Homohegemony and the Other:

Canada and Jamaica

by

Kyle Brandon Jackson

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Program in the Department of Political Studies

in conformity with the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Queen’s University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

January, 2015

Copyright © Kyle Brandon Jackson, 2015
Abstract

Existing scholarship on LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or queer/questioning) rights, regulation, “homonationalism,”¹ and citizenship fails to consider lesbian and gay inclusion as a hegemonic state ideology. This dissertation addresses this lacuna, with particular attention to Canada and Jamaica. It considers the political implications of near legal equality for gays and lesbians in Canada, not merely in terms of the entrenchment of a regime of sexual citizenship rights culminating in same-sex marriage, but, relatedly, in terms of significant popular consent to the notion of gays and lesbians as equal and included citizens. It theorizes and critically demonstrates “homohegemony,” an ideology of relative inclusion of gay and lesbian citizenship in the national imaginary, in which the state extends selective citizenship rights to the gay and lesbian minority in a benevolent liberal fashion. However, these rights are premised on moments of illiberalism both within and outside the Canadian nation-state. Drawing on a neo-Gramscian understanding of hegemony, these illiberal exclusions may also be seen to characterize homohegemony, ideologically and materially. Once homosexual inclusion in the national imaginary becomes hegemonic, symbolized by the granting of near legal equality through same-sex marriage, longstanding and novel “others” are (re)imagined as exterior to the ideal-typical national community. One illiberal “other” is “homophobic Jamaica,” which functions as a significant constructed counterpoint, or foil, to a newly homohegemonic “national self.” A historical preoccupation with the “homosexual other” within Canada has significantly turned to a fixation on homophobic other nation-states. The ideological construction of Jamaica in particular is persuasive, not least because it bases itself in a degree of truth grounded in real heterosexism. The construction is, however, replete with generalizations, distortions,

exaggerations, and omissions, and occurs in the context of historic colonial and other stereotypes. This image of Jamaica invisibilizes a much queerer reality. Homohegemony, both in its veritable benevolent liberal inclusions, and its less commonly appreciated significant illiberal exclusions, is thus set out in a broadly understood Canadian context. That such a context includes the imagination of Jamaica and Jamaicans, within a broader neocolonial relationship, represents a queer development in the history of hegemonic Canadian sexual ideology.
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Preface

What initially brought me to the framework of “homohegemony and the other” was an experience I commonly encountered when I first started my research. I kept coming into contact with family members, friends, and colleagues who would invariably ask the question every doctoral student dreads: “So, what are you writing your thesis on?” When I would excitedly respond “queer issues in Canada and Jamaica,” they would nearly always respond with some variation of “Oh, Jamaica is so homophobic! You aren’t going there are you? It would be really dangerous for you.”

At the same time as I was encountering such feedback, I was engaged in brainstorming what I thought would be a straightforward comparative project on Canada and Jamaica as case study countries for an analysis of “LGBTQ rights” given their similar but different British colonial histories. I was, however, increasingly struck by the neocolonial thinking contained in the blanket statements about Jamaica that I was encountering, particularly pronounced in mainstream – and I would add “malestream”¹ – queer and allied spaces that seemed to be very much invested in this narrative. I would usually explain that there is real heterosexism² in Jamaica, but that it is uneven across the country based on factors such as class, gender, race, and geography. I would further highlight features of Jamaica’s historical context, such as the history of plantation slavery and colonialism, and that the laws against men’s same-sex sexual activity extant in Jamaica are vestiges of British colonialism in the first place.

These engagements, though frustrating, ultimately proved to be productive. It was these emphatic, stereotyped, and seemingly ideologically invested responses that got me thinking about how these often well-meaning assessments of Jamaica have as much to do with perceiving contemporary Canadian national identity as “homo-friendly” as they do with Jamaica’s apparent
“homophobia.” It became clear to me that the people making these pronouncements did not in fact know a great deal about LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or queer/questioning) issues in Jamaica, or in Canada for that matter. Yet, they were invested in a narrative about “homophobic Jamaica,” and this appeared to function as a fairly significant counterpoint or contrast to a sense of national pride in Canada.

Personally experiencing such obvious instantiations of ideology helped to open my eyes to the reality that the “homohegemonic nation,” although I had not yet termed it as such, and the “homophobic other nation” are two sides of the same ideological coin or construction. With the help of my supervisor, I would later come to theorize that under conditions of contemporary homohegemony, the homohegemonic nation-state depends upon a conception of “the other.” Gay and lesbian inclusion, however imperfect and tenuous, has become a pervasive part of Canadian national identity. National identities inherently imagine not only those who are included in the nation, but also those who are excluded from membership in, or are contrasted with, the national community. On issues of gender and sexuality, longstanding colonial and racial tropes seemed to me to be rising up to the surface in the current day: the colonial gaze of sexuality’s historical regulation was becoming the neocolonial gay’s gaze. I began to consider the implications of not discounting “LGBTQ rights” but not taking these rights gains at face value either. I set out to determine the ideological and national stakes of LGBTQ rights, and to set these considerations within a neocolonial context.

It was at this point that I began working with the powerful frame of “homonationalism,” provocatively introduced by Jasbir Puar and very meaningfully engaged with by Scott Morgensen and others. Lisa Duggan’s notion of “homonormativity” was instructive as well. These ideas were broadly consistent with the recent folding of some newly normative gays and
lesbians into the Canadian national imaginary, and the significant role of “othering” in
underwriting understandings of gay and lesbian normalization and inclusion in “nation.” Yet, I
became increasingly discouraged as I sought to apply homonationalism, in particular to the
specificity of the Canada/Jamaica relationship. For one thing, homonationalism appeared to be
much more developed in Canada than in the American case that served as Puar’s primary focus.
Writing ten years after the onset of legal same-sex marriage in Canada, I found myself trying to
explain a context in which even many conservatives supported legal equality for gays and
lesbians. In addition, I found that Puar’s notion of “the other,” meaningfully contextualized as it
was within the “war on terror,” imperfectly described the investments involved in Canada’s
neocolonial caricature of Jamaica as a “homophobic other nation.”

These doubts were joined by the insistence of my supervisor, Dr. Abigail Bakan, that I
name and elaborate a new concept consistent with the context under consideration. Noting that I
was moving in a slightly different direction than homonationalism, and acknowledging the
increasing significance of Antonio Gramsci’s writings on hegemony to my own thinking, we
devoted some time to considering the implications of this turn to Gramsci. These reflections and
conversations resulted in the idea of “homohegemony.” The new but related concept would
reflect the hegemonic or pervasive nature of “homonationalism” in Canada, a decade after the
achievement of legal equality for gays and lesbians. The hegemonic – rather than merely
majoritarian – nature of this ideology about homosexual inclusion in the nation could in turn
explain the compulsion to single out and construct homophobic other nations such as Jamaica.

The rest of the project has flowed, with fits and starts, from this basic insight about
homohegemony and the other, and has been motivated by two imperatives. First, it responds to
the scholarly imperative to engage with LGBTQ rights in Canada and internationally at the level
of national identity and ideology. This includes attending to real inclusions of LGBTQ people, as well as underappreciated ongoing and new exclusions of LGBTQ people and others. The project also addresses the ethical imperative to expose some of the complicities and complexities of queer citizenship and belonging in Canada so that we may work toward the realization of a more inclusive vision of national and transnational political community. Homohegemony represents a “new normal” that I find myself a significant beneficiary of in many ways. Not least, it conditions my ability to engage in this project in a Canadian university context. This new normal, however, also contains underappreciated realities of continuing heterosexism, sexism, cisgender normativity, racism, class exploitation, colonialism, and the illiberal demarcation of homophobic others. The following discussion will hopefully shed some light on the inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of homohegemony, and contribute to advancing further critical and constructive conversations.

Notes

Chapter One. Introduction. Homohegemony and the Other: Canada and Jamaica

When Gay and Lesbian Rights Become Hegemonic

What happens when gay and lesbian rights become hegemonic? What are the political implications when full or nearly full legal equality for gays and lesbians becomes not just entrenched in the institutions of the state, but when the notion of gays and lesbians as equal and included citizens becomes a sentiment widely shared in civil society and across a nation’s population? Such a reality represents a marked departure from the explicitly heterosexist history of most nation-states.¹ This conjuncture is marked by an ideological construction this dissertation terms “homohegemony,” an ideology of relative inclusion of gay and lesbian citizenship in the national imaginary, in which the state extends selective citizenship rights to the gay and lesbian minority in a “benevolent” liberal fashion.² These rights are premised, however, on serious moments of “illiberalism,”³ in terms of specific exclusions both within and outside the nation-state.

Homohegemony as an ideological construction is a novel expression of national citizenship, corresponding to the explicit and recognized benevolent liberal inclusion of LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or queer/questioning)⁴ citizens to varying degrees via rights and relationship recognition in place of a longstanding assumption, practice, and projection of unapologetic national heterosexism or homophobia.⁵ As an ideological construction, it is an element of the ruling relations⁶ expressly pertaining to sexuality. Temporally, it is unique to the twenty-first century, although elements of homohegemony were noticeable in the 1990s in Canada and other countries.⁷ Homohegemony advances homosexual inclusion in the national imaginary, and when it becomes hegemonic at the national level,
symbolized by the granting of near legal equality through same-sex marriage, longstanding and novel “others” are (re)imagined exterior to the ideal-typical national community. Not least, the inclusion of transgender, bisexual, and queer identities continues to be limited, though connected, to notions of gay and lesbian inclusion because of the linked understanding of LGBTQ rights. Further, such illiberal “othering” in the context of homohegemony consists of strong and subtle forms of racialization and neocolonialism, as well as discourses of the sometimes well meaning but deeply problematic “rescue” of “third world queers.” In terms of neocolonialism, this dissertation defines it as continuing features of asymmetrical economic, social, and political relationships between Northern nation-states/blocs of nation-states and theoretically sovereign Southern nation-states despite the end of formalized colonial power relations. Neocolonial relationships are part of the wider context of homohegemony, particularly in terms of the ideology’s illiberal exclusions.

Identifying the political meaning and implications of homohegemony in a broadly understood Canadian context is the central focus of this dissertation. Drawing on Canada as an example of the homohegemonic Northern nation-state par excellence, it will further demonstrate that a constructed image of Jamaica functions ideologically as a prominent “homophobic other” Southern nation-state for Canadian homohegemony. That is, this dissertation will argue that Canada has become homohegemonic, and, although this corresponds to moments of benevolent liberalism, this ideology about inclusive gay and lesbian citizenship is entrenched in part through a decidedly illiberal construction of Jamaica as a homophobic other. This construction is persuasive, not least because it bases itself in a degree of truth grounded in real practices and experiences of heterosexism in the Jamaican context. The construction of “homophobic Jamaica” is, however, highly ideological, replete with generalizations, distortions, exaggerations, and
omissions, and occurring in the context of historic colonial, racial, and sexual stereotypes. It takes place in the context of entrenching homohegemony, in which the constructed imaginary of “Jamaica” functions as a foil for Canadian ideology grounded in the state and in civil society. Simply put, Canada’s contemporary common sense understanding of itself as “gay friendly” is partly but seriously undergirded by a common sense understanding of other nations, and prominently Jamaica, as horrifically homophobic. Homohegemony and the other are thus two sides of the same ideological construction. Assessments of the perceived homophobia of other nations are not neutral. Rather, these are appraisals steeped in ideological investments in the ascendancy of the homohegemonic moment in Canada.

The sexual other in Canada, as in many other nation-states, has historically been cast as the homosexual citizen/subject within its borders. However, under conditions of contemporary homohegemony, this other has in effect “flipped” from the homosexual within Canada to the homophobic nation without, making it a new supporting actor in the historical national drama of the regulation of sexuality. Canadian homohegemony is an inclusive imagining of the national “self” on the score of gay and lesbian citizenship that occurs in the context of measures and moments of benevolent liberalism. However, that this is significantly linked to a decidedly illiberal construction of “homophobic Jamaica” constitutes a major part of the argument of this dissertation. Homohegemony is a veritable moment in the development of sexual ideology in Canada, and one cannot speak meaningfully about the homohegemonic national “self” without considering the construction and function of the homophobic other nation. Significant to scholarship on sexuality and North/South relations alike, homohegemony recasts and complicates the development of admittedly important liberal LGBTQ rights regimes in Canada and other Northern nation-states, as these are understood ideologically and are seen to rely on
important undercurrents of exclusion and caricature, both within and beyond the nation-state, consistent with illiberalism.

Gays and lesbians have been positioned outside of most nation-state formations until very recently.¹⁰ This was not simply a discursive positioning; it was backed up by the full force of the state, which outlawed same-sex sexual activity, provided no protection against sexual orientation discrimination, and did not recognize same-sex relationships.¹¹ This legalized discrimination and institutionalized oppression were supported by an extensive network of state and civil societal relationships and institutions; these included medical and psychiatric establishments that treated homosexuality and lesbianism as diseases or perversions,¹² a hegemonic interpretation of Christianity that deemed homosexuality a sin,¹³ and a popular culture that normalized and valorized the heteronormative nuclear family and considered other expressions of intimacy and family to be deviant.¹⁴ In short, the idea of lesbian and gay rights being hegemonic could only have been conceptualized under very recent historical conditions, and has only taken place in a relatively small number of nation-states with particular histories of sexual regulation, homosexual identity-formation, exclusion, mobilization, and pursuit of gay and lesbian rights.

While same-sex identities and practices outside of the heterosexual/homosexual binary, and outside of gay and lesbian identities, have existed and continue to exist in contexts marked by different histories of sexuality,¹⁵ heterosexuality/homosexuality and the state regulation of homosexuality have been overarching norms in the history of the modern West.¹⁶ This modern Western history has placed gay and lesbian sexual citizens¹⁷ in a context of oppression, along with other others, such as racial minorities,¹⁸ indigenous peoples and their nationalities and polities,¹⁹ and women.²⁰ Of course, these identities intersect.²¹ The issue of the relative exclusion/inclusion of each of these groups is complex and distinct. For example, white
heterosexual women, in the context of North American and Western European liberal “democratic” government, were excluded from anything resembling legal equality, specifically in terms of civil or legal personhood within courts of law, voting rights, divorce law, and access to abortion, among other markers of women’s legal equality/inequality, and therefore from equal citizenship as far as the public sphere of the state was concerned well into the twentieth century. Yet, women in this context of clear legal inequality were still considered to be “full” members of the nation through their role in the private sphere, even as “mothers of the nation.” A robust examination of these specific contexts of exclusion is beyond the scope of this discussion, but the politics of oppression, exclusion, and differential rights is indicative of the nature of state hegemony generally. Homohegemony addresses one particular form of state hegemony regarding one status group of oppressed and excluded citizens who have recently been folded into the nation. It intersects with other hegemonic ideologies, or superstructures, dealing variously with gender, race, class, and so forth, and their social and political ruling relations. Although homohegemony indirectly and relationally includes LGBTQ people in general, it mainly describes understandings and realities of gay and lesbian inclusion in particular because of the arrival of near legal equality for lesbians and gays, and their corresponding imagination into the nation as equal sexual citizens. The specific example of the continuing lack of explicit transgender legal protections in Canadian jurisdictions indicates a clear absence of legal equality that would serve to symbolize equal citizenship in the national imaginary. Furthermore, though legal advances like same-sex marriage, based on the judicial interpretation of the constitutionally protected status of sexual orientation, have benefitted bisexuals and other queer-identified persons in addition to gays and lesbians, it is unclear whether the Canadian courts and nation conceive of bisexuality and other queer identities as “innate” identities and “insular” social
groups – and therefore as representing legitimate claims to sexual citizenship – equal to homosexuality.\textsuperscript{27} Under homohegemony, the binary opposition of heterosexuality/homosexuality remains firmly in place, and the minority sexual citizen is typically not imagined as bisexual or queer.

Even where gays and lesbians are concerned, homohegemony does not imply that heteronormativity ceases to exist, or that subtle systemic oppression and occurrences of explicit discrimination against gays and lesbians have suddenly disappeared in this context. On the contrary, in Canada, there continue to be numerous police-reported hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation each year, nearly a decade after the cross-national legalization of same-sex marriage.\textsuperscript{28} Furthermore, same-sex marriage marked the arrival of near formal equality for gay and lesbian citizens, but there exist continued restrictions even in this realm of legal equality. Family policy continues to institute legal inequality;\textsuperscript{29} age of consent laws remain unequal for vaginal versus anal intercourse, with a higher age of consent for the latter in jurisdictions where Canada’s anal sex law has not been deemed unconstitutional by the courts, and prohibitions on anal sex in which more than two persons participate or are present likewise continue to be legally in effect in some Canadian jurisdictions in spite of no similar prohibitions on “group sex” for other forms of sexual activity;\textsuperscript{30} and restrictions on the donation of blood by sexually active homosexual and bisexual men are still instituted by Canadian Blood Services. The latter is despite the recent (2013) announcement lifting the previous ban on any man donating blood who has had sex with another man since the year 1977, even if he has only had sex with another man on one occasion.\textsuperscript{31} Moreover, the “law of provocation,” recognized by common law, retains homophobic\textsuperscript{32} elements. This law has operated to allow the “reasonable” heterosexual man who kills another man in a fit of “panic” because of a perceived “homosexual sexual advance” to be
convicted of manslaughter instead of murder. Thus, subtle and systemic legal and societal inequality persists even for those sexual citizens who have been granted significant citizenship rights marking their imagined inclusion as equal members of the nation.

The point of emphasis here regarding the turn to homohegemony, therefore, is that the public institution of same-sex marriage is symbolic, marking the arrival of what is commonly perceived as complete legal equality for lesbians and gays, and signaling their normative citizenship status. This is a citizenship status understood as benevolently bestowed by the Canadian state and national community to the gay and lesbian minority. The notion of a benevolent liberal bestowal of rights to the gay and lesbian minority adds a celebratory air to the ideology of homohegemony. Long positioned as others or outsiders to the nation, or even as enemies within, gays and lesbians are now imagined as members of the Canadian nation in good standing. This marks a change that demands analysis within political studies, similar to how other benevolent liberal dynamics operative in terms of women’s rights, multiculturalism, and the rhetorical recognition of Aboriginal rights have demanded considered attention. In short, gays and lesbians have become part of the national imaginary, even if still imagined as a minority. But just as systemic sexism or patriarchy did not cease with the onset of women’s near legal equality, racism did not end with an official policy of multiculturalism, and colonialism did not end with an official government apology to Aboriginal Canadians for the history of residential schools, heteronormativity and heterosexism have not ended in practice with the adoption of same-sex marriage.

Homohegemony is therefore principally an ideological construction. The ideology impacts institutional and material realities, and is advanced in the context of institutions and material experiences, but it is not reducible to these. Applying Antonio Gramsci’s powerful
notion of hegemony,\textsuperscript{42} the construction of a dominant state ideology relies on a relationship of limited consent among the subaltern classes, marking a specific relationship between political and civil society.\textsuperscript{43} It has necessarily some bearing in material reality – the state cannot simply “make up” the ideology in the absence of a regime of gay rights – but at its core it speaks to an ideology that predominates and for which significant popular consent is required.\textsuperscript{44}

Homohegemonic ideology turns on a relationship between the state and significant sections of civil society, but it is not entirely grounded in moments of inclusion. As illustrated, it also demands others, both longstanding and novel. It offers a dominant ideological construction but clearly invisibilizes more complicated and uneven material and experiential realities. Even those gays and lesbians most included in the homohegemonic moment continue to face systemic heterosexist discrimination, yet this is rendered outside or beyond the hegemonic claims. Hence, the incorporation of lesbian and gay rights is uneven. Discrepancies include those between urban meccas with their fabulous “gay villages,” and rural areas, where stares and glares sometimes meet open expressions or manifestations of gay identity and same-sex intimacy. Such unevenness is also observed among different provinces and territories, different “nations” (Québec, English Canada, First Nations), diverse ethno-cultural communities, distinct experiences of socioeconomic class, and so forth. The ideal-typical gay or lesbian citizen is rarely imagined as a racialized minority,\textsuperscript{45} and is usually imagined as middle-class and/or a professional.\textsuperscript{46} Such a sexual citizen, as a member of a constitutionally interpreted and nationally imagined status group based on sexual orientation, must not transgress certain boundaries of sexual fluidity\textsuperscript{47} and gender normativity\textsuperscript{48} lest he or she sacrifice newly normative citizenship status. These specific exclusions within the nation-state emerge as the price of inclusion within the benevolent liberal rights regime in which homohegemony advances.
The relative inclusion of some gays and lesbians described by homohegemony is one significant shift in a continuously shifting spectrum of inclusion and exclusion that defines the relationship between citizenship/national belonging and non-citizenship. In this sense, it is not altogether new or surprising. At about the same time as the onset of legal same-sex marriage in the Canadian context, a new other was being imagined by North American and European nation-states in a patently illiberal fashion: the Muslim and/or terrorist other in the aftermath of the 9/11 terror attacks in the United States. Jasbir Puar’s ground-breaking work on “homonationalism,” and its penchant for the imagination of sexual and racial others in this context, is highly illuminating. Puar underscores how the recent notable inclusion of certain gays and lesbians has taken place alongside the continuing exclusion of other gays and lesbians, longstanding other others, as well as the imagination of new others. Significantly, new moments of exclusion often rely on past historical stereotypes, just as the post-9/11 moment renewed and built on a long and harmful history of Orientalist ideology. The continuity of stereotypes can be observed in the case of Jamaica. A key point of both continuity and change, for example, is indicated in discourses of travel to the Caribbean when contrasting colonial and neocolonial periods. Today’s discourses about the “exotic Caribbean” are now joined by concerns about homophobia and sexual repression in the region, whereas, historically, colonial discourses were attached to anxieties about non-European sexual and gender identities/practices and hypersexuality in the Caribbean. In other words, Caribbean colonies used to be chided for not conforming to a rigid heteronormativity represented by the nuclear family model, and this failure was even viewed as contributing to a lack of political and economic development in the region. In neocolonial time and space, “former” colonies are chastised for not conforming to homohegemony. Another difference between classic colonialism and neocolonialism is that a
select group of LGBTQ citizens, mainly white middle-class gay men and some lesbians, are now participants in queer travel to the Caribbean and hold their own anxieties about the exotic other. Such fears about the homophobic other are shared with their heterosexual compatriots, and would not be intelligible absent recent gay and lesbian incorporation into the Canadian national imaginary on a hegemonic scale.55

These considerations shed light on the way sexual and gender relations have impacted significantly the national imaginaries of various states in imperial relations. An obvious question is why should we expect nationalism to function any differently? Studies of nationalism have long documented how understanding “oneself” as a national community depends just as much on demarcating and distinguishing oneself from “others” who do not belong as it does on diffusion of a shared culture among those who do belong.56 Returning to the frame of Puar, she contends that the homonational state depends on the production of a racialized and sexualized Muslim and/or terrorist other in order to secure its existence.57 Puar also refers to the neoliberal investments associated with considering some communities, cultures, and nations more homophobic than others.58

The concept of homohegemony put forward in this dissertation builds on Puar’s concept of the homonational state, but goes beyond a discursive analytic to consider the construction of state hegemony. It also moves into an examination of a different sexual and racial other, to consider more explicitly and systematically the notion of a constructed homophobic other nation as a component of this ideology. The notion of homohegemony also gestures outside of the context of the War on Terror, and into the realm of neocolonial relationships between specific nation-states. That is, homohegemonic nation-states produce not just an ideology about the national self as gay friendly through measures of state benevolence to select sexual citizens, but
also construct key other nations as homophobic as a by-product of this ideology, and as a condition of its continuation and entrenchment. Such assessments of self and other are loaded with unexamined racial, sexual, gendered, classed, and neocolonial representations and assumptions. Which nation a homohegemonic nation “chooses” to construct as a homophobic other will have more to do with the investments involved in constructing particular nation-states than it will with realities of heterosexism therein. As with LGBTQ rights and internal national assessments of gay inclusion, there is a corresponding basis in material reality to draw upon when constructing a homophobic nation, but as a hegemonic ideology, the generalizations and embrace by ruling interests demand an ideological construction or imagined national/other pairing, in the spirit of Benedict Anderson’s pioneering understanding of the nation as an “imagined community.”

In short, as will be further discussed, this dissertation’s elaboration of homohegemony differs from Puar’s work by conceiving of the basic idea of homonationalism along the lines of a hegemonic ideology that is grounded in political and civil societal relationships in a particular nation-state. It can further be differentiated from Puar in that it explicitly and systematically considers this hegemony in regard to a constructed homophobic other nation. This dissertation addresses homohegemony and the other with respect to the particular nation-states of Canada and Jamaica, rather than in the general theoretical context of the American War on Terror, as in Puar’s intervention.

Homohegemony, though a constructed ideology, following Gramsci’s contributions is also grounded in material and political realities. It is an ideological and material reality that describes a particular nation-state, in this case Canada, rather than merely a fleeting and fragmentary expression or experience of nationalism. And, as hegemonic, the superstructure is at the same time subject to contestation, and is therefore unstable. Homohegemony arises as part of
a curious historical moment in the long and varied life of nationalism and the imperial capitalist state. It speaks to the sheer variation that is possible within the spectrum of ruling relations in the capitalist state, particularly when it comes to the regulation of sexuality, gender, and race. While the framework of this study relies broadly and interpretively on Antonio Gramsci’s notion of hegemony, significantly, it wades into political waters that Gramsci himself did not consider expressly or systematically, and thus adapts and challenges his thought as well. This dissertation applies Gramsci in conversation with the contributions of queer and feminist scholarship, particularly that which pays attention to the ways in which multiple systems of oppression, identification, and resistance intersect and combine with one another. Particularly informative in this regard is the queer scholarship of Gary Kinsman, who explicitly adopts a Gramscian frame. This is done alongside, and by drawing inspiration from, the neo-Gramscian school. This study also derives inspiration and tools from Stuart Hall, given his Jamaican background and embeddedness in Caribbean and diasporic discussions, and his celebrated adaptation of Gramsci’s thought to issues of critical and cultural political inquiry. This has included careful attention to coloniality, race, the notion of “the other,” and the way understandings of “diaspora” condition(ed) the Caribbean context, among other interventions. However, the interpretations and extensions of Gramsci’s basic ideas contained in this dissertation are ultimately original, rather than constituting an interpretation of an interpretation. Crucially, these are interpretations that significantly arise in the context of the empirical and experiential realities uncovered during the fieldwork for this research, to be discussed below.

