

PRAISE FOR *THE CANADIAN WAR ON QUEERS*

“Compelling personal stories illuminate this impeccably researched analysis of the use of national security legislation to wage a war against lesbian and gay Canadians during the Cold War years. As if that wasn’t enough to accomplish in a single book, the authors employ this history to lay bare the current government’s use of national security legislation to silence critics of corporate power and justify a litany of human rights abuses in today’s ‘war on terror.’ A profound and extremely readable contribution to both queer history and the politics of fear that masquerade as straightforward policy concerns.”

— Lynne Fernie, filmmaker, co-director of *Forbidden Love:*

The Unashamed Stories of Lesbian Lives and Fiction and Other Truths: A Film about Jane Rule

“*The Canadian War on Queers* is destined to be a landmark book in the study of Canadian state security apparatuses and an important contribution to Canadian history and LGBT studies.”

— Barry Adam, author of *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*

“*The Canadian War on Queers* is a major work on the history of the Canadian state security practices and an astonishing piece of queer social history. Kinsman and Gentile present an account of a national security regime built on persecutory practices that are mind-boggling in their scale and longevity. At the heart of this book is a collection of oral histories that are smart, heartbreaking and funny. While it might sound trite, they have a lot to tell us about the importance of community and the possibility of resistance. The analysis offered by Kinsman and Gentile and the extensive archive constituted through their work is going to make an invigorating contribution to the history of sexuality in Canada.”

— Mary Louise Adams, author of *The Trouble With Normal: Postwar Youth and the Construction of Sexuality*

“*The Canadian War on Queers* is a groundbreaking account of campaigns by the Canadian state against its own people. Passionately written and thoroughly researched, the book performs a public service by revealing how prejudice can destroy lives but, as importantly, how bigotry can be resisted. This book not only deserves to be read, it *needs* to be read.”

— Steve Hewitt, author of *Spying 101: The RCMP's Secret Activities on Canadian Universities, 1917-1997* and *Snitch! A History of the Modern Intelligence Informer*

THE CANADIAN WAR ON QUEERS

Sexuality Studies Series

This series focuses on original, provocative, scholarly research examining from a range of perspectives the complexity of human sexual practice, identity, community, and desire. Books in the series explore how sexuality interacts with other aspects of society, such as law, education, feminism, racial diversity, the family, policing, sport, government, religion, mass media, medicine, and employment. The series provides a broad public venue for nurturing debate, cultivating talent, and expanding knowledge of human sexual expression, past and present.

Other volumes in the series are:

Masculinities without Men? Female Masculinity in Twentieth-Century Fictions,
by Jean Bobby Noble

Every Inch a Woman: Phallic Possession, Femininity, and the Text, by Carellin
Brooks

Queer Youth in the Province of the "Severely Normal," by Gloria Filax

The Manly Modern: Masculinity in Postwar Canada, by Christopher Dummitt

Sexing the Teacher: School Sex Scandals and Queer Pedagogies, by Sheila L.
Cavanagh

Sapphistries: A Global History of Love between Women, by Leila J. Rupp

Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile

THE CANADIAN
NATIONAL SECURITY AS SEXUAL REGULATION
WAR ON QUEERS



UBC Press · Vancouver · Toronto

© UBC Press 2010

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, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright (Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency), www.accesscopyright.ca.

17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Kinsman, Gary

The Canadian war on queers : national security as sexual regulation /
Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile.

(Sexuality studies series, ISSN 1706-9947)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1627-4

1. Homosexuality – Government policy – Canada – History. 2. Internal security – Canada – History. 3. Gay rights – Canada – History. 4. Homosexuality – Law and legislation – Canada – History. 5. Subversive activities – Government policy – Canada. I. Gentile, Patrizia, 1970 II. Title. III. Series: Sexuality studies series

HQ76.3.C3K54 2010

323.3'2640971

C2010-903770-X

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of 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 Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Cover photo credits: Montreal demonstrations against Olympic “clean-up,” June 19, 1976, CLGA 1986-032_08P (28) 01P (front); Ottawa conference demonstration, June 30, 1975, CLGA 1986-032_02P (40) 01 (back).

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083

www.ubcpress.ca

This book is dedicated to all those
who resisted the Canadian war on queers
and for those
who continue to resist the national security campaigns
today.

Contents

List of Illustrations / xi

Preface: National Security Wars – Then and Now / xiii

Acknowledgments / xix

List of Abbreviations / xxi

- 1** **Queering National Security, the Cold War,
and Canadian History**
Surveillance and Resistance / 1
- 2** **Queer History and Sociology from Below**
Resisting National Security / 27
- 3** **The Cold War against Queers**
Social and Historical Contexts / 53
- 4** **Spying and Interrogation**
The Social Relations of National Security / 115
- 5** **The “Fruit Machine”**
Attempting to Detect Queers / 168
- 6** **Queer Resistance and the Security Response**
Solidarity versus the RCMP / 191
- 7** **The Campaign Continues in the 1970s**
Security Risks and Lesbian Purges in the Military / 221

8	“Gay Political Activists” and “Radical Lesbians” Organizing against the National Security State / 243
9	Sexual Policing and National Security Sex Scandals, Olympic Clean-Ups, and Cross-Country Organizing / 302
10	Continuing Exclusion The Formation of CSIS and “Hard-Core Lesbians” / 336
11	From Exclusion to Assimilation National Security, the Charter, and Limited Inclusion / 391
12	From the Canadian War on Queers to the War on Terror Resisting the Expanding National Security State / 429
	Appendix: Index of Interviews / 459
	Notes / 462
	Bibliography / 523
	Index / 546

Illustrations

FIGURES

- 1 Mapping of social relations of the Canadian war on queers up to 1980 / 114
- 2 The social organization of military surveillance, reporting, and discharge under CFAO 19-20 / 364

MAP AND LEGEND

Queer spaces in Ottawa, c. 1962 / 202-3

PHOTOGRAPHS

- 1 Dr. Frank R. Wake, c. 1960s / 172
- 2 The Chez Henri, Hull / 200
- 3 Rideau Street, c. 1962 / 201
- 4 View of Major's Hill Park / 204
- 5 First gay rights demonstration, 1971 / 256
- 6 Charlie Hill at Ottawa demonstration, 1971 / 257
- 7 John Wilson at 1971 demonstration / 258
- 8 Revolutionary Marxist Group poster for 1975 Toronto demonstration / 284
- 9 Marie Robertson at 1975 International Women's Day rally / 289
- 10 Maurice Flood, May 1979, Ottawa / 298
- 11 Montreal demonstration against Olympic "clean-up," 1976 / 311
- 12 National Gay Rights Coalition conference, 1975 / 318
- 13 Marie Robertson at 1975 demonstration / 319
- 14 Ottawa conference demonstration, 1975 / 319
- 15 Conference demonstration, 1975, Ottawa / 320

- 16 RCMP officers watching the 1975 conference demonstration,
Ottawa / 321
- 17 Protesters confront Prime Minister Trudeau at Liberal Party
convention, 1975 / 325
- 18 Lesbian contingent at demonstration against Anita Bryant, 1978 / 331
- 19 Right to Privacy Committee demonstration against bath raids, 1981 / 334

Preface

National Security Wars – Then and Now

National security campaigns are very much in the news as we put the finishing touches to this book. Under the guise of the “war on terror,” “evidence” provided by Canadian security police resulted in the extradition (i.e., rendition) of Maher Arar to Syria, with the knowledge that he would be tortured.¹ We have seen the indefinite detention of Muslim- and Arab-identified “non-citizens” under the so-called national security certificates as well as the racial profiling and targeting of people identified as Arabs and Muslims.² Under cover of national security, we have seen the mobilization of racism and the continued denial of human and civil rights. The targets of these most recent national security campaigns are once again defined as enemies of Canada, are denied citizenship, and are identified as national security risks. At times, allegations of “national security risk” and even “terrorism” have been directed towards global justice and anti-poverty activists who challenge the injustice and misery that capitalist social relations have produced in the lives of people around the globe.³

In all this we hear the echoes of earlier national security campaigns against suspected lesbians and gay men – campaigns that took place across the Canadian state from the 1950s into the late 1990s and that, in some ways, continue today. These earlier campaigns live on in the current national security war, which is now directed at new targets. We therefore reject current national security campaigns, and we support those who have been tortured and imprisoned for no reason other than their perceived country of origin or their assumed religious and/or political commitments. In resisting this current national security war, we must critically examine earlier national security campaigns both within the Canadian state and elsewhere. There is much to be learned by linking the earlier story of national security wars against queers with current campaigns against Arabs and Muslims. We cannot view the injustices of these campaigns as simply “mistakes” or “excesses” committed by a few overzealous security operatives; rather, these injustices are an integral part of the ideology and practice of national security itself. There is something very dangerous at the heart of national security, and we need to challenge and resist it.

While we have been working on this book in our historical present, during the so-called war on terror, we have been surprised to find that, since 9/11, the relatively constant generation of fear and crisis over security issues has not resulted in major attempts to learn from earlier national security campaigns against “others.” It is as if we are so mesmerized by the spectacle of 9/11 that we have forgotten the earlier history of national security and its wars on “subversion.” In part, this is because the ideology of the war on terror works through ahistorical decontextualization, which results in the forgetting of how national security operated long before September 2001. Given this context, we hope *The Canadian War on Queers* succeeds in linking this past to our historical present.

