 249]); the Front de libération homosexuel (Montreal, March 1971); the Gay Alliance towards Equality Saskatoon (April 1971); Toronto Gay Action and Gay Alliance towards Equality-Vancouver (June 1971); the Gay Alliance towards Equality (Edmonton, summer 1971); Gays of Ottawa/Gays d’Ottawa (September 1971); the Gay Alliance for Equality (Halifax, June 1972); Gays for Equality (Winnipeg, 1973; formerly the Campus Gay Club, University

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

of Manitoba); Montreal Gay Women (March 1973); the Centre humanitaire d'aide et de libération (Quebec City, May 1973), which held the first pan-Canadian queer conference several months after it was founded; Lesbian Feminists (Saskatoon, autumn 1973); the Rights of Lesbians Subcommittee of the British Columbia Federation of Women (October 1974); the Coalition for Gay Rights in Ontario (January 1975); the Lesbian Organization of Ottawa Now (1976); the Association des gai(e)s du Québec (autumn 1976); and the Lesbian Organization of Toronto (late 1976; disbanded spring 1980) (McLeod 1996, 46–100, 138, 186, 225–27). Vancouver's first gay pride rally was organized in June 1972, and Toronto's first Gay Pride Week was held in August 1972. Regional gay newspapers (such as *Gaezette* in Halifax and *Gay Tide* in Vancouver) were started, and *Body Politic*, a Toronto-based magazine that was to play a leadership role in queer activism in Canada, was founded in late 1971 and published until 1987. As evidenced by the formation in 1975 of the first pan-Canadian queer rights group, the National Gay Rights Coalition/Coalition nationale pour les droits des homosexuels (in 1978 renamed the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Rights Coalition/Coalition canadienne pour les droits des lesbiennes et gais), the gay liberation groups that sprang up in the 1970s were not limited to local organizations.

The 1970s also saw the first attempts by LGBTQ people to gain equal rights. On 28 August 1971, the first queer demonstration in Canada took place: the August 28th Gay Day Committee, a coalition of twelve groups from Vancouver, Waterloo, Toronto, Ottawa, and Montreal, presented the federal government with a brief (entitled “We Demand”) containing ten demands – a brief that was to frame the LGBTQ movement advocacy agenda for several years. The committee demanded equality for Canadian queer people in matters of criminal justice, immigration, divorce, employment, and promotion in the federal civil service (including in the Canadian Armed Forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) as well as “all legal rights for homosexuals which currently exist for heterosexuals” (Jackson and Persky 1982, 219), and it denounced certain inequities that existed because lesbians and gays could not marry. Although it was certainly not a central concern, this last claim reflects the fact that, at the time, “gay marriage” may have been framed according to the canons of gay liberationism (see Chenier 2013). Although, in 1977, the Parti québécois government was the first in Canada to include sexual orientation among illegal grounds for discrimination (for an analysis of this decision, see Tremblay 2013), in 1971 GATE (Edmonton) lobbied the Alberta government on this issue and members of the University of Toronto Homophile Association demanded similar protection from the attorney general of Ontario (McLeod

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

1996, 72, 79; see also Jackson and Persky 1982, 221–23). In August 1973, the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission recommended, albeit unsuccessfully, that the government provide such protection (McLeod 1996, 134). In October 1973, Toronto City Council became Canada's first legislative body to forbid discrimination due to sexual orientation (Rayside 2008, 93). The need to have discussions with the state to obtain rights may have convinced LGBTQ people to make their initial incursions into national electoral politics: in 1972, the National Gay Election Coalition (NGEC) was instituted for the federal elections of 1972 and 1974 (Kinsman and Gentile 2010, 317; Warner 2002, 76).

The 1980s offered a paradoxical juncture: on the one hand, the HIV/AIDS pandemic was ravaging the queer community; on the other hand, Canada voted in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, section 15 of which, devoted to equality, left out discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation – discrimination that was hitting people with HIV/AIDS extremely hard, as evidenced by their difficulty gaining access to health care (Rayside and Lindquist 1992) and (shameful) proposals made in British Columbia and Nova Scotia to quarantine people suspected of carrying the virus (Knecht 2011, 93–94). The absence of the mention of sexual orientation in the Charter was even more disturbing because representations had been made to the federal government to have sexual orientation included among the proscribed grounds for discrimination (notably by Svend Robinson, an openly gay MP, and the Canadian Association of Lesbians and Gay Men, which, in December 1980, pleaded before a parliamentary committee for the inclusion of sexual orientation in the evolving Charter; see Rayside 1998, 193; Warner 2002, 158; 2010, 111) and Quebec had, several years earlier, added this criterion to its provincial charter of human rights and freedoms (Tremblay 2013). This lack of protection, fully endorsed by the state and as a consequence of its homophobia and heterosexism, combined with the many kinds of discrimination experienced by gays (and perpetrated by federal, provincial, and even municipal governments, which were slow to react to the pandemic, and by families, who sometimes purely and simply refused to allow a surviving spouse to inherit an estate accumulated over the course of a relationship with a deceased spouse) and lesbians (who, ignorantly, were also seen as carriers of the plague) led the movement to demand that the state focus on the area of rights, notably with regard to recognition of same-sex relationships. This was a strategy for securing both economic redistribution and social justice (Onishenko and Caragata 2010). In fact, as illustrated by the case studies presented in this collection, the HIV/AIDS crisis and the Charter were to dictate the agenda of Canadian LGBTQ activists for decades to come, whether the aim was to attain protection against