**Homohegemonic Canada**

If a select few states are homohegemonic, then Canada is an example *par excellence* of homohegemony. There are important reasons for selecting Canada as the focus of this project’s elaboration of homohegemony. Homohegemonic ideology involves not merely significant strains
of gay-friendliness, but homosexual inclusion or citizenship being truly widespread. Such a situation is grounded in a legal reality, with firm “trench-systems” of support situated across a broad swath of civil societal territory, in terms of widespread beliefs that reject discrimination against gays and lesbians, and that favour same-sex relationship recognition among other values associated with the equality of lesbian and gay sexual citizenship. In the case of Canada, this obviously does not mean that every Canadian agrees with homosexual inclusion, but it does mean that opinion leaders in various spheres of Canadian society do, and that such positions are endorsed by a significant majority of the general population. For example, a 2010 survey indicated that a supermajority of the Canadian population, nearly 70 percent, supported same-sex marriage rights merely five years after their cross-national legalization. Further, the minority of Canadians who continue to advance overtly discriminatory beliefs have lost standing in the national conversation on gay and lesbian rights, particularly in the post-same-sex marriage era, with even Canada’s evangelical Christian Conservative Prime Minister championing gay and lesbian rights vis-à-vis Russia. Social conservative views retain a degree of unofficial influence within the Conservative Party of Canada, but such influence is called into question through global developments and events. This is the culmination of a historical process causing the loss of social conservatives’ ideological and institutional standing due to the influence of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms on English Canadian nationalism and the lack of legal avenues for social conservatives to challenge and overturn gay rights gains once they have been won in the Canadian context.

A few examples are instructive in terms of the rationale behind choosing Canada to contextualize homohegemony. It is noteworthy that even the Conservative Party of Canada, while opposed to same-sex marriage, supported same-sex civil unions as a matter of party policy
at the time of same-sex marriage’s federal inauguration.\textsuperscript{76} At the time, the members of the effective legislature, the House of Commons, were unanimously in support of either civil unions or civil marriage for same-sex couples.\textsuperscript{77} Notably, since that time more members of the Conservative Party of Canada have publicly supported either leaving the law in place or same-sex marriage itself,\textsuperscript{78} as well as other measures impacting LGBTQ people.\textsuperscript{79} This represents an unusual all-party national consensus on the incorporation of gay and lesbian citizens via a regime of near legal equality. Such a political consensus is generally unusual in Canadian public policy, and has not always existed in nation-states that have adopted same-sex marriage legislation. Moreover, the only two nation-states that legalized same-sex marriage before such a process began in Canadian jurisdictions, Belgium and the Netherlands, “had exclusions in the area of adoption”; these were parenting rights that were available to \textit{de facto} same-sex couples even before same-sex marriage in Canada.\textsuperscript{80} It is these aspects of hegemony that are missed by simply looking to the existence or nonexistence of legalized same-sex marriage, and that bolster the argument that Canada is consummately homohegemonic. Same-sex marriage rights are significant to the notion of equal gay and lesbian citizenship, but they do not deterministically capture the considerable consent that also attends the ideology of homohegemony. One need only be reminded of the recent vocal protests during the highly conflictual debate on and passage of same-sex marriage in France, a context with a long, dueling history of entrenched secularism versus religious conservatism, in which the civil unions or partnerships previously available to same-sex couples did not include key rights and privileges associated with marriage.\textsuperscript{81} The civil unions advocated by the federal Conservatives in Canada effectively included such key rights and privileges, such as adoption rights, particularly since these already existed for \textit{de facto} same-sex couples in Canadian law.\textsuperscript{82}
Where there was significant debate in Canada, it was not generally about legal equality for gays and lesbians. As the debate was grounded in the context of a constitutional requirement that significantly built on previous Supreme Court decisions surrounding sexual orientation discrimination and relationship recognition dating back to the mid to late 1990s, a regime of robust relationship recognition was unanimously consented to in Parliament. This is not to suggest, however, that such a consensus has arisen purely as the result of uniform values. For example, it is not completely clear whether terming such relationship recognition “civil union” instead of “civil marriage,” as Conservatives then advocated, would have satisfied the Supreme Court of Canada as representing “full legal equality,” as the top court only weighed in on the issue of same-sex marriage in a non-binding reference case. This particular debate, which may or may not have proven to be mostly semantic, has long since passed. As David Rayside notes, in spite of a degree of regional variation in Canada, “characteristic of the whole country is the finding that opposition to the full recognition of lesbian and gay relationships has declined rapidly once major legal or legislative steps have been taken.”

Even the federal Conservative Party has realized the benefits of appearing to be gay friendly, effectively leaving same-sex marriage in place in spite of internal party opposition. Again, it bears reiterating that there had already been a build-up towards substantive equality for gay and lesbian relationships before same-sex marriage, mainly in response to court decisions to which governments at both levels, and of all partisan stripes, overwhelmingly acquiesced. In some cases, however, legislative foot-dragging or the wording defining gay and lesbian relationships evidenced a degree of symbolic opposition to full substantive relationship recognition before the onset of same-sex marriage.

These transformations in lesbian and gay citizenship have involved more than
institutional and political changes. They extend into civil society, and into the relationships between political and civil society. As noted, in the post-same-sex marriage era, a supermajority of the population is supportive of same-sex marriage rights. All major federal party leaders, except the current Prime Minister, leader of the federal Conservatives, regularly attend the Toronto Pride Parade, Canada’s largest LGBTQ pride parade in the country’s most populous city. This attests to the fact that gays and lesbians and their allies have become not just an important political constituency, but that symbolic support for LGBTQ issues is a prerequisite for being perceived as a progressive leader of a country imagined as inclusive of gays and lesbians. Provincial conservative leaders also attend such events and embrace a gay and lesbian constituency. Moreover, as of 2014, and at the time of this writing, Canada has an openly lesbian elected premier of Ontario, the most populous province in the country. Moving from the political and civil societal relationships to religious institutions, the United Church of Canada, Canada’s largest Protestant denomination in terms of religious affiliation, was a strong and early supporter of the passage of same-sex marriage rights. This is an indication that support for LGBTQ citizenship exists even in major religious organizations in civil society, a counterintuitive fact for those who associate strong religious beliefs with a lack of support for LGBTQ rights. Back at the level of state institutions and their overlap with civil society, even members of the Canadian Armed Forces, a bastion of legal discrimination against gays and lesbians into the 1990s, now march in the Toronto Pride Parade and attend similar events in other Canadian cities. These annual marches have become symbolic moments in civil society, attesting to a fundamental change in the way the nation-state relates to LGBTQ people, and in turn how LGBTQ people relate to and identify with a nation-state that excluded them from full and equal membership as sexual citizens for so long.
All of these examples are rooted in some reality of especially gay and lesbian experience, and certainly represent advances in terms of gay and lesbian rights. These examples also speak to the fact that gay and lesbian inclusion has become hegemonic as an ideology in Canada across a broad swath of the state, civil society, and indeed the general population. The fact that even significant religious, conservative, and military voices, historically among the most opposed to LGBTQ rights in various contexts, are part of this new national consensus is significant. Clearly, there has been a coalescing around gay and lesbian citizenship by various segments of political and civil society in a way that is suggestive of homohegemony as a national ideology. This is a part of the national identity that is increasingly celebrated and projected as a sign or signifier of state benevolence in and around liberal tolerance of diversity. A focus on LGBTQ rights alone, absent hegemony, will miss the full significance and implications of these developments in the Canadian context.

Canada is among the top few candidate states in the world (arguably along with Spain, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Denmark, listed in no particular order) with/in which homohegemony can be contextualized. Given that Canada is commonly compared with the United States, it is notable that the former fits this working definition much better than the latter, to which the impressive frame of “homonationalism” has been applied by Puar. In the United States, the cross-national incorporation of gay and lesbian citizens into the national imaginary, signalled by a regime of full legal equality in every state, remains far from a reality. Even with the 2013 Supreme Court decisions to strike down the key parts of the federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) and to effectively invalidate Proposition 8 in California, along with a notable flurry of favourable court rulings and legislation in their wake, same-sex marriage is still only a legal reality in nineteen states and the District of Columbia at
the time of this writing.\textsuperscript{105} Same-sex marriage legislation or legalization has had to proceed state-by-state,\textsuperscript{106} in light of individual states having jurisdiction over the right to marry.\textsuperscript{107} This state-by-state trajectory has also been influenced by state jurisdiction over criminal law, “freestanding” state constitutions, and a decentralized federal court structure. These factors register differences from the Canadian context.\textsuperscript{108} In Canada, significantly, the federal government has jurisdiction over the definition of marriage,\textsuperscript{109} and federal legislation in 2005 applied to the whole country even though “the vast majority of Canadians [already] lived in regions where gay marriage was legal,” owing to previous judicial interpretations of the Charter in the provinces and territories.\textsuperscript{110} By contrast, jurisdictional and judicial differences in the United States have operated amidst the various checks and balances of a federal “separation of powers” system, one that is further imbued with various mechanisms of ostensible direct democracy that can overturn (or enact) gay rights at the state level. In short, institutional differences in the US have created roadblocks, logjams, and reversals when it comes to lesbian and gay rights that have slowed, and rendered uneven, the national pace of change. This is in spite of the pioneering efforts of select states on gay and lesbian rights, such as Massachusetts and Vermont on the issues of civil unions and same-sex marriage.\textsuperscript{111}

The United States surely contains significant “traces” of Puar’s homonationalism, not least in terms of recent shifts in national public opinion, federal government support for same-sex marriage,\textsuperscript{112} and a series of federal and state court rulings striking down same-sex marriage bans in the aftermath of the 2013 Supreme Court decisions that may well indicate the beginning of “a process of nationalization” in this issue area.\textsuperscript{113} The strong language used by the Supreme Court in striking down the heart of \textit{DOMA} in 2013 set a powerful precedent for subsequent court rulings and legislation. The active role of federal courts in overturning particular state bans on
same-sex marriage based on wider US constitutional principles, though often occurring in the context of upholding the decisions of state courts, has been a major trend since 2013. The turn toward “nationalization” of same-sex marriage in the US is therefore also significantly a turn toward the increasing “federalization” of this sexual citizenship right, in which recalcitrant states are being brought into line with federal standards directly via federal court rulings, as well as indirectly via the growing weight of norms that were given legitimacy by the Supreme Court in their own court systems. Indeed, the veritable patchwork quilt that is same-sex marriage in the US at present may require the Supreme Court to step in at some point and render a truly national decision. In any case, the very notion of a large number of states whose governments oppose same-sex marriage still having to be “brought into line” by the judiciary is indicative of the continuing lack of cross-national consensus, or hegemony, related to gay and lesbian rights in the US. Moreover, the framing of same-sex marriage has been largely along the lines of a “right to marry” and other fundamental rights in the United States, rather than in terms of a clear constitutional obligation to ensure legal equality based on sexual orientation, as in the Canadian experience. This means that same-sex marriage is somewhat decoupled from the ideology, and even the legal reality, of equal gay and lesbian citizenship. For example, some US states still do not recognize sexual orientation as a legally prohibited ground of discrimination, a measure recognized by all Canadian provinces and the federal government in terms of their human rights legislation over a period from 1977 to 1998. Thus, in the United States, homosexual inclusion is uneven in terms of significant and symbolic institutions of legal equality, and is certainly not hegemonic across a supermajority of the population, across regions or civil society.

Canada is also differentiated from the US case in terms of the temporality of
homohegemony. Canada partially decriminalized consensual same-sex sexual activity in 1969, and this decision applied cross-nationally in light of the federal Criminal Code. This was arguably the moment when homohegemony, in both its benevolent liberal and illiberal or regulatory moments, began to form in earnest. By contrast, the United States Supreme Court only invalidated “statutory bans on homosexual sexual behaviour” in states where such legislation was still in effect in the 2003 Lawrence v. Texas decision. To put this in perspective, it has been ten years since the arrival of legal same-sex marriage in Canadian jurisdictions, versus ten years since the cross-national invalidation of sodomy statutes in the US. This is not to minimize that there have been notable shifts in the US discussion and legality of gay and lesbian rights very recently. However, Canada is a more suitable case study in terms of a national ideology surrounding gay and lesbian inclusion that is hegemonic. The earlier, more gradual, and more even advance of homosexual inclusion in the Canadian legal and civil societal context in fact goes some way toward explaining its contemporary hegemony. Canadian homohegemony has further experienced a decade of entrenchment across levels of government, the military, political parties, regions, major religious organizations, and popular attitudes in civil society. Near legal equality, along with considerable consensus that gay and lesbian citizens are deserving of equal membership in the national community, not merely in spite of their sexual orientation but through their sexual orientation and/or relationships, is characteristic of homohegemony. Same-sex marriage has been symbolically significant to the onset of homohegemony in the Canadian case. The hegemony of such sentiment also explains the “flip” from a longstanding illiberal fixation on the homosexual other within the nation to a new, equally illiberal if more subtle preoccupation with homophobic other nations.

Jamaica as “Homophobic Other”

Homohegemony is an ideology about the national self and national others alike. Who,
then, are Canada’s others? Certainly there are many, but one prominent other nation that figures in Canadian homohegemony is Jamaica. Canadian homohegemony, though it derives from internal ideological processes and the history of gay and lesbian rights briefly outlined above, is also bound up with a particular, and particularly illiberal, construction of Jamaica as a homophobic other nation-state.

Homohegemonic nation-states can only fully understand themselves as such by way of constructing other nations as horrifically homophobic. Such constructions can be seen to cement homohegemony. These constructions commonly take place along key fault lines inherent in the national imaginary, including racialized and (neo)colonial dimensions. This is the case with Canada and Jamaica.

Canada and Jamaica are not just nation-states that regulate gender and sexuality differently. More accurately, they are nation-states that marshal and project gender and sexuality in discrepant ways as part of their respective national identities and histories. They also have very different international reputations on the issue of gay rights, as the “homophobic Jamaica” construction can be observed with respect to international media and activist discourses. While some of the Canadian discourses in this area are more nuanced than others, they collectively occur in the context of a hegemonic national ideology about homosexual inclusion that is ipso facto invested in the construction of homophobic other communities, cultures, and countries. This is consistent with how nationalisms develop in the context of imaginaries of self and of various others upon whom such demarcations of national community depend. To get a sense of this ideological operation and Jamaica’s function as a “homophobic other nation,” an example is helpful. Consider the following selection that appeared in the respected, mainstream Canadian daily, The Globe and Mail, on June 23, 2008:
Overall, Mr. Henry says, life in Jamaica was “miserable, with happy times, until the end of 2006. Then, in 2007, it became miserable with the absence of happy times. The worst I’ve ever seen homophobia in Jamaica. There were over 10 gay murders. Over 43 mob attacks. I received 8 to 10 threats from the police, turning up at my apartment and threatening me. Four lesbians raped that year alone. It was a total nightmare.” Why are Jamaican men and women so hostile to gays? (Even in Toronto, he says, he avoids areas frequented by his countrymen.) The island’s religious figures preach against homosexuality. The law penalizes anal sex with sentences of up to 10 years. Songs frequently celebrate the beating and killing of gay men. The government is silent. “The violence is there,” he says, “because it’s state-sanctioned violence and it’s church-sanctioned violence.” And now? Mr. Henry lives in Toronto with his Jamaican partner, volunteers as a diversity and equity consultant, and, he says, is “still trying to adjust to a culture that speaks [of] diversity and inclusivity and freedom of expression. I don’t have to look over my shoulder when I walk down the street. Canada is what I want to see Jamaica mirror.”

The news article, titled “It was a Total Nightmare,” was written by columnist Gerald Hannon, and is not atypical of Canadian news media discourses on this topic. The article clearly paints Jamaica as a homophobic nation – so much so that the phrase “total nightmare” from Henry, the “native informant” or “queer ethnic” now living in Canada, makes its way right into the title. Key here is that the text sets up a categorical distinction between Canada and Jamaica on the issue of gay and lesbian inclusion. While Jamaicans are represented as “hostile” to gays and lesbians, Canada is represented as a country of “diversity and inclusivity and freedom of expression” that Jamaica should “mirror.” While the experiences of Henry are real and his
perspective valid, the article, and others like it, marshals his words in the service of Canadian homohegemony in a way that is fairly plain to see once we understand the workings of this ideology.

Jamaica is painted as monolithically homophobic in a manner inconsistent with liberal values. The context and history of Jamaica’s legislative and civil societal regulation of sexuality is rendered invisible or secondary. The history of British colonialism that led to the original “buggery” (referring to anal sexual intercourse or sodomy) and “gross indecency” (referring to expressions of intimacy between men short of buggery) legislation in Jamaica and other former British colonies, including Canada, is elided. This article, like many others, also fails to talk to LGBTQ Jamaicans living in Jamaica. Instead, it represents someone who has had to leave Jamaica because of their sexual orientation and who is now living in Canada, leaving the impression that it is universally impossible to negotiate a minority sexual orientation while remaining in Jamaica. The implication is that coming “into” presumably Canada is a crucial prerequisite in order to come “out” to a modern gay or lesbian identity – and what better place to do this than in (English) Canada’s gay capital, Toronto? This is Canada cast in an imperial light, as the beneficent space for the neocolonial other.

The article caricatures Jamaica and indeed Jamaicans as hopelessly backward and traditional, including religiously traditional, in their intolerance. This is in contrast to a progressive, modern, and secular Canada. This polarized binary plays into and reproduces neocolonial ways of thinking about the Caribbean in general and Jamaica in particular. Clearly, certain assumptions of Canada’s “gay-friendliness” are not far from pronouncements of Jamaica’s “homophobia.” Other examples of the discursive construction of Jamaica along these lines are readily observable in the Canadian news media, particularly in Toronto, prompted by
the substantial Jamaican diaspora centred in this city, where 70 percent of the 230,000 Jamaican-Canadians in Canada reside.\textsuperscript{131} Toronto is also home to a robust and visible queer community, rivalled in Canada only by Montréal and Vancouver.

The next chapter will show that the construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” like homohegemony itself, is significant in civil and political societal representations. The body of this dissertation will demonstrate further that “queer Jamaica” is an alternative reality that needs to be foregrounded, one that considerably challenges the constructed image of “homophobic Jamaica.” The point of emphasis, by way of introducing the argument, is that these are not neutral or objective assessments of “homophobia” in Jamaica, but instead indicate how Canada’s relatively recently formed homohegemonic ideology is invested in depicting Jamaica in a particular light.

This dissertation seeks to deconstruct this common sense narrative that “Canada is super gay friendly” and “Jamaica is horribly homophobic,” and to interrogate the power relations and ideology that make the narrative thinkable and speakable. This can be explained by identifying and elaborating the ideology of homohegemony in Canada, and the relationship between Canadian homohegemony and the other, specifically Jamaica. This dissertation attends to both sides of this ideological dynamic – homohegemony and the other – and to its benevolent liberal/illiberal moments more generally.

**The Canada/Jamaica Relationship**

These ideological assessments occur within a neocolonial context. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, M. Jacqui Alexander\textsuperscript{132} and other scholars confirm that colonialism persists, termed either neocolonialism or postcolonialism,\textsuperscript{133} in the form of unequal relationships between Northern and Southern states/blocs of states and capital. These are cemented in the context of capitalist “recolonization,”\textsuperscript{134} which proceeds after, and in spite of, formal political
independence. These economic and political processes are intimately connected to global neoliberalism and neocolonial states that represent these “global economic interests.”\textsuperscript{135} Insofar as Canada and Jamaica are concerned, Canada has been increasingly assuming – or at least sharing with the United States – the role of “mother country” for Jamaica since Jamaican independence from Britain in 1962. An imagined imperial relationship between Canada and Jamaica, however, with Jamaica imagined as within Canada’s imperial sphere of influence, significantly predates Jamaican independence, dating to the era of Canadian Confederation in 1867.\textsuperscript{136}

In the post-independence period, many Jamaican migrants have pursued “double lap migration”; upon initial emigration to the United Kingdom, migrants or their children eventually emigrated again from the United Kingdom to Canada.\textsuperscript{137} Increasingly, Jamaican migrants have skipped the United Kingdom altogether to migrate to Canada to be employed as domestic workers, health care workers, or agricultural labourers, often in the context of low-paid forms of labour. These migration patterns have included institutional support from government-sponsored programs and agreements between the two countries,\textsuperscript{138} such as the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP), and the Live-in Caregiver Program (LCP).\textsuperscript{139} While those who participate in these programs are often “low-skilled,” some “skilled” migrants also participate in these programs, along with other immigration channels, prompting the Jamaican government’s concern about a “brain drain.”\textsuperscript{140}

Abigail Bakan and Daiva Stasiulis write about the changing migration patterns of West Indian migrants in general, illustrating how a first wave of post-Second World War out-migration (1955–61) mainly to the UK shifted to a second wave of migration (1979–85) mainly to North America.\textsuperscript{141} While there were more foreign-born Jamaicans living in the US and the UK
than in Canada as of 2006–2008 (637,000 in the US and 150,000 in the UK, versus 123,500 in Canada), foreign-born Jamaicans make up a higher percentage of the Canadian population than those in the American and British populations. Total Canadians of Jamaican ancestry represent nearly 1 percent of the Canadian population. The Jamaican diaspora in Canada is therefore significant in size.

The almost exclusively South-North migration path is a defining feature of a neocolonial relationship, as it is a path that includes frequent return migration and the maintenance of political, affective, and economic ties to Jamaica, including sending remittances back home. The heavy indebtedness of the Jamaican state to international loans and reliance on Northern-country aid further justifies the neocolonial designation. This relationship is associated with institutions including the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), which insist upon structural adjustment and other conditions that dictate or circumscribe Jamaican politics to a great extent. The reliance of the Jamaican economy on remittance flows from Britain, the US, and Canada, and the involvement of Canadian state and corporate actors and interests in key sectors of the Jamaican economy, such as the banking and mining sectors, also indicate an unequal, neocolonial relationship. Finally, the neocolonial character of the Jamaican economy is exemplified in the fact that tourism represents one of Jamaica’s top few foreign exchange earners, as will be discussed in Chapter One.

If the Jamaican economy could be said to be undergoing “dependent development,” a phenomenon in which the state exercises a limited form of autonomy from multinationals and Northern countries, as in the classic case of Brazil, then this might give one pause about using the neocolonial classification. However, unlike Brazil, India, China, or any of the emerging
economies of Latin America, the Caribbean displays political economies which remain much more circumscribed by outside forces. In the Caribbean, economic development in the “postcolonial” period has largely occurred along pre-existing colonial patterns, or else has inaugurated new neoliberal limitations on state sovereignty. In short, the Jamaican state and many other Caribbean states (with the notable exception of Cuba, with its socialist economy and partial break from the capitalist world system) cannot be said to exercise even the level of autonomy enjoyed by states undergoing “dependent development.”

The term “neocolonial” is used in existing scholarship to describe the Canada-Jamaica relationship. For example, Jenny Burman summarizes the relationship between Canada and Jamaica as follows: “Canada’s public and private investments in the Jamaican economy through banking, bauxite extraction, foreign aid, and immigration policies [including temporary foreign workers and deportation], have had a distinctly neocolonial flavor.”148 In Transnational Yearnings: Tourism, Migration, and the Diasporic City, Burman prefigures Toronto as a Jamaican diasporic city, and sets this within the context of the neocolonial relationship between Canada and Jamaica. Her work provides a great deal of context for the Canada/Jamaica relationships that undergird this dissertation’s discussion of homohegemony. In particular, Burman helps us understand the function of Toronto in connecting these two nation-states together within a wider neocolonial relationship. Burman illustrates and engages with various transnational routes of circulation between the two sites of Toronto and Jamaica, including circuits of yearning and affect, as well as decidedly less romantic circuits such as the deportation of Jamaicans from Canada. Burman’s work shows how the city of Toronto is transformed in the process of these varied transnational interactions and may therefore be seen as a major Jamaican diasporic city of the same ilk as London and New York. Significantly, it does not take Burman
more than three pages to mention the issue of heterosexist violence in Jamaica, and its international reception in the form of Northern-based tourism boycotts and censorship of dancehall music, in pointing to the salience of homosexuality as an issue that mediates the ideological relationship between Jamaica and Canada.

While Burman explores the relationships between Jamaica and Toronto, and by extension Canada, in a valuable way, she does not focus primarily on homosexuality or gender. As well, she does not systematically attend to the workings of national and hegemonic ideology in terms of the Canadian state’s relationship to Jamaica, given her mostly Toronto/Jamaica focus. Given the presence of prominent Jamaican-Canadian LGBTQ activists in Canada and the homohegemonic context, the Jamaican diaspora in Canada, though smaller than that extant in the US and the UK, might well be the queerest. Bringing the focus to the level of “Canada/Jamaica” on issues of homosexuality can be accomplished through provision of the frame of homohegemony.

Why Homohegemony?

While some of the rationale for the analytical turn to homohegemony in the context of this project has already been explained, it should prove useful to more specifically situate the concept in existing literature. Why homohegemony? Homohegemony as a concept and theoretical framework is able to grapple with the incorporation of mainly gays and lesbians into the national imaginary via the benevolent liberal extension of selective citizenship rights culminating in same-sex marriage; the ongoing illiberal exclusions of LGBTQ people and others; and the illiberal imagination of homophobic national others. The concept is also capable of providing insight into how these developments are related.

Antonio Gramsci’s notion of hegemony is obviously central to the concept.149 Hegemony solves some of the limitations of homonationalism, developed by Puar and discussed above.
While homonationalism, as understood by Puar and Scott Morgensen, and the related frame of homonormativity, as expounded by Lisa Duggan, are extremely insightful and useful ways of understanding national queer incorporation and imagination, mainstreaming in modern queer movements/identification with the nation-state, as well as the imagination and construction of sexualized, racialized, and classed others, they suffer from some limitations. In terms of homonationalism specifically, one might expect that, like nationalism, homonationalism would refer principally to an ideology. Yet, in the writings on homonationalism, the ideological component of national homosexuality is more gestural and left incompletely developed. Rather, “biopolitics” – encapsulated by the notion that certain people, groups, or communities are marked for death and dying so that others may live, and connected to intersections of race and sexuality in particular – tends to be foregrounded, in the tradition of Michel Foucault, Giorgio Agamben, and Achille Mbembe. A lacuna is therefore observable in terms of understanding the phenomena in question as centrally pertaining to national sexual ideology. But what if some nations like Jamaica are marked not for death per se as much as for distinguishing the national self from the national other? Although certainly there are biopolitical implications of this ideological construction, the contention being made here is that the other can in this context be understood as fulfilling a mainly ideological, rather than biopolitical, function.

A related limitation already introduced above is that homonationalism is not currently developed as an analytical concept. At present, it represents more of a provocative frame and powerful lens for dealing with some of these surprising issues of LGBTQ inclusion, nation, terror, and empire. In part, this is because the reference point for homonationalism is generally the US, where LGBTQ incorporation into the national imaginary is uneven and is not decisive, and in part it is due to a post-structural epistemology that predominates in queer studies, where
“homonationalisms” are characterized as plural, fragmentary, fleeting, and intangible strains – “some dissipating as quickly as they appear” – running through discursive circuits of state and market. The same would seem to apply to currents of Duggan’s “homonormativity.” Homonationalisms seemingly coexist alongside heteronationalisms. Homonationalism therefore serves as a heuristic category, but does not describe a pervasive and entrenched ideology of gay and lesbian incorporation into the national imaginary, and does not readily translate to the level of specific state/civil society relations and contexts. As mentioned, neither does it fully entertain the implications of constructing homophobic other nations, as the full compulsion to engage in such constructions only comes into being once homonationalism becomes hegemonic.