In this book we provide a detailed and critical examination of the social organization of the national security campaigns against lesbians and gay men from the 1950s until the present. This is not simply a sad and depressing story about injustices committed against those identified as lesbian and gay; it is also very much a story of how this experience was lived by the people most directly affected and how, even in extremely difficult circumstances, there was always resistance. For instance, even in the restrictive atmosphere of the 1960s, it was possible for people involved in lesbian and gay networks to force security police to alter their tactics.

The Canadian War on Queers has been a long time coming. In 1998, we released a preliminary research report on national security campaigns against lesbians and gay men, focusing on the late 1950s and the 1960s.⁴ Since then we have done a great deal more research, especially on the national security surveillance of the lesbian and gay activist movement in the 1970s and developments in the 1980s and 1990s. We hope this book is well worth the wait, although, given the urgency of the questions it raises, we are pained by how long it has taken for it to see the light of day.

Most of this book is a duet; however, since Gary was personally involved in some of the events that we describe, his particular voice comes through at times, and this is signalled by a sans serif font. The following vignette is an example of this.

TOWARDS A GENEALOGY OF “COMMIE PINKO FAG” – NATIONAL SECURITY AND ME

My life history as a gay man and an activist is interwoven with a number of the stories told in this book. I am, therefore, very interested in this critical interrogation of national security for multiple personal, political, and social/historical reasons.

“Commie, pinko, fag.” This used to be scrawled on my locker and was used as a greeting in the halls when I was a student at Victoria Park Secondary School in Don Mills in the early 1970s. I was involved in the radical left as a member of the Young Socialists and, later, of the Revolutionary Marxist Group, so the “commie” part made some sense to me. I never understood where the “pinko” came from. The sole basis for the “fag” part seemed to be my refusal to laugh at the anti-gay jokes that were all-pervasive at my school.⁵ A certain type of “cutting out” operation was mobilized against me, much as George Smith describes, as I was socially cut out of regular forms of “normal” heterosexual interaction.⁶ I do remember some of the school jocks squirming when I pointed out to them that they spent all their time hanging out with other guys. It was during these years that I was beginning to explore my sexuality and starting to come out to myself and to others as gay. So I did become an anti-Stalinist “commie fag.”

My interest in national security campaigns against queers flows from my continuing interest in exploring where this association between commies and fags, which has been integral to my experience, has come from historically and socially. And this particular association was forged in important ways during the years of the national security campaigns against gay men and lesbians, and also through the very real connections of some queer activists with sections of the left.⁷

I made an Access to Information request for my personal files in 1999 in preparation for this book, only to be disappointed by the RCMP’s response. I received a letter saying that no such files existed. I know they should have had information on me since I knew they did surveillance work on the Revolutionary Marxist Group. When my father’s workplace was taken over by the government for a period of time he was even asked a security-related question about me. I have been involved in the left since 1971 and in the gay movement since 1972. I have been present at many of the events, demonstrations, and conferences at which the RCMP conducted surveillance in the 1970s, and I was at the Young Socialist convention, where the RCMP put letters on everyone’s chairs during the lunch break (this is referred to in Chapter 8).

THE HISTORICAL PAST, THE HISTORICAL PRESENT

In contrast to the historical past, which involved the general national security campaigns against lesbians and gay men from the late 1950s through the 1990s, the historical present finds us in a rather different position with regard to lesbian and gay rights.⁸ Although the national security campaigns against queers are not over, especially for those of us deemed to be in the closet or to have

something to hide, and for those of us who are people of colour (specifically those identified as Arab and Muslim), the lesbian and gay movements have made remarkable progress with regard to human rights.⁹ We have won important human rights victories and have been able to utilize the shift in Canadian state legal formation signalled by Section 15 (the equality rights section) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which was enacted in the 1980s. For example, there has been significant progress on basic human rights protection, spousal rights, family recognition rights, and same-sex marriage rights. This has led some to view the existing federal form of the Canadian state, and particularly the Charter, as crucial to queer liberation.¹⁰

At the same time, major forms of sexual censorship remain, as do issues relating to the criminalization of our consensual sexualities, and many queer people experience poverty, racism, sexism, and class exploitation. Although the December 2005 Supreme Court decision regarding “swingers” clubs in Montreal expanded the ability of heterosexuals to engage in sexual activities in sex clubs, such freedom has not been extended to gay men in bathhouses and sex clubs, and queer sex can still be defined as “acts of indecency.”¹¹ This shapes the contradictory situations queer people now face. On the one hand, lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals have won recognition of our individual human rights; we have established our formal equality with heterosexuals in a number of realms. On the other hand, we have yet to establish substantive social equality with heterosexuals, and major forms of marginalization, exclusion, violence, and hatred continue to exist.¹² Legal acceptance of our rights has done little to create full social acceptance of our sexualities and lives. Grudging acceptance of rights for queer people can still easily give way to expressions of hatred and violence. *The Canadian War on Queers* thus reminds us of the heterosexist past and the ways in which it continues in the historical present as a central part of Canadian state and social formation.

For example, the current federal Conservative government – supported by the Liberals and most of the NDP – raised the age of sexual consent from fourteen to sixteen without proposing a comparable reduction in the current age of consent from eighteen to sixteen for anal sex (often homosexualized in official discourse) outside Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia. This change will have a major impact on queer young people, and young people more generally, decreasing their ability to gain access to sexual and safe sex information.

In 2009, our right to marry has been established through federal legislation, even though it has been contested by the current Conservative government.¹³ The present government cannot overturn the legislation; however, by raising the issue, it continues to create opportunities for moral conservative organizing

and anti-queer bigotry. More moderate forces in our communities and movements, as well as much of the media, view winning the right to marriage as an end point of our struggles.¹⁴ It is suggested that, in winning the right to marry, we have achieved full equality (really full integration) and that our oppression will soon be over. Although, as queer authors and activists, we welcome this victory and support the fight for formal equality, in our view this legal victory has neither magically eliminated our oppression nor encouraged discussion of developing forms of relationships based on equality and democracy outside institutionalized marriage.¹⁵ The focus on our right to marry has been tied up with strategies for integrating us into the existing capitalist, patriarchal, and racist social order and with strategies for how we can perform social “respectability” and “responsibility.”¹⁶ We need to challenge existing social forms such as marriage, which have historically been based on our exclusion and marginalization as well as on the oppression of women, and we need to focus more on how to transform oppressive social relations and how to build social alternatives.

Some queers – but only some – are now being included in the fabric of the “nation” and the “national security” mobilized in its defence. In the context of the national security state and the war on terror, some queers (usually white, middle-class men) are now defending national security against a series of “others” (including people of Arab descent and Muslims in Canada), against global justice and anti-capitalist protesters, against people living in poverty, against prostitutes and hustlers, and against groups of queer people such as queers of colour, queers living in poverty, and young queers. It is for these reasons that we must proceed with caution in our fight for legal “victories,” as these may well continue to perpetuate social exclusions based on class, race, gender, and sexuality.

This strategy of integration and normalization is tied up with the emergence of stronger professional, managerial, and middle-class social strata within gay and lesbian communities. The people who occupy these strata share a number of social commitments with the broader middle class. They are not interested in questioning the social relations of capitalism and raise only those queer issues that do not challenge these relations.¹⁷ They are invested in the commercialization and commodification of capitalist society.¹⁸ Such people often suggest that existing Canadian state formation and, especially, the equality rights section of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms are the royal road to our liberation.¹⁹ Although the use of Section 15 has been crucial to our struggles, including those against the national security regime during the 1980s and 1990s, it has not brought about our liberation. And the strategy of integration, which is premised on the desirability of being incorporated within the heterosexually defined

nation, leads to a reconciliation with the forces of national security. We come back to some of the limitations of this strategy in Chapters 11 and 12. The analysis developed in this book is directed not only at locating resources for our current battles against national security but also at providing ways for queer activists in the historical present to reignite a more radical movement – one that gets at the root of the problem and resists a strategy of integration that would see us buy into a “normality” and a “respectability” that includes support for national security.

Acknowledgments

The Canadian War on Queers has been a very long time coming. Since 1993, many people have been invaluable to the making of this book. We are grateful to Cynthia Wright, who convinced Gary to embark on this project, and Dean Beeby, whose work leading to the release of security regime documents related to the campaigns against queers made our work seem possible. The chapter on the surveillance of gay and lesbian groups in the 1970s is inspired by Steve Hewitt's generous gift of security documents. These documents extended our research and, we believe, made this a better book.

Books are always collective endeavours because they are much more than the product of individual research, writing, and conceptualization, especially when they are a collaborative project. Ultimately, they are about friendship, support, and community. Many people assisted us along the way, including Aerlyn Weissman, A.K. Thompson, Amy Gottlieb, Becki Ross, Brian Drader, Cathy Jones, Corinne Gaudin, Dan Irving, Daniel J. Robinson, David Kimmel, David Pepper, Deborah Brock, Dieter Buse, Dino Zuccarini, Elise Chenier, Greg Kealey, the late Greg Pavelich, the late Jennifer Keck, Joan Kinsman, Kaili Beck, Karen Pearlston, Kevin Crombie, Kim Tomczak, Larry Hannant, Laurent Gagliardi, Len Scher, Lesbians Making History, Lisa Steele, Lorna Weir, Lynne Dupuis, Lynne Fernie, Maureen Fitzgerald, Mercedes Steedman, Nancy Nicol, Paul Jackson, Richard Goreham, Robin Metcalfe, Ross Higgins, Scott Neigh, Steven Maynard, Svend Robinson's office, and Terry Pender.