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

discrimination, to gain recognition for same-sex unions and their families, to obtain health care services adapted to the needs of LGBTQ people, or to provide information to young people about sexuality. Put another way, the HIV/AIDS crisis boosted LGBTQ organizing around access to treatments, support for people living with HIV/AIDS, and information and education regarding safer sex. It also led to the formation of a plethora of groups embracing a wide array of ideological stances, from assimilationism to a more militant style (such as ACT UP and AIDS Action Now!). That said, although the HIV/AIDS crisis galvanized grassroots LGBTQ activism, it also led to a certain mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS issues through their appropriation by medical professionals and (partial and insufficient) financing by federal, municipal, and provincial governments.

From the second half of the 1980s to the late 1990s, LGBTQ people mobilized to amend provincial human rights laws (except in Quebec, where the criterion of sexual orientation was added to the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms in 1977; on LGBTQ activism to amend provincial human rights laws, see Warner 2002, 197–211; more specifically, on Quebec, see Tremblay 2013). As a result of years of organizing to achieve protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation, Ontario (in 1986) and the Yukon and Manitoba (in 1987) followed Quebec by amending their human rights legislation to include sexual orientation as a prohibited ground for discrimination (Knegt 2011, 40). In 1986, Hamilton became the first large Canadian city to extend workplace benefits for its employees to same-sex partners. As a baby boom took place among lesbian women, the 1980s saw the first decisions favourable to LGBTQ people for both relationship and parental rights (Rayside 2008, 168–73). In June 1989, the Fifth International Conference on AIDS was held in Montreal, and queer activists took this opportunity to criticize how the federal government was managing the pandemic. The first steps towards activism also took place in the education sector, including regarding sex education, information on HIV/AIDS, and the fight against homophobia and heterosexism (Rayside 2008, 222–23).

On the organizational level, the Canadian queer movement was extremely active, and a plethora of groups was founded in the 1980s, including Calgary's Lesbian Mothers Defence Fund in the early 1980s and Gay Asians of Toronto in 1980; Zami, the first group in Canada for black and West Indian lesbians and gays, and Lesbians of Colour in 1984 (Warner 2002, 181, 185–86); the Nichiwakan Native Gay and Lesbian Society in Winnipeg in 1986; AIDS Action Now! in Toronto in 1988; the Gay and Lesbian Association of Nova Scotia and the Nova Scotia Coalition of People with AIDS, also in 1988; and

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

the 2-Spirited People of the First Nations in Toronto in 1989. As well, in 1981 the first National Lesbian Conference was held in Vancouver. The sustained activism and organizational vitality of LGBTQ people in the heart of the HIV/AIDS crisis was paralleled by growing activism in the social and religious conservative movement (Farney 2012, 106–12; Herman 1994a).

The 1990s saw a reformist and even, in the view of some, conservative and assimilationist activism (Knecht 2011, 7; Warner 2002, 218–46) oriented towards the state, its goal being to attain both negative rights (i.e., protection against discrimination) and positive rights for LGBTQ people. Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere (EGALE) – the country’s only national queer lobby group – embodied the reformist, legalistic orientation adopted by queer activists to promote rights claims. Nevertheless, the very conditions under which EGALE was formed indicated a position that favoured the search for equality for LGBTQ people as the group had deep roots in the 1985 parliamentary hearings on section 15 of the Canadian Charter. In addition to lobbying MPs and governments, one of EGALE’s main goals was to take a role in Charter cases and litigation involving sexual orientation (Smith 1999, 77–101) – a role that it played effectively in trials such as *Mossop* (1993) and *Egan* (1995). Although it was important, EGALE was not alone as other groups also negotiated with the government to obtain queer rights. For example, in the early 1990s CLGRO mobilized in relation to Bill 167, the objective of which was to amend notions of “spouse” and “marital status” in some fifty Ontario laws to include LGBTQ people.

Although it was not completely successful, the reformist activism of the 1990s resulted in a number of rights gains. For instance, in 1992 the ban on queers serving in the Canadian Armed Forces was lifted. Following the *Haig and Birch v. Canada* ruling (1992), in 1996 the federal government amended the Canadian Human Rights Act to add sexual orientation to the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination. Six provinces and Nunavut did the same thing between 1991 and 1999. In addition, the courts made a series of rulings, many of which supported queers’ equality-seeking rights claims (Smith 2005a). For example, in *Egan and Nesbitt v. Canada* (1995), the Supreme Court ruled that sexual orientation is analogous to other grounds for discrimination listed in the Canadian Charter section on equality. The ruling in *Vriend v. Alberta* (1998) resulted in sexual orientation being read into Alberta’s human rights law. In *Rosenberg v. Canada* (1998) and *M v. H* (1999), the Supreme Court of Canada recognized same-sex relationships by attributing certain rights and obligations to them, notably regarding tax benefits for company pension plans and spousal support. In 1995, the government of British Columbia adopted Bill 51, which legalized the adoption of children by “two adults jointly” (Rayside

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

2008, 174). During the second half of the 1990s, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Alberta recognized same-sex couples' right to adoption (179). Also in the 1990s, benefits were extended to same-sex partners of employees of the federal government, nine provinces, and two territories (98) – gains that benefited from union support of queer demands.