Gramsci’s contribution can serve to address these lacunae, though it certainly also presents challenges of its own. Gramsci’s contribution suggests the importance of the further development of a materialist approach that is a welcome, if, to date, limited, intervention into queer studies. Writers such as Donald Morton, Alan Sears, Gary Kinsman, and M. Jacqui Alexander showcase the significance of various tools of the materialist approach to queer issues, such as ideology, class, civil society, the capitalist state, and hegemony. Further, socialist feminism provides a helpful guide, integrating the study of class exploitation with gender, sexual, and racial oppressions. Writers like Abigail Bakan and Daiva Stasiulis, M. Jacqui Alexander, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, and Margaret Little are instructive in that they are by no means orthodox or economistic in their materialism, making use of a range of discursive and institutional methodologies. They underscore that the state, although connected to capitalism, can take on many different forms of rule within this system. Notably, the classical liberal/neoliberal state has demonstrated the capacity to regulate sexuality in the context of formalized heterosexism, and under conditions of contemporary homohegemony. This broadly
Gramscian appreciation of the significance of politics is helpful in explaining recent changes to LGBTQ inclusion/exclusion. The key is that the sexual ruling relations and their related “superstructures” (ideologies) cannot be read off the economic “base” (productive foundations of the political economy) in any easy fashion. It is important to focus in on the relations and specific forms of ruling and nation-state formation as containing dynamics significantly autonomous from the mode of production.

Gramsci’s Prison Notebooks are regarded by scholars as a major updating of Marxism, particularly in terms of how Marxism understands and appreciates politics. Gramsci’s writings continue to be particularly relevant to understanding the maintenance and contestation of power and inequality in complex capitalist societies. For example, Roger Simon underlines that “the main proposition advanced by Gramsci is that the state cannot be understood without a thorough understanding of civil society.” It is worth quoting Gramsci directly on his definition of civil society, found in a section dealing with “The Intellectuals,” because it centrally informs hegemony:

What we can do, for the moment, is to fix two major superstructural “levels”: the one that can be called “civil society”, that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called “private”, and that of “political society” or “the State”. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of “hegemony” which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of “direct domination” or command exercised through the State and “juridical” government.

According to Gramsci, politics under capitalism therefore includes not just the formal political sphere but the private/societal sphere as well. Simon condenses these insights and explains that civil society includes all those private organizations that are not directly related to production or
the public institutions of the state, including “churches, trade unions, political parties and cultural associations,” and even the family.\textsuperscript{177} Crucially, “civil society is the sphere where capitalists, workers and others engage in political and ideological struggles,” and “it is in civil society that the struggle for hegemony between the two fundamental classes takes place.”\textsuperscript{178} Civil society is therefore closely related to the “function” of hegemony, according to Gramsci, in that active or passive consent is given to ideologies “imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group.”\textsuperscript{179}

Hegemony, in Gramsci’s contribution, involves a leading class or “social group” that predominates, rather than merely dominates, within the state.\textsuperscript{180} The ability to lead and continue to lead in the sphere of civil society (necessary conditions for the exercise of power as domination\textsuperscript{181}) is accomplished through the development, instantiation, and renewal of a hegemonic ideology. A hegemonic ideology is one that is pervasive or widely shared throughout civil society, one that is understood as “common sense”\textsuperscript{182} by most people in various types of subaltern organizations, parties, and associations.\textsuperscript{183} That is, a hegemonic ideology, reflecting the fundamental interests of the dominant class but combined with other national, popular, and/or caste aspirations that are not immediately class-based as well,\textsuperscript{184} is consented to “by the great masses of the population,” not merely adhered to as a product of coercion.\textsuperscript{185} Moreover, while ideology is a body of ideas, these ideas are grounded in collective material relations and experiences.

Political society, on the other hand, refers to the formal state apparatus,\textsuperscript{186} and corresponds to the function of domination or coercion.\textsuperscript{187} That said, Simon points out that relations of consent and coercion in the Gramscian state are complicated, since “state apparatuses [also] play a vital part in the organization of consent.”\textsuperscript{188} Significantly, the Gramscian
understanding of the “integral state” is a holistic one that includes civil society and political society. The state is famously summed up by Gramsci as “political society + civil society, in other words hegemony protected by the armour of coercion.” Gramsci also refers to the “regulation” of sex and sexuality, including a pejorative reference to sodomy. The point in this respect is that though Gramsci’s treatments of “the sexual question,” and especially sexuality, were limited and problematic, he did recognize these issues as important and as raising “complex problems of a ‘superstructural’ order.”

The Gramscian state, or what this dissertation will mostly refer to as the “nation-state” since the integral state clearly includes a national population, as well as national and popular identifications, aspirations, and cultural characteristics, is an expansive and ideological one, well suited to this dissertation’s discussion of homohegemony and the other. It should be noted that Gramsci was writing in the context of the Italian state and a particular Western European experience of nation-state formation more generally; he also devotes some attention to the United States and to the Russian context. However, his insights can be and have been successfully applied to contexts of the global South and to transnational relationships, for example by neo-Gramscian Stuart Hall. As with gender and sexuality, the key here is to recognize the relevance of the theoretical spirit, if not always the letter, of Gramsci’s formulations. For example, in applying Gramsci, a hegemonic belief in homosexual inclusion in the nation-state can explain the neocolonial gaze toward the homophobic other. This constructed ideological image can then be effectively explained and analyzed using a Gramscian frame.

Nevertheless, this issue does represent an obvious limitation and disadvantage in terms of using a Gramscian rather than a Foucauldian theoretical framework that is in a sense “ready-made” for the analysis of especially sexuality and race. Yet, the benefits of a materialist and
ideological frame in this case outweigh the drawbacks. Gramsci’s insights can be adapted to the study of queer issues, as is so adeptly accomplished by Gary Kinsman. The tools of Foucault, queer studies, socialist feminism, transnational feminism, anti-racist studies, and intersectionality can also be broadly and interpretively drawn upon to understand the specificities of ruling relations and ideologies pertaining to sexuality, gender, race, and neocolonialism. In this spirit, one can speak of multiple hegemonic ideologies within the nation-state; these include not just the “political-economic” ideologies that have commonly captured the imaginations of political scientists, as in liberalism, conservatism, socialism, fascism, and so forth. Applying Gramsci, one can systematically name and elaborate sexual, gender, racial, and neocolonial ideologies that are connected to these more familiar political ideologies, as well as to legal structures, but not in any reductive one-to-one fashion. What is more, one can assess whether an ideology is hegemonic at a given time in terms of being broadly met with consent in civil society, and backed up by a legal structure. Furthermore, this method allows one to register divergences between juridical and societal regulations of identity, as understood in an intersectional and cultural context. Variation can also be observed within civil society, and within political society.

The suggested notion of homohegemony (or homo + hegemony) thus fills a gap in studies of hegemony by looking at homosexuality, specifically homosexual inclusion in the nation-state. The concept also fills a lacuna in the sexual/queer citizenship literature by focusing attention on the ideological and material character of sexual citizenship set within an expansive, contradictory nation-state. Such an expansive and contradictory field of citizenship and nation means that sexual citizenship is not merely conferred by the state, but also actively contested, claimed, negotiated, and consented to in civil society. The idea of sexual citizenship deserves
brief elaboration before returning to how the theoretical framework associated with homohegemony is presented in the study that follows.

As a way to delve into the meaning of sexual citizenship, recall that homohegemony is a hegemonic ideology about gay and lesbian inclusion in the national imaginary, corresponding to the extension of selective citizenship rights approaching legal equality; in such a context, gays and lesbians are commonly conceived, at least abstractly, as full citizens. Gays and lesbians are here thought of as citizens through their sexual orientation as a minority status group, rather than in spite of their sexual orientation. It is for this reason that one may refer to the idea of sexual citizenship. While the notion is cast slightly differently by different scholars, Carl Stychin’s influential contribution characterizes sexual citizenship as dependent upon the public recognition of the rights and relationships of gays and lesbians, and the “reimagination of nation through the deployment of rights.” Stychin has also included in his account specific attention to Canada as potentially “the first postmodern state,” with an open national imaginary and contingent notion of citizenship that have expanded and deepened “along sexual lines.” The result is a scenario in which sexual minorities are no longer “strangers” in their own national polities, a form of political and cultural alienation from the “political community” and “national imaginary” described by Shane Phelan with respect to the contemporary United States. While different authors broaching questions of sexual citizenship disagree on the value of normalization, or the ability to “trouble” or “queer” the norm through rights politics and the public recognition of relationships, there is widespread agreement that sexuality, specifically LGBTQ identities, are part of the fabric of citizenship and nationalism, and that this is linked to the existence or absence of specific sexual citizenship rights in particular legal contexts. As Stychin summarizes well in *A Nation by Rights*, in a section titled “sexualizing citizenship,”
Modern nations and nation states constitute themselves through the construction of others, who are located outside of the national imaginary . . . “Deviant” sexual identities exemplify this process of othering. Not surprisingly, those who take up identities that have been inscribed in this way often respond by seeking inclusion within the national imaginary. They argue, generally through social movements, that deviance from the heterosexual norm should not be a bar to full membership (or citizenship) in the nation. Thus, lesbians, gays, and bisexuals attempt in various ways to construct themselves as “good” citizens . . . that is, “normal” citizens.206

Stychin goes on to highlight contentious social movement debates around relatively more essentialist or assimilationist versus relatively more deconstructionist approaches to sexual identity and citizenship claims.207 He states that in spite of these “vociferous disagreements,”208 diverse social movement constituencies “share a politics of interest where a broadening of the national imaginary is demanded to include sexual ‘minorities.’”209 He also entertains criticism directed at the inherently exclusionary potential of “citizenship discourse”210 and “nationhood discourse,”211 and admits the conferral and constitution of sexual citizenship outside of the realm of human rights and legal equality, for example, in the marketplace.212 He ultimately holds out hope, however, for the potential of gay and lesbian rights to expand and transform sexual citizenship, and to “reimagine national identity in a less exclusionary fashion.”213

Yet, the process of sexual citizenship advancements is much more intimately connected, as national community always has been, to demarcations and delineations of outsiders and insiders. This illiberal, exclusionary side of sexual citizenship gains is the part that is incompletely acknowledged and developed by Stychin. Consideration of this significant illiberal side of citizenship gains impels consideration of normative and substantive constructions of
citizenship in addition to mere formal or legal equality, questions that often lead to analysis of the way citizenship is experienced in civil society and negotiated in the politics of everyday life. As Bakan and Stasiulis underline, in deploying and extending T.H. Marshall’s classic formulation of citizenship, the notion of modern citizenship as membership in a nation-state has origins in both universalistic and particularistic understandings of who is permitted to be a citizen. In practice, citizenship is hierarchical, based on how much one accords with, or deviates from, from the “ideal citizen.” Such assessments are based on complex combinations of gender, race, and class, as much as on formal citizenship status.\textsuperscript{214} (Neo)colonialism and sexuality, including the spectrum from hetero- to homo- sexuality, can be further added to this intersectional formulation.

Diverse scholarly and social movement perspectives thus recognize that nation-states have historically constructed and projected themselves in heteronormative and heterosexist terms, with sexual citizenship only being fully accessible to heterosexual people as a modern historical norm, at least since the invention of heterosexuality and homosexuality as identities in the late 1800s.\textsuperscript{215} A significant lacuna in the literature, however, concerns the appreciation of both the inclusionary features of contemporary gains in gay and lesbian rights and citizenship, and the continuing and novel exclusions of citizenship and nationalism upon which such inclusions may be seen to depend. An ideological and material interpretation that attends to these significant contradictions can be furthered by advancing an expansive, Gramscian conception of the nation-state. This understanding allows one to distinguish between juridical and societal realities, and between ideological claims and more complicated material experiences. In addition, such a frame appreciates the agency of individual queers and queer social movements to contest, negotiate,\textsuperscript{216} claim, or consent to sexual citizenship across a broad field of power relations in
political and civil societal spaces alike. This notion of negotiating sexual citizenship draws on political science literature dealing with the everyday experience of gender, race, and class in a broadly understood Canadian context. In short, the framework adopted in this project provides insight into how specifically sexual citizenship is inherently contradictory, and negotiated.

This section has suggested that the frame of homohegemony offers an ideological, materialist, and analytical contribution to considerations of homosexuality in Canada/Jamaica that is to date limited in discussions of homonationalism. Further, it has been suggested that the concept adds to understandings of hegemony by elaborating a novel hegemonic sense of homosexual inclusion in the Canadian national imaginary, explaining and outlining its significant connection to a construction of Jamaica. In the process, the frame underscores the importance of bringing what might be termed “the homosexual question” into materialist political studies scholarship. Finally, the theoretical framework contributes in the context of an existing sexual citizenship and LGBTQ rights literature mainly by emphasizing the profoundly contradictory and negotiated moments of contemporary hegemonic (homo)sexual ideology in Canada.

**Multidimensional Method**

This dissertation combines original research material with a novel theoretical framework. The argument advanced is that Canada is newly homohegemonic and that Jamaica is being constructed and is functioning as a homophobic other. The dissertation uses a “multidimensional method” to describe and explain this multifaceted phenomenon, particularly regarding the relational aspect of considering both Canada and Jamaica. The first part of the project can be read as justifying the theoretical frame or concept of homohegemony. This is addressed firstly though a media survey of Canadian newspaper articles on homosexuality and gay and lesbian issues in Jamaica. This analysis draws upon queer and feminist intersectional and postcolonial approaches and discourse analysis to consider ideological constructs through selected news
media representations. The first part of the dissertation also advances a critical theoretical engagement with related scholarly literature, including a close reading of two principal narratives on the recent history of LGBTQ rights and regulation in Canada that offers an original interpretation of these developments.

The second part of the dissertation moves to demonstrate homohegemony’s utility as an analytical concept in light of empirical and experiential realities, particularly as it applies to “homophobic Jamaica.” Legislative and non-governmental organization (NGO) document analysis, 18 semi-structured interviews with LGBTQ-identified Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians (12 in the former category and 6 in the latter) representing 25.5 hours of audio-recorded and transcribed material (408 typed transcribed pages), as well as an identified interview with Maurice Tomlinson, a prominent Jamaican-Canadian LGBTQ activist centrally involved in most of the existing challenges to Jamaica’s anti-homosexual laws, comprise the bulk of the original material for this part of the dissertation. The Jamaican-Canadian interviews were significantly conducted in person in Canada, and the interviews of Jamaican citizens residing in Jamaica were conducted via “Skype” from Canada. I met and spent time with many of the participants in Jamaica, during a January 2013 trip devoted to observation of the Jamaican context. Many of the interview participants were also referred to me via a snowball sampling method. Some of the Jamaican-Canadian interviewees responded to a recruitment letter sent out to LGBTQ and Caribbean-Canadian organizations in Toronto. Participants signed a permission form or orally consented (in the case of Skype interviews) before being interviewed and audio recorded. Given the potentially sensitive subject matter, great care was taken to change all names and disguise other identifying personal information to protect the participants’ anonymity. Other ethical guidelines were followed in keeping with the ethics approval process.
A serious attempt has been made to integrate the voices and representations of LGBTQ Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians directly into the narrative of this dissertation, since these sexual citizens find themselves located at the benevolent liberal and illiberal interstices of homohegemony and the other.  

Personal travel notes comprising ethnographic observations from a ten-day trip to Jamaica in January of 2013, mentioned above, have also been drawn upon in the second part of the dissertation. These observations occurred mostly in the capital city of Kingston, but I also travelled through or spent time in four out of fourteen parishes and two of the three historic counties. My observations notably include my time spent with LGBTQ Jamaicans in a variety of public and private settings, as well as a visit to the Jamaica Forum for Lesbians, All-Sexuals and Gays’ (J-FLAG) headquarters in Kingston, at which time an informal and exploratory interview with a program coordinator for that NGO was conducted. J-FLAG is the main LGBTQ rights NGO in Jamaica, and is active in lobbying the government to change the laws, in performing community outreach and education, and in forging alliances with other human rights organizations.  

All of the research methods employed for this dissertation were critical and qualitative in nature. More specific notes on methodology are broached within the chapters, as the dissertation unfolds.  

In Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices, Caroline Ramazanoğlu and Janet Holland characterize the feminist research process as “data production.” This view of the research process as inherently political and normative is widely shared in feminist theory and one that this dissertation has self-consciously adopted. To this end, I have consulted with Jamaican-Canadian and Jamaican interviewees widely after visiting Jamaica and after conducting interviews. I have been in regular contact with many interviewees through social media. This has
been done in an effort to make particularly the part of the project dealing with Jamaica as accountable as possible to queer Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians and their everyday experiences and ideas. As an “outsider,” being neither Jamaican or Jamaican-Canadian, nor a queer of colour, I am mindful of how this can be challenging. However, I am convinced, like M. Jacqui Alexander, that feminist and queer solidarity, properly conceived of and practiced, crosses arbitrary borders and boundaries. My rootedness in homohegemony, in terms of being in Canada, and in terms of being cast within normative constructions of queer Canadian citizenship, also offers opportunities for self-reflexive analysis. To this end, I explicitly locate and theorize my own social location in Canadian homohegemony in the conclusion chapter, which recounts portions of my trip to Jamaica. This can be seen as part of the process of ensuring my own accountability and mindfulness of power relations in the research and writing process, and of locating myself within this process.

A relevant question, since this project adopts a broadly Gramscian framework, concerns whether Gramsci himself shared such a normative view of the research and writing process. The answer is undoubtedly, “Yes.” As Gramsci reminds us of the importance of the intellectual ethically and affectively locating herself or himself in the “particular historical situation” she or he is engaged in “representing”:

The intellectual’s error consists in believing that one can know without understanding and even more without feeling and being impassioned . . . in other words that the intellectual can be an intellectual . . . without feeling the elementary passions of the people.

Mapping Homohegemony and the Other: Canada and Jamaica

The chapters that follow together demonstrate that there is a national ideology in Canada that this research terms “homohegemony,” and that it is connected to Jamaica, as it is constructed
as other. In “Part One: Homohegemony Has Something to Say,” the contributions of homohegemony as a theoretical concept and framework are demonstrated. Homohegemony is shown to provide a critical explanation for illiberal Canadian assessments of “homophobia” in Jamaica, and serves to overcome some of the limitations of other scholarly literature. It is suggested as a helpful means of constructively weighing in on the modern history of LGBTQ rights and regulation in Canada.

In “Chapter Two: The Problem of Homohegemony and the Other: Canadian Media Constructions of Jamaica as a ‘Homophobic Other,’” the basic conundrum of homohegemony and the other is set out by demonstrating how Canadian civil and political society – specifically using the window of written news media discourses – illiberally constructs Jamaica as a homophobic monolith as a means of advancing its own newly hegemonic gay-inclusive ideology. Constructions of Jamaica are shown to support a homophobic/homo-friendly binary that secures Canadian homohegemony. The illiberal construction of Jamaica is shown to occur in a neocolonial, subtly racialized fashion, with Jamaica’s queers positioned as being in need of rescue by Canada. The key aim of this chapter is to suggest how assessments of Jamaica’s apparent homophobia, uttered in the Canadian civil and political societal context, have as much to do with hegemonic Canadian sexual ideology, homohegemony, as they do with realities of heterosexism in Jamaica. Drawing on media constructions, discourse analysis is adopted. While discourse analysis might not at first glance appear materialist, attention to discourse is in fact an important way to identify ideological factors, contextualized and analyzed according to their social and political conditions. Indeed, a form of textual analysis was at times engaged in by Gramsci himself throughout the Prison Notebooks. Stuart Hall notes “the astonishing range of [Gramsci’s] writing on cultural questions, on language and popular literature and, of course, his
work on ideology.” These are subjects that Hall has himself written about from a broadly Gramscian perspective. Queer studies scholar Gary Kinsman, who adopts an explicitly Gramscian frame, at times engages in textual analysis of the news media, explaining that “[t]hrough its selective representation of reality, the media plays a clear ideological role. The mass media relies on accredited sources, and thus the perspective of agencies of social regulation are part of the formulation of ‘objective’ news accounts.” Thus, the media is here seen to function ideologically in a context that interrelates with civil and political society. Finally, transnational feminist scholar Chandra Talpade Mohanty successfully engages in textual analysis of the discursive construction of “‘Third World woman’ as a monolith” in Western feminist texts/Western feminism. It must be explained that Mohanty is committed to recognizing a “coherence of effects” in such writing through “the implicit assumption of ‘the West’ . . . as the primary referent in theory and praxis.” She writes, “My reference to ‘Western feminism’ is by no means intended to imply that it is a monolith. Rather, I am attempting to draw attention to the similar effects of various textual strategies used by writers that codify others as non-Western and hence themselves as (implicitly) Western.” This is very similar to the strategy undertaken in this chapter in terms of uncovering a “coherence of effects” of the discursive construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” when such discourses are spoken and received in the implicit context of Canadian homohegemony. The net effect of a constructed image of “homophobic Jamaica” occurs in spite of a degree of heterogeneity in Canadian news media discourses about homosexuality in Jamaica.

“Chapter Three: Critical Literature Review and the Need for Homohegemony” critically engages with related scholarly literature in order to document the contributions and limitations of such scholarship. The chapter also demonstrates the need for homohegemony as an original
theoretical framework that can deal with the full implications of queer inclusion in Canada and its relationship to exclusionary realities, including illiberal constructions of Jamaica.

Also demonstrating that homohegemony has something to say, in “Chapter Four: Into the National ‘Self’: Reconstructing Canadian Queer History Through Homohegemony,” the theoretical framework takes inventory of the history of LGBTQ inclusion/exclusion in Canada, from the time of the partial decriminalization of same-sex sexual activity in 1969, through to the contemporary post-same-sex marriage moment. The chapter engages with two principal and representative narratives of queer history in Canada introduced in Chapter Three, Miriam Smith’s work on gay and lesbian rights and Gary Kinsman’s work on gay and lesbian regulation. The chapter places these significantly contradictory narratives together, to show how homohegemony emerges out of a history of shifting benevolent liberal inclusion of gay and lesbian citizens via the extension of selective citizenship rights, and to illustrate that such inclusion has been and continues to be premised on certain limits and conditions that represent the illiberal regulation of LGBTQ citizens and constructed others. The chapter reads the histories presented by Smith and Kinsman in terms of a contradictory unity in order to explain Canadian queer history post-1969 as a story of homohegemony in formation and eventual fruition.

The concept and theoretical framework of homohegemony, having been shown in Part One to have something to say, are then shown to have an experiential and material basis in the second part of the dissertation. In “Part Two: Homohegemony Has Something to Show,” the dissertation sets out to deconstruct the illiberal caricature of Jamaica exposed in Chapter Two in the light of material and experiential realities. This section then turns to showing the realities of the benevolent liberal/illiberal features of Canadian homohegemony, as they impact on the sexual citizenship imaginings and negotiations of LGBTQ Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians,
and, briefly, considers my own experiences in Jamaica. In short, the illiberal caricature is deconstructed, and homohegemony, as an ideology of inclusive gay and lesbian citizenship in the national imaginary, premised upon both benevolent liberal and illiberal moments, is attested to.

In “Chapter Five: Queer Jamaica?,” the dissertation challenges the construction of “homophobic Jamaica” in an effort to show that Jamaica is substantially queerer than meets the image. The main objective of the chapter is to “trouble” the constructed image of Jamaica, thereby exposing it as a manifestation of illiberalism in the context of homohegemony. This is done in a manner mindful not to minimize the heterosexism in Jamaica, but to tell a different side of the story, of a Jamaica that is at once considerably queerer and less monolithic than the illiberal construction. The neo-Gramscian framework is once again put to work in this chapter in order to distinguish between a formally heterosexist legal framework in political society, and a civil society with more robust opportunities for the everyday contestation, claiming, and negotiation of queer citizenship in social spaces. This negotiation of queer citizenship in civil society is seen to depend on factors such as gender, race, class, geography, Christianity, and dancehall music. Crucially, in addition to engaging in NGO and legal document analysis, the chapter connects with the voices of LGBTQ Jamaicans themselves. Apart from being immersed in the Jamaican “sex/gender regime,” and therefore being in a position to speak to its complexities and contradictions, their assessments and representations of sexual citizenship in Jamaica are the ones most often lacking in international and Canadian discourses.

In “Chapter Six: Looking in, Coming In, and Coming Out in Canada,” the chapter begins by flipping the Canada/Jamaica binary (Jamaica/Canada) to consider how LGBTQ Jamaicans imagine Canada on the issue of gay and lesbian inclusion from the vantage point of Jamaica. LGBTQ Jamaicans residing in Jamaica, as they look into Canada and sometimes imagine
migrating to this context, demonstrate that the ideology of gays and lesbians as included in the Canadian national imaginary is something widely shared beyond Canada’s borders. More to the point, this is a national ideology that is neocolonial in the sense that it is consented to as common sense within the very nation-state constructed as “homophobic other” along decidedly neocolonial lines. For example, the interviewees consistently characterized Canada as a “gay mecca.” It is also significant that Canada is imagined as gay inclusive based on knowledge of real sexual citizenship rights, benevolently conferred by the Canadian state. The chapter also addresses how the sexual citizenship negotiations of LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians evidence a much more contradictory reality, clearly illustrating benevolent liberalism and illiberalism. Notably, the interviewees show how homohegemony is conditioned within a complex context of multiple intersecting oppressions in political and civil society, as well as that sexual citizenship is itself differentially experienced or “graded” based on the intersectionality of one’s identifications and their experience in the politics of everyday life. Jamaican-Canadians notably also consistently confront the illiberal construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” and are queerly included in homohegemony in reality, attesting to its fundamentally contradictory nature.

In the conclusion chapter, “Chapter Seven: Kingston to Kingston and Transnational Sexual Solidarity,” the main argument that Canada is homohegemonic is summarized using a range of examples, including those derived from fieldwork in Jamaica consistent with the methodology of ethnographic observation. Here, I self-reflexively place my own social and political location and experiences, as a relatively “normatively queer” Canadian citizen visiting the Jamaican context, into the narrative’s summation of the argument. The dissertation ends with a call to theorize the replacement of national sexual othering with relations of transnational sexual solidarity.
This chapter has set out the curious, indeed queer, case of Canadian homohegemony, including its illiberal relationship to a novel constructed other, “homophobic Jamaica.” The next chapter launches into Canadian constructions of Jamaica, in order to show that homohegemony and the other, as a manifestation of homohegemonic ideology’s constitutive benevolent liberal and illiberal moments more generally, are two sides of the same hegemonic ideology.

Assessments of Jamaica’s “homophobia” in Canadian news media discourses take place within the context of Canadian homohegemony, and within a broader neocolonial cartography.