We are indebted to the invaluable work of the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (CLGA) and, especially, to Harold Averill and Paul Leatherdale, who helped us with the wonderful photographs that animate this book. Many of the CLGA photographs originally appeared in the *Body Politic*, and were taken by a number of its contributors, including Gerald Hannon. Many thanks also to Harriet Fried from the City of Ottawa Archives, who assisted us in procuring images. Patti Harper at the Carleton University Archives helped us with photos and institutional files on F.R. Wake, for which we are also grateful. Kim Foreman from the National Archives of Canada helped us muddle through the Access to Information requests for documents regarding the gay liberation

movement and organizations. Rhonda Hinthner of the Museum of Civilization helped us with leads on the “fruit machine” housed at the Canadian War Museum in Ottawa.

The Canadian War on Queers could never have been written, however, without the contributions of all those who spoke to us and shared their experiences and stories, including Albert, Andrew, Arlene, Barbara, Barry Deeprose, Bernie, Blair Johnston, Bob, Brenda Barnes, Brian Waite, Bruce Somers, Charles Hill, David, David Garmaise, Dorothy Kidd, Doug Sanders, Ellen Skinner, Frank Letourneau, the late George Hislop, Hank, Harold, Hector Mackenzie, the late Herbert Sutcliffe, Jake, the late Jim Egan, Joan, the late John Grube, John Sawatsky, John Wilson, Josh, Lois, Marie Robertson, Marielle, Marty, Marvin, Merv, Michael, Morgan, Patrick, Paul-François Sylvestre, Peaches Latour, Peter, Pierre, Robert, Sam, Shawn, Simon, Steve, Sue, Svend Robinson, and Tom Warner.

Without the work of Heidi McDonell and Treanor Mahood-Greer (in an earlier period) and Grace Irving, Tracy Gregory, Oren Howlett, and Ander Reszczyński (in the present), *The Canadian War on Queers* would have taken even longer to complete. Wendy Atkin did editing work at an early stage, and Ellen Vincer copyedited a version of the manuscript. Grace Irving was an endless source of support for us as we prepared the manuscript in its last stages. The critical work of helping with the research, editing, and formatting of this book was not always fun, but it was indispensable, and we are very thankful for the time and effort we received from these individuals.

We thank Jean Wilson (the book’s grandmother), Darcy Cullen, Ann Macklem, Joanne Richardson (the copy editor), Melissa Pitts, and UBC Press for persevering during this extended research and writing journey. We also thank the two anonymous reviewers who provided many useful suggestions for improving *The Canadian War on Queers*. Needless to say, these individuals bear no responsibility for any errors found in the book you now hold in your hands.

This research was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council grant #410-94-1609, a Laurentian University Research Fund Grant for 1995-96, an emerging researcher grant at Laurentian University for 1996-97, and a research start-up fund provided by Carleton University. This financial support was critical, and we are thankful to the institutions listed above.

Gary thanks his partner, Patrick Barnholden, and their wonderful son, Mike, for love and support. Patrizia is thankful for the comfort and love provided by Pauline Rankin.

Abbreviations

AIM	American Indian Movement
APEC	Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation
ASK	Association for Social Knowledge
ATIP	Access to Information Program
BEAVER	Better End to All Vicious Erotic Repression
CBC	Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
CBNRC	Communication Branch of the National Research Council
CCRH	Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual
CF	Canadian Forces
CFAO 19-20	Canadian Forces Administrative Order 19-20 (1967 and 1976)
CGAA	Canadian Gay Activists Alliance
CGRO	Coalition for Gay Rights in Ontario
CHAR	Comité homosexuel anti-répression/ Gay Coalition against Repression
CHAT	Community Homophile Association of Toronto
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CLGA	Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (Toronto)
CNR	Canadian National Railways
CPC	Commission for Public Complaints against the RCMP
CSIS	Canadian Security Intelligence Service
CSP	criminal sexual psychopath
DEA	Department of External Affairs
DL2	Defence Liaison Division 2, Department of External Affairs
DMI	Directorate of Military Intelligence
DND	Department of National Defence
DSI	Directorate of Security and Intelligence
DSO	dangerous sexual offender

FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FLH	Front de libération des homosexuels
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
GAE	Gay Alliance for Equality
GATE	Gay Alliance towards Equality
GLF	Gay Liberation Front
GLOV	Gay and Lesbian Organization of Veterans
GO	Gays of Ottawa
HALO	Homophile Association of London Ontario
IPC	Intelligence Policy Committee
IPP	internationally protected person
IWD	International Women's Day
KGB	Committee for State Security (USSR)
LAC	Library and Archives Canada
LIP	Local Initiative Program
LJS	Ligue des jeunes socialistes
LMDF	Lesbian Mothers Defence Fund
LOON	Lesbians of Ottawa Now
LOOT	Lesbian Organization of Toronto
LOR	Ligue ouvrière révolutionnaire
LSA	League for Socialist Action
LSO	Ligue socialiste ouvrière
MP	Military Police
NAC	National Action Committee on the Status of Women
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCO	non-commissioned officer
NDP	New Democratic Party
NFB	National Film Board
NGEC	National Gay Election Coalition
NGRC	National Gay Rights Coalition
NMI	New Marxist Institute
OCAP	Ontario Coalition against Poverty
OFY	Opportunities for Youth

PCC	Public Complaints Commission
PCO	Privy Council Office
QR&O	Queen's Regulations and Orders
RAWA	Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan
RCAF	Royal Canadian Air Force
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
RCN	Royal Canadian Navy
RMG	Revolutionary Marxist Group
RWL	Revolutionary Workers' League
SID	Special Investigations Detachment
SIU	Special Investigations Unit
SPP	Security and Prosperity Partnership
SWP	Socialist Workers Party
TGA	Toronto Gay Action
THA	Trent Homophile Association
TWC	Toronto Women's Caucus
TWHC	Toronto Wages for Housework Committee
UTHA	University of Toronto Homophile Association
WAWAW	Women against Violence against Women
WD	Wages Due Lesbians
WTO	World Trade Organization
YS	Young Socialists

THE CANADIAN WAR ON QUEERS

Queering National Security, the Cold War, and Canadian History

Surveillance and Resistance

We even knew occasionally that there was somebody in some police force or some investigator who would be sitting in a bar. And you would see someone with a ... newspaper held right up, and if you ... looked real closely you could find him holding behind the newspaper a camera, and these people were photographing everyone in the bar. (May 12, 1994)

This is David speaking about his experiences of police surveillance around 1964 in the basement tavern at the Lord Elgin, which was one of the major gathering places for gay men in Ottawa.¹ Surveillance was one way that the RCMP collected information on homosexuals during the Canadian Cold War against queers. David's story is a remarkable example of how the men in the bar resisted police surveillance strategies.

We always knew that when you saw someone with a newspaper held up in front of their face ... that somebody would take out something like a wallet and do this sort of thing [like snapping a photo] and then, of course, everyone would then point over to the person you see and, of course, I'm sure, that the person hiding behind the newspaper knew that he had been found out. But that was the thing. You would take out a wallet or a package of matches or something like that ... it was always sort of a joke. You would see somebody ... and you would catch everyone's eye and you would go like this [snapping a photo]. And everyone knew [to] watch out for this guy. (May 12, 1994)

Rather than diving under the tables or running for cover, these men turned the tables on the undercover agents. David's story reveals not only the 1960s national security surveillance regime but also how people resisted it. In *The Canadian War on Queers*, we weave together stories of how people resisted the security regime, and, starting from the social standpoints of those who were watched, interrogated, and purged, we develop an analysis of the social organization of that regime and its war on queers.

David is among the thirty-six gay or bisexual men and ten lesbians we interviewed about their experiences with the anti-homosexual national security campaigns of the 1950s and 1960s. David, who was not a civil servant, was involved in gay networks in Ottawa during the 1960s. His entanglement in the security campaigns began when a friend gave the RCMP his name during a park sweep of one of Ottawa's cruising (or meeting) areas for men interested in sex with men. These sweeps were fairly common, and the RCMP had jurisdiction over the city's parks. According to David, the RCMP was far more interested in getting the names of homosexuals than in arresting people for "criminal" activities. Officers would threaten to lay criminal charges against the men they apprehended unless they gave them the names of other homosexuals.² David described how he first came into contact with the RCMP:

I had a telephone call to say that a mutual friend of my caller and myself had been caught in flagrante delicto [caught performing a sexual act by the police] and had given my name, among others, to the RCMP in order to avert their giving away his identity [and revealing] his situation to his employer and his family ... The mutual friend then phoned me in great consternation to let me know that my name had been given to the RCMP. And sure enough, about ten days later I had my first contact with the RCMP.

David was interrogated and followed; his home was searched by RCMP officers. He reported that, when he went in to talk to the officers, "they asked me to confirm that I was gay. I felt there was no use to ... not admit what they obviously knew or they wouldn't have asked. So I agreed I was gay. They then wanted me to give the names of all the people who I knew who were gay, and I just simply said to this I was not the person who'd been caught in the indecent act" (May 12, 1994). In this account, the police were interested in collecting the names and identities of other gay men. David refused to cooperate. RCMP surveillance work and investigations extended into the lives of those who were not public servants, who, at times, played an important part in providing

information for the security regime. As informants, these people were integral to the RCMP's public service surveillance, and they were its weakest link. We return to David's story when we explore the surveillance and interrogations of homosexuals outside the public service and their resistance to these security campaigns.