Beyond rights claims lobbying by large organizations such as EGALE, LGBTQ activism in the 1990s was propelled by a wide range of groups involved in a multitude of regional and local projects. For example, in the 1990s the Foundation for the Advancement of Trans-Gender Equality was created and protests for transgendered human rights protections were organized, notably in Vancouver in 1998. In the same decade, LGBTQ-focused health organizations sprang up across Canada to compensate for the inadequate services available to queer people. In 1990–91, Toronto and Vancouver were the scenes of Queer Nation Acts Up activism. The Lesbian and Gay Immigration Task Force was founded in Vancouver in 1991. Also that year, the Nova Scotia Men's Project, dedicated to rural communities and marginalized groups such as male prostitutes, was launched; two years later, the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Youth Project was founded in Halifax. In 1995, the Triangle Program, a schooling initiative focusing on the needs of LGBTQ people, their identities, and their cultures, was set up in Toronto. Newfoundland Gays and Lesbians for Equality was created in 1995. The Lotus Root Conference for gay, lesbian, and bisexual East Asians was held in 1996. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, gay-straight alliances began to emerge, raising resistance on the part of some parents as well as Roman Catholic and Protestant schools. However, from the 1990s onward queer activism could count on the support of unions, as illustrated by the Marc Hall high school prom case (see Hunt and Eaton 2007).

The turn of the twenty-first century did not interrupt the queer movement's quest for rights. Although, earlier in the 1990s, some lesbians and gays had attempted to have their union recognized or to marry (Larocque 2006, 15–18), it was not until the late 1990s and early 2000s that this battle monopolized the lesbian and gay agenda. Over the course of this period, many resources were devoted to the fight for the recognition of unions between two women or two men and for the opening of civil marriage to same-sex couples. These battles, fought in the courts and the political arena, notably by EGALE and its offshoot, Canadians for Equal Marriage, clearly illustrate how the Charter served the equality rights of LGBTQ people. For instance, in its *M v. H* decision (1999), the Supreme Court ruled that the definition of spouses as a “man and woman” in Ontario's Family Law Act was unconstitutional under the Charter. In response, in 2000 the federal government adopted the Modernization of

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

Benefits and Obligations Act, extending to same-sex couples a series of rights and social benefits. Between 2001 and 2005, eleven of the twelve provincial and territorial courts called upon to give rulings on cases brought by same-sex couples invalidated the traditional common-law definition of marriage and substituted a definition based on the right to equality provided in section 15 of the Charter (Hurley 2005, 6).

The opening of civil marriage to same-sex couples constituted an incontestable victory for the equality of lesbians and gays in Canada. However, this claim was not unanimously accepted within the movement as many (including numerous lesbian feminists) rejected marriage not only because of its non-egalitarian nature and its role in the oppression of women but also because making it accessible to lesbians and gays was a way of “heteronormalizing” them and marginalizing those who refused to marry (Cossman and Ryder 2001; Mulé 2010; Young and Boyd 2006). Peter Knegt (2011, 47) gives a succinct description of the reasons for this resistance: “Essentially, same-sex marriage only serves people who are in a position to take advantage of such expanded recognition. It also maintains the idea of heterosexual marriage as a ‘norm’ to which queer people should aspire. And ... it leaves many other important issues out in the cold.” What is more, access to civil marriage for same-sex couples in no way meant that equality had been achieved for LGBTQ people in Canada, as evidenced by the police raids on men’s bathhouses in Calgary and Hamilton as recently as 2004 (57) and the increase in the age of consent decreed by Stephen Harper’s Conservative government in 2006 (Warner 2010, 85–93; see also Dauda 2010; Wong 2006). Despite its apparent normalization, “homosexuality remains contentious” (Altman 2013, 164).

Although the opening of civil marriage to same-sex couples monopolized the queer activist agenda at the turn of the twenty-first century, LGBTQ people had a number of other reasons to mobilize. The fight against discrimination, in the field of human rights, remained central to queer activism. For example, the Canadian Rainbow Health Coalition was formed in 2002 to educate about and advocate for LGBTQ health concerns. The International Conference on LGBT Community Human Rights was held in Montreal in 2006, leading to the creation of the International Day against Homophobia. A major source of homophobia is HIV/AIDS, which explains ongoing queer struggles on this terrain. This activism is worthwhile, as suggested by the adoption in Nova Scotia of the first provincial strategy on HIV/AIDS. In August 2011, a conference was held in Vancouver entitled “‘We Demand’: History/Sex/Activism in Canada/Nous demandons: Histoire/Sexe/Activisme au Canada.”⁷ The conference marked the fortieth anniversary of the demonstration held on 28 August 1971, when, for

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

the first time, LGBTQ people – some two hundred of them – and their allies gathered on Parliament Hill in Ottawa to denounce discrimination against them and to demand their right to equality (see above for more details). This fight against discrimination went hand in hand with the question of human rights for transgender and transsexual people. Several provinces, including Manitoba and Ontario (since the summer of 2012) and the Northwest Territories, now offer these people protection against discrimination. However, homophobia and transphobia remain a particular concern in Canada. Governments are now becoming more aware of the issue, as evidenced by Nova Scotia's 2012 adoption of a policy mandating that no school can prohibit gay-straight alliances, by Ontario's 2012 adoption of the Accepting Schools Act, and by Quebec's 2009 adoption of the Policy against Homophobia and its 2011 adoption of the Government Action Plan against Homophobia, 2011–2016.