Notes


2. The extension of selective sexual citizenship rights by the state is constructed, and commonly perceived by society (often by LGBTQ people themselves), as a “benevolent” gesture within a liberal “minority rights” frame. The benevolence of the Canadian state/society is therefore not being posited in this dissertation as a fact but rather as a pervasive ideological construction that obscures the selective and circumscribed character of LGBTQ inclusion in Canada, as well as ongoing and novel exclusions upon which queer inclusions have been/are premised. Moreover, the common sense understanding of such rights having been benevolently bestowed “from on high” by the Canadian state and the heterosexist and cisgender majority actively erases the fact that these rights were (and continue to be) put on the agenda and fought for by LGBTQ people themselves and their allies, namely in context of LGBTQ social movement activism. The Canadian state has, however, acceded to reform at key points in this historical trajectory (dealt with in Chapter Four) once such reforms reached a certain point of popularity among the general population and in Canadian civil society. This has allowed the state to control the pace and limit the extent of change, while recasting LGBTQ inclusion as a benevolent state project that “leads” civil society, rather than the other way around.

3. Liberalism is inherently contradictory, characterized by both inclusionary and exclusionary features. This dissertation’s use of the term “illiberality” is not meant to suggest that the specific exclusions under consideration always reside outside of liberal ideology or the capitalist system that it upholds. On the contrary, “illiberality” is being used here to underscore just how far liberalism strays from its ideological ideals of equality and freedom in actual practice. Understood in this way, “illiberalism” or “illiberal exclusions” are endemic to a contradictory liberalism. The use of the term “illiberalism” also speaks to the fundamentally contradictory character of homohegemony specifically, in terms of the “benevolent” liberal and illiberal moments that together characterize the ideological and material context of the ideology. Both of these moments, however, reside largely within Canadian liberalism.

4. The acronym LGBTQ is used when LGBTQ rights are referred to broadly, even though this dissertation will be mainly referring to lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) human rights and relationship recognition. Trans rights (representing the “T”) in terms of explicit protections of gender identity and expression are lacking in some provincial human rights codes in Canada, as well as in federal human rights and hate crimes legislation. Yet I have included these here to indicate the relational context of even minimal rights recognition. Queer
(representing the “Q”) is included here because, even though the “queer” of queer theory or radical queer activism is a subversive identity – a sort of “anti-identity” not necessarily amenable to the securing of rights in a liberal human rights frame – its common usage, including among those who identify as queer, is as just another, slightly less identitarian word for gay, lesbian, bisexual and/or transgender. In short, there are no “queer rights” per se, but some people who identify as “queer” would be included among those who have benefited from LGBT human rights. This would likewise be the case for some individuals engaged in “questioning” their sexual or gender identity (also referred to by the “Q” in LGBTQ). Gays and lesbians are hegemonic in the LGBTQ formulation, but all of the identities in the acronym have been granted some rights and have garnered recognition in the national imaginary to an extent as part of the process of becoming homohegemonic. Sometimes “queer” is used as an umbrella term in this dissertation for non-normative sexual and gender identities/practices, in keeping with the scholarship in this area.

5. Generally, this dissertation uses the term “heterosexism” to refer to prejudicial/oppressive relations towards especially homosexual citizens. The term “homophobia” is a difficult one, but is used in this dissertation in some contexts as well. The term arose in the Northern context as a psychological inversion of the sickness model of homosexuality by gay and lesbian social movement activism; in effect, the ones who were frightened of/hateful towards homosexuals were recast as those who were psychologically disturbed, as phobic, rather than homosexuals. The term is often used more broadly to refer to prejudice or discrimination towards/oppression of gays and lesbians, along the same lines as sexism and racism. In this more general meaning, the term might sometimes be used in a Southern context as well, in spite of it having a different history of sexuality in general, and homosexuality in particular. As indicated, this dissertation typically opts to use the term heterosexism to refer to the system of homosexual oppression, highlighting its connection to patriarchy. (See Tom Warner, Never Going Back: A History of Queer Activism in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).) However, at times the discussion will use the term “homophobia” in quotation marks in cases in which this is the common sense or hegemonic ideological language that is being used. Later on in the dissertation, this term is used in connection with the interviewees, many of whom use the term to describe prejudice, discrimination, and oppression in the Jamaican context rather than “fear” of homosexuals. Finally, it is important to note that given that heterosexism is connected to gender oppression, it does not strictly impact gays and lesbians but others in the LGBTQ acronym as well. Once again, the relational aspects of “LGBTQ” are sometimes difficult to describe, but a Gramscian and intersectional interpretation must endeavour to do so.

6. Dorothy Smith, Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People (Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press, 2005).


9. This is distinct from a relation of “settler colonialism,” in which basic decolonization has yet to take place. See, for example, Scott Lauria Morgensen, Spaces Between US: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2011). Transnational feminists Chandra Talpade Mohanty and M. Jacqui Alexander deploy the term “capitalist recolonization” in order to highlight the centrality of global neoliberalism to contemporary economic and political conjunctures that build upon previous colonial legacies in the neocolonial moment. See, for example, Mohanty and Alexander, Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures (New York and London: Routledge, 1997). Jasbir Puar finds it useful to invoke “imperialism” to describe present-day US and other Northern-country relations with the global South, political relations that are entangled with neoliberal economic relations. See Puar, Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007). Finally, the Gramscian cultural theorist Stuart Hall has devoted considerable attention to the usage of “post-colonial,” writing that the term “may help us to . . . describe or characterise the shift in global relations which marks the (necessarily uneven) transition from the age of Empires to the post-independence or post-decolonisation moment. It may also help us (though here its value is more gestural) to identify what are the new relations and dispositions of power which are emerging in the new conjuncture.” This is from Hall, “Chapter 20: When was ‘the post-colonial’? Thinking at the limit,” in The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons, eds. Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti (New York: Routledge, 1996), 246. Italics are his. While
appreciating the complexity of debates surrounding these terms, this dissertation often uses “neocolonial” simply for descriptive reasons in order to emphasize that for a subset of ostensibly “post-colonial” societies, genuine political and economic autonomy was either never achieved after formal independence, or else was achieved only briefly and then quickly reversed by processes of recolonization.

19. Morgensen, Spaces Between Us.
25. This is understood in a similar way to how socialist feminist Heidi Hartmann, drawing on Gayle Rubin, conceives of various systems of domination or exploitation – namely patriarchy and capitalism – in “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union,” in Feminist Theory: A Reader, 2nd edition: 356–65.
27. The exclusions of bisexuality in Canada are returned to and discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.
The result of additional pressurization in the aftermath of the 1999 constitutional amendment (Quebec jurisdiction) of the extensive rights and recognition afforded to opposite-sex couples was to not only codify but affirm existing rights and protections for same-sex couples. It is crucial to understand same-sex marriage occurred in Ontario and British Columbia in 2003, which represented the first same-sex marriage dates from 2003 in Ontario and British Columbia, which represented the first same-sex marriage in the world to be “free of major discriminatory provisions,” as “the marriages open to gay/lesbian couples in the Netherlands and Belgium [at the time] had exclusions in the area of adoption.” Same-sex marriage was already in process in Ontario, Quebec, and BC in the year 2000, as eventually successful court challenges were launched at this time. The first positive decision in favour of same-sex marriage occurred in 2003, what is more, Rayside carefully explains that legal same-sex marriage regimes in the world to be “free of major discriminatory provisions,” as “the marriages open to gay/lesbian couples in the Netherlands and Belgium [at the time] had exclusions in the area of adoption.” Same-sex marriage was already in process in Ontario, Quebec, and BC in the year 2000, as eventually successful court challenges were launched at this time. The first positive decision in favour of same-sex marriage occurred in Ontario in 2003, though its implementation was delayed. Thus, it is noteworthy that same-sex marriage was being imagined as a distinct possibility, if not probability, prior to 2003. What is more, Rayside points out that it is crucial to understand same-sex couples in Canada had already achieved many or all (depending on the jurisdiction) of the extensive rights and recognition afforded to opposite-sex de facto or “common law” couples in the aftermath of the 1999 M. v. H. Supreme Court ruling over the period from 1999 to 2002, before legal same-sex marriage. These rights included adoption rights, although not always initially, and sometimes as a result of additional pressure from the courts.
51. Puar, Terrorist Assemblages.
52. Ibid., 66, 126.
56. For example, Anderson’s inclusive understanding of nationalism in Imagined Communities can be contrasted with the more exclusionary understanding of modern nationalism of Anthony Marx, Faith in Nation: Exclusionary Origins of Nationalism (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
57. Puar, Terrorist Assemblages, xxiv, 2.
58. Ibid., 28–29. Puar writes about the production of racialized populations within the nation as more homophobic than white citizens, as well as about the neoliberal investments involved in considering some communities, cultures, and countries more homophobic than others. Puar also goes some distance toward elaborating on the production of Muslim populations as particularly “homophobic” in the context of homonationalism. See pp. 18–21, 90–94, 111, 138–40.
59. Anderson, Imagined Communities.
60. Puar, Terrorist Assemblages, 27. Puar here considers capitalism’s historical “ambivalence” in terms of being open to a variety of family forms.
65. Hall, “Chapter 20: When was ‘the post-colonial’? Thinking at the limit.”
70. Stychin, “The Sexual Citizen.”
80. Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 110, 178–79.
82. Smith, Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada, 159.
83. Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 119.
85. Ibid., 157.
86. Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 121.
87. Ibid., 117.
88. One notable exception of this trend was British Columbia, in which legislative initiative on relationship recognition had a more leading role, as Rayside points out in Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 98–99.
89. Ibid., 105–25; Smith, 131, 142–44.
90. Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 105–07, 121; Smith, 143–44.
91. Adams, “Why do we support gay rights?”
101. Smith, Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada; Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions.
102. Puur, Terrorist Assemblages.
103. Ibid., 10; Smith, Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada; Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions.
106. Recent federal appellate court rulings overturning bans on same-sex marriage and the United States Supreme Court’s decision to effectively let these rulings stand (October 2014) have begun to break this pattern, taking the number of states with legal same-sex marriage well beyond nineteen at the time of the final submission of this dissertation. States that have not been part of such court cases, but that exist within the same federal court
structure as those states whose bans have been directly overturned, are now likewise experiencing same-sex marriage being instituted in their states in an effectively federal fashion. That is, these federal court rulings vis-à-vis particular states effectively apply to all states banning same-sex marriage within that particular federal circuit.

109. Ibid.
110. Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 118.
114. Ibid., 21.
116. Smith, Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada; Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions.
118. Smith, Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada.
119. Rayside, Queer Inclusions, continental Divisions, 93.
120. Smith, Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada, 6; Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 93; Kinsman, The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada, 171–72.
123. Puar, Terrorist Assemblages, 29.
124. Anderson., Imagined Communities.
125. Anthony Marx, Faith in Nation; Bakan and Stasiulis, Negotiating Citizenship.
130. Kempadoo, *Seeing the Caribbean*.
135. Ibid., 66.
136. Dr. Beverley Mullings (Acting Head of Department of Gender Studies and Associate Professor of Geography and Gender Studies, Queen’s University), in discussion with author, April 2014. Dr. Mullings also pointed out that the second wife of Canada’s first Prime Minister, John A. Macdonald, was in fact Jamaican. Her name was Susan Agnes Bernard, named a “Lady” when Macdonald was knighted at the time of Canadian Confederation, and later named a Baroness. See also Sir John A. Macdonald Library, “Domestic Life: Second Marriage,” http://www.sirjohnnamacdonaldlibrary.ca/library/domestic_life/second_marriage/index.shtml.
140. Glennie and Chappell, “Country Profiles.” Such concern about a “brain drain” is contradictory and may in fact be over-stated, as professional out-migration, and tapping into the professional and business networks of members of the Jamaican diaspora, can alternatively be seen as part of the Jamaican state’s contemporary development strategy. See, for example, Beverley Mullings, “Diaspora Strategies, Skilled Migrants and Human Capital Enhancement in Jamaica,” *Global Networks* 11, no. 1 (January 2011): 24–42.
146. Ibid., 26
152. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*.
156. Ibid., xiv. Puar begins to explain her methodology on this page.
157. Ibid., xii.
160. Ibid.
161. Sears, “Queer Anti-capitalism.”
166. Mohanty, Feminism Without Borders.
170. Ibid., 163.
171. Ibid., “Notes on Italian History,” 53–120.
175. Simon, Gramsci’s Political Thought, 69. Italics his. Some of the ensuing discussion of Gramsci is indebted to Simon.
176. Gramsci, Prison Notebooks, 12.
177. Simon, Gramsci’s Political Thought, 70.
178. Ibid.
179. Gramsci, Prison Notebooks, 12.
180. Ibid., 57–58.
181. Ibid.
182. Ibid., 131, 421.
183. Ibid., 53.
184. Ibid., 115–16, 421f.
185. Ibid., 12.
186. Ibid., 52.
187. Ibid., 12.
188. Simon, Gramsci’s Political Thought, 71; Gramsci, Prison Notebooks, 246–47.
190. Gramsci, Prison Notebooks, 263.
191. Ibid., 294–96. On pp. 294 and 295, Gramsci refers to the “regulation of sexual instincts,” and on p. 296 to “the regulation of sex” in the context of gender relations. “Bestiality and sodomy” are referred to on p. 295. It is not clear here whether Gramsci is in favour of the emancipation of the sodomite.
192. See, for example, Gramsci’s treatment of “feminism” in Prison Notebooks, 297–98. He does not come out full force in support of the movement; admittedly, he appears to be concerned about the problematic ways in which feminism may get taken up by conservative forces within society, a cautionary anxiety that remains relevant today. There are other places, for example p. 296, where Gramsci sounds practically feminist, writing about the need for women to gain “not only a genuine independence in relation to men but also a new way of conceiving themselves and their role in sexual relations.”
193. Ibid., 295–96.
194. Ibid., 418.
195. Ibid., 421f.
196. Stuart Hall, “The Spectacle of the ‘Other.’”
197. Ann Laura Stoler, Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of


204. For considered coverage of the debate about the value of formal recognition in this issue area, see Rayside 9–17.

205. These debates are taken up in the literature review in Chapter Three.


207. Ibid., 13–14.

208. Ibid., 13.

209. Ibid., 14.

210. Ibid., 15.

211. Ibid.

212. Ibid.

213. Ibid.


216. Bakan and Stasiulis, Negotiating Citizenship.

217. Ibid.

218. This of course echoes and joins longstanding Marxist, and especially socialist feminist, attention to what has variously been called “the sexual question,” “the woman question,” and “the feminist question” in Marxism. See Friedrich Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, in the Light of the Researches of Lewis H. Morgan (New York: International Publishers, 1972); Gramsci, Prison Notebooks, 294–301; Heidi Hartmann, “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a more Progressive Union.”


220. “Mr. Pratt,” a Jamaican-Canadian interviewee, was interviewed via Skype only. Typically, after initial interviews “in person,” follow-up interviews with Jamaican-Canadian interviewees were conducted over Skype. A third interview with “Mr. Budding” was conducted using social media. “Mr. Miller” was unable to participate in a follow-up interview. Maurice Tomlinson, the only interviewee not part of the anonymous interview sample, was interviewed at length over email. Please see “Interviews” at the end of this dissertation for more information.

221. Two follow-up interviews with Jamaican citizens residing in Jamaica were conducted over social media. Please see “Interviews” at the end of this dissertation for more information.

222. A small amount of monetary compensation was offered to thirteen of the participants (one Jamaican-Canadian interviewee and the twelve Jamaican interviewees living in Jamaica) as fieldwork funds became available during this phase of the research. The amount was consistent with cultural expectations of gifting and compensation for participants’ time, and with ethical standards currently being employed by other Caribbean researchers.

223. I have used Bakan and Stasiulis, “Gatekeepers in the Domestic Service Industry in Canada,” in Negotiating Citizenship, 63–85, as a model for this. I have also drawn from Wekker, The Politics of Passion, and Carlos Ulises Decena, Tacit Subjects: Belonging and Same-Sex Desire among Dominican Immigrant Men (Durham
227. Decena, Tacit Subjects.
229. Dorothy Smith, Writing the Social: Critique, Theory, and Investigations (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1999.)
233. See Kinsman, The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada, 205.
235. Ibid., 17–18.
236. Ibid., 18.
237. This dissertation will occasionally employ “sex/gender regime” as shorthand for those state/societal ruling relations pertaining to the interlinked regulation of sexuality of gender. This is based on Gayle Rubin’s influential notion of “sex/gender systems,” but deliberately uses the word “regime” to denote the importance of political institutions in addition to social structure in the structuration of sexuality and gender in specific nation-states. See Gayle Rubin, “The Traffic of Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex,” Toward an Anthropology of Women, ed. Rayna Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975): 157–210
238. Dorothy Smith, Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People (Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press, 2005).
Part One

Homohegemony Has Something to Say
Chapter Two. The Problem of Homohegemony and the Other: Canadian Media Constructions of Jamaica as a “Homophobic Other”

Homohegemony signals the popular imagination of a new sector of gay and lesbian sexual citizens – and to a lesser extent bisexual, transgender, and other queer citizens – while, at the same time, historical exclusions are maintained and new demarcations of difference are invented; enter the homophobic other nation. Hegemonic understandings of who is included in a nation, and to what extent they are included, develop as a result of internal processes of socialization and education into a common culture by institutions of the state (for example, the education system) and civil society, as well as the active imagination or production of those who belong to the national community. The construction of various others at home and abroad who belong incompletely, or not at all, in the national imaginary is also pivotal to constructing a sense of nationhood. The construction of other nations as ideological foils or contrasts for the identity of the national “self” is significant to this process. Various intersecting identities of gender, race, class, ability, sexuality, and coloniality enter into the spectrum of constructed inclusions/exclusions.¹

This chapter addresses Canadian homohegemony and its relationship to one notable homophobic other through a close examination of Canadian news media discourses about homosexuality in Jamaica. It documents how such coverage illiberally constructs “homophobic Jamaica” in concert with neocolonial and racialized stereotypes, and constructs Canada as specifically gay friendly, and therefore as containing an exceptional type of sexual citizenship in the process. The chapter offers an elaboration of the active ideological process that is taking place, arguing that assessments of Jamaica’s “homophobia” uttered in the context of Canadian civil and political society are not politically neutral. Rather, these assessments are occasioned by
and reflective of the homohegemonic moment in Canada. Simply stated, the aim is to show that Canada’s national identity as newly inclusive of gays and lesbians is intrinsically associated with a sharp illiberal contrast, demonstrated with the construction of Jamaica as homophobic other. Under conditions of hegemonic homosexual inclusion, the sexual other incompletely but nevertheless significantly “flips,” from the homosexual other within the Canadian nation to homophobic other nations, communities, cultures, and/or religions. This shift is exemplified in precisely those nations with which Canada has had, and continues to have, longstanding relations of a neocolonial character, illustrated by migration patterns, economic activity, and political influence, which is the case with Jamaica.

This chapter will begin to map the discursive terrain of the integral Canadian nation-state as it engages in a discussion about homosexuality in Jamaica, employing the method of discourse analysis, as elaborated in the introduction. Discourses located in Canadian civil society that refer to actors and institutions are taken seriously as both windows into the ideological construction of “homophobic Jamaica” and engines of this ideological construction. That is, they both reflect and significantly construct the phenomenon. In this analysis, the prevalence of certain discourses will matter less than their patterns and their imbrications with power – in short, their effects. The mass media, specifically the news media, is one of our best windows into ideology in civil society. Its importance is owed to its ability to cut across the different apparatuses or spaces of civil and political life – state institutions, trade unions, political parties, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and so forth. As noted by Kinsman, some of the major sources that the news media relies on for information are state and other regulatory agencies.\(^2\) There is, therefore, an interrelationship between the formal state apparatus in political society and media outlets in civil society that further speaks to the Gramscian state and the important role of the media within
it. Even more elementally, the news media largely operates according to a market imperative in Canada, with the partial exception of the public broadcasters, which means that the news media must largely reflect the beliefs and values of the national population in order to keep and attract an audience. In sum, the news media acts as mirror and motor for some of the hegemonic ideologies in Canadian civil society.

The research for this chapter has taken into consideration articles from the *Toronto Star*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *Montreal Gazette* and *CBC News*, available online at the time of this writing and retrieved using the search terms “homosexuality and Jamaica,” and “gay and Jamaica.” Many of the articles deal with LGBTQ issues more generally. One additional article retrieved using the search term “homosexuality and Commonwealth countries” was added to the sample since Jamaica is a member of the Commonwealth group of nations, and a prominent one singled out for its retention of buggery and gross indecency legislation and an alleged homophobic culture. The search was limited to articles published after the year 2000, a year selected to serve as a chronological marker of the ascendency of the homohegemonic moment given that significant *de facto* recognition of same-sex relationships was already a legal reality, and given that ultimately successful same-sex marriage cases were launched at this time. However, since changes in discourses can occur over even a short temporal period, this chapter directly engages with only those news articles from the larger sample that have been published since the year 2007.

The news media search produced a total of twenty relevant articles that are listed in the references at the end of the dissertation. Most of the articles (fifteen) were from the *Toronto Star*. This is not surprising given that 70 percent of the estimated 230,000 Canadians of Jamaican origin in Canada live in metropolitan Toronto. Toronto also is home to one of the most robust
and visible LGBTQ communities in Canada. The focus on Toronto does not mean that we are only speaking to the realities of Toronto, however, because the city figures disproportionately in hegemonic Canadian ideologies. A hegemonic ideology tends to gloss over certain regional differences, as well as weigh some regions, cities, and groups more heavily than others. This is reflected in political and economic conditions as well. Toronto is Canada’s most populous city and is Canada’s business capital, and thus it stands to reason that themes contained in Toronto newspaper articles reflect and reinforce popular understandings to an extent. As Karen Duder, citing the argument advanced by Mary Louise Adams, asserts in relation to an earlier time period in the volume *Queerly Canadian: An Introductory Reader in Sexuality Studies*: “Toronto was the centre of English-language publishing, broadcasting, and cultural production in Canada” and was therefore bound up with Canada’s “national culture.” While significant changes in the cultural balance of the nation have been taking place for some time now, notably tilting the scales of cultural production ever westward, Toronto continues to be a significant site of cultural and political representation for English Canada.

While newspaper discourses emanating from Toronto may be said to speak to and reflect English Canadian homohegemony as a whole to a certain extent, French Canada, specifically Québec, is a different matter. The analysis that follows deals with English-Canadian discourses only. Discourses from Toronto newspaper articles, or even the English-language Montréal Gazette, cannot be assumed to inform or reflect Québécois understandings of homosexual inclusion and citizenship in any significant way. In fact, scholarship convincingly demonstrates that Québec has its own particular “homohegemony.” Stychin, for example, refers to Québec as an example of a “queer nation.” Québec’s homohegemony predates that of Canada as a whole, although it began to lag behind many other jurisdictions in Canada by the late 1990s and early
2000s largely as a result of its different legal system, only to reaccelerate on queer family law policy. Québec’s hegemonic notion of homosexual inclusion has been tied to projections of a modern, progressive, secular, and civic Québec nationalism, registering a break from Québec’s perceived parochial and Catholic past, often in the context of its struggle for independence from Canada.

Rather than providing a quantitative content analysis, a limited representative sample of articles is addressed here in a detailed fashion. The aim is to directly engage with a representative sample of themes found among the twenty newspaper articles. At times, the chapter will briefly contextualize the discourse analysis by supplementing the discussion with literature on homosexuality in Jamaican or with original data gleaned from fieldwork observations and interviews. This is done sparingly, in an effort to keep the focus on the constructed ideological image. The deconstruction of this image, through the everyday lived experience of LGBTQ Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians, is demonstrated later in the dissertation’s discussion of queerer realities in Jamaica. The chapter proceeds to establish some basic observations in terms of how Canadian discourses illiberally produce and reproduce Jamaica as a homophobic other nation in a neocolonial and racialized cartography, whose queers, and particularly queers of colour, are presented to be in need of rescue. To this end, a few specific ideological effects are uncovered.

First, these discourses tend to simplify the situation of “homophobia” in Jamaica and caricature the nation-state, often generalizing based on particular experiences or expressions of heterosexism, or based on the legal situation alone. Crucially, these discourses lack attention to the complicated history of the Jamaican sex/gender regime, let alone the Canadian sex/gender regime. Second, these discourses lack appreciation of the agency of individual queers and queer
social movements to negotiate and claim sexual citizenship in Jamaica, amidst both opportunities and obstacles. Finally, the discourses tend to implicitly or explicitly congratulate Canada for its inclusive sexual and multicultural citizenship, cast as state benevolence toward sexual and multicultural minority communities alike in a liberal rights frame.

The neocolonial character of this othering is evidenced by the fact that discourses about LGBTQ issues in Jamaica map onto a number of problematic binaries that we associate with colonialism, including the “traditional/modern binary,” which ultimately inform a “homophobic Jamaica/homo-friendly Canada” dualism. This dualism is the ideological cornerstone of Canadian homohegemony and the other. Sexual neocolonialism is further evidenced by the widespread existence of discourses of “shaming Jamaica,” and especially of “saving LGBTQ Jamaicans,” an expression of the deep roots such narratives have in the colonial construction of sexuality. These discourses of rescue, while sometimes well intentioned, predominate over discourses of meaningful solidarity with LGBTQ Jamaicans living in Jamaica. When these discourses are taken together, the construction of “homophobic Jamaica” by Canada is just that, an ideological construction. Though this construction is obviously based in a degree of truth concerning really experienced heterosexism in the Jamaican context, a central contention of this chapter is that it has just as much to do with the Canadian context. Hence, the onset of a hegemonic sense of homosexual inclusion in Canadian civil society, and the corresponding need to differentiate this national ideology from the practices of other nations with which Canada has historically had, and continues to have, relations that are deeply inflected with economic, political, and cultural (neo)colonialism. This is not to suggest that Jamaica is the only or even the primary nation-state, community, culture, and/or religion that Canada is actively othering in this fashion. Yet, the analysis will show that Jamaica does occupy a significant space in the Canadian
imagination of homophobic other nations.

**Queer Canada in the Missionary Position**

In “Jamaica’s leading gay activist, Maurice Tomlinson, married a Torontonian,” the author, Catherine Porter, implicitly articulates a series of discursive themes that characterize many of the media constructions of Canadian homohegemony and “homophobic Jamaica.” These themes include: elision of history; imperial/colonial language; subtle racialization; a narrative of rescue or saving; and making use of the “native informant.” These are themes consistent with Canadian homohegemony in a neocolonial imaginary that includes Jamaica.

In the article, the author prominently characterizes Tomlinson’s existence as a “double life,” with being gay cast as completely different in Canada relative to Jamaica. Notably, the metaphor of the “double life” lends itself to thinking about Canada and Jamaica in binary terms on the issue of homosexuality. It also excludes the possibility that a gay or lesbian-identified Jamaican-Canadian could negotiate an integrated diasporic and transnational existence in spite of the differences that exist in the regulation of homosexuality between the two nation-states. The text highlights the real heterosexism in Jamaica that has in fact forced some gay and lesbian Jamaicans to flee the country. As the interviews conducted for this dissertation illustrate, such out-migration sometimes occurs through the seeking of official refugee status, but more often happens through standard immigration channels (for example, through the skilled worker category). The interviews furthermore confirm reports from this and other news media texts that such heterosexism in Jamaica includes mob violence against homosexuals by vigilantes enforcing heterosexism, typically, though by no means exclusively, against gay men rather than lesbians.