Thousands of lesbians, gay men, and those suspected of homosexuality were directly affected by these campaigns, especially following the specific targeting of homosexuals in the late 1950s. In 1959, the homosexual screening program was initiated in the federal public service. Total reports of suspected and confirmed homosexuals, including those outside the public service, went up from 1,000 in 1960-61 to 8,200 in 1966-67. By 1967-68, the list had expanded to 9,000 names.³ David was one of the more than nine thousand "suspected," "alleged," and "confirmed" homosexuals the RCMP investigated in the 1960s.⁴ The people who appeared on this list were based in the Ottawa area, and most were neither public servants nor involved in the military.⁵ Hundreds (if not thousands) of others were purged, demoted, and forced to inform on friends and acquaintances. Of this number, many were forced to resign or were transferred. At the core of this screening program was the belief that gay men and lesbians suffered from a character weakness that made them vulnerable to blackmail and subversion, thus rendering them susceptible to the machinations of Soviet agents.⁶ The RCMP collected the names of thousands of possibly gay men and lesbians, and the government funded and sponsored research into ways of "scientifically" detecting homosexuals – research that came to be known as the "fruit machine" (see Chapter 5).

In 1960, the RCMP reported that, over the previous two years, it had conducted investigations in "high security" areas such as the Department of Agriculture, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Post Office Department, the Public Works Department, the Unemployment Insurance Commission, and the Department of Transport.⁷ The National Film Board and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation were also caught in this investigative net. Indeed, the security campaign extended throughout the public service and beyond. However, investigations did tend to focus, especially in the early years, on the Department of External Affairs (DEA) and the Royal Canadian Navy (RCN). For example, it was reported in 1960 that, in the RCN, 123 members had been confirmed as homosexuals and another 76 were suspected of being homosexual, for a total of 199. Of these, 90 had been released (or discharged). The same 1960 report stated that 59 suspected homosexuals had been identified in the DEA and that, of these, 9 had

resigned, 1 had been released, 1 was retired, and 2 were deceased. These numbers were out of a total of 363 people in government work who were classified as “confirmed,” “alleged,” or “suspected” homosexuals and out of a total of 117 who had died, resigned, retired, transferred, or been released.⁸ These security practices and the reactions to them had a major impact within the DEA.

A memo written in 1961 stated: “the RCM Police have identified some 460 public servants as confirmed, alleged, or suspected homosexuals. Of these about one-third have since left the service through resignation or dismissal.”⁹ In 1961-62, the RCMP reported having identified 850 suspected and confirmed homosexuals in the civil service.¹⁰ Unfortunately, the documents we have been able to acquire do not provide a clear “homosexual count” for later years.

David’s account of surveillance and resistance not only gives us a sense of the extent of the national security regime but also demonstrates that the gay networks in which he participated were aware of the security campaigns. These men were not simply victims of the national security war on queers; rather, within the major social constraints of the day, they creatively exerted their own agency and resistance.¹¹ We explore the social and historical conditions that made such resistance possible. David’s story also provides us with the social standpoints taken up in this investigation – namely, those of the men who had sex with men and the women who had sex with women who were directly affected by these security campaigns. This places us outside the confines of national security discourse and ideology.

Viewing national security as an ideological practice is crucial. We use the term “ideological” not to refer to “biased” or “non-objective” knowledge but, rather, to refer to a social practice of knowledge production that comes to rule over people’s lives. Ideology is separated from people’s lived experiences and from the social practices through which the very concepts used to explain the world are themselves produced. It is thus separated from social relations.¹² It follows that the concept of “national security” is an ideological practice in that it is separated from the social practices through which it is produced and is part of the relations that rule and manage people’s lives. Throughout this book, we try to resist ideological practices by grounding knowledge in people’s lives, social relations, and practices.

REWRITING HISTORY AND CHALLENGING MASTER NARRATIVES

We disrupt the master narrative of heterosexual hegemonic mainstream Canadian history by placing the social experiences (including the resistance) of

queers at the centre of our analysis. To begin, it is necessary to clarify our terms. “Heterosexual hegemonies” are the social practices and ideologies through which lesbian, gay, and queer sexualities are constructed as deviant, abnormal, and unnatural, and through which, simultaneously, a particular male-dominated form of heterosexuality is naturalized and normalized. “Hegemony,” as used by Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, describes how coercion and the manufacturing of consent are joined in the social organization of ruling.¹³ As a major form of sexual regulation, heterosexual hegemony brings together coercive means of enforcing heterosexuality with the manufacturing of consent to the idea that heterosexuality is the only natural sexuality.

Our use of the phrase “war on queers” parallels anti-poverty movements’ use of the phrase “war on the poor.” Without trivializing the experiences of warfare and colonialism, we wish to point to the serious and systemic character of the national security campaigns against lesbians and gay men and to the devastation these have wrought in thousands of lives. At the same time, notions of “war” – as in the “Cold War,” the “war on drugs,” and the “war on terror” – have often been colonized by right-wing usage.¹⁴

We use the word “queer” in order to reclaim a term of abuse and stigmatization. The idea is to ensure that it can no longer be used against us as a form of derision and to turn it back on our oppressors. We also use it to identify with newer forms of queer activism, although it should be noted that we do this in a way that differs from what is done in queer nationalism or queer theory.¹⁵ The term “homosexual” has a clinical connotation, and “gay” and “lesbian” are often defined very narrowly. “Queer,” on the other hand, entails a broader scope of practices than do “lesbian,” “gay,” or “homosexual,” including non-normalized, non-heterosexual consensual sexual and gendered practices not easily captured by the latter terms (e.g., bisexual, transgender, two-spirited, and other sexual/gender practices).¹⁶ In other words, “queer” allows us to point towards the diverse social character of sexual and gender practices and identifications that do not fall under the rigid categories of “homosexual,” “lesbian,” “gay,” “bisexual,” or “heterosexual” – or even “male” and “female.” Many people who identify as heterosexual, for instance, engage in same-gender sex, and the term “queer” can encompass aspects of such experiences. This notion of queer practice also permits us to construct a place from which to challenge heterosexual hegemony and the taken-for-granted two-gender binary (or “opposite”) way of doing gender.¹⁷ Used in this broader sense, the word “queer” captures the experiences of people engaged in sexual and gender practices that defy heterosexual hegemony and the restrictions of the male-dominated two-gender system.¹⁸

Sexuality is a historical and social creation that builds on and transforms our physiological potential; it is not an innate biological essence rooted in our genes or hormones.¹⁹ Many people engage in same-gender sex, but how this is made sense of and lived will vary dramatically in differing social, cultural, and historical contexts. Language becomes a problem when attempting to describe the identifications of people who engage in same-gender sex and sexual practices more generally. While in many ways we prefer the rather cumbersome “same-gender sex” or “same-gender eroticism,” for practical reasons (albeit provisionally), we often use “homosexual,” “lesbian,” “gay,” “bisexual,” and “heterosexual.” In doing so, we do not mean to suggest that any of these terms has an ahistorical biological essence.

In response to our 1998 research report, in some media interviews Gary was accused of producing “revisionist” history.²⁰ Some journalists posited that the Cold War context justified concerns over blackmail and security risks, and that for us to suggest otherwise was to rewrite history – to be revisionist. Gary submitted that many of the gay men and lesbians we interviewed who were purged from their jobs or interrogated by the RCMP reported that the only people who tried to blackmail them were the RCMP. It was, after all, the RCMP who tried to force them to give the names of other homosexuals. We reject revisionism as a way of framing struggles over history; however, we do intend this to be a work of transformative historical sociology that will change Canadian history. *The Canadian War on Queers* challenges current Canadian historiography: it is based on previously excluded and denied social experiences, making visible what was invisible and giving voice to what was silenced. It therefore points towards a more accurate social and historical account of what transpired in Canada during the second half of the twentieth century.

MAKING US THE PROBLEM: A TASTE OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY DISCOURSE

The national security discourse that constructed queers as a security problem permeated David’s experiences with surveillance and his resistance to it. It was this discourse that mandated the RCMP practices of surveillance and interrogation. The term “discourse” refers to a social language that is tied to social power relations – relations that define how we can name and define problems and how we can speak about our lives. In this case, the language of national security is integral to the social power relations of Canadian state formation. National security is a social language, and, when actively mobilized, it carries with it

immense social power. Our use of the term “discourse” is informed by the work of Michel Foucault, but it goes beyond his focus on statements to view language as produced and used by people to coordinate and organize social practices and relations.²¹

In the national security discourse, homosexuals were constructed as suffering from an unreliable and unstable character, which made us a threat to national security. The notion of reliability was central to this construction, as is illustrated by the following passage from a 1959 Security Panel memorandum. This memorandum was written by Don Wall, who was secretary of the Security Panel, the interdepartmental committee responsible for coordinating national security:

Sexual abnormalities appear to be the favourite target of hostile intelligence agencies, and of these homosexuality is most often used ... The nature of homosexuality appears to adapt itself to this kind of exploitation. By exercising fairly simple precautions, homosexuals are usually able to keep their habits hidden from those who are not specifically seeking them out. Further, homosexuals often appear to believe that the accepted ethical code which governs normal human relationships does not apply to them ... From the small amount of information we have been able to obtain about homosexual behaviour generally, certain characteristics appear to stand out – instability, willing self-deceit, defiance towards society, a tendency to surround oneself with persons of similar propensities, regardless of other considerations – none of which inspire the confidence one would hope to have in persons required to fill positions of trust and responsibility.²²

From the late 1950s, regulations influenced by the ideas outlined in documents such as this 1959 memorandum caused problems for hundreds of lesbians, gay men, and others who lost jobs or who were demoted to less “sensitive” positions in the federal public service. In these security texts, homosexuals are depicted as a security problem because of our “weaknesses,” “unreliability,” and “immoral” or “unethical” traits, which supposedly make us vulnerable to blackmail and compromise. In this discourse, the essential character of the homosexual is presented as a security problem. In part, Wall drew on earlier constructions of homosexuals as “psychopathic personalities” who were unable to control their sexual impulses and who suffered from an absence of moral regulation.²³ These earlier categorizations, coupled with Cold War security ideology, informed national security concerns regarding character weaknesses.