I cannot claim that this brief look at the Canadian queer movement is fully representative of LGBTQ activism in Canada. In fact, it positions at the forefront a privileged category of queer people – male, white, middle-class, living in urban areas, English-speakers, well-educated, able-bodied, and so on. Unfortunately, this kind of emphasis is a well-known phenomenon in history and in social sciences more generally – that is, the dominant group has the power to assimilate its own specific stories with history and to claim that its history is universal (i.e., neutral, non-gendered, non-coloured, non-classed, and so on) when in fact it is its own stories that are told. I do not claim that *Queer Mobilizations* escapes this hegemonic and assimilationist process; it is even possible that it exemplifies it. However, I dare to hope that several of the chapters in this collection allow this gap to be partially addressed by examining some specific queer groups (notably Aboriginals, Quebec francophones, and trans activists). Words have the power to cause a hermeneutic and ontological shift through the writing and publishing of different histories. More important, below I conduct a brief review of existing literature on the LGBTQ movement in Canada. My purpose is twofold: (1) to map research on queer activism in Canada – that is, to provide a reading of the current state of knowledge on the subject; and (2) to situate this collection in relation to works published up to now and (secondarily) to shed light on its contribution and originality.

The State of Knowledge about Queer Activism in Canada

What is most notable when examining works published on queer activism in Canada since the 1970s is their sheer number: it is impossible to claim that this field of research is underdeveloped. Of course, this does not mean that all

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

topics have been covered and that there is no more research to be done. However, it does mean that this review cannot mention all the works published in the last fifty years. Moreover, my intention here is not to compile an exhaustive bibliography of all publications on LGBTQ activism in Canada since the 1970s (excellent databases on the subject exist) but, rather, to reveal major research niches. Consequently, as a general rule, I mention the best-known and most accessible titles for each niche, with an emphasis on books (although I also cite journal articles). Also notable is the diversity of themes that has inspired research on queer activism in Canada: from the homophile groups of the 1950s and 1960s to the social conservatism of the 1990s and 2000s via the HIV/AIDS pandemic, lesbian invisibility, homophobia and transphobia in schools and in the media, same-sex union recognition and resistance to this form of heteronormalization, transgender identities, and the clash between the right to equality and freedom of religion. Yet such diversity is hardly surprising since – as mentioned above – it can be interpreted as simply reflecting the diversity of LGBTQ activism in Canada. Below, I suggest a reading (without a doubt both subjective and selective) of the current state of research on queer activism in Canada.

This review is based on a cleavage that certainly is not beyond criticism: that between general works and particular, or thematic, works. The former provide a broad – one might say horizontal – look at LGBTQ activism, using a historical, theoretical, and/or comparative approach, while the latter provide a more focused – one might say vertical – look, concentrating on specific themes. By recounting the history, and offering an interpretation, of queer activism in Canada, historical works provide vital aspects of queer memories, identities, and communities. Published in 1972, *A Not So Gay World: Homosexuality in Canada*, by Marion Foster and Kent Murray (both pseudonyms), was the first book to use a sociological approach to look at the nascent lesbian and gay communities in Canada in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Foster and Murray 1972). That said, the most comprehensive books ever published on the history of queer activism in Canada – and written from a liberationist viewpoint – are Tom Warner's (2010) *Never Going Back: A History of Queer Activism in Canada* and Gary Kinsman's (1996) *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities*. For those who do not have the time to read these two thick books, Peter Knegt's (2011) *About Canada: Queer Rights* is a highly recommended shortcut. People looking for dates and events may consult Donald W. McLeod's (1996) *Lesbian and Gay Liberation in Canada: A Selected Annotated Chronology, 1964–1975*, and those who want to revisit the times or read interpretations of the gay liberation movement from the mid-1970s to the early 1980s may read

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

Flaunting It! A Decade of Gay Journalism from The Body Politic, an anthology edited by Ed Jackson and Stan Persky (1982). Although they do not deal specifically with Canada, two books – *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement* by Barry D. Adam (1995) and *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics* edited by Barry D. Adam, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and André Krouwel (1999) – help to situate the emergence and early years of queer activism in Canada within the broader context of several Western countries. Biographies also give insight into the history of queer activism in Canada, such as Jim Egan’s (1998) *Challenging the Conspiracy of Silence: My Life as a Canadian Gay Activist* and Ann Silversides’s (2003) *AIDS Activist: Michael Lynch and the Politics of Community*.