What is most notable, however, is what is not mentioned in the news text, specifically contextual social movements and everyday challenges to extant heterosexist practices in Jamaica,
queer spaces extant in Jamaica, or ongoing heterosexism in Canada. Language like “the country’s [Jamaica’s] virulent homophobia,” and “[Tomlinson] is right to be scared” since “vigilante justice against gay men is common in Jamaica,” lead to the impression that Jamaica is a uniformly homophobic place. A whole culture of “virulent homophobia” is herein generalized from particular and particularly shocking incidents of heterosexist violence. This can be observed where the article relates: “Last year, two men were chopped to death with machetes because they were gay.” Importantly, it is the function and meaning of these discourses, rather than the particular examples to which they relate – examples that are tragic and truly unspeakable – that must be queried. The troubling effect of the discursive relating of these types of examples is that their horrific details and imagery have a tendency to slip into a generalized notion of an almost monstrous Jamaican homophobia. At no point in the storyline is there a “breakage” to reflect on whether realities of violence against gays and lesbians occur in the Canadian context. The spectre of such violence in Canada is thus relegated to the past, further illustrated in the text’s assertion: “Change both seeps and charges. Just think: 11 years ago this month, [Reverend] Hawkes performed the country’s first gay wedding, wearing a bulletproof vest under his clerical vestments.” While the admission of realities of violence against gays and lesbians in Canada could be read positively, as a breaking down of the Canada/Jamaica dualism, the statement also reads as a suggestion of how far Canada has come since the legalization of same-sex marriage, relegating Jamaica to a much earlier stage of gay and lesbian rights development during the same temporal period.

Besides the “double life” construct that lends itself to dualistic thinking about Canada/Jamaica on homosexuality, the text mentions that Tomlinson will be receiving a gay rights award in England. This is not problematized in spite of the irony of this event, given the
legacy of British colonialism that led to the buggery and gross indecency laws in Jamaica and other Anglophone Caribbean and Commonwealth countries, including Canada, in the first place.\textsuperscript{14} Further, the brutal history of British colonial plantation slavery and institutionalized racism left important traces on the present-day regulation of gender and sexuality in Jamaica.\textsuperscript{15} Of course, one does not expect a newspaper article to go into this much historical detail, but the fact remains that this report of Canadian-married Tomlinson (shown beside the article’s text in a photo of his wedding ceremony in Canada) receiving an award in the United Kingdom does leave readers with the impression that Canada and the UK are obviously and unproblematically more advanced than Jamaica on gay and lesbian issues, while omitting any sense of historical context on the colonial transposing of compulsory heterosexuality.

The elision, or active invisibilization, of history is a problem common to the treatment of homosexuality in Jamaica in many of the articles considered. Puar notes that assessments of some communities, cultures, countries, and/or religions as more homophobic than others tend to elide history, as well as economic disparities, and therefore “miss a more critical assessment regarding the conditions of [homophobia’s] possibility and impossibility.”\textsuperscript{16} She also writes that “the designation of homophobia produces a geopolitical mapping of neoliberal power relations in the guise of cultures of sexual expression and repression.”\textsuperscript{17} Otherwise stated, the elision of history and of current political and economic conditions is a sign of illiberal, self/other ideological thinking that is more interested in nationalist contrasts than in bringing internationalist attention to complexities of sexual regulation.

Returning to the text, Stephen Lewis, a prominent former Canadian social democratic politician with an impressive record of involvement with the UN and in development work, as well as a colleague of Tomlinson’s through their mutual work for AIDS-Free World,\textsuperscript{18} is quoted
in the article as saying that Tomlinson is “on a personal crusade to convert Jamaica to tolerance.” While Lewis is considered to be solidly on the left of the Canadian political spectrum, the language used here betrays an implicit acceptance of a form of neocolonialism surrounding issues of homosexuality. This suggests that such contemporary imperial assumptions are shared across even left segments of the political spectrum in Canada, befitting a national identity that is hegemonic. The religious metaphor of “converting” Jamaica conjures up colonial imagery and the role of religion in colonialism historically. That idea that Jamaica needs to be converted to “tolerance” assumes its presently intolerant nature. This stands in contrast to the unstated but heavily implied assumption, through the text and photo alike, of Canada’s modern, advanced, or more enlightened nature. Interestingly, the implication is also that Tomlinson is only in a position to save Jamaica now that he himself has been saved by Canada. A national self is herein produced as a gay and lesbian refuge, a position from which gestures of assistance to Jamaica can be made. This narrative of rescue is characteristic of much of the discourse about Jamaica’s gays and lesbians in these news media texts, speaking to an understanding of Jamaican queers as “third world queers” that need help in the context of an intractable intolerance.

Speaking about homonationalism in another regional context, that of Israel/Palestine, Puar cautions against “queer missionary, liberatory, or transcendent paradigms that might place Palestinian queers in a victim narrative.” Despite the difference in context, as well as the difference between homonationalism and homohegemony noted in Chapter One, it can be extracted from this insight that a missionary impulse to save “third world queers,” noteworthy in the context of significant strains of global feminism in their construction of “third world women” as objects of liberation, is a problematic feature of some moves to promote global gay rights. The Northern queer is implicitly positioned as the quintessential queer subject. The Southern
queer is positioned as a victim, the object of global gay liberation. Interestingly, Puar confirms that the victim who needs saving is often read through the lens of their more traditional, often religious, culture. In terms of the text under consideration, mention of Jamaica’s “powerful evangelical churches” aids in producing a focus on Jamaica’s traditionalism. The key here is that gestures of assistance like those from Lewis, or even those from Tomlinson, may “unwittingly replicate . . . neo-colonial assumptions” in the context of Canadian homohegemony.

The representational role or symbolic function of the immigrant gay Jamaican-Canadian man – rarely a lesbian in these discourses – is crucial here. The gay Jamaican-Canadian who has left Jamaica for Canada tends to be celebrated in these discourses in a way that presumably makes Canadians feel proud of their nation’s status as a gay-friendly refuge. This discourse, however, generally also ignores race, class, gender, and other intersections of the gay Jamaican-Canadian’s identity that must be negotiated upon migration to Canada. That the gay Jamaican-Canadian might have to negotiate racism, for example, particular forms of sexual exoticization or objectification in the case of black Caribbean-Canadians in the mainstream LGBTQ community in Canada, is unlikely to even be intelligible in the delimited field of meaning constructed by these popular discourses on coming in and coming out under homohegemony.

The immigrant gay Jamaican man, functioning as both the native informant and a symbol of queer Canadian multiculturalism, is able to attest to the “homophobia” of Jamaica and the “gay-friendliness” of Canada in a way that shields homohegemonic ideology from critiques concerning its predications on normative whiteness and continuing racism. In other words, the gay Jamaican immigrant’s testimony gets taken up in ways that symbolically neutralize the issues of race and racism in Canada. The unexamined assumption is that the “homophobia” of Jamaica is greater, and a greater problem, than the racism of an ostensibly multicultural Canada,
including within queer and queer-friendly communities. The gay Jamaican-Canadian ultimately functions in these discourses as evidence of the fact that gayness and Jamaica are incompatible. After all, the gay Jamaican-Canadian had to leave Jamaica for this very reason. Thus, coming into Canada and migrating away from traditionalism is constructed as a prerequisite for coming out into a modern queer identity.

The gay Jamaican-Canadian in these texts speaks to lived experiential realities of heterosexism in Jamaica, but, crucially, the gay Jamaican-Canadian does not completely represent himself nor does he represent all queer Jamaicans still living in Jamaica. He is largely represented by Canadian investments in homohegemony. His story legitimizes the construction of “homophobic Jamaica” for a mostly liberal audience that presumably finds othering much more palatable under the guise of multiculturalism. Such an ideological operation would seem to be particularly fitting in the case of Canada, where there is an official policy of multiculturalism with a hegemonic ideological status in civil society and among the national population. In this formulation, the racialization of Jamaica and Jamaicans occurs in a subtle fashion – often hidden behind more explicit neocolonial language, to which racial language has historically been linked.

This news media text ends with a curious statement that needs to be interrogated: “Looking at the freckles that splash down Tomlinson’s left cheek like sugar grains, I wonder how anyone could hate a man so breathlessly beautiful.” This physical description is odd for its inclusion in the article, not least since there is already a photo of Tomlinson and his husband. The statement is also heavily racialized. Tomlinson’s freckles appearing to look like “sugar grains” seems to connect to Jamaica’s plantation history involving sugarcane, a history in which black African slaves laboured under coercive and torturous conditions. Further, that it is “hard to
imagine” that anyone could “hate” Tomlinson implies that Jamaicans must be extremely, monstrously, or perversely homophobic – a homophobia cast as truly other for the Canadian national imagination. This is revealing of a tendency to treat Jamaica, and indeed even the character of Jamaicans, as stereotypically uncivilized, with modern civilization now defined fundamentally in regard to the issue of benevolent state treatment of homosexuality, and with Canada acting as exemplary in this regard.

**Generalizing a Homophobic Culture, Generalizing a Homophobic State**

Another article, “‘Murder music’ sparks Caribbean tourism boycott call,” wades into an ongoing debate about “homophobic” music and its international export, mainly from Jamaica. Jamaica provides the primary context for the article’s discussion of the group “Stop Murder Music (Canada)” and its supporters, who have been attempting to prevent dancehall music, or what the article imprecisely refers to as “reggae,” from being distributed and performed in Canada. These actions are based on the grounds that the music, dubbed “murder music” by gay rights activists, contains “threatening sentiments toward homosexuals and pejorative patois terms for them.”26 The motivation behind this campaign is that cracking down on the “homophobic” music will have an impact in Jamaica, where, according to gay Jamaican asylum-seeker Gareth Henry, quoted in the article, a climate of homophobia and homophobic violence is “sanctioned” by the state and “supported by reggae artists and the church.”

As background to the discursive analysis of this article, it is important to point out that the coalition comprising “Stop Murder Music (Canada)” has been part of a larger international campaign and has contained a number of groups, including LGBTQ, Caribbean-Canadian, and other human rights organizations. The campaign itself was a working group of the Canadian Caribbean Human Rights Group (CCHRG).27 The coalition was initially aligned with the Jamaica Forum for Lesbians, All-Sexuals and Gays (J-FLAG), the main LGBTQ rights NGO in
Jamaica. One of the interview participants for this research, a current coordinator for J-FLAG, explained that the organization, then under a different generation of leadership, was an early supporter of the Stop the Murder Music campaign, but has since sought to distance itself from some of the discourses and “persona” surrounding it, including the idea of a tourism boycott. This interviewee and others notably pointed out, however, that the campaign did enjoy a degree of success in persuading artists to abandon “homophobic” lyrics that should be acknowledged.

Returning to the article, the text recounts a Toronto forum in 2008 called “The Sound of Hate,” where two hundred people turned out to talk about the problem of “murder music” on a Friday evening at the University of Toronto. A tourism boycott was suggested at this forum, as the title of the article and its very first line indicate. While the report of this town hall style gathering goes on to suggest a careful conversation took place, the text is nevertheless revealing of the common sense construction of “homophobic Jamaica.”

Situating the story in material conditions, the very idea of a forum consisting of several hundred people in Toronto, brought together to discuss the problem of Jamaican dancehall music, suggests a certain preoccupation in Canada’s largest city with Jamaica’s ascribed homophobia. While this interest is no doubt fuelled by the legitimate concerns of members of the substantial Jamaican and Caribbean diasporas in Toronto, as well as, and including, members of the queer community there, both the meeting and the reporting of it are also conditioned by homohegemony. The decision to focus on hateful, heterosexist music and its international circulation presumably grabs Canadians’ attention. Yet, this is precisely the issue, as a Canadian audience is likely to interpret this message as a representation of Jamaica in general. This is particularly the case since the article shifts among discussions of “this popular segment of reggae,” to “homophobic violence,” to “homophobia” in Jamaica more generally. The causal
arrows are here obscured in one convoluted image of a homophobic nation. Particular instances or expressions of heterosexism, in this case once again related by a gay Jamaican-Canadian immigrant who functions as the native informant, tend to be generalized in these discourses and their reception.

The discussion of “murder music” and “homophobic violence” at the outset of the article quickly moves into a wholesale portrayal of Jamaica in a decidedly backward light: “a country where sodomy is a criminal offence, abortion is illegal and a condoms-in-schools proposal was recently shot down.” This is a portrayal of Jamaica as socially and politically pre-modern, with homophobia providing the main context of this assessment. Seen in this example, the shaming of “murder music” and the “sound of hate” can quickly slip into a shaming of Jamaica’s assumed murderous homophobia and hateful culture. More elementally concerning homohegemony, the very first line of the text includes the statement that Caribbean governments need to be pressured “to protect the human rights of their gay citizenry.” Given that homohegemony is precisely about the imagination of gays and lesbians as full sexual citizens, it is highly significant that this opening statement calls attention to a lack of gay and lesbian citizenship in Caribbean countries. This is a clear gesture at homophobic other nations on precisely the issue, sexual citizenship, that homohegemony has come to crystallize domestically, with Jamaica functioning as the main Caribbean “homophobic” counterpoint.

A tourism boycott, suggested at the meeting and included in the title of the article, would have the effect of seriously harming the Jamaican economy, dependent as it is on tourism from key countries of the global North, including Canada. This heavy dependence on tourism is a manifestation of an unequal economic relationship with Canada and other Northern nations, as well as the continuation of colonial economic patterns. As Jenny Burman points out, tourism is
one of Jamaica’s “top few foreign exchange earners . . . (along with bauxite and migrant remittances),” exemplifying contemporarily “the distinctive ways in which Canada as a former British settler colony, and Jamaica as a former plantation and slave colony with few settlers, were integrated into the global economy.”31 The economic power imbalance between Canada and Jamaica remains a largely unproblematised condition in Canadian media coverage of “homophobic Jamaica,” elided in framing Jamaica’s problem with its sexual citizenry.

Finally, the news article omits what the problem of “homophobic” dancehall music is actually about, although a quotation by anti-racist and queer scholar Rinaldo Walcott at the end of the article points us in this direction. Walcott is quoted as saying that the music “has become a way of defining Caribbean nationalism.” The particular dancehall music under discussion is, however, not situated in its historical context. It is worth considering that this type of overt or extreme heterosexist and misogynistic dancehall music is actually rather new, and came about as part as a wider reaction within Jamaican society to the increased global and local visibility of gays and lesbians in the late 1990s.32 Understood in this context, the dancehall artists in question have not been reacting to same-sex sexual activity or same-sex sexual object choice per se, though certainly this forms part of the context of these reactions, but to the increased public visibility of “out” gays and lesbians. This is particularly the case regarding gay Jamaican men, who are sometimes perceived to be in direct violation of masculinity and/or to be feminine, and are thus constructed as offensive or even threatening to black Jamaican postcolonial masculinity, and to the hetero-patriarchal neocolonial state.33 These reactions are therefore significantly linked to dominant masculinity and the association of male homosexual identity with feminization, for example in terms of a perceived failure to dominate women as mandated by traditional masculinity.34 That such concerns with homosexuality in dancehall music largely turn
on masculinity and the particular threat of male homosexuality is evidenced by “the paucity of dancehall songs that violently denounce lesbianism and the . . . surfeit of songs and lyrics that denounce male homosexuality.”\textsuperscript{35} This amplified heterosexist reaction, within both dancehall music and some segments of the wider Jamaican society, has also been advanced in the context of perceptions of homosexuality as an elite/outside/foreign/Northern influence, as something fundamentally un-Jamaican.\textsuperscript{36}

Such a contextual analysis is not meant to minimize or act as an apologist for heterosexist lyrics in popular music. Yet, the unproblematized assumption of “homophobic” music, let alone a homophobic culture, is inaccurate given that it ignores that these reactions advanced within dancehall music have been motivated as much by concerns about foreignness, publicity of gay and lesbian identity, and gender nonconformity within a heteropatriarchal and neocolonial context, as they have been by concerns about sexual orientation. These artists and their followers are also, as Donna Hope argues, reacting in the context of somewhat of a crisis of black masculinity brought on by the difficult economic circumstances in Jamaica induced by neoliberalism, and women’s advancements relative to some groups of men under contemporary social and economic conditions.\textsuperscript{37} The significant point here is that these types of questions, issues, and concerns are effaced by Canadian news media discourses that fixate on the “sound of hate,” a sound that registers as emanating from a generally homophobic nation.

Moving from media coverage of civil society to media coverage of political society, in “Commonwealth countries ignoring hatred, Baird says,” Laura Payton writes about Canada’s Foreign Affairs Minister, John Baird, as he turns to a promotion of gay rights and religious freedom internationally. Notably, this combination of gay rights and religious freedom is itself curious. It speaks to the need to appease the Conservative Party’s political base in Canada,
including electoral and financial constituencies, and thus balance homohegemony with socially conservative elements still influential in spite of being politically marginalized in Canadian society. The article recounts a “sweeping speech about human rights” delivered by Baird in London, England, in which the Conservative Minister hammered home the message that “Canada won’t stand by while its ‘Commonwealth cousins’ criminalize homosexuality and ignore other fundamental freedoms.” The following is a passage from the article that is worth quoting at length:

Speaking to an audience in London, England, Baird said Canada and the U.K. share values and won’t compromise on basic rights. “Dozens of Commonwealth countries currently have regressive and punitive laws on the books that criminalize homosexuality,” Baird said in his prepared text. Homosexuality is illegal in 41 of 54 Commonwealth member states. “We will continue to press countries in the Commonwealth to live up to their international obligations, and uphold the basic contract any government should have with its people. To inform, to educate, to be tolerant and accepting.” Baird said Canada will speak out on issues that matter to Canadians, including on how women are treated around the world, the persecution of gays, lesbians, bisexual or transgendered people, and targeted attacks on those practicing their faith. “We will not sit in our far-off homes and plead ignorance to crimes against those who seek the same freedoms we enjoy,” he said.

The article continues on to mention that in 2011, Baird “took on Nigeria” for its treatment of gays and lesbians, and that Baird represented Canada as “one of the countries pushing at a meeting of Commonwealth heads of government for member states to decriminalize homosexuality.” The article then paraphrases from Baird’s speech, noting that he has found that
diplomacy must sometimes be “balanced with tough talk in the course of frank discussions” on human rights. Finally, the article quotes Baird as saying that “darkness still lives” in the world, presumably referring to the denial of human rights by some of the countries mentioned in the speech.

This speech and its coverage represent an example of Canadian homohegemony and the other in its most stark and contradictory light. While the article does not refer specifically to Jamaica, Jamaica is a prominent Commonwealth country retaining buggery and gross indecency legislation. What is perhaps most interesting about the text is that even the Conservative government, a government initially reluctant to symbolically embrace full gay rights in Canada via same-sex marriage, has now joined in enthusiastically projecting Canadian homohegemony abroad by exposing other countries as “homophobic” and referentially producing Canada as gay inclusive. The government has perhaps concluded that the benefits of advancing the Canadian hegemonic project internationally in the current geopolitical climate outweigh the necessary price of homohegemony domestically. That social democratic (as represented by Stephen Lewis, discussed above) and conservative Canadian politicians alike are, a decade into the twenty-first century, invested in Canadian homohegemony in terms of both its domestic benevolent liberal inclusive elements and its international illiberal exclusionary elements speaks to its pervasiveness as a marker of national identity befitting the term “hegemonic.”

There is a highly self-congratulatory tone to the article in terms of Canada and the United Kingdom’s “shared values” and common dedication to promoting those values, whereas, in a display of neocolonial illiberalism, Southern Commonwealth countries are chastised on the particular issue of the criminalization of “homosexuality.” This is notable given the British imperial history of much of the anti-homosexual legislation in question, for example, in the
Jamaican and wider Anglophone Caribbean legal context. The article problematically reports that “homosexuality is illegal in 41 of 54 Commonwealth member states.” First of all, in the Jamaican context, it is men’s same-sex sexual activity, rather than homosexual identity, that is in fact illegal; same-sex sexual activity short of anal intercourse is criminalized specifically between men in the gross indecency legislation, and anal intercourse, effectively between men, is criminalized in the buggery legislation. This is the same form that the criminalization of same-sex sexual activity has historically taken in England, Canada, and other legal contexts influenced by British colonialism. Thus, perhaps more significant than the text’s conflation of the criminalization of men’s same-sex sexual activity with the criminalization of homosexuality is that the text fails to subsequently explain the identified statistic about Commonwealth countries by making a connection to British colonialism. That such a high percentage of Commonwealth member states have anti-homosexual legislation can largely be explained precisely by the British colonial origins of much of the legislation in question. It cannot be assumed that readers will simply make this connection, particularly since the statistic is cited alongside a celebratory mention of Canada and the United Kingdom. That such a significant connection is not even drawn out in the news article reflects the hegemony of homosexual inclusion in Canada. Canada’s shared British colonial history of the harsh legal regulation of homosexuality is herein eliminated, and homophobic other nations like Jamaica are rendered as backward and immature members of the Commonwealth family. The statement, furthermore, that “darkness still lives” in the world, betrays a longstanding colonial and racial construction of hinterlands that have yet to see the light of progress, serving as models of countries with “regressive” laws, according to Baird.

Finally, the “tough talk” that Baird sees as a requirement to bring wayward countries of
the global South into line with liberal human rights norms is suggestive of a neocolonial perspective invested in shaming countries regarding women’s rights, also mentioned in the passage cited above, and LGBTQ rights. The complications of the domestic context are omitted in the text, and the Conservative government is able to present itself as gay inclusive. This discourse suggests the common sense, or unquestioned, status of homosexual inclusion in Canada and the related compulsion to name and shame ostensibly uniform homophobic, Southern other nations.

Saying that people in contexts that are “far-off” from Canada need to be “tolerant and accepting” like those in Canada and the UK constructs a binary between metropole and satellite, or colony, wherein the metropole is constructed through a modern liberal benevolence and the colony is constructed as backward in its traditionalism, illiberalism, and intolerance. The text illustrates Canadian homohegemony and the other on many levels, but is especially valuable in its demonstration of the Conservative government. Simply put, the ruling party of the Canadian state for most of the homohegemonic period has been actively constructing and shaming other countries for their alleged “homophobia”; this is in spite of a very poor record regarding their own attempts to ensure rights for lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgender people and/or queer people domestically. This construction of Commonwealth nation-states makes sense given Canada’s influence as a Northern nation-state within the organization, and given that 41 out of an estimated 78 countries that criminalize same-sex sexual activity among consenting adults worldwide are members of the Commonwealth.40

Silences of the National “Self”

In “Simpson Miller daring to take Jamaica in a different direction,” readers learn about the election victory of Portia Simpson Miller as Prime Minister on December 29, 2011, and some implications of this victory.41 The article mentions former Jamaican Prime Minister Bruce
Golding’s public declaration that he would not appoint openly gay cabinet ministers. The article correctly reports that Simpson Miller spoke out against this position during the election campaign. She also vowed to bring Jamaica’s buggery legislation to a vote of conscience in Parliament, a development that has yet to take place as of the fall of 2014. The article accurately points out that Simpson Miller’s election therefore represented a major change in the official state discourse on homosexuality in Jamaica. Many pundits were surprised she won the election at all given these controversial statements against the status quo on this marker of Jamaican national identity, for some Jamaicans, in neocolonial times.

While the article is about Simpson Miller’s election in general and touches on many different policy areas, it is noteworthy that homosexuality is the central issue that provides the policy context of the text. This is clearly something that registers with a Canadian audience’s understanding of Jamaica. In fact, that Simpson Miller is Jamaica’s first elected woman Prime Minister is not even mentioned in the article. In electing a woman Prime Minister, Jamaica has accomplished something that Canada has yet to witness. Canada’s only woman in this position, Kim Campbell, assumed the office without a general election from June-November 1993, and failed to retain the office following the campaign of 1993. While Jamaica’s election of a woman Prime Minister would logically serve as an important element in a focus on Simpson Miller’s political career, attention to the breaking of traditional gender norms would presumably disrupt the effect of constructing Jamaica as socially conservative and backward, as gender equality rights, like gay rights, are understood as a feature of modernity.

Furthermore, on the issue of homosexuality, there is an implication in the article that not having openly gay cabinet ministers at the national level is something unique to Jamaica. In actual fact, Canada currently has no openly gay cabinet ministers federally. The fact that Jamaica
has now progressed to the point of potentially having openly gay cabinet ministers is emphasized, without putting this into perspective in terms of a comparison to Canada or other countries.

These types of omissions serve as a recurring theme in the construction of “homophobic Jamaica.” That the new Prime Minister of Jamaica “dares to take Jamaica in a different direction” on gay rights suggests to a Canadian audience a potential break with an entrenched traditionalism, and a “coming out” into modernity, even as features of the Jamaican context that would speak to its already modern status, such as having an elected woman Prime Minister, are left out of any explicit consideration. Seen in this context, a lack of gay rights is a significant frame through which Canadian media discourses relate to Jamaica in general, attesting to the function of Jamaica as homophobic other under homohegemony.

The Gaze of the Neocolonial Gays

The next article to be considered consists of a much more nuanced treatment of homosexuality in the Caribbean. In “Caribbean can be chilly when it comes to welcoming gays,” Julia Steineche explores the differences in the treatment of homosexuality among Caribbean islands, which includes some attention to their different histories, including the mention that “some say that homophobia is worse on the islands colonized by Victorian-era England.” Steineche notes some other complexities as well, including an acknowledgement of Jamaica’s “underground gay community.” She further frames her discussion in terms of both “bad news” and “good news” on gay and lesbian inclusion in the region.

However, the title, “Caribbean can be chilly when it comes to welcoming gays,” represents and feeds into the main neocolonial frame that Canadians use to view the Caribbean in general, and Jamaica in particular. It is notable that Jamaica provides the context for the article’s discussion of “bad news” on gay and lesbian issues in the Caribbean region. In the text, the
Caribbean is constructed as a tourist destination, and one that is, in general, “homophobic.” Where “good news” in terms of changes in the region is noted, even this is constructed with a degree of distance from Canada. For example, the author describes the Netherlands Antilles, which she casts as relatively gay friendly for the region, as requiring discretion in openly expressing one’s sexual orientation. The author states that this discretion “was hard for me, as a Canadian, to understand.” After exploring important advancements in LGBTQ rights in Cuba, the article concludes with the statement: “Change is coming, sometimes where we least expect it.” The fact that these changes are “unexpected” to a Canadian imaginary belies the common sense construction of the Caribbean as homophobic, with Jamaica acting as the main representative in this text.