Wall was also influenced by and drew from US anti-queer national security discourse, particularly that of former CIA director Admiral Roscoe Hillenkoetter, at the height of the early 1950s US anti-sex-pervert campaigns. Hillenkoetter portrayed the homosexual character as dangerous and perverted and, thus, as a security risk:

The consistent symptoms of weakness and instability which accompany homosexuality almost always represent danger points of susceptibility from the standpoint of security ... The moral pervert is a security risk of so serious a nature that he must be weeded out of government employment ... In addition homosexuality frequently is accompanied by other exploitable weaknesses such as psychopathic tendencies which affect the soundness of their judgement, physical cowardice, susceptibility to pressure, and general instability ... Lastly, perverts in key positions lead to the concept of a government within a government ... One pervert brings other perverts.²⁴

Much of the language employed by Hillenkoetter informs the discourse Wall developed for the Security Panel and was given its own “Canadian” character when used in texts produced by that panel, which was the epicentre of national security policy in the Cold War era.

National security discourse regarding homosexuals was also connected to the right-wing anti-queer discourse of the 1950s and earlier. Referring to a 1935 RCMP surveillance report on the Communist Party’s activities on university campuses, Hewitt writes, “There is the subtext of the report which equated communism with immorality, specifically illicit sexuality, so that reading communistic literature took on the status of masturbation or homosexuality, acts also deemed reprehensible in Depression-era Canada. Such discourse had American echoes: J. Edgar Hoover described the route to communism as ‘perverted’ and compared communists to drug addicts, while the rhetoric of the state linked the conversion to communism with sexual weakness or degeneracy.”²⁵

Initially, queers and communists were seen as fellow travellers in right-wing Cold War discourse because we transgressed sexual, class, social, and political boundaries. This idea built on earlier moral and political constructions of homosexuality and heterosexuality. Heterosexuality was associated with the natural, normal, clean, healthy, and pure; homosexuality was associated with the dangerous, impure, unnatural, sick, and abnormal. R.G. Waldeck’s “Homosexual International,” published in 1960, is an example of this conservative discourse:

Homosexual officials are a peril for us in the present struggle between West and East: members of one conspiracy are prone to join another ... Many homosexuals from being enemies of society in general become enemies of capitalism in particular. Without being necessarily Marxist they serve the ends of the Communist International in the name of their rebellion against the prejudices, standards, ideals of the “bourgeois” world. Another reason for the homosexual-Communist alliance is the instability and passion for intrigue for intrigue’s sake, which is inherent in the homosexual personality. A third reason is the social promiscuity within the homosexual minority and the fusion of its effects between upper-class and proletarian corruption.²⁶

In Waldeck’s understanding, the problematic “homosexual personality” is associated with Marxism and its challenge to capitalism. By challenging erotic and social boundaries, gays and lesbians are also seen as transgressing class and political boundaries. Crossing class boundaries in the context of erotic liaisons between elite and working-class men is perceived as a particular social danger.

There are important connections between this conservative discourse and that of the Security Panel. While Wall’s discourse shifts from this overtly right-wing form and moves away from earlier conceptualizations of homosexuality as psychopathology, it still suggests that homosexuals suffer from instability, tend to defy society, and have a specific homosexual personality. The links between these different texts and discourses demonstrate a dialogical relation within national security texts, whereby later documents are infused with the language of earlier documents. In other words, they are informed by the discourses of other texts even as they shift these discourses in a different direction. All language and discourse – including that of national security – exist in relation to other languages, discourses, and speakers.²⁷ In the case of the security purges of gay men and lesbians, the 1950s anti-queer right-wing discourse lives on within Canadian national security discourse, even though it has a somewhat different character. At the same time, the discourse as an ideological practice tends to portray itself as having a singular monological voice, thus denying the diversity of the social dialogues that surround and challenge it.

THE SECRETIVE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE CAMPAIGNS AGAINST QUEERS

Canadian historians are recording the involvement of Canadian state agencies and national security campaigns in the internment, surveillance, and interrogation of ethnic and racial groups, trade unionists, socialists, communists, and

their sympathizers.²⁸ The recording and understanding of the involvement of Canadian state agencies in attacks on queers, by contrast, is still in its nascent stages.²⁹ Historical work has revealed that, contrary to popular mythology, Canadians were not spared the traumatic experience that Americans endured under the McCarthy campaigns. Part of this mythology is centred on the fact that, generally, Canadian national security campaigns were much more secretive than were those south of the border. Canadians were not exposed to the same level of publicity and visibility that went along with the McCarthy hearings, the “sex pervert” investigations, and the State Department purges. Canadian state agencies were especially invested in keeping security issues cloaked from public view; however, this supposed veil of secrecy did not in any way reduce the impact these security campaigns had on people’s lives.

Interestingly, it was an American who first scrutinized the secretive behaviour of the Canadian state. In a 1956 right-wing publication, Canada’s security practices and policies were described as suppressing individual rights in favour of those of the state:

Canada ... has a stringent program to protect Government secrets against subversives, cocktail party talkers, and people who associate with Communists ... Policies and standards are set by a committee of high officials representing several Canadian agencies [the previously mentioned Security Panel]. The Special Branch of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police ... has a representative on this policy-making body. The identity of individual members of this panel is not disclosed to the public. Only a few in Government know who the members are. The panel meets in secret. The Government refuses to tell who makes the major decisions about security or what those decisions are ... In Canada, the security system is a tough one. There is less concern than in the United States about the rights of individuals involved. To Canadian officials, safety of the state comes first.³⁰

The phrase “safety of the state comes first” expresses a key feature of the social organization of national security in Canada. Maintaining a security system while preserving individual rights was considered to be a difficult task. In the context of the postwar era and the insecurity surrounding the implicit loyalty and reliability of citizens, the American and Canadian governments established surveillance and interrogation campaigns to respond to security concerns.

In the early 1960s, Prime Minister Diefenbaker made the following statement regarding the supposed conundrum security officials faced as they grappled with the problem of policing the “other” while preserving individual rights:

How are you going to maintain security while at the same time preserving and maintaining the fundamental rights of the individual? It is a difficult problem. It is so easy to criticize, but it is so much more difficult, having that responsibility, being desirous of maintaining those freedoms, to be able to carry out one's wishes. Loyalty is expected of all Canadians. It is imperative as a quality of public service. There are many cases in which the loyalty of the individual is not a question. But that individual may still not be reliable as a security risk ... because of defects of character which subject him to the danger of blackmail ... It is a fertile field for recruiting by the USSR, where public servants are known to be the companions of homosexuals. Those are the people that are generally chosen by the USSR, in recruiting spies who are otherwise loyal people within their countries.³¹

It was believed that homosexuals, who might otherwise have been considered loyal citizens, were unreliable. Therefore, homosexuals would continue to be viewed as security risks if they were put in compromising positions by Soviet agents interested in blackmailing public servants who had secrets to keep as well as access to Canadian, American, and British security information.

All Canadian national security campaigns were secretive, but those against homosexuals were especially so. This secrecy and its concomitant silence are what is reflected in most research on the national security campaigns, though there have been important breakthroughs. John Sawatsky's pioneering work on the internal workings of the RCMP Security Service provides a starting point for the project of uncovering the security campaigns against gay men and lesbians. Dean Beeby's later work, which involved gaining access to security documents on the anti-homosexual purges, has also been crucial.³²

The silence surrounding the Canadian war on queers not only distorted history in official Canadian Cold War historiography but also shaped the experiences of gay men, lesbians, and others during these years. Many people who were investigated and purged knew very little about the extensive social organization behind the security campaigns. As has been said, security regime practices that ensnared suspected gay men and lesbians were mediated through the use of classified state texts that defined homosexuals as security risks suffering from a character weakness.³³ The social organization of these practices would have been invisible to most people because it was produced through the conceptual framework of the security regime and the official courses of action that it set in motion. One goal of this book is to make this framework visible and to reveal what would have been only partially perceptible to many people from the vantage point of their daily lives.

During these years, gay activists outside of Ottawa had little or no awareness of the Canadian security campaigns. Throughout the 1950s, Jim Egan, Canada's first gay activist, wrote articles against the American anti-homosexual security campaigns. While he was aware of the McCarthy campaigns, he had little knowledge of what was happening in Canada.³⁴ He remembered that "whatever investigations were being conducted in Canada did not get the publicity of the McCarthy hearings ... To be perfectly frank with you I was not aware that there was this intensive campaign going on in Canada ... In those days there was nothing in the newspaper about a purge" (January 5, 1998). For Jim Egan (and, in the 1960s, for Doug Sanders, an active member of the Association for Social Knowledge [ASK], Canada's first gay rights group), the US security campaigns were the main reference point. As Egan said: "I guess what I did was spend far more time reading American literature because it was easier to get your hands on. A lot of the articles that I wrote were obviously based upon information coming out of the United States" (January 5, 1998).