The history of LGBTQ activism in Canada has also been addressed through the perspective of groups with more targeted identities within the queer movement. Lesbians have been the subject of several books, including *Lesbians in Canada*, edited by Sharon Dale Stone (1990), a very avant-garde anthology published in 1990 that deals with various aspects of living as a lesbian in Canada, including the invisibility of Afro-Caribbean lesbians, the life of lesbians living outside of major cities, and aging lesbians. *The House That Jill Built: A Lesbian Nation in Formation*, by Becki L. Ross (1995), offers a rare in-depth case study of a lesbian feminist group in the second half of the 1970s – the Lesbian Organization of Toronto (LOOT); in *Mémoires lesbiennes*, Line Chamberland (1996a) retraces the life of lesbians in Montreal during the 1950s and 1960s; and in *Awfully Devoted Women*, Cameron Duder (2010) examines sexuality, relationships, and community life of Canadian middle-class lesbians from the early twentieth century to 1965.

Some historical writings look at populations that have been widely ostracized within Canadian society, including First Nations people and trans people, and this marginalization unfortunately continues within an LGBTQ movement still dominated by white and cissexual people.⁸ In “The Regulation of First Nations Sexuality,” Martin Cannon (1998) shows in what ways the colonization of First Nations people led to the erasure of their traditional multiple genders and sexuality systems (see also the fascinating piece by Hérault 2010). Transsexual and transgender people have been the subject of much research in recent years. In *C’était du spectacle!*, Viviane Namaste (2005) recounts and analyzes the history of transsexual and transvestite artists in Montreal from 1955 to 1985, while bringing to light their strategies of resistance to the cisnormative and cissexist order.

Because Canada is a country of regions, more localized histories of LGBTQ activism have also been written. *Les homosexuels s’organisent au Québec et*

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

ailleurs, by Paul-François Sylvestre (1979), was one of the first books to give a historical overview of queer activism in Quebec, although its narration ends in the 1970s. While its objective was not to give a history of LGBTQ activism in Quebec, Patrice Corriveau's (2011) *Judging Homosexuals: A History of Gay Persecution in Quebec and France* adopts a largely historical approach and covers a vast period of time from the New France era to the middle of the first decade of the twenty-first century. LGBTQ activism in Alberta between 1968 and 1998, and notably its progressive struggles to have the state respond to queer citizenship claims, is the subject of reflections by Laura L. Bonnett (2006; for a historical account since 1990, see Lloyd and Bonnett 2005). Applying a method akin to ethnology to innovative and original sources – trial dossiers on consensual sex between men – Gordon Brent Ingram (2003) suggests a reading of the history of male homosexuality in twentieth-century British Columbia (see also Ingram 2000 on the history in British Columbia). As queer activism was deployed mainly in cities, a number of authors limit their investigations to urban centres, including Irène Demczuk and Frank W. Remiggi (1998), Ross Higgins (1999), Fiona Meyer-Cook and Diane Labelle (2003), and Julie Podmore (2006) on Montreal; Catherine Jean Nash (2005, 2006, 2011) on Toronto; Anne-Marie Bouthillette (1997), Gordon Brent Ingram (2010), Jenny Lo and Theresa Healy (2000), Vincent Miller (2005), and Becki Ross and Rachael Sullivan (2012) on Vancouver. In comparison to this profusion of writings on queer activism in urban spaces, Michael Riordon's (1996) *Out Our Way: Gay and Lesbian Life in the Country* stands out for its view of LGBTQ life outside of the city.

Some general works on queer activism in Canada adopt a scholarly tone, with a thesis to verify, a theoretical framework to follow, and empirical results to present. One example is *Lesbian and Gay Rights in Canada: Social Movements and Equality-Seeking, 1971–1995*, in which Miriam Smith (1999) uses social movement theory to orient her historical reading of lesbian and gay activism in Canada. She demonstrates that rights claims and equality-seeking constituted both ideologies and strategies for lesbian and gay activism in Canada: before the Canadian Charter was adopted, claiming rights and seeking equality were used to build a lesbian and gay political identity and community; after the Charter was adopted, they were used to gain rights and to achieve political victories (more recently see Snow 2014). Other examples of books that link historical and theoretical perspectives are Patrice Corriveau's (2011) *Judging Homosexuals*; Pamela Dickey Young's (2012) *Religion, Sex and Politics: Christian Churches and Same-Sex Marriage in Canada*; Didi Herman's (1994b) *Rights of Passage: Struggles for Lesbian and Gay Legal Equality*; Gary Kinsman's

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

(1996) *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities*; David Rayside's (2008) *Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions*; Carolle Roy's (1985) *Les lesbiennes et le féminisme*; and Miriam Smith's (2008) *Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada*.

Rayside's and Smith's works exemplify another approach found in general works on queer activism in Canada: the comparative approach. Both compare Canada and the United States, as does *Faith, Politics, and Sexual Diversity in Canada and the United States*, edited by David Rayside and Clyde Wilcox (2011), although this book covers a very specific issue. LGBTQ activism in Canada and in the United States share several traits, which is not surprising given the two countries' geographic proximity, their similar philosophical and socio-cultural traditions, and their close economic ties. Yet their political institutions are profoundly different, and this difference has an effect on capacities for mobilization, resources, and the successes and failures of the Canadian and American queer movements.