Returning to the key issue of tourism, the central point in this connection is that the text suggests that the concern about gay and lesbian rights in the region is prompted by the desire of gay and lesbian Canadians to travel to the Caribbean in what could be described as a neocolonial economy of desire. This discursive construction around tourism and gay rights is significant to homohegemony. It has been well established in the literature that the exoticism of tourist cartographies tends to be interwoven with constructions of sexual exoticism, both of which are racialized and gendered. Thus, these two types of discourses, touristic and sexualized, are closely related. This particular text clearly exemplifies how the concern with gay and lesbian issues has shifted from Canadian internal to Jamaican external under conditions of homohegemony, so much so that the newly incorporated and imagined Canadian sexual citizen is expected to be able to travel freely in transnational circuits. Whereas colonies used to be critiqued for not conforming to a regulatory heteronormativity, neocolonies like Jamaica are today critiqued for not being gay friendly enough. Moreover, gays and lesbians themselves are
now part of the historical colonial gaze. Reporting on the travels and travails of the Canadian homosexual citizen is a very effective way of making a direct contrast between Canada and countries like Jamaica on an issue of interest to many Canadians. Moreover, the rights of the gay Canadian tourist have now been inscribed discursively as the citizenship “right” of Canadians to vacation in the Caribbean, a right of voyage with a historic legacy deeply ingrained in imperial relations. That gayness is now a part of this relation suggests that an economic hegemony of Canada vis-à-vis Jamaica is significantly joined by homohegemony.

**Canada at the Centre of Global Pride**

In another article, “Pride Toronto extends its reach,” Paul Gallant opens with a celebratory mention of Canada as one of the most gay-friendly countries in the world and Toronto as one of the most diverse global cities.45 These bold assertions are then followed by the assertion that Canadian queers now see it as their responsibility to help LGBTQ people in less gay-friendly countries. Gallant writes about the city’s annual gay pride parade, Pride Toronto, and its plan to focus on one country each year in which discrimination against LGBTQ people has recently taken place, with the objective of yielding “maximum emotional and political impact.” Gallant explains that in 2008 Jamaica was chosen for this purpose. The article relates that Gareth Henry, already introduced by this chapter in the course of analyzing a different news article that mentions him, was selected as the International Grand Marshall that year. Thus, it can be observed here that the construction of “Canada [being] at the centre of global pride” is connected to the construction of homophobic other nations in general, and Jamaica in particular. Notably, it is mentioned that the 2008 Pride Toronto selection of Henry and Jamaica “seems particularly suited to making waves.”

Admittedly, there are some important nuances in this article. For example, Pride Toronto Executive Director Fatima Amarshi is quoted as saying, “Jamaica isn’t a place that should be
demonized” in spite of a “culture there that can be hateful.” As well, in connection with the text’s discussion of the notion of a Canadian tourism boycott of Jamaica based on its treatment of queers, the text mentions that not everyone agrees with such a measure, notably including J-FLAG. In spite of these nuances, Toronto is cast as a sort of global gay capital, and Toronto Pride is characterized as a kind of secular mecca of an international gay rights movement, seen specifically through the prism of “standing up” to a sometimes “hateful culture” in Jamaica, from the “privileged position” of queers in Toronto/Canada. The politics of naming homophobic others, in this case Jamaica, and rescuing third world queers are therefore repeated as overarching themes in the article.

Particularly interesting is the closing line of the text, in which we learn that Toronto Pride will now be streamed online for an international audience. This online streaming is intended to get “Henry’s message - and the message of Pride itself - out to the world.” This will ensure that, according to Amarshi, “Even if you’re in a remote place in another part of the world, you have the opportunity to see this Pride and participate in it, and you’ll see faces like yours and make the connection.” This quotation reveals that, Toronto being a representative city for Canadian homohegemony, Toronto Pride has taken up responsibility for global gay public relations in order to reach people who have not yet heard “the message of Pride itself.” This is another example of a rescue narrative cast within the unexamined context of contemporary neocolonial relations. It is noteworthy that the message-carrying modality, which could be compared to evangelism, is similar to that of a religion, consistent with the notion of “converts” referred to above. This is a constructed discourse that serves as a means of legitimizing homohegemony by casting it internationally, just as religion has provided much of the ideological cover for heteronormative colonization historically. The discourse assumes people need to be rescued, but
it also assumes a commonality of interests and identities among LGBTQ people. This produces the “South,” again expressly represented by Jamaica in this article, as other in its treatment of LGBTQ people, and at the same time precludes the possibility of the existence of same-sex identities and practices outside of a public gay and lesbian identity frame consistent with a modern Western experience of homosexuality. Such an ascribed essentialism or universalism is reminiscent of second-wave feminism’s historically hegemonic tendency, not without serious objections and countervailing approaches, to assume a global “sisterhood” of women with uniform interests and identities.

A more practical question regarding the online streaming of Toronto Pride is perhaps in regard to its effectiveness, namely whether it will even be noticed in the global South. Will queers from countries in the global South, like Jamaica, log on and tune in? If they do, will they see “faces like theirs” whose global class interests and particular racialized identities they share? Such efforts could as readily solidify Canadian homohegemony as a sturdy ideological edifice as destabilize alleged “homophobia” in Jamaica and other countries.

**Homohegemony, the Military, and the Other**

A final article under consideration concerns the textual collision of the Canadian military, homosexuality, and Jamaica. In “Military joins Pride parade,” Emma Reilly writes about the first official participation of personnel from the Canadian Armed Forces in the Toronto Pride Parade in the summer of 2008. This was the same year as the selection of Henry, formerly of Jamaica, as international Grand Marshal, a fact that provides the context for the conclusion of the article. After mentioning the official participation, for the first time, of members of the Canadian Armed Forces in the Parade, the text moves on to highlight a number of political leaders from different political parties who were also in attendance. Brief attention is then given in the article to the history of struggle of gays and lesbians in the military, with Pride Toronto’s Executive Director
Fatima Amarshi (who makes a return appearance in this article) summarizing: “So for the military to turn around and recognize its soldiers, the diversity within its ranks and the need to have a presence at Pride means a tremendous amount.” Mention is also made of the fact that the Hamilton Pride Parade controversially banned members of the military from participation earlier that same month, causing a major reaction among some members of the gay community who argued that the military has substantially changed since its discriminatory policies in the early 1990s. Some of the more political messages of the Toronto Parade are then noted in the article, which also points out that the women-centred “Dyke March” is a more “grassroots” and radical parade that occurs alongside the larger event. As mentioned, the article ends on Henry, with a specific focus placed on his decision to leave Jamaica because of “homophobic” violence.

The discursive pairing of members of the Canadian military marching in the Toronto Pride Parade and Jamaica’s uniquely identified “homophobia” is perhaps the consummate example of Canadian homohegemony. This moment indicates how homohegemony simultaneously corresponds to highly visible moments of hegemonic benevolent liberalism in Canadian institutions and social spaces, and the illiberal construction of Jamaica as homophobic other. The internal and external developments in this text are part of the same homohegemonic conjuncture. Along with the police, the military is the classic expression of a nation-state’s coercive authority. Furthermore, who is included in the military carries substantial symbolic and ideological weight in many nations.\(^{49}\) That the military is now marching in Pride speaks to a fundamental transformation in the dominant Canadian understanding of the relationship of homosexuality to national identity and the state. It also reflects a fundamental transformation in the LGBTQ community’s overall orientation toward and identification with the state and military, which have historically, and decisively, excluded them.\(^{50}\) These centres of power,
symbols of security, and conveyors of national community have been among the most resistant to change as homohegemony has gradually and unevenly ascended.\textsuperscript{51} The military’s marching in Pride and the overall celebratory reporting in texts such as this article in this regard together represent a normalization of homosexual citizenship in the Canadian national imaginary in a way that would have been almost unthinkable even twenty years ago. The militarization of Pride and the homosexualization of the military reflect a massive change in common sense and LGBTQ conceptions of sexual citizenship in Canada.

The reporting of the military marching in the Toronto Pride event is overwhelmingly celebratory. This is exemplified by the Pride Toronto’s Executive Director’s mention that there were no “substantial” negative reactions to the military’s presence, and by the description of international Canadian Armed Forces’ violations of human rights as only “alleged.”\textsuperscript{52} However, mention of the more radical Hamilton Pride Parade indicates the gradual and uneven nature of homohegemony, and to the credit of this report since not all reporting acknowledges the complex material realities of homohegemonic ideology. Counter-hegemonic ideologies that resist LGBTQ alignment with the Canadian state, particularly the military, continue to circulate and coexist with homohegemony, much as minority socially conservative elements persist. In the same vein, the mention of the much more politicized Dyke March demonstrates that while hegemonic, “mailestream” LGBTQ culture has become more comfortable with the state and sexual normativity, counter-hegemonic LGBTQ spaces continue to queer the Canadian state and larger society. They remain politicized in a radical fashion. For example, the contrast between the report of military personnel marching in the main event of the Pride Parade on the one hand, and women protesting the government by fighting a \textit{papier maché} version of Prime Minister Stephen Harper in the context of the “smaller” Dyke March on the other, is illustrative of normative
sexual citizenship under homohegemony versus less statist versions of queer counter-hegemony.

The examples discussed indicate that there are those who, though they may be supportive of important liberal developments within the institutions of the military, reject the unquestioned militarization of Pride. The examples also indicate that there are queers who question the ruling party of the Canadian state, which has overseen the entrenchment of homohegemony during most of the post-same-sex marriage period. Thus, while the article is significant in highlighting and constructing some of the hegemonic trends in terms of an ideology about the nation-state’s relation to homosexuals and homosexuals’ relation to the nation-state, it also points to counter-hegemony: the fact that there are those within the LGBTQ community who resist the terms and conditions of the particular vision of inclusion currently on offer, and who call attention to the illiberal features of homohegemony both domestically and internationally.

In spite of some of these complications vis-à-vis the contradictory domestic context accounted for in the article, there is no such nuance in terms of the coverage of Jamaica. As part of the text’s treatment of the more “political” side of Pride, it closes with a discussion of Jamaica. This is in effect a recognition that the political focus of Pride has importantly, if incompletely, shifted from a domestic to an international context. Jamaica is identified in the article owing to the fact that Gareth Henry was chosen as International Grand Marshall of the Pride Parade that particular year. Unlike with the military controversy or the more radical Dyke March, however, no diversity of opinion is sought out or provided to the reader on the issue of homosexuality in Jamaica. Instead, the testimony of Henry provides the context for the article’s conclusion and is presented as typical: “Canada mirrors the experience that I want to see in Jamaica.” It is important to note here that this is a similar statement to one quoted in a separate article, written by another author and appearing in a different newspaper, that was discussed in
Chapter One. It is as if to suggest that while there may be minor disagreements on how far Canada has come on gay rights, Jamaica is of course in a very different situation and has a uniquely threatening problem when it comes to this issue.

What is clear is that the same hegemonic ideology of homosexual inclusion that characterizes a situation in which the military joins in Pride is connected to the gaze outward toward Jamaica. This article and the Pride event itself both show that domestic ingredients of benevolent liberal inclusion of gays and lesbians, like the military marching in Pride, that fuel Canadian homohegemony from the inside are joined by processes of illiberal othering that gradually come to bolster the new national sexual ideology from the outside. Jamaica functions as homophobic other in this context. Homohegemony and the other, as a reflection of homohegemony’s constitutive benevolent liberal/illiberal moments more generally, are clearly linked in these texts.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has demonstrated that homohegemony as an analytical concept has something to say about Canadian civil and political societal discourses on homosexuality in Jamaica. The notion of homohegemony’s advance, away from an illiberal internal national focus on homosexuals as others and towards a benevolent liberal internal national focus, along with a novel illiberal external focus on homophobic other nations, makes sense of the types of discourses about Jamaica’s alleged homophobia contained in these news media texts. These texts both construct and express homohegemony as an ideology in Canadian civil society, an ideology that contains a constructed image of Jamaica.

The key objective of this chapter has been to show that when Canadian civil and political societies “talk” about Jamaica and gay and lesbian issues, their language, far from being neutral or objective, is invested and inflected with homohegemony. While based on a review of relevant
news media, this analysis is not meant to suggest that gay Jamaican-Canadians do not negotiate the news media strategically, selectively, and with a high degree of knowledge and consideration of the various trade-offs involved in bringing visibility to issues of queerness in Jamaica. Neither is this analysis meant to suggest that individual journalists do not sometimes do the same in an effort to simply get the story and issues into print. The ideological operation and caricature this chapter has identified accrues neither to the malicious intent nor to the inadequacy of the authors of the texts under consideration, but to the news media’s important position in the production and reproduction of a common sense, homohegemonic ideology in the context of the contemporary Canadian ruling relations surrounding sexuality.

Significantly, the discourses in these texts were shown to lack attention to the agency of queers and queer social movements in Jamaica, preferring to rely on selective testimony from individual informants that conforms to the dominant expected narrative. The discourses were seen to congratulate Canada for its inclusive sexual and multicultural citizenship, or to assume such a state of liberal benevolence toward sexual and cultural minorities. These articles project the impression that Canada no longer suffers from heterosexism, if it ever did, and yet it is well known if actively forgotten that manifestations of heterosexism, often of a violent nature, continue. For example, 224 police-reported hate crimes in Canada in 2010 were motivated by sexual orientation, with 65 percent of those being considered “violent.” This statistic does not take into account the epidemic of gay bullying and gay teen suicide, which have prompted such noble if structurally insufficient interventions as the “It Gets Better” campaign. While the differences in violent manifestations of heterosexism between Canada and Jamaica should not be minimized, it is clear that there is embedded in these texts the concept that gay and lesbian rights can be understood in dualistic or binary terms rather than along the lines of a continuum. The
overall effect of these news media texts is that Jamaica is written about as a curious, tragic and/or horrible outlier, as if heterosexism does not also persist in Canada. Jamaican queers are herein produced as largely passive victims in need of rescue by a gay-inclusive, modern nation capable of such neocolonial interventions, centred in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). The contemporary neocolonialism of the discourses is further demonstrated by noting how gay and lesbian issues in Jamaica are marshalled and molded into imperial/colonial binaries, including the traditional/modern dualism. Collectively, the texts can be seen as informing the homophobic Jamaica/homo-friendly Canada binary that underpins Canadian homohegemony in this context. The discourses have further been shown in this chapter to include racialized implications, in spite of a stated and celebrated ideology of multiculturalism. The notion of homohegemony can therefore be discursively documented in Canadian news media discourses about “homophobic Jamaica,” and offered as an explanation for many of the specific features of the discourses under consideration.

The concept of Canadian homohegemony is therefore distinguishable in the context of a constructed image of Jamaica as a homophonic other. Next, in Chapter Three, this dissertation turns to consider how the theoretical framework associated with homohegemony contributes in the context of relevant scholarly literature.

Notes

6. Representationally, the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) is the most politically represented urban region in Canada, constituting a significant portion of Ontario’s federal electoral districts, and independently sending more Members of Parliament (MPs) to the federal House of Commons than each of Canada’s other provinces, with the exception of Québec. See Parliament of Canada, “Federal Electoral Constituencies by Province,” October 15, 2008, http://www.parl.gc.ca/ParlInfo/Compilations/ElectionsAndRidings/ConstituencyProvince.aspx?Language=E. This powerhouse political status of the GTA in Canada is only set to increase under federal redistricting. See The Canadian Press, “Redrawn federal ridings could mean big Conservative gains,” The Toronto Star, January 31, 2014, http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2014/01/31/redrawn_federal_ridings_could_mean_big_conservative_gains.html; Raveena Aulakh and Laura Kane, “Growing population means 11 new ridings in the GTA,” The Toronto Star, August 27, 2012, http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2012/08/27/growing_population_means_11_new_ridings_in_the_gta.html. Moreover, the symbolic cultural weight of Toronto in English Canadian nationalism is somewhat akin to the status of New York City in American popular mythology. Perhaps more to the point, we know from the study of LGBTQ politics specifically that particular cities and their experiences (New York and San Francisco; Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal) often set the tone for national, and popular understandings of, LGBTQ issues. In other words, the role of large cities is particularly pronounced in national ideologies surrounding queerness because of the history of gay and lesbian community and identity formation, as well as organizing, taking place in large urban centres. This was initially as a result of changes in capitalist social relations related to wage labour and urbanization that allowed for the formation of urban homosexual subcultures among men, and later was a result of gay and lesbian internal migration to the cities once “gay ghettos” or “villages” became established. See Jasbir Puar, Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007), 27; Kinsman, The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada, 43, 51, 97–98, 144–47, 182–83.
8. Rayside, Queer Inclusions, Continental Divisions, 107.
13. Male homosexuality tends to meet a more violent reaction than lesbianism, according to many of the interview participants. This will be discussed in Chapter Five. Yet, this is not to suggest that lesbians have it easy. Rather, the preoccupation with male homosexuality in many contexts, including Canada, is often a sign of either lesbian invisibility or the eroticization or assimilation of lesbian relationships in a hetero-patriarchal context, a state/societal context in which male homosexuality is often perceived as a greater or more direct threat to dominant forms of masculinity that undergird the regime.
14. These laws will be discussed in the Canadian and Jamaican contexts, in Chapters Four and Five respectively.
17. Ibid.
29. Mr. Lees (LGBTQ activist with J-FLAG), recorded Skype interview and transcription by author, May 2013.
31. Ibid.
33. Ibid., 79–84. This analysis derives from a number of interviews, and will be returned to with respect to particular participants and their reflections in Chapter Five. As well, see LaFont, “Very Straight Sex”; Donna Hope, Man Vibes: Masculinities in the Jamaican Dancehall (Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randall Publishers, 2010); Lawson Williams, “On Homophobia and Gay Rights Activism in Jamaica,” in Our Caribbean: A Gathering of Lesbian and Gay Writing from the Antilles, ed. Thomas Glave (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2008): 382–88. These scholarly contributions are discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.
34. Of course, constructions of male homosexuals as improperly or insufficiently masculine (and lesbians as improperly or insufficiently feminine) have been and continue to be historically significant in a number of contexts, including in Canada.
35. Hope, Inna di Dancehall, 83.
36. This is returned to and fleshed out in greater detail in Chapters Three and Five. Although focused on a different context (the Muslim and Arab world), see Joseph Massad, “Re-orienting Desire: The Gay International and the Arab World,” in Desiring Arabs (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007): 160–90. The dissertation will return to demonstrating this point in the Jamaican context in Chapter Five.
37. Hope, Inna di Dancehall, 84–85.
39. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five, on the queer Jamaican domestic context.


47. Mohanty, Feminism Without Borders, 7.


52. The objective here is not to impugn individual members of Canada’s Armed Forces, who are diverse in terms of their backgrounds and come to the service of their political community with diverse perspectives on the military and the role of the military in society and internationally. I am pointing to systemic lapses that occur in the context of any military and its involvement in overseas missions. Rather than the existence or nonexistence of human rights abuses, which are nonetheless important questions, I am signalling the ways in which human rights abuses and gay and lesbian rights are being represented by the article.


54. It Gets Better Canada, Home page, https://www.facebook.com/pages/It-Gets-Better-Canada/158465104191229. “It Gets Better” is a video campaign showcasing prominent and everyday LGBTQ people for whom life has gotten better as they have gotten older. The campaign has been a response to the epidemic of the bullying and suicide of LGBTQ teens in high schools in both Canada and the US, and is meant to provide inspiration to struggling youth that the bullying and hardship based on their sexual orientation or gender identity will eventually abate, allowing them to fulfill their dreams in a similar fashion to the people in the videos. Non-LGBTQ people sometimes also appear in the videos. Criticism of the campaign is that it does not deal with the structural issues of heterosexism in schools. For more on continuing heterosexism in the Canadian school system, see David Rayside, “Chapter 19: Canadian School Lethargy,” in Queerly Canadian: 293–310.
Chapter Three. Critical Literature Review and the Need for Homohegemony

This chapter engages in a critical literature review of selected relevant scholarly literature spanning the fields of political studies, gender studies, cultural studies, sociology, postcolonial studies, the politics of race and ethnicity, and queer studies. This literature has informed the development of the concept of homohegemony. The scholarship discussed in this chapter also contains certain limitations, which, it is suggested, can be addressed in part through the provision of the analytical frame of homohegemony.

This critical review will begin broadly with theories of sexual regulation, and will progressively narrow to a focus on literature dealing with homosexual inclusion in Jamaica and Canada. Overall, the literature review will consider the regulation of (homo)sexuality; sexual citizenship; sexual othering and biopolitics; the transnational negotiation of citizenship; queerness in the Caribbean and homosexuality in Jamaica; and lesbian and gay rights and regulation in Canada. The chapter will critically engage with each scholarly contribution, highlighting both strengths and limitations in relation to the theoretical approach associated with homohegemony. The concept and theoretical scaffolding of homohegemony are by no means the solution for all of these issues, but the analytical frame has particular advantages in terms of dealing with the challenges and implications of gay and lesbian inclusion in Canada and Jamaica, and the relationship between the two contexts.

The Regulation of (Homo)sexuality

Michel Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction* revolutionized scholarly understandings of sexuality and its regulation in the modern era.¹ Foucault has inspired the dominant currents within the regulation of sexuality and queer theory literatures, and is also commonly taken up by those exploring issues of race and racism. Foucault outlines the particular
historical trajectory of sexuality in the modern West, with his main objective being to call into question the “repressive hypothesis,” which was the conventional Freudian wisdom that maintained that people in the modern era are sexually repressed. Foucault raises a number of doubts about this notion of sexual repression, and seeks to put the repressive hypothesis itself “back within a general economy of discourses on sex in modern societies since the seventeenth century.” With this as his point of departure, the task for Foucault then becomes a matter of “[defining] the regime of power-knowledge-pleasure that sustains the discourse on human sexuality in our part of the world.”

According to Foucault, sexuality has not so much been repressed in the modern era as it has been regulated. The increasing regulation of desire and the “[putting] into discourse” of sex have served to invent totally new sexualities, heterosexuality and homosexuality being chief among them. Rather than the erasure of sex and sexuality, the modern era has witnessed the regulation and manipulation of desire more than ever before in the service of a particular regime of power known as “bio-power”; this is a power that helps to shore up the state via the policing of a “population,” and sex and sexuality have been significant in this process. Sexuality, its regulation by the state, and national populations are therefore all intimately linked under this formulation.

Foucault describes how, in the eighteenth century, a concern with regulating desire in the religious realm migrated into the realm of the secular or rational. States began to police sexuality as a means of securing “bio-power.” This discourse of sexual regulation penetrated pedagogical institutions, among many other institutions, and continued to enlarge and take shape into the nineteenth century. Psychoanalysis can be seen as an example of the growing scientific nature of the discourse of sexuality. This historical trajectory refers to a process wherein “a
multiplication of discourse” on sexuality was linked to an “intensification of the interventions of power.”11 The bottom line, then, is that modernity is actually associated with more talk and more silences about sex as an intervention of power, rather than the less talk that we might associate with the conventional wisdom of repression. The multiple discourses on sex operating in multiple institutions are, however, part of one dominant regime of knowledge and regulation. This does not mean that sexually “repressive” laws ceased to exist. On the contrary, new laws harshly governing sexuality emerged in the latter half of the nineteenth century.12 However, laws governing sexuality were increasingly reflective of the importance of sexuality as an intervention of power, and increasingly embedded within a wider regime of elaborating and regulating sexuality in all of its infinite detail and presumed perversity.

Significant to the present discussion, Foucault’s history of sexuality does not close the door on an underlying economic logic to said history. It does insist, however, that a purely economic logic cannot account for the discursive explosion and creation of new sexual types, and new types of sexual regulation, in modern times.13 Insofar as the regulation of same-sex desire in particular is concerned, according to Foucault, from a pre-modern discourse on proper sexuality that was concerned with sexual acts and of a mainly juridical nature, including within religious law,14 the modern era turned sexuality into an identity. Much like the Christian confession turned the one who sins into a sinner, nineteenth century discourses on sexuality would regulate sexual desire by inventing identity-based perversions. In terms of homosexuality and heterosexuality, this would represent a major change. For the first time, people were to be conceived of sexually in terms of either having a same-sex or opposite-sex sexual object choice.15 This was in fact a gradual process in which the monogamous heterosexual couple came to be the “norm,” and same-sex desiring individuals came to be defined as a deviant type of
The process culminated in the latter nineteenth century, aided by a new science of sexuality. Therefore, the notion of opposite-sex desiring subjects and same-sex desiring subjects, as opposed to subjects who engaged in proper (reproductive) sexuality and subjects who engaged in or had a predilection for sodomy, was a novel historical invention. Foucault sums up the invention of a range of sexual identity perversions in the following dramatic fashion: “It was time for all these figures, scarcely noticed in the past, to step forward and speak, to make the difficult confession of what they were.” Concerning homosexuality, Foucault states:

As defined by the ancient civil or canonical codes, sodomy was a category of forbidden acts; their perpetrator was nothing more than the juridical subject of them. The nineteenth century homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form, and a morphology, with an indiscreet anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology. Nothing that went into his total composition was unaffected by his sexuality.

There was clearly a fundamental change in the regulation of same-sex desire in the nineteenth century, in which the regulation of the act (sodomy) decisively gave way to the regulation of the identity (homosexual). This simultaneously invented the notion of heterosexuality, one might say, in place of a previously unstated and undefined effective heteronormativity. This process, Foucault illustrates, involved a discursive shift away from juridical discourses aimed at prohibition, to discourses about human bodies in a population aimed at complex gradations of power. Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction* also gestures towards the importance of race as it relates to sexuality, a subject addressed more directly in his lectures.

In *Sex, Power and Pleasure*, Mariana Valverde provides readers with what could be read
as an important extension and corrective to Foucault’s historical genealogy of sexuality in the modern West, though her discussion also draws on psychoanalysis. Further, Valverde advances a critique of some of the assumptions, silences, and practices of the women’s movement in and around sex and sexuality. In relating Valverde to Foucault, her contribution can be interpreted as a reminder that the regulation of sexuality or desire is always intimately connected to the regulation of gender, and that heterosexism has historically impacted gay men differently than lesbians. Valverde’s discussion of the history of lesbianism in the West draws our attention to the fact that homosexual men and women have had overlapping yet different histories organized by gender and gender oppression, with “compulsory heterosexuality” representing a major component of women’s modern oppression in general and lesbian oppression in particular. Speaking to the particular history of lesbianism, Valverde characterizes it as a “country that has no language,” in which lesbians have had to largely “invent” their realities from scratch in the face of a “dearth of images of lesbianism” in the “general culture.” She thus notes the relative invisibility of lesbianism compared to men’s homosexuality, a phenomenon that extends into contemporary times. She chronicles the rise of lesbianism as a sexological subcategory of homosexuality in the late nineteenth century, as well as the social conditions at the turn of the century that gave rise to lesbian and other gender nonconforming subcultures among women. Lesbianism is, therefore, in a sense added to Foucault’s popularized history of sexuality and singled out for independent analysis by Valverde. In addition to her historical discussion of lesbianism, Valverde explores bisexuality, women’s sexual liberation, pornography, eroticism, and many other issues of sexuality, sexual politics, and sexual freedom that she argues mainstream feminism still finds contentious. This dissertation reads Valverde’s work as an important injunction to consider gender and sexuality together, not just abstractly, but in terms of
attending to the experiential realities of lesbian, bisexual, and other queer women, as these overlap with the material conditions of queer men under homohegemony and its construction of Jamaica.