Although the magnitude of the state-sanctioned security purges against gay men and lesbians was largely unknown, some sense of its presence was felt, especially in Ottawa. Throughout the public service, the military, and in Ottawa gay networks, there were plenty of rumours regarding the security campaigns. A number of the people interviewed expressed an awareness both of the campaigns and of advice regarding coping strategies in the event that one was caught in the interrogation net. This "queer talk" and network formation was the social basis for non-cooperation with and resistance to these campaigns. With the expansion of gay movements and community formation in the 1970s and 1980s, these capacities for resistance developed further.

GROUNDING THE INVESTIGATION: STORIES OF THE DIRECTLY AFFECTED

The Canadian War on Queers begins not with the official discourse proclaiming gay men and lesbians as national security risks but, rather, with the stories of those who were purged, transferred, interrogated, and spied upon – and of those like David, who resisted these campaigns. This social standpoint informs our investigation of security regime practices and provides the entry point for our exploration of security regime relations. The stories of those people whose everyday lives were affected by security regime practices ground this investigation in *their* social experiences rather than in the ideology of the national security regime. We begin from and constantly return to the experiences of those

most directly affected. We begin not in abstractions or in a discourse separated from social practice and relations but, rather, in the social worlds of people's experiences. And we ask how those experiences were socially organized.³⁵

Our research reveals a disjuncture between national security discourse and gay/lesbian accounts of the security campaigns.³⁶ Our major question concerns how these campaigns could create such problems in the daily lives of gay men and lesbians – problems with a continuing legacy today. We want to make visible what these first-hand accounts reveal regarding the social organization of these campaigns.

Since the postmodern turn, “experience” has been seen as “contaminated” by discourse. Our intent is not to reify the experience embodied in these accounts as the “truth.”³⁷ While social experiences are always shaped by social discourse, they are also extremely useful in that they can place us in the midst of the rupture between official accounts and social experiences. They provide a different starting point than do the security texts – one that allows us to see much more and that moves us beyond the confines of the security regime. The light they throw on historical events helps to reveal social organization and relations.³⁸ Based on the standpoints of oppressed and marginalized people, those whose lives were disrupted by official policies, these narratives enable us to see aspects of the social process that are concealed from the standpoints of those in positions of power (e.g., the RCMP, military police, members of the Security Panel [and later CSIS]).³⁹

These narratives constitute a form of resistance that makes visible the social knowledge that national security texts actively suppressed. We collect these stories and let them come to life as you, the reader, enter their worlds and interact with them. Given our commitment to preserving the voices of those most affected by the national security campaigns, we offer quotes that are longer than those typically found in texts, whether academic or non-academic. We do this because we do not want to decontextualize them.⁴⁰ These different voices are crucial to this investigation, and, in important ways, *The Canadian War on Queers* is a co-production between the interviewees and the interviewers (although the analysis is, of course, entirely our responsibility). These accounts provide us with access to “the social” from numerous viewpoints, and this, in turn, enables us to critically explore the social organization of Canada's security regime.⁴¹

The official discourse of the national security regime attempts to create a unitary monologue. First-hand accounts often disrupt this monologue and open up spaces for critical inquiry, allowing us to grasp aspects of the regime's

social organization that are hidden within official discourse. These narratives display the multiple and diverse voices that are suppressed within the monologic voice-over of official discourse.⁴² These voices include those of our research participants, activists, politicians, the police, security regime texts, and ourselves. Our analysis of the national security regime grows out of the dialogical character of the social world. There is not just one official story: rather, there are multiple stories, and they allow us to expose the partial and ideological character of the official story. It is our hope that the reader will enter into and use these stories to develop her or his own analysis of the national security war on queers. As an active text, this book encourages the reader to consider whether or not the analyses we have developed based on these experiences and stories are accurate.⁴³ We do not want *The Canadian War on Queers* to become yet another monologue.

The narratives we present are based on discussions with gay men and lesbians who had some direct experience of the security regime during the 1950s and 1960s. We also draw on several first-hand accounts and a number of interviews conducted by others. In this chapter, the participants are David, Sue, Yvette, Harold, Herbert Sutcliffe, Albert, Robert, Hank, and Arlene. We briefly introduce their stories in order to contextualize the postwar period, and we return to their narratives in Chapters 4 and 6. For the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, we meet another group of participants, including people active in queer organizing.

The interweaving of these stories with our developing analysis of the social organization of the security regime is key to our method and theory. We integrate experience, analysis, and theory in order to display the relations between the social experiences of lesbians and gay men, which include the problems created in their everyday lives by the security regime, and the wider social relations of the national security state. We move from first-hand accounts to the wider social and political relations that shaped them. This exploration leads to a broader social and historical analysis of the national security campaigns than has thus far been offered.

When we started this research in 1993, we thought that the security campaigns in the public service and those in the military were distinct from each other – and they often are – but we quickly discovered that they were all part of a common campaign. The RCMP participated in military investigations, and national security concerns were used to justify purges in the military. The Department of National Defence (DND) was centrally involved in the Security Panel and in the development of the fruit machine. Until the late 1980s and early 1990s, the military, like the RCMP, was vociferous in its opposition to

allowing lesbians and gays to become members. These first-hand accounts suggest both common and diverse queer experiences organized through national security regime practices. We begin with narratives from the military, then move on to those from the public service, and conclude with an account drawn from outside both the military and the public service.

Sue: “So I’ve lost my career”

The military provided a place where some women could survive outside heterosexual marriage and could seek career advancement and economic independence from husbands, individual men, and their families. The military also provided a place where women interested in sexual relations with other women could meet in a same-gender context; however, as an organization, the military had strict regulations prohibiting sexual and emotional relations between women. In particular, lesbian sexual relations were subjected to severe regulations.⁴⁴

Sue was forced out of the militia in Halifax in the early 1960s for being a lesbian. She described the sequence of events leading to this dismissal:

I was going to make it [the military] my ongoing career. And I had been out with this woman who had a child [and] who had a husband. He found out that she was a lesbian [and] had a current lesbian lover. And, may I say that the shit hit the fan. He found all these love letters and said, “What is going on here?” ... He says, “I want my daughter, we’re going to court.” He said, “Will you testify on my behalf?” I said, “No!” He said, “How would you like me to go to your colonel? How would you like me to go to your parents, your place of employment?” I said, “What is it that you would like me to say?” It’s called blackmail, and when you are eighteen, you are scared to death. And I had no rights, couldn’t go to a lawyer, couldn’t talk to anyone else. And we did go to court over custody. Her lawyer was a military colonel in the Canadian Intelligence Corps ... I said to the judge in court, I said, “I don’t want to talk about this.” And he said, “Well, nothing will happen to you from this.” And I said, “You’re going to assure me that I won’t lose my career, that nothing will happen?” He said, “No problem, you can speak.” Well, I want you to know that his honour was a liar. ‘Cause here’s this military chap writing down my name, anybody else’s in the courtroom, trying to figure out what was going on. Within a month and a half, there was this cute little colonel knocking on my door, saying, “Would you like to leave the military?” I said, “No, I really like it.” And he said, “Well, I’m telling you, you’ll be leaving.” So he passes me this letter

and he said, “You got two choices, you can leave or you can be court martialled” ... He said, “Yeah, think of the publicity and embarrassment to your family.” I said, “Well, I think probably by next week I could have things tidied up and be out of here. No problem, I will leave” ... So I’ve lost my career, and I had just gotten a promotion to a lance corporal, the youngest ever. (February 23, 1996)

Sue’s account reveals the link between civil legal proceedings (which brought her lesbianism to the attention of military authorities) and the military’s policy to “dispose” of lesbians. What this meant to Sue was the loss of her career in the military. The threat of blackmail was used against her, and it was orchestrated through anti-lesbian policies and the social stigma attached to lesbianism.

Yvette: “So, sexual orientation ... made me a non-person in their eyes”

Yvette, a franco-Ontarian woman from Northern Ontario, was discharged from the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) in the late 1950s for being a lesbian. She had joined the RCAF in North Bay with the specific intention of finding other lesbians (although, at the time, she did not know this word). She developed a sexual relationship with another woman on the base. This led to a rumour about her being involved with a woman, which incurred a great deal of stress. She was eventually taken to a psychiatrist at St. Mary’s Veterans’ Hospital in Montreal. Even though she had been valedictorian, had a good service record, and had been recommended for a commission, there was concern that, being a lesbian, she would be subject to blackmail. As Yvette put it, “[My] sexual orientation ... made me a non-person in their eyes.” She was given a Five D Discharge (i.e., an honourable discharge for medical reasons) and was deemed unsuitable for further service.⁴⁵

Harold: “I have undergone an experience which has destroyed the efforts of my life to date”

Harold’s account, written in the early 1960s, tells of his experience of being purged from the RCN in the late 1950s. He described the impact this had on his life:

Until recently I was a trusted, respected citizen. I held a position of responsibility and had spent years working hard in what I believed – and still do – was a worthwhile, if not highly remunerative, organization. Then one day, the culmination of months of severe mental stress, I was dismissed ... I have

undergone an experience which has destroyed the efforts of my life to date ... I have been deprived of two basic human needs – a reason for living and a degree of self-confidence ... At an age when I had commenced to reap the benefit of years of conscientious and highly commended effort I have been removed from my position and world because ... my superiors discovered I am a homosexual.⁴⁶

Harold's words reveal the fault line between his lived experience and the security regime practices that made him a security problem, the "solution" to which was his forced resignation. Harold's experiences were shaped through both security regime practices, which defined homosexuals as threats to national security, and the policies of the Canadian military, which called for the "disposal" of all "sex deviates" – policies that predated and developed in tandem with the security campaigns.⁴⁷