As mentioned above, this literature review is articulated around a distinction between general works, which take a horizontal look at LGBTQ activism, and particular works, which take a vertical look, focusing on specific issues. The latter, in fact, comprises the lion's share of research on the subject. In the historical overview provided in the second section of this introduction, I describe some of the events that have marked queer activism in Canada – events that become meaningful in the light of an interpretive model suggested by Waaldijk (2000): (1) decriminalization of homosexual acts, (2) adoption of protection against discrimination, and (3) recognition of rights. Works that look at specific issues reflect this tripartite division. These important works not only testify to the diversity and richness of queer activism in Canada but also help to trace the boundary between the licit and the illicit, defining themes upon which it is legitimate to reflect, research that is “worthy” of funding, and works whose results meet the lofty standards of the scholarly press. For lack of space, only some of these themes are addressed here, all of which manifest themselves in a clear dialogue between queer activism and governments in Canada.

One extremely rich research issue concerns fights against discrimination and for acquisition of equality rights – gains that could be extracted only from the state. A book edited by Irène Demczuk (1998), *Des droits à reconnaître: Les lesbiennes face à la discrimination*, is devoted to describing and analyzing the manifest and latent discrimination experienced by lesbians in Quebec. In *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation*, Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile (2010) expose the witch hunt orchestrated by

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

the federal government against queer civil servants and high-ranking officials in the late 1950s and early 1960s in the name of national security. Other works about changes in law and to statutes regarding queer people in Canada include Kathleen A. Lahey's (1999) *Are We 'Persons' Yet? Law and Sexuality in Canada* and Bruce MacDougall's (2000) *Queer Judgments: Homosexuality, Expression, and the Courts in Canada*.

Another theme to which much ink has been devoted is the HIV/AIDS crisis, especially in a country in which health care is essentially provided by the public sector. As mentioned above, the HIV/AIDS pandemic has had significant – and often unexpected – effects on LGBTQ activism in Canada. In *AIDS Activist: Michael Lynch and the Politics of Community*, Ann Silversides (2003) examines HIV/AIDS activism from within the LGBTQ movement – that is, through the eyes of an activist. Michael P. Brown's (1997) study of AIDS organizing and activism in Vancouver, *RePlacing Citizenship: AIDS Activism and Radical Democracy*, is an invitation to broaden understandings of democracy and citizenship as conceived of in the Western world (for a quick overview on HIV/AIDS activism in Canada, see Fung and McCaskell [2007] 2012). Rayside and Lindquist (1992) argue that the HIV/AIDS pandemic spurred queer activism partly because of the willingness of governments at all levels to provide funds to LGBTQ community groups. Yet these interactions with the state were not without deleterious effects on queer activism. For instance, it is possible that state funding helped to split the queer movement into institutionalized and professionalized “AIDS organizations,” on the one side, and the LGBTQ community, on the other (Lavoie 1998). It is certainly possible that the mechanisms used by governments to manage the pandemic also formed an effective strategy for regulating queer activism (Kinsman 1997). It is also possible that the pandemic served as a pretext for governments to pursue their colonization of Aboriginal people, who responded with resistance strategies (see, for example, Morgensen 2008). Today, increased awareness of the complexity of queer identities and life experiences has resulted in highly sophisticated views of HIV/AIDS (see, for example, Adam, Betancourt, and Serrano-Sánchez 2011; Poon et al. 2005).

As mentioned above, same-sex union recognition and civil marriage monopolized lesbian and gay activism in the late 1990s and early 2000s, forcing a dialogue with the state. The many works published on the subject not only situate the debate but also bring to light the stakes for LGBTQ citizenship (see, among others, Dickey Young 2006, 2011, 2012; Larocque 2006; Matthews 2005; Nicol and Smith 2008; Pettinicchio 2010; Smith 2005b). Works looking more specifically at lesbian and gay marriage also reveal the many tensions

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

generated by this issue, both inside and outside the LGBTQ movement. The view that civil marriage should be opened to same-sex couples was far from unanimously held among queer activists (Mulé 2010; Onishenko and Caragata 2010; Smith 2007; Young and Boyd 2006). What is more, this demand unleashed the most obvious adversary (or counter-movement) to queer activism: the social conservatism movement (Haskell 2011; Herman 1994a, 1994b, 1997; Rayside and Wilcox 2011; Warner 2010).

Although the problem of discrimination of all sorts against sexual minorities has preoccupied LGBTQ people for several decades, struggles over homophobia and transphobia have increasingly mobilized governments in recent years; in several provinces, policies have been adopted to combat these scourges. Some authors expose the sometimes extreme violence to which LGBTQ people may be subjected (see, for example, Field 2007; Janoff 2005). However, they also reveal that not only did homophobia and transphobia manifest as physical violence and even murder but they also took much more subtle forms that could lead to death. Research shows that queer people and those self-identified as heterosexual had very different relations with the health care system in Canada (see, among others, Mulé and Smith 2014; Tjepkema 2008). Starting from the principle that LGBTQ people do not form a homogeneous group, other authors emphasize that queer people who live on the edge of the edge – that is, those who display other traits lending themselves to discrimination, such as being a self-identified Two-Spirited person, an aging lesbian, or a trans person – might have even more problematic relations with the health care system than do “mainstream” LGBTQ people (see, for example, Brotman et al. 2002; Brotman, Ryan, and Cormier 2003; Mandlis 2011; Taylor 2009). Michel Foucault ([1976] 1978) shows that the health sciences, broadly defined (e.g., medicine, psychiatry, and psychology, among others), have constituted very powerful mechanisms for imposing heterosexuality on subjects defined as “deviating” from “normal” sexual behaviours, a theoretical approach that has inspired several Canadian researchers (Chenier 2008; Perreault 2011; see also Adams 1997; Filax 2006). That “reparative therapies” are gaining some popularity today shows that, in Canada, these heteronormalization mechanisms are not a thing of the past.