In *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia*, Dan Healey explores the regulation of same-sex desire in Russia before the October 1917 revolution, as well as in its Soviet aftermath, through to Stalinist Russia and beyond. Healey looks specifically at the regulation of homosexual desire. Like Foucault and Valverde, he observes this regulation from a variety of angles, including legislative, religious, psychiatric, and popular cultural aspects. Unlike Foucault or Valverde, Healey is focused on the regulation of homosexual desire in a single political context over time. Valverde’s contribution is often contextualized in the Canadian setting, but not in the form of a formal country case study. A central focus of Healey’s contribution concerns the Soviet regime’s 1922 decision to dispense with the previous Tsarist government’s anti-sodomy legislation targeting consenting adults. Healey indicates that it was then that Soviet Russia became the first major power since revolutionary France to decriminalize consensual sodomy, at a time when the crime of buggery could still bring a sentence of life imprisonment in England, when consensual anal sex between two persons and other forms of consensual sexual intimacy between two male persons would still be illegal in Canada for another forty-seven years via buggery/sodomy and gross indecency legislation, and when laws against same-sex sexual activity would still be in effect in some US jurisdictions for eighty-one more years. Notably, hard and fast age of consent laws were also eliminated in Russia at this time, with consent to any sexual activity, whether heterosexual or homosexual, becoming dependent on medical opinions of “sexual maturity.” This is significant considering that age of consent laws are still unequal for vaginal versus anal sexual intercourse in some Canadian jurisdictions, as
explained in Chapter One, and returned to later in this chapter. Healey shows how the change in
the regulation of homosexuality ushered in by the 1922 Russian criminal code was a product of
multiple historical discourses, emanating from various spheres of state and societal regulation.

To this end, he explains how the 1922 code borrowed heavily from the liberal legal
discourses of homosexual emancipation focused on the right to privacy, discourses common
throughout Europe at the time. It also drew extensively from the modern medicalization of
sexuality that catered to Soviet concerns about bourgeois morality and a dedication to sexual and
gender liberation, and simultaneously contained traces of the particular Russian Marxist
asceticism, characteristic of the Stalin era, that would eventually reverse these pioneering
reforms. Healey traces the history of the Russian/Soviet regulation of same-sex desire as being
complex and contradictory, uneven (for example, between East and West, town and country),
unstable, racialized to an extent, and heavily gendered.

In terms of identity formation, Healey attends to the construction and agency of the
homosexual subject as well. He does this, for example, by exploring a historical Russian
bathhouse culture among men, documenting the emergence of a homosexual urban subculture,
and documenting the experiences and life histories of lesbian women, some of whom managed to
be perceived as good comrades in spite of their somewhat public sexual identity in newly Soviet
Russia. Healey’s work is thus a good model of a focused and detailed historical reconstruction of
the regulation of same-sex desire in a particular national context.

One limitation of the scholarly contributions to the regulation of homosexuality literature
considered thus far is that they are unable to offer insights into relatively inclusive queer
citizenship, as described by homohegemony. Another limitation is that these contributions fail to
self-consciously appreciate state ideology. A focus on ideology problematizes regulation in that
it considers regulation as more than a question of fact in terms of its existence or nonexistence, and connects it to the broader context of strategies of rule and nation-state formation in the capitalist nation-state. Furthermore, a focus on ideology allows one to view the disparate apparatuses of regulation dealt with by Foucault, Valverde, and Healey as part of a single state superstructure consented to in civil society and backed by juridical government.

The work of M. Jacqui Alexander can, therefore, be read as a materialist and ideological corrective to the regulation of (homo)sexuality literature considered so far. In “Erotic Autonomy as a Politics of Decolonization: An Anatomy of Feminist and State Practice in the Bahamas Tourist Economy,” Alexander makes the case that women’s sexual agency has “always been troublesome for the [capitalist] state.” This is because the capitalist state traditionally depends on the heterosexual nuclear family to carry out domestic functions that are critical to society and the nation. With reference to what she characterizes as a neocolonial Bahamas, Alexander argues that the erotic autonomy of the lesbian and the prostitute constitute a particular threat to “black hetero-patriarchy” in the contemporary unstable conjuncture of gender, sexuality, and the state. The neocolonial state has, therefore, followed and built on a legacy of “white imperial heteropatriarchy” by taking up regulating lesbians and prostitutes through specific new legislation. This has been met with legislation aimed at entrenching heteropatriarchal inheritance law within the ambit of legislation ostensibly addressing domestic violence, representing a degree of co-optation and reorientation of the demands of the Bahamian women’s movement. Alexander’s analysis takes place, furthermore, within the material context of the problematic neocolonial tourist economy. Drawing on Lynda Hart’s notion of “heteropatriarchy,” Alexander’s chapter begins with the important assertion that although much has been done within feminism to uncover the patriarchal nature of the modern state, much less has been done
Specifically related to this dissertation, Alexander explores the 1991 enactment of legislation in the Bahamas that criminalized lesbian sex. She asks why it was necessary for the neocolonial state to re-enact the heteropatriarchy inherited from colonialism. Her main argument is that this heteropatriarchal recolonization allowed the neocolonial state to protect a colonial inheritance of inbuilt social hierarchy during a time of instability, and enabled “the political and economic processes of recolonization” within a wider global neoliberal economic context. Overall, Alexander deals with issues of ideology and the ways in which the regulation of homosexuality and gender are more broadly connected to the capitalist state. Her work can also be read as a clarion call to theorize “the imbrication of the imperial and the national, of the colonial within the postmodern.”

Alexander’s work contains important lessons for examining heteropatriarchal ruling relations in another neocolonial Anglophone Caribbean context: Jamaica. Yet, her context-bound analysis is, like the other contributions considered in this section, theoretically unable to anticipate a move away from the heterosexist state to a different moment of much more inclusive, though contradictory, sexual citizenship. Such a moment is, as homohegemony exemplifies, also consistent with the capitalist state. Moreover, Alexander’s argument leaves out an examination of how the promotion of gay rights by Northern nation-states may partly explain the more explicit heterosexism of neocolonial Caribbean nation-states in the 1990s, as a form of reactionary nationalism, though she gestures in this direction when she writes about problematic “prevalent metropolitan impulses” regarding a perceived lack of gay visibility in the Caribbean, and later contextualizes Bahamian heteropatriarchy in perceptions of “Western influence” concerning homosexuality and its acceptance.
The contributions engaged with in this section bring attention to important issues of sexual and gender regulation, insights that can be applied to the histories of many modern nation-states. Alexander’s contribution offers a materialist and ideological interpretation of heteropatriarchal state regulation that is applicable to the Jamaican context. Yet, what happens when the queer subject of sexuality’s historical regulation is brought into the fold of normative sexual citizenship, as under conditions of homohegemony in Canada?

**Sexual Citizenship**

Sexual citizenship was discussed in Chapter One, where it was indicated that a lacuna in the existing literature concerns the need to account for the contradictory aspects of sexual citizenship as an ideology and a material reality. Attending to such contradictions requires an expansive understanding of the nation-state, as it is comprised of both political and civil societal spaces. Such an expansive and contradictory field of citizenship and nation means that sexual citizenship is not merely conferred by the state, but also actively contested, claimed, negotiated, and consented to in civil society. The objective of this section is to query, or queer, Carl Stychin’s optimistic account of the transformative potential of gay and lesbian rights to expand and trouble sexual citizenship, and to reimagine the Canadian nation.

Lesbians and gays have historically been excluded from sexual citizenship in a variety of nation-states, in no small part due to the criminalization of their sexual practices and/or identities, the denial of basic anti-discrimination protections, as well as through a lack of recognition of their relationships. These factors have resulted in a lack of legal equality and have contributed to the imagination of many modern nations in heterosexist terms. Stychin helpfully shows how this is changing in some contexts, including in Canada. In the case of Canada, he refers to the emergence of a “postmodern national identity,” an example of which is the inclusion of sexual orientation as a constitutionally prohibited ground of discrimination.\(^{50}\) He writes that
“as an amalgam of identities, it [sexual orientation] presents a study in the transgressive power of ‘new’ identities to shift the frontiers and borders of citizenship and nationalism.”

He goes on to condense his basic argument as follows:

If the Western nation has been defined and maintained by the creation of a devalued other placed outside the boundaries of the state, then one such expulsion . . . traditionally has been the “homosexual.” Once sexual orientation is accepted as an illegitimate basis of discrimination and recognized as a legal, political, and cultural identity worthy of protection, then the definition of citizenship (and correspondingly the composition of the nation) broadens and deepens along sexual lines.

This is a welcome contribution that is attentive to the important institutional changes in the Canadian juridical context, as well as to resultant changes in understandings of sexual citizenship and indeed the national imaginary. In fact, homohegemony is expressly theorized as an ideology of relative gay and lesbian inclusion in the national imaginary, corresponding to the extension of selective citizenship rights to the gay and lesbian minority in a benevolent liberal fashion. However, Stychin’s account becomes problematic where it relies on the notion of sexual orientation as a postmodern identity, and Canada as having a postmodern national sensibility. Here, he conflates the identities of new social movements, set perhaps within post-materialist conditions, with postmodernism. In actual fact, new social movement identities have been known to assume a fairly essentialist or even ethnic character, arguing that they represent coherent and bounded groups that have suffered historical disadvantage, whose membership is based on fixed or immutable characteristics. In Stychin’s own account, he considers that it is largely this perceived fixity of identity, and thus essentialism of group membership, that has allowed discrimination based on sexual orientation to be judicially interpreted as an “analogous ground”
to those grounds specifically enumerated in section 15 of the Charter: race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age, and mental or physical disability. Stychin acknowledges the essentialist problems and limitations associated with this inclusion through the prism of immutability, but he holds out hope that even arguments for inclusion with some basis in essentialism or fixity of identity can both “expand” and “decenter” the “universal subject position.” In other words, he is optimistic, particularly in the Canadian context, that the accommodation of sexual minorities in this fashion can lead to a queering (or at least a decentering) of sexual citizenship and the national imaginary along postmodern lines that are open to difference and resignification.

Yet, it is difficult to understand how such rigid identity categories constructed within a liberal frame of minority rights can be understood as postmodern. Stychin’s assessment of Canada as a postmodern nation fails to consider that a truly postmodern nation, assuming one could ever exist, would be substantially queerer, in terms of being much more provisional and fluid on the score of sexual identity, than simply allowing for the inclusion of those with a congenital minority sexual orientation. Clearly, important changes in terms of gay and lesbian citizenship and inclusion in the national imaginary have in fact resulted from this very interpretation of the Charter, but viewing these changes as postmodern, queer, or as otherwise decentering normative constructions of citizenship, is problematic. Such changes expand sexual citizenship and the national imaginary for some identities to be sure, but this expansion is more properly understood as being premised on ongoing and new exclusions. The analytical frame of homohegemony entails that, rather than troubling the very notion of citizenship and national identity, such an ideology of relative inclusion of lesbian and gay citizenship represents simply another chapter in a shifting spectrum of inclusion and exclusion that characterizes Canadian
nationalism. This view is echoed in Gary Kinsman’s critical assessment that Stychin’s argument “obscures the racism, sexism, heterosexism, and class exploitation at the roots of Canadian state and social formation.”

Provision of the concept of homohegemonic ideology acknowledges the significant transformation that has taken place in terms of constitutional recognition of discrimination based on sexual orientation. This transformation paved the way for eventual near legal equality for gays and lesbians, associated with same-sex marriage in the Canadian legal context. Yet, the related imagined inclusion of some members of a sexual minority in the Canadian nation does not fundamentally destabilize the subtle status of the heterosexual majority as normative, particularly in societal spaces. This is the difference between a nation that understands itself as postmodern or queer, and a nation that imagines itself as including some queer citizens. It is the hugely contradictory reality of gay and lesbian citizenship in Canada under present conditions that homohegemony is well positioned to explain. As sexual citizenship is closely connected to gay and lesbian rights, some of these issues will be returned to in the discussion of gay and lesbian rights in the Canadian context, below.

As Stychin underscores, homosexuals have long been positioned as others within modern nation-states. This has only recently begun to change with the advent of significant lesbian and gay citizenship rights in certain states. Yet, novel others have been constructed in the same temporal period that has witnessed significant gay and lesbian citizenship inclusions. These constructed others build upon historical stereotypes and legacies. It is to a broader context of sexual othering that this chapter now turns.

Sexual Othering and Biopolitics

In Orientalism, Edward Said revolutionized scholarly understanding of the notion of “the other” with his bold and clear assertion that the identity of the modern West, specifically Europe,
has been forged in relation to historical constructions of a pre-modern, Oriental other.⁵⁹ Scholars in many fields in the social sciences and humanities have incorporated this basic insight, applying it to novel phenomena and contexts within a broadly postcolonial approach. In its most basic sense, the notion of Orientalism necessitates grappling with how seemingly peripheral identities may actually be constitutive of the identities of what appear to be more central contexts. “The Orient” is not just a place, and “Orientalism” is not merely the study of “the Orient.” Orientalism, in Said’s basic formulation, refers to the fairly consistent ways in which the East has been constructed and represented as “other,” producing the identity of the Western Occident as “self” in the process. The postcolonial insights contained within the notion of Orientalism lend credence to this project’s contextualization of homohegemony in neocolonialism, and the distinction registered between realities of heterosexism in Jamaica and the othering of “homophobic Jamaica.” Said’s contribution, however, does not squarely address all forms of difference, specifically issues of homosexual exclusion/inclusion. To the extent that the basic frame of Orientalism necessitates grappling with others, primarily racial and religious others have been the obvious candidates. Yet what of sexual others who are simultaneously racialized? Recent scholarship has foregrounded the socio-political and cultural processes of specifically sexual othering.

In Desiring Arabs, Joseph Massad directly engages with the (homo)sexual aspects of Orientalism.⁶⁰ To this end, he illustrates how Europeans who came into contact with the Muslim and Arab world framed it as a sexually licentious, pre-modern other. He argues that contact with the West brought the Muslim and Arab world into the epistemological and teleological frame of modernity, with “assimilation into Europe” as the ultimate goal.⁶¹ According to Massad, some Muslims and Arabs, especially elite scholars and writers in his view, have historically
internalized these beliefs, and have striven to overcome them in an unyielding desire to be modern.

While Muslim and Arab writers have been embroiled in debates with European Orientalist writers since this initial framing, these debates have crucially taken place on largely unchanging terms set by the Orientalists. This colonial encounter between the West and the Muslim and Arab East has been, and continues to be, underwritten by a powerful discourse on sexuality. For example, Massad points out the irony that the Orientalists originally critiqued the Muslim world’s sexual licentiousness, and now critique the Muslim and Arab world’s perceived sexual repression. This occurs in spite of the fact that the latter often corresponds to regimes of regulation that the West imposed on the Muslim and Arab context in the first instance, as part of a broader colonization of sexual epistemology. The notion of sexual epistemological colonization is broadly relevant to the Caribbean historical context as well.

Also significant for this dissertation, Massad contentiously argues that sexual colonization continues to occur through the globalization of Western gay and lesbian identity. The contemporary debate around homosexuality in the Muslim and Arab world takes place over whether to embrace or reject gay and lesbian identity, but tellingly does not question the heterosexual/homosexual binary itself as a colonial imposition associated with the regulation of sexuality, a regime of regulation explored above with reference to Foucault. The debate therefore elides the existence of indigenous or contextual same-sex identities and practices outside of this epistemological frame, which have been actively invisibilized by Muslim and Arab scholars since the Arab Renaissance as a means of overcoming the interiorized notion of a shameful culture teeming with scandalous same-sex activity among men, in contradistinction to a constructed superior European heteronormativity.
One of the strengths of what some critiques have termed a provocative contribution by Massad, is that it observes how Muslim and Arab self-representations have been influenced by Orientalism via a process of interior colonization. Massad identifies this as a significant gap in the existing literature, which tends to focus on how othering has impacted the imperial power’s identity rather than on how othering has transformed and created the identity of the colonized other. Another contribution of Massad’s work is that its understanding of the colonization of sexual epistemology points in the direction of what a more liberatory sexual politics for the Arab and Muslim world, and by extension other neocolonial contexts in the global South, might look like. Although Massad does not develop this idea in detail, he suggests that such a liberatory sexual politics would have to escape the modern/pre-modern epistemological binary. An emancipatory sexual politics would have to involve not a struggle for or against gay and lesbian rights, but rather some type of recovery of indigenous or contextual practices of same-sex sexuality. In other words, true decolonization would have to include sexual decolonization.

In the chapter, “Re-Orienting Desire: the Gay International and the Arab World,” Massad interrogates the globalization of gay identity. He deconstructs the globalization of a dominant form of gay identity, which is often interpreted in an unproblematic way as a sign of progress within a universal liberal human rights discourse, and casts these developments in the light of contemporary colonialism. The question he considers is the following: what happens when the “Gay International,” which includes the “missionary tasks” of international gay and lesbian rights discourses and organizations, comes in contact with the Muslim and Arab world that it seeks to liberate?

Massad argues that rather than liberating an already homosexual population, the Gay International is actually creating both homosexuals and heterosexuals where they did not exist in
the past. In its quest to liberate gays and lesbians, the Gay International is colonizing the Muslim and Arab world according to the heterosexual/homosexual binary, which results in the “[repression] of same-sex desires and practices that refuse to be assimilated into [this] sexual epistemology.”\(^65\) Massad argues that the imposition of this binary onto a socio-political landscape not historically characterized by it produces “less than liberatory outcomes.”\(^66\) Under this new sexual order, men who continue to engage in same-sex sexual activity – both passive and active, traditionally important distinctions in the context under consideration\(^67\) – are suddenly branded as gay, which has a negative association because of its imperialist imposition. The imposition of “gay and lesbian rights” therefore creates a population stigmatized based on same-sex sexual object choice in a manner that simply did not attend to same-sex sexual practices traditionally extant in the region. There is an obvious connection here to the neocolonial dimensions of Canadian homohegemony, including the unintended consequences and unexamined implications of the politics of rescue vis-à-vis queer Jamaicans.

A shortcoming of Massad’s account is that it arguably generalizes the experiences of people in diverse Muslim and Arab nation-states. In addition, it possibly produces a binary notion of Eastern/Western sexuality, homogenizing indigenous Eastern versus Western sexual epistemology. This is significant given that Massad’s overarching objective is to destabilize such binaries. His account implies there is a “Western” gay identity and a “Muslim and Arab” queer practice, eliding the possibility of hybrid forms of queer identification and practice. Massad’s account appears to confer little agency on the Muslim and Arab queer to resist sexual epistemological colonization, or otherwise claim, negotiate, or resignify/redefine gay and lesbian identity within a Muslim and Arab frame.

While this dissertation draws on some of the powerful neocolonial insights of Massad
related to sexual othering, it does so within the much more focused and narrow context of Canada and Jamaica. The framework adopted in this dissertation further recognizes the importance of sexual citizenship rights within a liberal rights framework in diverse contexts of the global North and global South alike. Though insufficient for addressing queer exclusion, and susceptible to problematic neocolonial and other illiberal entanglements, there is still a need for the global promotion of queer citizenship rights. Such a movement must, however, be based on transnational queer solidarity and attuned to contextual needs, aspirations, and realities. Finally, assumptions about the impact of the neocolonization of queerness are not inferred from Canada’s constructed image of Jamaica within this research project; on the contrary, this dissertation theorizes that the everyday reality in Jamaica is much queerer than the construct. Thus, registering a difference from the approach taken by Massad, the sexual citizenship negotiations of Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians in uneven civil and political societal spaces – in both Canada and Jamaica – are paramount considerations under the analytical concept of homohegemony. This includes significant attention to people’s everyday experiences, something that is missed by an exclusively discursive focus.

The work of Jasbir Puar also informs homohegemony. In order to further differentiate homohegemony, however, it will first prove useful to focus on some of the more specific features of Puar’s argument. In *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*, Puar argues that, “during this [current] historical juncture, there is a very specific production of terrorist bodies against properly queer subjects.” Puar argues that while the early twenty-first century United States is marked by the inclusion of some queers, this “rests upon specific performances of American sexual exceptionalism vis-à-vis perverse, improperly hetero- and homo- Muslim sexualities.” In other words, the inclusion of some queers, which includes
mostly white, middle-class gay men and some lesbians, performs the function of showcasing purported American sexual exceptionalism at a time when such moral legitimacy is crucial in the context of the War on Terror, and in the context of global capital accumulation.

Homonationalism therefore depends not merely on the exclusion of others from the national imaginary, but also on the active production of others who are sexualized and racialized. Constructed Muslim and/or terrorist others are central to Puar’s formulation. It is significant that in this evocative contribution, homonationalism refers to the “dual movement in which certain homosexual constituencies have embraced US nationalist agendas and have also been embraced by nationalist agendas.”

Puar goes on to write about three interrelated manifestations of homonationalism in queer times: the first is US sexual exceptionalism, referred to above. The second is “queer as regulatory,” which means that “queer liberal secularity,” though conventionally regarded as less regulatory than gay and lesbian identity, is in fact capable of being regulatory by virtue of its complicities with racialized, gendered, nationalist, and imperialist formations. The third manifestation of homonationalism is the “ascendency of whiteness,” which refers to the fact that homonationalism and the gay/lesbian/queer subject it embraces or includes are imagined as white, ultimately serving to bolster a racialized nation and imperial project.

Puar’s contribution is extremely significant for thinking about issues of queerness, race, gender, nation, and empire. Yet, as explained in Chapter One, homonationalism is not developed fundamentally as an analytical concept, applicable to specific sexual state superstructures and their corresponding political/societal citizenship structures. Rather, homonationalism is deliberately advanced as a paradigm, one that is able to offer insight into a novel conjuncture of race and sexuality: significant strains of homo-inclusive nationalism in the United States in
relation to deeply problematic – indeed deadly in the context of war – currents of sexual and racial othering of Muslim populations and others. There is a lack of systematic attention to homonationalism as an ideology, though ideological considerations permeate Puar’s discussion in an indirect fashion. The racialization and sexualization contained within homonationalism are viewed primarily through the theoretical lens of biopolitics, the marking of some subjects for life and other subjects for death and dying. Homonationalism is also cast by Puar as highly fragmentary and fleeting. The notion of mere strains of homo-inclusive nationalism, rather than an overall ideology, likely results from Puar’s postmodern epistemology. This is the same epistemology that favours the language of “assemblages” over nation-states. Lack of consideration of an overall ideology of gay and lesbian inclusion likely also flows from Puar’s decision to focus on the US, a context in which homonationalism is not yet hegemonic, and that indeed presents more along the lines of fragmentary currents or strains of nationalism.

Understanding the state in Gramscian terms, and focusing on the Canadian state in particular, allows for important discussions of many of the dynamics that Puar brings attention to, yet along the lines of a really existing sexual ideology that is hegemonic. Homohegemony thus builds on many of Puar’s important insights, while bringing further dynamics to light. For example, the hegemony of a homosexual inclusive ideology illuminates the “flip” from the nation-state’s longstanding illiberal fixation on homosexual others within the nation, to a novel illiberal focus on specific constructed homophobic other nations. The frame of homohegemony necessitates the consideration of the “homophobic other nation” as a particular type of constructed sexual other. While Puar’s discussion of homonationalism points in the direction of the homonationalist investments involved in considering some nations more homophobic than others, it does not account for the full scope and implications of the “homophobic other nation”
as a significant ideological construction set within neocolonial relations. This makes sense, since the full compulsion to construct homophobic other nations cannot come into being absent a hegemonic sense of the inclusion of gays and lesbians as equal sexual citizens in the national imaginary. Strains of homonationalism may coexist alongside hegemonic state heterosexism, in which case the construction of “homophobic other nations” as national foils is ideologically illogical, or at the very least premature. The constructed “homophobic other nation,” as a novel type of sexual other, is a more central feature of homohegemonic ideology. The other in this case is constructed as a means of distinguishing the national self rather than as a marker of death or destruction per se. As noted, Puar points to this type of ideological analysis of homophobic others, by provisionally elaborating on the production of Muslim populations as particularly “homophobic” in the context of homonationalism, and as “sexually lascivious and excessive, yet perversely repressed.”\(^{76}\) She also signals the political import for homonationalism of an “emergent neo-Orientalist . . . human rights frame resting upon the absoluteness of Muslim sexual repression.”\(^{77}\)

Building on Puar, as well as on queer, Native, and colonial studies, Scott Morgensen “interpret[s] homonationalism as an effect of US queer modernities forming amidst the conquest of Native peoples and the settling of Native land.”\(^{78}\) In other words, it is suggested, the terrorizing biopolitics of settler colonialism that marked Natives for death, and settlers for life, continues to be naturalized in modern queer projects in North America. Homonationalism can therefore be read as resting atop a biopolitical foundation of settler colonialism and a continuing colonization of Native peoples, including within modern queer movements. For Morgensen, these are enabling conditions that make homonationalism possible. They secure homonationalism’s existence, much as the production of a sexual and racial other in the War on
Terror functions in the same biopolitical fashion. Elsewhere, Morgensen explains that “in a white settler society, queer politics produces a settler homonationalism that will persist unless settler colonialism is challenged directly as a condition of queer modernities.”\textsuperscript{79} Morgensen further elaborates on the appropriation of Native culture by queer modernities in the context of asserting a quasi-ethnic cultural authenticity,\textsuperscript{80} and the simultaneous disappearance and erasure of Native peoples and nationalities in the production of “non-Native queer modernities.”\textsuperscript{81}

Morgensen’s incisive account implores scholars and students to view settler colonialism as an ongoing condition of homonationalism’s possibility, and to keep this in mind as a feature of a “Canadian” context amidst First Nations. It also informs the notion that diasporic subjects, including queers of colour, can be party to settler colonial nation-state formations. Like with Puar’s homonationalism, Morgensen’s use of the frame is not focused on developing it as an analytical concept in a particular, empirically demonstrated context. There is likewise a lack of attention to ideology, and more of a focus on biopolitics. Homohegemony therefore shifts attention to the ideological considerations strongly implied but not fully elaborated by scholars dealing with homonationalism. It adds a much needed dose of socio-political context to a discussion that has thus far been fairly general and almost entirely textual.