Herbert Sutcliffe: "I'm in a daze. I don't know what's going on"

Herbert Sutcliffe, who died in 2003, was also forced out of his position in the military.⁴⁸ He described being in a daze when he was confronted by his superior officer with the following accusation:

The fatal day was the 6th of June 1962. That morning I went into my office, and when I left the apartment the movers were moving my furniture into their van to take it to Washington because I had been posted to the Pentagon, which was one of the choicest postings that the military had. I had hardly reached my desk when the phone rang and I picked it up ... A female voice said, "The director [of military intelligence] would like to see you right away." So I walked down to his office ... and [he] said, "You are not going to Washington, there will be no luncheon for you. The RCMP has advised us that you are a homosexual and you'll be out of the military in three days. Return to your apartment, wait for me to contact you." Period. I'm in a daze. I don't know what's going on. I come out of his office, I go down to the street and I take a bus and I come back to my apartment, and the people are just putting the last of the furniture in the van. And I said, "I can't explain anything, just take everything out of the van and put it back into the apartment. And I'll contact you later." And then I went and hid myself somewhere until I heard the van go. Then I came back out. I went to the bedroom. I had a [type of gun]. So I got the [gun] out and I put the bullets in it. I came back and I looked out the living-room window. I put the [gun] on the TV and I went into the kitchen and

poured myself a scotch and soda, and I had a couple of drinks. Then I tried the [gun] against the side of my head, and I'm standing there, and then I say, "Fuck them, they're not going to kill me, the bastards!" So I go and put the [gun] away. (March 1, 1996)

Due to the secret nature of the social organization of the security investigation, Sutcliffe was completely unprepared to face the accusation of homosexuality. He was about to be appointed as an integrated Canadian officer to G-2 Intelligence at the Pentagon. Although he was cleared for counter-intelligence, it is likely that a new security check had been conducted because the new posting required a higher level of clearance (questions regarding military advancement and security checks for high levels of clearance are explored in Chapters 3 and 4). Herbert Sutcliffe's story clearly reveals the connection between the RCMP and military intelligence.

Robert: Tom Was Asked "Very Politely" to Leave the DEA

Robert, a gay man working in the DEA during the late 1960s and early 1970s, described what happened to his gay friend Tom, who had been posted with him to New York City: "It was shortly after I was with the NATO-NORAD division [in Ottawa] that Tom was let go. Actually, he was asked 'very politely.' They knew that he was gay and that [this] was not, for security reasons, conducive to future work. And he was given the 'option' of leaving as opposed to being ... just drummed out. And Tom did leave, and actually, he totally left the country" (October 10, 1996).

According to Robert, "[Tom received an ultimatum] to either leave on his own or else this would all come out ... They would basically tell all his family and it could be published. He was being dismissed because of security reasons because of the fact that he was gay." Officials used outing, or threats of outing, as a main tactic in their attempts to force people to resign from their positions.⁴⁹ As Robert remembered, "[Tom] had been called in and asked a great number of questions. He said that it was not pleasant. It was an experience he did not want to remember ... They knew of his sexuality, they knew what he had been doing, they knew where he had been. They knew of people he had been with. And when they were talking to him they had names and addresses and photographs and it was just – 'we know.' And so like – 'You're gone.' You're gone from the Foreign Service and the government" (October 10, 1996). The "option" of resigning quietly was a common form of dismissal. This account of Tom's ex-

perience also indicates the detailed surveillance work that would have been required to gather names, addresses, and photographs.

Albert: “I was confronted by my director”

Albert’s long career in the civil service came to an abrupt end in the late 1960s, when, thanks to media coverage of a court case in which he was involved, his superior discovered he was a homosexual:

When I returned to the office I was confronted by my director. He indicated to me that I should no longer be associated with the type of work [that] dealt with personnel matters because of the trial, since it would appear I might be a homosexual and should not be dealing with people that had personnel [sic] problems, such as alcoholism or drug-related difficulties or even collective bargaining ... As a result I was transferred from that work to another area. So this did affect my employment since this was an area I felt I was reasonably skilled in, and it was going to be denied me because of a judgment they had read in the press and which was not even proven. There was no day in court, there was nothing but a statement of fact. I accepted this since there was no point in challenging it since it would only lead to more disaster on my part. (October 19, 1993)

Albert’s story highlights how court cases initiated outside the security regime itself could affect security investigations. Cases like this provided valuable information for the RCMP, who did rely on police and court information regarding criminal charges and proceedings involving homosexuality. This story indicates that, within the public service, homosexuality was seen as incompatible with personnel responsibilities and even with collective bargaining. Albert’s sense of futility with regard to resistance is indicative of the social power relations that constrained public servants.

Hank: A Very Intimate Surveillance

Hank started work in the public service during the late 1960s. Some time in the late 1960s or early 1970s, a gay RCMP officer was “forced” to investigate two other gay men, including Hank. The officer was, in effect, blackmailed by his superiors, who had discovered his homosexuality. It was only on the condition that the officer investigate Hank and another public servant that he would be eligible to be released from the RCMP with a workable service record. This

officer sought Hank out at various parties in Ottawa and eventually developed a personal and sexual relationship with him. One day, when they were in bed together, the officer revealed that Hank was under surveillance. Hank was outraged. The officer also mentioned that he was dating another gay man for similar reasons (February 20, 1995). Even though it is unlikely that the RCMP officially authorized these sexual liaisons, it did force this officer to conduct surveillance work on these two men. Eventually, the officer left the RCMP with a workable service record. Hank's story suggests the extent of some of the RCMP investigations as well as the pressure exerted on individual officers.

Arlene: "I am a national security risk!"

Refused a pardon in the 1970s due to a prior conviction a decade earlier, Arlene was informed that she was a national security risk:

I went for a pardon, for my criminal record. I can't get a pardon: they classed me as a national security risk. I am a national security risk! And I did a real sneaky thing. Freedom of information came up, and I got my file, which wasn't worth the paper it was written on because three-quarters of it was deleted. And under the deletion it said: "National security list." So I phoned Mark Bonokoski at the *Sun*. And he said, "Okay, I've got a friend, a connection at the RCMP?" And I said to my lawyer at the time: "Don't tell Bonokoski I'm gay." And within an hour after I talked to Bonokoski, he got back to me and he said: "Why didn't you tell me you were a lesbian?" I said, "Since when does being a lesbian have to do with B&E [breaking and entering]?" I said, "I didn't think that was a predisposition of gay women. I thought it was more of a criminal disposition." He says, "Well, I'm telling you, the first thing the RCMP handed me was, you're gay." (Lesbians Making History, 1987)

Here we see the interrelation between local police work and RCMP surveillance, the implication being that the Toronto police, who knew Arlene was a lesbian, had forwarded this information to the RCMP.

In all these narratives there is an experiential rupture between the accounts of lesbians and gay men who were directly affected by the national security regime and the official discourse of the Canadian war on queers. It is with this rupture that our inquiry begins. These accounts enable us to undertake a critical analysis of the official national security regime discourse as well as the discussions we had with people who were active in that regime (specifically, in the RCMP and the DEA). The critical interrogation of those who were involved

in the regime is informed by our reading and analysis of the first-hand accounts of the gay men and lesbians who were affected by its campaigns.⁵⁰

A PASSION FOR REMEMBERING: THE ANTI-QUEER CHARACTER OF CANADIAN STATE FORMATION

In *The Canadian War on Queers*, we remember the deep roots of heterosexism in Canadian state and social formation and argue that, given this anti-queer history, which continues to shape our present, queers require a much more profound social transformation than that constituted by simply winning the right to marry. We confront current claims that same-sex marriage is the solution to past oppression (and, to some extent, present oppression). We bring together the past and the present of queer oppression and the national security campaigns in the hope of producing creative and productive tensions. As David McNally points out, drawing on the work of cultural critic and theorist Walter Benjamin, “rather than something laid down once and for all the past is a site of struggle *in the present*.”⁵¹

In part, capitalism and oppression rule through what we call “the social organization of forgetting,” which is based on the annihilation of our social and historical memories. This process also leads to the acceptance of social mythologies that assert that the Cold War was “good” and that our notions of the “nation” and “national security” are unproblematic. This social organization of forgetting is crucial to the way in which social power works in our society. We no longer remember the past struggles that won us the social gains, social programs, and human rights that we now often take for granted.⁵² This is also how strategies of respectability and responsibility gain hegemony in queer communities, and these strategies are related to class. We have been forced to forget where we have come from; our histories have never been recorded and passed down; and we are denied the social and historical literacy that allows us to remember and relive our past and, therefore, to grasp our present. By telling these stories of resistance – stories that the national security regime did not and does not want told – this book is an act of rebellion.

We try not to forget the development of human and social capacities for agency, creativity, and resistance.⁵³ If we simply rely on official stories and national security campaign texts, which attempt to subdue other voices, this development can be overlooked. Relying on official texts, even critical readings of them, can trap us in the discursive processes of reification, whereby social practices and relations between people are transformed into relations between

things, variables, categories, or concepts. Reifying approaches to social history prevent us from remembering past struggles and compromises. As Theodor Adorno and others have stressed, “all reification is a form of forgetting” – that is, a forgetting of the human social practices involved in creating our past, present, and possible futures.⁵⁴ One limitation of Foucauldian and post-structuralist-inspired analysis within queer theory is that it often remains trapped within the confines of official discourse, even though it is based on a critical reading of it. This is why we move beyond reinterpreting and rereading texts and, instead, attempt to rediscover social organization, social relations, and social practice.