In addition to the health care system, homophobia and transphobia in the education sector have drawn more and more attention in the last few years, to the point at which EGALE has recently begun to campaign on the issue (see Taylor et al. 2011). A number of aspects of this issue have been explored, including bullying and harassment of LGBTQ youths in high schools (see, for example, Haskell and Burtch 2010; McCaskell 2005), fierce resistance from

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

conservative and religious groups to sexual and gender diversity in schools (see, among others, Grace and Wells 2005; see also Rayside 2014; Wintemute 2002), and strategies deployed to resist homophobia and transphobia (such as gay-straight alliances; see, for example, Fetner et al. 2012; Smith 2004; see also Dorais and Verdier 2005). Homophobia and transphobia also affect teachers and school administrators, who either are subjected to a code of silence with regard to sexual diversity (forbidden to be “out” at work or forced to adopt a heteronormative framework for their syllabuses; see, for example, MacDougall 2002; Moon 2011) or are the object of manifest discrimination. What also emerges from these works is the fact that, in recent years, much effort has been expended to question the heteronormative parameters that frame the teaching profession (see, for example, McNinch and Cronin 2004).

One component of LGBTQ activism that, until now, has remained somewhat in the shadows but that has been gaining importance in recent years concerns transsexual/transgender people. The writings of Namaste (2000, 2005, 2011) are essential reading in this regard. Aside from transphobic violence, a number of challenges face trans activism, including trans human rights protection, trans identity recognition on legal documents such as passports, and public funding of sexual reassignment surgeries. Trans Lobby Group (2013) was set up in 2001 with two goals: to educate the public on trans issues and to pressure the political decision-making process on needs of trans people, notably regarding health care and human rights. The Association des transsexuels et transsexuelles du Québec (2013) and the Trans Equality Society of Alberta (2013) pursue similar objectives on the provincial level.

Although incomplete, this brief survey of works (to which should be added archival collections, such as the British Columbia Gay and Lesbian Archives located in Vancouver’s West End, the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives in Toronto, and Les archives gaies du Québec in Montreal, and numerous websites on the subject, including www.fugues.com and www.dailyxtra.com) is nevertheless sufficient to reveal the wealth of knowledge accumulated to date – a wealth of knowledge that the case studies presented in the chapters below further flesh out. But if so much research exists on LGBTQ activism in Canada, why is this book necessary?

Outlining *Queer Mobilizations*

As mentioned above, the authors in *Queer Mobilizations: Social Movement Activism and Canadian Public Policy* explore the relations between LGBTQ activism and the federal, local, and provincial governments in Canada. More

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

specifically, the analyses adopt two perspectives: one privileging the institutional aspect by looking at mechanisms deployed by governments in Canada to regulate (or repress) LGBTQ movements, the other focusing on the queer movement by examining how its activists attempt to influence the public decision-making process in Canada.

In order to look at the complexities that characterize relations between LGBTQ activism and governments in Canada, *Queer Mobilizations* takes a pluralistic approach that deploys a number of layers. First, by considering how public policy has or has not included queer dimensions, the contributors examine a broad array of policy areas. Second, they adopt and combine horizontal and vertical perspectives – the former consisting of a historical look at a given political jurisdiction (the federal government, a region, or a city), the latter consisting of thematic analyses (case studies). This mix of perspectives provides an original framework for investigating queer activism and public policy in Canada. Third, the contributors are leading researchers in a wide range of fields – criminology; gender, sexuality, and women’s studies; geography; history; law; political science; and sociology. Fourth, they use diverse theoretical and methodological approaches. In fact, while they were constrained to follow a specific format for each chapter (see below), the contributors enjoyed full freedom to choose their theories, methods, and case studies. As a consequence, the chapters exhibit a broad range of theories (e.g., resource mobilization, political process theory, social constructivism and new social movements theories, liberal pluralism, institutionalism, and critical legal theory) and methodologies (e.g., case studies, interviews with activists, and content analysis [of newspapers, archival materials, and court decisions]), all of which are explored with rigour, openness, flexibility, and creativity.

The book contains thirteen chapters (including the Introduction and the Conclusion) and is divided into three parts in order to reflect not only the fact that Canadian governments are multi-layered but also to determine how local, federal, and provincial governments interact with queer activism. [Part 1](#) consists of two chapters on the federal government and Aboriginal peoples. This grouping reflects the fact that the federal government and Aboriginal peoples are inescapable interlocutors since they are trapped in a colonial relationship in which the latter are dependent on and subjugated to the former. [Part 2](#) consists of five chapters, each of which is devoted to a particular region of Canada: Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia. The last two provinces are singled out because of their apparent contrast: while the latter is seen as an avant-gardist paradise for LGBTQ people, the former is often depicted as a bastion of backwardness. [Part 2](#) is based on the rationale that region is a familiar tool

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

for analyzing Canadian politics. However, it must be remembered that each region is heterogeneous as each encompasses a wide range of diversities and specificities. As becomes evident in this part, queer activism is also heterogeneous. **Part 3** consists of four chapters, one of which deals with Vancouver, one with Toronto, one with Montreal, and one with Halifax. This section highlights the fact that queer activism was first deployed in urban spaces.