QUEERING THE COLD WAR

One of the most insightful parts of queer theory involves the notion of “queering” aspects of social life from the social standpoints of queers. The marginalized experiences of queers become central in this process of queering social discourses and relations. An aspect of queering pursued throughout this book is related to the Cold War and national security. We are not simply adding the campaign against queers to the established historiography of Cold War Canada; rather, we are queering and transforming our very analysis of the Cold War. A shortcoming of official, and even of more critical, narratives regarding the Cold War is that they emphasize only the conflict between the American and the Soviet empires.⁵⁵ We use the term “Cold War” in two different senses. Although, from the 1940s to the 1980s, the Cold War era was characterized by proxy battles between “West” and “East,” it was also, and more broadly, an era that witnessed Western campaigns against political, social, and sexual others.⁵⁶ The move beyond a narrow reading of the Cold War was signalled in *Whose National Security*, which indicated the need to rethink the basis of national security and expand the analysis of the Cold War to include relations of ethnicity, immigration, race, gender, sexuality, and class.⁵⁷ The Cold War was not only about defending Western capitalism and the expanding US empire against the bureaucratic class societies that emerged in the USSR and elsewhere.⁵⁸ Primarily, it was about pushing back and weakening the struggles of working-class and oppressed peoples.

The national security campaigns of the Cold War period, including the war on queers, came out of a particular configuration of social and political forces. The United States, in a leadership role with other Western powers, responded to the growth of the Soviet bloc and Third World national and social liberation movements by attempting to contain the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba through

wars (e.g., in Korea, Vietnam, Nicaragua, and El Salvador) and through destabilizing and overthrowing governments seen as opposed to capitalist, Western, and US interests (e.g., Guatemala, Iran, Indonesia, Chile, and Grenada). Key to these cold and hot wars was the defence of capitalism, whiteness, the patriarchal family, “proper” forms of masculinity/femininity, and heterosexuality. These were wars for normality and against political, gender, and sexual deviance. The effects of these wars resonated into the 1990s with the collapse of the Soviet empire and helped to shape the current national security campaigns and the war on terror.

In the early years of the Cold War, the United States positioned itself as the military, political, and economic hegemonic power. For example, the Marshall Plan (1947) was a strategic reconstruction initiative used by the United States to secure its economic and ideological influence in western Europe. The Marshall Plan was also a vital tool to repress the actual and potential uprisings of the working class and poor.⁵⁹ New socio-economic approaches, such as Keynesianism, were developed in response to workers and social struggles. These approaches spread to western European countries and Canada, where limited social funding provisions and the “social wage” were used to attenuate the contradictions of capitalism and stifle rioting in the streets by ensuring that the poor could continue to purchase some commodities.⁶⁰

The Cold War was centrally a war *against* Third World liberation movements and *for* neocolonialism. This war for imperialism and empire-building had a racial character and was part of the hegemonic production of a white middle-class way of life on a global scale.⁶¹ This Cold War against the Third World and for white hegemony continues – from the US blockade of Cuba, to Western-imposed “structural adjustment programs,” to the global food crisis, to the war on terror, to the wars and occupations in Afghanistan and Iraq, to the more recent threats being made against Venezuela and Iran.⁶²

Cold War strategies also focused on gender and sexual “normality” with regard to the remaking of heterosexist and patriarchal relations after the social disruptions of the Second World War, especially in the West but also around the globe. These built on earlier practices of gender and sexual regulation. During the war years in the West, sex and gender relations were transformed as women entered the wage labour force in unprecedented numbers, daycare centres were established, and more queers came out in these altered sex/gender conditions.⁶³ After the Second World War, others were forced “out” and into emerging queer ghettos in response to the reconstruction of patriarchal and heterosexist relations that opposed these potential and actual queer and feminist threats.⁶⁴ A central aspect of the Cold War was, therefore, gender

and sexual regulation, and the war on queers was an integral feature of this. The scrutiny of queers was not simply a mistake; nor was it about individual homophobia. Homophobia, used to refer to the “dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals,” focuses on an individual phobia and thus obscures how heterosexist practices are shaped through broader social relations.⁶⁵ Anti-queer aspects of the Cold War are central to its deeply rooted and socially mediated character. Consequently, in this period, queers were constructed as a threat not only to heterosexual hegemony but also to national security. By the late 1960s and the 1970s, these continuing anti-queer mobilizations were focused on attempts to contain the re-emergence of gender and sexual political struggles.

A key objective of Cold War mobilizations was the creation of the “normal,” as Mary Louise Adams and others have persuasively argued.⁶⁶ Moral regulation was always an essential feature of these mobilizations as certain forms of social practice were defined as moral and normal, whereas others were constructed as immoral and deviant.⁶⁷ This making of the normal was posited against “others,” “dangers,” and “risks.” A central and continuing aspect of the Cold War was the construction of sexual normality and sexual deviance. Linked to this were the mobilizations against queers and those for heterosexual normality.⁶⁸ In effect, we are thrown outside the fabric of the “nation.” But this is also a relational social process, with the Cold War being fought *for* heterosexual hegemony – producing heterosexuality as being in the national interest, as loyal, and as safe. Heterosexuality becomes the national sexuality.

The Cold War, in its various phases, was directed against differing forms of political, social, sexual, and cultural subversion. The adaptability of the concept of “subversion” was and is key to the Cold War and the national security discourse. As Grace and Leys argue regarding state definitions of subversion,

Many writers on subversion have complained that the term refers to a “grey area” and is difficult to define. Our view is that it has always referred to a fairly clear reality: legal activities and ideas directed against the existing social, economic and political [and we add sexual, gender, and racial] order ... Any radical activity or idea with the potential to enlist significant popular support may be labeled “subversive” ... [Subversion] is invoked ... to *create* a “grey area” of activities that *are* lawful, but will be denied protection from state surveillance or harassment by being *declared* illegitimate, on the grounds that they *potentially* have unlawful consequences. In capitalist societies the targets of this delegitimation have been overwhelmingly on the left.⁶⁹

Through the application of the concept of subversion in national security discourse, some groups are excluded from the nation and become targets of surveillance.

The term “subversion” is linked to terms like “national security risk” and even “terrorist.” It is an administrative collecting category into which, at various historical moments, assorted social and political practices can be placed and thus be read out of the normal and national social fabric.⁷⁰ These conceptualizations can be expanded or contracted depending on social and political contexts. Some groups are denied their rights and become objects of surveillance in a “cutting out operation” that separates them from the nation.⁷¹ Once categorized as subversive or as a national security risk, these groups can then be denied their human and citizenship rights. For example, communists, socialists, peace activists, trade unionists, Red Power and Black Power activists, Quebec sovereigntists, immigrants, feminists, high school students, and queers have all, at one time or another, been designated subversive in Canadian state formation.⁷² More recently, the state designation “terrorist” has been applied not only to al Qaeda and violent Islamic fundamentalists in general but also to members of left Palestinian resistance groups such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and to global justice and anti-poverty activists who engage in direct action politics.⁷³

Cold War mobilizations against queers have had major and lasting consequences for the left. They have affected not only those who supported the USSR (where homosexuality was often seen as “bourgeois decadence” or as linked to fascism) but also those who rejected Stalinism.⁷⁴ For instance, in the context of the social mobilization of heterosexism and the US Cold War on queers, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) viewed lesbians and gays as security risks and prohibited them from party membership.⁷⁵ Accepting blackmail as a risk but reversing the focus so that the US government became its source led the SWP leadership to view gay and lesbian members as a risk to the party, as people who could supposedly be blackmailed to reveal party secrets to US security agents. Cold War mobilizations against queers helped produce the heterosexism on the left that the gay and lesbian liberation movements confronted in the late 1960s and the 1970s (see Chapter 8).

MAPPING OUT THE BOOK: WHAT COMES NEXT?

In Chapter 2, we focus on theory and method, providing a historical, sociological, and critical analysis of the ideology and practice of national security.

In Chapter 3, we locate the national security campaigns against queers within their broader social, political, and historical contexts in order to clarify their socially mediated character. In Chapter 4, we return to a detailed analysis of the first-hand accounts of those most directly affected by these campaigns in the 1950s and 1960s. Here we develop an analysis of the social relations of surveillance and interrogation employed in the national security campaigns. In Chapter 5, we investigate the attempt to construct the fruit machine, which involved the development of a battery of psychological tests whose purpose was to scientifically identify homosexuals. In Chapter 6, we examine the possibilities for non-cooperation with and resistance to the security campaigns as developed through the expansion of gay and lesbian networks, community formation, communication, and solidarity. We also explore how the RCMP responded to this non-cooperation through the local policing of gay men and lesbians. In Chapter 7, we unearth the continuing security campaigns of the 1970s. In Chapter 8, we look at the extension of RCMP spying operations to lesbian and gay liberation and rights organizations in the 1970s, including the RCMP's construction of the "gay activist" and the "radical lesbian." Chapter 9 focuses on the relation between sexual policing and national security, with the sex scandal in Ottawa and the Olympic clean-up campaign leading up to the bath raids of the early 1980s. Chapter 10 highlights the continuing national security campaigns in the 1980s in the military, the RCMP, and in the newly created Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), whereas Chapter 11 covers the use of the equality rights section in the new Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the ending of the most overt forms of the national security campaigns in the public service, the RCMP, and the military. In Chapter 12, we move into our historical present, where some queers are now perceived as being within (as opposed to without) the nation and national security. We draw together insights from this investigation and also point to the new targets of the national security regime in the context of the war on terror. We conclude with a call for continuing queer opposition to the ideologies and practices of national security.