All chapters adopt a common format. Following a brief introduction, the first section, entitled “Historical Background,” identifies the main aspects of LGBTQ activism to be discussed. The second section, entitled “Queer Activism Today,” paints a portrait of present LGBTQ activism in the area to be discussed: its agenda, actors, and resources (the main groups, their membership, and other aspects), strategies (such as using the courts, pressuring governments, having allies within the political class and being active in political parties, electing lesbians and gays to the provincial legislative assembly or municipal council), and so on. The heart of each chapter is the third section, entitled “Queer Activism and Public Policy Changes: Case Studies,” in which a relationship is established between the two analytic axes of this book – (1) how the government of a given political entity (e.g., the Alberta government or the Toronto city council) regulates (or represses) queer activism and (2) how LGBTQ activism has mobilized to shape public decisions and policies in this political space (e.g., the opening of civil marriage to same-sex couples at the federal level, the closer and better collaboration between the City of Montreal Police Service and the queer community). In each chapter three or four case studies are analyzed. Authors selected their own case studies to illustrate relationships between queer activism and public policy.

The result is that *Queer Mobilizations* offers a richly diverse palette of public policy topics: criminal law (age of consent; the *Bad Attitude*, *Little Sister’s Art Emporium*, and *Vriend* cases); policing (in Montreal and Toronto); human rights (for lesbian and gays as well as for trans people; the case of Queers against Israeli Apartheid in the Toronto Pride Parade in 2010 and 2011; the adoption of Bill 44 in Alberta); health and social services (HIV/AIDS activism, education and prevention efforts); relationship recognition and parental and family rights (the *James Egan* case); education (anti-homophobic and transphobic initiatives in schools; residential schools for Aboriginal youth; Bill 44 in Alberta); queer space and infrastructure (in Montreal and Vancouver); Aboriginal issues (the Indian Act and residential schools); electoral politics (the “gay vote” in Montreal and Toronto and in the 2012 Alberta election). Each chapter concludes with a summary of its main observations and a glimpse of future challenges regarding queer activism and public policy in Canada.

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press

Notes

- 1 Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, transgender, and queer.
- 2 The terms “LGBTQ” and “queer” are used synonymously to designate all non-heterosexual people. I employ particular terms (such as “lesbians and gays” and “trans people”) when referring specifically to these groups.
- 3 This is much less true of bisexuals, transsexuals, transgenders, and queer people.
- 4 It is of interest to note that, in everyday language, the notions “heterosexism” and “homophobia” are used interchangeably, as if they were synonymous. However, they are not: “homophobia” borrows from the psychiatric and psychological discourses and tends to see the sources of discrimination against LGBTQ people in “phobic individuals,” whereas “heterosexism” focuses on society – its values and norms, its organizing and functioning – and argues that heterosexuality imbues all social relations (see Bryant and Vidal-Ortiz 2008; Herek 2004).
- 5 The Criminal Code has played a more peripheral role in controlling lesbians, whose sexuality and morality have been managed through other laws, such as those governing family (e.g., parental rights and child custody) and medicine (e.g., regarding mental health and access to new technologies of reproduction).
- 6 In August 1965, after stating that he had engaged in sexual acts with consenting adult males on four occasions, Everett George Klippert was charged with four counts of gross indecency. In March 1966, he was declared a “dangerous sexual offender,” which entailed a sentence of indefinite detention. In November 1967, the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed his appeal. This decision was very controversial and influenced Pierre Elliott Trudeau, then the justice minister, to expedite the reform of the Criminal Code that took place in 1969 (Kinsman 1996, 163; Kinsman and Gentile 2010, 215; McLeod 1996, 32).
- 7 The winter 2014 issue of the *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes* was published in commemoration of the We Demand demonstration.
- 8 Julia Serano (2007, 12) uses the term “cissexual” to describe “people who are not transsexual and who have only ever experienced their mental and physical sexes as being aligned.”

References

- Adam, Barry D. 1995. *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*. New York: Twayne.
- Adam, Barry D., Gerardo Betancourt, and Angel Serrano-Sánchez. 2011. “Development of an HIV Prevention and Life Skills Program for Spanish-Speaking Gay and Bisexual Newcomers to Canada.” *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality* 20 (1–2): 11–7.
- Adam, Barry D., Jan Willem Duyvendak, and André Krouwel, eds. 1999. *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics: National Imprints of a Worldwide Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Adams, Marie Louise. 1997. *The Trouble with Normal: Postwar Youth and the Making of Heterosexuality*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Altman, Dennis. 2013. *The End of the Homosexual*. St. Luca: University of Queensland Press.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., and Mary Bernstein. 2008. “Culture, Power, and Institutions: A Multi-Institutional Politics Approach to Social Movements.” *Sociological Theory* 26 (1): 74–99. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2008.00319.x>.
- Association des transsexuels et transsexuelles du Québec. 2013. *À propos de nous*. <http://www.atq1980.org/>.

Sample Material © 2015 UBC Press