In spite of some of the limitations of biopolitics noted in this chapter, particularly in terms of the contrast established between a biopolitical approach and a Gramscian ideological and materialist approach, it should nevertheless be taken seriously as a theoretical background for any account of the racialized and neocolonial dimensions of gay and lesbian national inclusion. This should be the case whether or not a project ultimately adopts biopolitics as a significant theoretical assumption. This section will therefore discuss biopolitics with reference to Thomas Lemke’s \textit{Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction}, which is a useful distillation of
major scholarly treatments of the subject in a single advanced volume.\textsuperscript{82} Biopolitics may be said to have escaped its original naturalistic connotations by way of Foucault, who discusses biopolitics/biopower in “Right of Death and Power over Life” in The History of Sexuality, discussed above. Foucault also addresses this subject in his lectures. According to Lemke, for Foucault, “biopolitics denotes a specific modern form of exercising power.”\textsuperscript{83} This is Foucault’s first meaning of the term, in which he sets up biopolitics as a modern contrast to sovereign power. Whereas sovereign power was a “right of life and death,” modern power increasingly seeks to “administer, secure, develop, and foster life.”\textsuperscript{84} In other words, an “ancient right over death” associated with sovereign power has been incompletely replaced in the modern era with a power bent on fostering life.\textsuperscript{85} Lemke summarizes this new form of power as follows: “Foucault sees the particularity of this biopower in the fact that it fosters life or disallows it to the point of death, whereas the sovereign power takes life or lets live.”\textsuperscript{86} The two forms that this power over life may take are: 1) disciplining of the individual body, and 2) “regulatory control of the population.”\textsuperscript{87} However, in practice, disciplining and controlling form two poles of the same overall “political technology”\textsuperscript{88}; disciplining emerged in particular institutions, while controlling or regulating emerged in the context of the state. Foucault observes that the two forms of biopower are often united in the form of “apparatuses” arising “in the course of the 19th century.”\textsuperscript{89} One such apparatus is sexuality. Sexuality is of such interest and importance to Foucault because it stands in between the two forms of biopower; sexuality is at once highly individual, and concerns whole human populations. As Lemke writes in his discussion of Foucault, “sexuality assumes a privileged position since its effects are situated on the microlevel of the body and on the macrolevel of the population.”\textsuperscript{90}

Lemke goes on to explain that “biopolitics marks a movement in which the ‘right’ is
more and more displaced by the ‘norm.’”91 This is connected to the fact that life is to be distributed, rather than merely granted or taken away. A particular quotation from Foucault, reproduced by Lemke, captures what is at stake:

It is no longer a matter of bringing death into play in the field of sovereignty, but of distributing the living in the domain of value and utility. Such a power has to qualify, measure, hierarchize, rather than display itself in its murderous splendour; it does not have to draw the line that separates the enemy of the sovereign from its loyal subjects. It effects distributions around the norm.92

Although biopolitics is all about distributing life, the harmful “paradox of biopolitics,” as Lemke describes, is that it makes possible the destruction of life.93 As Foucault, quoted in Lemke, writes: “It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many men [sic] to be killed.”94 Thus, biopolitics does not eliminate the destruction of enemies or others. Rather, it enhances this destruction by taking it to the level of total, racialized populations.

Lemke relates that, in his lectures at the Collège de France, Foucault expanded on how the modern racism of the nineteenth century “secure[d] the function of killing under the conditions of biopower.”95 Under what Lemke views as Foucault’s second meaning of biopolitics, he is interested in how racism: 1) establishes dividing lines between those “worthy of living” and “not worthy of living,” including within a national population, and 2) facilitates “a dynamic relation between the life of one person and the death of another.”96 In the latter case, racism can justify killing the other so as to secure or even merely “improve” the life of the self.97 This is the biopolitics associated with terror that both Puar and Morgensen call attention to in their work.
The third and final way in which Foucault discusses biopolitics, according to Lemke, is also addressed in his lectures, where he places the concept in relation to political economy and liberal government. Lemke describes Foucault’s interest in biopolitics’ relationship to liberalism as a self-critical attempt to broaden his original formulation of the concept, so as to link it more directly to economic and political themes. The key for this chapter’s present purposes is that “with liberalism, but not before, the question arises of how subjects are to be governed if they are both legal persons and living beings.” Thus, Foucault’s third treatment of biopolitics was a “reformulation of the concept . . . within an analytics of [liberal] government.” Unfortunately, Foucault never pursued these insights systematically. Other scholarship has, however, subsequently pursued this line of reasoning. These concerns can be observed in the substantial attention to liberalism in the work of Puar, for example.

Foucault suggests that biopower/biopolitics, as a new form of power, has occasioned new forms of resistance and practices of freedom. More specifically, “processes of power that seek to regulate and control life provoke forms of opposition, which formulate claims and demand recognition in the name of the body and of life.” In short, if there is political resistance where there is power, then there is biopolitical resistance where there is biopower. Lemke observes that Foucault conceives of many of the 1960s and 1970s protest movements and their demands around the body and life in part as critical responses to biopower. The major shortcoming of biopolitics, like Foucault’s work more generally, would seem to be an overall lack of connection to the fundamental imperatives of capitalism and the capitalist state. Again, there is a related limitation in terms of being unable to interpret histories of sexuality and race ideologically.

Yet, recovering some of the nuance of Foucault’s treatment of biopolitics implies that not all others are marked explicitly for death; some are marked for a lesser distribution of life. This
appears to describe the neocolonial Canada/Jamaica relationship, in which “homophobic Jamaica” is not delineated for death in the form of outright destruction, but is rather constructed as an ideological marker of distinction, legitimating economic and other relations of dependency. Dependency in turn perpetuates a diminished distribution of life. Although this is somewhat of a tangential relationship to homohegemony, it is one worth noting. Ultimately, however, the provision of the frame of homohegemony seeks to read queer developments through the lens of ideology rather than expressly through biopolitics. Such a frame is better suited to the internal ideological ascendency of gays’ and lesbians’ benevolent liberal inclusion as citizens in the Canadian national imaginary and to the shift in focus on illiberally constructed homophobic other nations as national foils.

Returning to scholarship on sexual othering, Ann Laura Stoler’s work represents another significant contribution. Stoler begins by posing the following question, critical of Foucault’s works on the history of sexuality: “Why, for Foucault, [do] colonial bodies never figure as a possible site for the articulation of nineteenth century European sexuality?” Stoler then asks about the implications of this omission for Foucault’s treatment of racism “in the making of the European bourgeois self.” Stoler’s aim is essentially to read colonialism and empire into Foucault’s history of sexuality. In other words, how was European bourgeois sexuality constituted, in part, by a sexualized colonial other, and what implications does this have for Foucault’s treatment of race?

One of Stoler’s most relevant insights for the purposes of this dissertation’s elaboration of homohegemony is that the colony and metropole can be treated as being within a single analytical field when it comes to the analysis of race and sexuality. The sexual politics and management of sexuality in the colony is, in fact, as much constitutive and informative of
sexuality in the metropole as the sexual politics of the metropole is constitutive and informative to that of the colony. This echoes Alexander’s ethical and academic injunction to theorize empire and nationalism together,¹⁰⁹ and Said and Massad’s powerful invocations of self/other within political and cultural processes.¹¹⁰ It is also consistent with the elaboration of homohegemony and the other as two sides of the same ideological construction, with Canada and Jamaica positioned at national and neocolonial levels of analysis. The limitations of Stoler’s work concern a lack of consideration of state ideology. Moreover, in dealing with a colonial context, Stoler’s work does not provide insight into the gay-inclusive national moment in a neocolonial context.

Scholarly literature on sexual othering informs this project’s frame of homohegemony and the other. In addition, a significant focus of this dissertation is breaking apart some of the constructed ideological images of “homohegemonic Canada” and “homophobic Jamaica,” in order to reveal queerer and more contradictory material and experiential realities of sexual citizenship. It is therefore necessary to move from a consideration of literature that informs the ideological construction of national others and national selves within a transnational frame, to literature that informs the complex negotiation of citizenship within a transnational frame. In short, sexual citizenship is not only ideologically constructed but also actively negotiated. The notion of negotiating sexual citizenship is important to this dissertation, and thus a turn to the consideration of socio-political scholarship that informs the negotiated character of citizenship is necessary.

The Transnational Negotiation of Citizenship

This chapter has already explored sexual citizenship. Citizenship is however not merely about the conferral of rights by the state, but is also based in the active negotiation of forms of belonging, a negotiation that may also be seen to take place at transnational and global levels of
political community. It is helpful to return to the work of Abigail Bakan and Daiva Stasiulis here, particularly as their work considers West Indian migration to Canada, which is inclusive of the Jamaican-Canadian migration context. In *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*, the authors assert that there were an estimated 150 million migrant workers (documented and undocumented) worldwide in the year 2000. The focus of their study is “the implications posed by the growing numbers of female migrant workers from third world states for our understanding of citizenship.” Female migrant workers from the global South are largely ignored and invisibilized in studies of globalization, and Bakan and Stasiulis seek to render female migrant workers of colour visible.

The second chapter of *Negotiating Citizenship* outlines a theoretical framework for understanding negotiating modern citizenship in the context of globalization, and the remaining chapters apply this theoretical framework to the case study of female West Indian and Filipina migrants to Canada who work either as live-in domestic workers or as nurses. Bakan and Stasiulis underscore that modern democratic citizenship continues to include some and exclude others, as is reflected in longstanding discriminatory immigration policies and practices, including “a secular trend towards more restrictive and selective immigration, [and] refugee and border crossing laws and policies within advanced states.” Contemporary developments in advanced capitalist states, even within “the seeming instance of ‘post-national’ membership offered by European citizenship,” demonstrate that there continues to be a strong “equivalence between citizenship and state formulated and racialized concepts of nationality.” Furthermore, these hierarchical tendencies in citizenship policy and practice have been exacerbated by neoliberal globalization. Neoliberal state retraction has magnified the citizenship divide in general, but this development has been particularly hard felt by migrant workers. Bakan and
Stasiulis point out that, in an increasingly globalized capitalism, an advanced capitalist state’s ability to deny citizenship rights is somewhat like the denial of meaningful global citizenship. In spite of the exercise of agency on the part of migrant women workers to negotiate new forms of transnational citizenship, there exist significant limitations in terms of the enforcement of transnational citizenship rights, and to moving toward some type of meaningful “de-territorialized citizenship.” The nation-state still looms large in mediating citizenship within the global capitalist system. The authors’ focus on negotiating citizenship in, and in between, unequal nation-states in the global system informs this project’s conception of the negotiation of specifically sexual citizenship in nation-states set within a transnational, neocolonial context. Negotiating subjectivity or identity is a common line of inquiry in feminist, queer, anti-racist, and sociological studies, but the idea that citizenship is also negotiated has resisted the same degree of elaboration, particularly within political studies. While Bakan and Stasiulis do not consider the sexual dimensions of citizenship in terms of homosexuality or LGBTQ identities and practices, their intersectional approach to gender, race, and class provides some direction for considering the additional intersection of sexuality within the ambit of the negotiation of citizenship. In short, their basic idea of the fact that citizenship is not only conferred but also actively negotiated in political and civil societal spaces alike, along multiple axes of identity or subjectivity, is one that this dissertation employs in its treatment of sexual citizenship. In addition, since their treatment of negotiating citizenship is inclusive of a transnational level of analysis, it is relevant to this dissertation’s recognition that neocoloniality impacts the negotiation of queer citizenship in Jamaica and Canada alike. That is, Bakan and Stasiulis’ focus on specifically diasporic, racialized minority subjects makes their contribution all the more relevant to the transnational dimensions of sexual citizenship that this dissertation seeks to render
visible, including in its attention to the sexual citizenship negotiations of LGBTQ Jamaicans in the diaspora. Finally, Bakan and Stasiulis point to the agency of women migrant workers in forging a social movement that spans nation-states, and this is relevant to the discussion of the need for a movement based on an ethics and praxis of transnational queer solidarity, discussed in Chapters Six and Seven.

This critical literature review has thus far mainly considered theoretical contributions concerning the regulation of (homo)sexuality, and aspects of the construction and negotiation of sexual citizenship. Yet, this dissertation is also centrally informed by features of the Canadian and Caribbean/Jamaican context, out of which the idea of homohegemony and the other significantly arises. This chapter now pivots to reflect on some of the scholarly literature on queerness in the two contexts that centrally occupy this dissertation.

The Queer Caribbean and Homosexuality in Jamaica

Queerness in the Caribbean has already been briefly explored with reference to Alexander’s helpful contribution, but it is useful to consider additional contributions in order to contextualize this part of the dissertation. In *Sexing the Caribbean: Gender, Race, and Sexual Labour*, Kamala Kempadoo explores varied dimensions of sex work in the Caribbean.\(^\text{116}\) She begins, however, by providing readers with a broad overview of the scholarly literature on gender and sexuality in the region. Kempadoo notes that Caribbean sexuality consists of a mixture of European, West African, Indigenous, East Indian, and North American influences, as well as other ideas and practices.\(^\text{117}\) Central to Kempadoo’s study are the notions of “hypersexuality,” “heteropatriarchy,” and “race.”\(^\text{118}\) She contends that the Caribbean, throughout its five hundred-year history of contact with the West, has been constructed as hypersexual, heteropatriarchal, and racialized,\(^\text{119}\) with the net effect being that LGBTQ people, heterosexual women, sex workers, and other “sexual deviants” have been marginalized.\(^\text{120}\) Kempadoo
Kempadoo recognizes the considerable heterogeneity of the region – English and French, Dutch and Spanish, Antilles and mainland – but she situates her work within an emerging scholarship that treats the Caribbean as a single, albeit fluid and complex, idea and analytical field.\textsuperscript{121}

Kempadoo asserts that Caribbean feminist scholarship, referring mainly to that of the Anglophone Caribbean, has reached a point of being nearly indigenized or contextualized, in understanding gender as complexly intertwined with race, class, and colonialism. Yet, Kempadoo argues that sex and sexuality continue to be ignored or “subsumed,” and therefore also assumed, within gender.\textsuperscript{122} Kempadoo indicts this as a “‘silence’ on the subject of sexuality in Caribbean feminist studies.”\textsuperscript{123} She concludes that although few feminists writing on the Caribbean have looked at sexuality explicitly or in depth,\textsuperscript{124} increasing numbers are now acknowledging that sexuality deserves sustained and detailed attention in its own right. She points to M. Jacqui Alexander’s scholarship, discussed above, as an example of an emerging scholarly conversation on sexuality in the Caribbean.\textsuperscript{125} Kempadoo is clearly part of this emerging conversation as well. The following selection from Kempadoo sums up what a critical, postcolonial feminist understanding of sexuality in the Caribbean might look like:

> Despite the many gaps, the records, documents, and data I have collected over the years and draw on for this study illuminate a complex interplay of various factors – racial discourses, indigenized traditions, colonial policies and laws, heterosexist-patriarchal paradigms and practices, and capitalist economic interests. Sexuality stands as a central prism for viewing racialized colonial oppression and domination and the refashioning of race, as well as for reading Caribbean struggles for emancipation, both historically and contemporarily.\textsuperscript{126} Kempadoo does not focus on homosexuality in the Jamaican context, but she does
provide important background information about the Caribbean as a whole, and about constructions of sexuality in this region. She also usefully considers the ways in which the Caribbean has been sexually constructed by the North as hypersexual, and this is highly relevant to the ways in which Canadian homohegemony constructs Jamaica, including the ways in which Jamaica was shown to be simultaneously exoticized and sexualized in the last chapter.

Where Kempadoo provides insight into sexuality in the Caribbean as a whole, Suzanne LaFont provides insight into sexuality in Jamaica in particular. In “Very Straight Sex: The Development of Sexual Morés in Jamaica,” LaFont traces “the racial, political, economic, religious, and cultural forces that have shaped sexualities in colonial Jamaica,” a history that holds the key to understanding sexuality in Jamaica in the present. LaFont finds that Jamaica is characterized not simply by “homophobia,” but more precisely by what she terms “anti-sodomism,” which includes a rejection of both heterosexual and homosexual anal and oral sex – essentially any sexual activity outside of procreative sex. She therefore contends that while sexuality “engulfs” Jamaican popular culture in rhythm and song, the range of “acceptable” sexual activity in Jamaica is actually rather narrow.

LaFont cites a number of examples of contemporary “homophobia,” or what this dissertation terms “heterosexism,” in Jamaica. These include former Prime Minister Patterson, long rumoured to be gay himself, feeling the need to publicly attest to his heterosexuality in 2001; the murder of a number of suspected gay men in a prison riot in 1997; the heterosexist lyrics of popular dancehall artists; and the less than warm reception and continuing treatment of J-FLAG. Yet, there is history that explains this “homophobia” and “anti-sodomism.” LaFont proceeds to historically trace the multiple factors that have contributed to Jamaica’s complicated current sexual landscape, noting that, “sexuality, as a topic of scholarly research in Jamaica, has
been neglected.” She argues that anti-sodomism emanates from religious and popular cultural sources, including historical cultures of resistance that slaves created for themselves, and works “as evidence of Jamaica’s moral superiority over Western liberal sexual moralés.” The ideology is therefore a product of Jamaica’s history, as well as a product of the country’s more contemporary relationship to the outside world; the latter is where this dissertation would say that the neocolonial dimensions of sexuality enter into the picture.

Some elements of the wide-ranging history that LaFont considers include: the indigenous legacy of the Arawaks (before an original Spanish colonization in 1494); the diverse West African legacy; the legacy of plantation slavery; the formation of creole sexual meanings as a result of interactions between the sexual systems of British elites, slaves, and Afro-Jamaican “free persons”; the different sexual exploitation and opportunities encountered by slave men and slave women vis-à-vis white elites within a context marked by rigidly racialized constraints on social and economic mobility; the influence of British colonial law and culture beginning in 1655, and the ability for elites to escape sexual regulation to an extent in Jamaica and sexually exploit black African slaves; the current legal prohibition of anal intercourse, as well as of indecent acts between men specifically; the longstanding and continuing climate of hidden sexuality (including same-sex sexuality) in Jamaica, which manifests as a dissonance between official discourses on and documentation of sexuality, and actual sexual practices; the historical and continuing difference between elite and popular sexual practices, and the ways in which these were constructed in terms of stereotypes about the other, and marshalled by Afro-Jamaicans in the cultivation of the notion of “respectability”; and the crucial role of a contested Christianity in providing much of the ideological glue that holds understandings of sexuality together, including in terms of reinforcing the importance of notions of reproductive
sexuality. The explanatory picture LaFont paints is one of a very complex system of sexuality, historically consisting of interactions between elites and slaves and the hybridization of Jamaican sexual culture, as well as the popular re-negotiation of sexual mōrēs as a contrast to the colonizer, the elite, and, more recently, the outside world. LaFont admits that her history of Jamaican sexuality raises more questions than it answers, yet her work is a significant step forward in terms of piecing together an overall history.

A particular issue with LaFont’s account concerns the notion of “anti-sodomism” as a way of understanding the full picture of heterosexism in Jamaica. For example, has “bugger” or “sodomite” typically referred to anyone engaged in non-reproductive sexuality, or have the terms tended to function as shorthand for men who engage in same-sex sexual activity in both the culture and law in Jamaica? In other words, once the sodomite became clearly identified within a British history of sexuality as a particular type of man who engaged in same-sex sexual activity in the early nineteenth century, how did this depart from and impact a more generalized understanding of anti-sodomism in Jamaica? “Anti-sodomism” may also obscure the extent to which contemporary negative attitudes in Jamaica have attached to homosexual/gay/lesbian identity categories since their invention. A broader limitation associated with LaFont’s account is that it does not pay enough attention to the state, and the capitalist state in particular. This makes sense given that this is a cultural and sociological analysis. A socio-political analysis consistent with homohegemony, however, can add something to the discussion by attending to civil and political societal spaces in relationship, and by considering the negotiation of sexual citizenship in these spaces. In other words, this dissertation suggests that a socio-political analysis can turn LaFont’s understanding of what Gayle Rubin would term the “sex/gender system” into a picture of the sex/gender regime. A final limitation is that LaFont takes “sexual intolerance” of
gays and lesbians in Jamaica as a fact, largely inferring this from contemporary examples of “homophobia” and a general historical and contemporary climate of anti-sodomism, without exploring the possibility that gay and lesbian Jamaicans might in fact be claiming public forms of sexual citizenship that exceed the notion of being completely “undercover.” Relatedly, she fails to consider the possibility of the negotiation of queer identities and practices outside of modern forms of gay/lesbian/homosexual identity, an important omission given her insistence on the importance of appreciating the autonomy of Afro-Jamaican sexual meanings. Thus, the consideration of forms of queer citizenship and subjectivity in a positive frame – rather than starting from the assumption of an absence or deviation from some assumed Western/Northern norm of gay rights and identity – is significant to this dissertation, and is actually in keeping with LaFont’s historical account of Afro-Jamaican autonomy and agency in the negotiation of sexual meanings, if not its attention to contemporary Afro-Jamaican queer agency.

Jamaican popular culture plays a large role in mirroring and producing contemporary heterosexism, specifically through its construction of popular gender norms. One of the most powerful transmitters of Jamaican popular culture today is dancehall music. In Inna di Dancehall: Popular Culture and the Politics of Identity in Jamaica, Donna Hope explores the important role of dancehall music in the construction of gender and other norms in the wider Jamaican society. She argues that to understand dancehall, which is a genre of music, one first has to understand that Jamaica is a society rigidly defined by class, colour, and race, with colour and race continuing to be highly correlated with class. Jamaica is thus a complex society characterized by a historic tension between upper-class culture and working-class culture, and European culture and African culture. Postcolonial Jamaica has incompletely broken with these longstanding tensions of colonial and creole legacy. As Hope states, “dancehall music and
culture, as the most contemporary manifestation of what is deemed Jamaican ‘low culture,’ actively creates and recreates symbolic manifestations of the tensions that operate in society.”

Dancehall music can be understood as the music of the popular urban masses, both lower class and working class, in a traditionally rural society, and as a critical response to the economic upheavals of the 1980s in the context of neoliberalism.

Dancehall music draws on a history of resistance music in the post-independence period, most notably reggae. While it emerged out of reggae in many ways, it also marked a break from the relatively more peaceful tone and inclusive message of reggae. Dancehall music can be “extremely violent, crass and biased,” reflecting dancehall’s more general “tendency to deal in hard truths” about the Jamaican context in ways that are seen as empowering for many Jamaicans. It has become a major economic niche for economically marginalized, urban, and mostly Afro-Jamaican individuals suffering from the painful dislocations caused by neoliberal economic policies. Hope argues that while dancehall music represents a form of economic and cultural resistance to the dominant scripts of Jamaican neoliberalism, “this revolt from the underbelly of Jamaican popular culture fails to confront the patriarchal gender ideology that underpins Jamaican gender relations.”

In terms of homosexuality in particular, according to Hope, much dancehall music manifests paranoia with visible male homosexuality. In fact, in Hope’s formulation, there is something tantamount to a whole sub-genre of the music devoted to the denigration of the homosexual male, often pejoratively referred to as a “chi-chi man” or “battyman.” This has brought dancehall music negative international media attention due to its export, and has resulted in Northern boycotts and censorship of famous dancehall artists, facilitated by groups such as Stop the Murder Music Campaign, discussed in the last chapter. Hope argues that the masculine
rejection of male homosexuality in the dancehall represents an extreme example of a more
generalized Jamaican masculine rejection of being feminized and thus stripped of patriarchal
power.\textsuperscript{154} In the dominant Jamaican gender ideology, set within the context of heteropatriarchy if
we invoke Alexander, discussed above,\textsuperscript{155} “to condone male homosexuality is to reveal an
ideological overview that legitimizes and supports the feminizing and subsequent loss of power
of men.”\textsuperscript{156}

Significantly, and something missed in the discursive construction of “homophobic
Jamaica,” dancehall’s anti-homosexual lyrics are more extreme than attitudes traditionally extant
in Jamaican society. They reflect a more visible or overt policing of the homosexual male
contemporarily in Jamaica, at least among certain segments of the population. Hope suggests that
the rise of this explicit heterosexism in dancehall music, mirroring and fuelling changing
dynamics in popular heterosexism, is partly a reaction to the intensifying public visibility of gay
men in the late 1990s, both in Jamaica and internationally.\textsuperscript{157} The reaction is therefore not to
homosexuality \textit{per se}, but to the breakdown of the previous and more permissive, though still
oppressive,\textsuperscript{158} arrangement, in which homosexuality was always there and known to be there, yet
was actively invisibilized. Hope writes in this respect that:

Homosexuality in Jamaica has been tolerated for many decades, cloaked under a
hypocritical kind of “respectable” silence as long as gays “do their thing” in private and
respect ritualistic ridicule or culturally sanctioned abuse as a part of their routine
marginalization.\textsuperscript{159}

Hope’s work makes it clear that the treatment of homosexuality in Jamaica is diverse.\textsuperscript{160}
Besides differing in terms of the treatment of male homosexuality versus lesbianism,\textsuperscript{161} it is
significantly variegated along class lines, with attitudes that might be described as “don’t ask,
don’t tell” (not Hope’s words) continuing to characterize middle- and upper-class spaces to a
high degree, and with more explicit currents of heterosexism often existing in lower-class and
working-class social spaces; these are precisely the spaces that much of dancehall music
responds to and influences. Hope further argues that paranoia around male homosexuality is
also conditioned by the contemporary instability of masculinity in Jamaica, out of which
increasing numbers of Jamaican men in particular are unable to find their footing in the difficult
global free-market economy. This combines with exclusions based on a “rigid
race/class/colour social hierarchy existing in Jamaica.” Many especially working-class men
are unable to enact roles traditionally constructed as masculine by middle-class gender and
sexual morality, such as the role of breadwinner. Bringing in LaFont’s contribution discussed
immediately above, these are forms of patriarchal privilege that have historically been denied
Jamaican men via colonialism and slavery, adding racialized and classed insult to gendered
injury. This loss of footing in the neoliberal economy has included the opening up of a
substantial new service sector that sometimes favours the exploitation of working-class women
over working-class men. Hope helpfully unravels some of the factors that contribute both to
heterosexism in Jamaica and to its recent, albeit uneven, amplification, as can be observed in
certain dancehall music. She demonstrates how dancehall music is an important mirror and
motor of both continuity and change in relations of gender, sexuality, race, colour, and class.

Hope’s account, though it includes attention to gay and lesbian issues as they relate to
dancehall music, is not focused on how gay and lesbian people themselves negotiate sexual
citizenship in diverse spaces in Jamaican political and civil society. Moreover, Hope’s account is
not intended to take inventory of the overall conjuncture of queerness in Jamaica. As well, she
does not focus on what has transpired in Jamaica’s sex/gender regime since the initial wave of
global/local gay and lesbian visibility and reactionary heterosexism that she mentions. In other words, the late 1990s was two decades ago, and the interviewees consulted in this research project underscore how there have been important changes in the negotiation of more robust forms of public queer citizenship more recently. Hope does, however, bring important popular cultural factors of the Jamaican context, such as dancehall music and identity politics, to our attention. These are factors that an expansive Gramscian analysis of queerness must integrate using its understanding of the formal political sphere.

In another contribution that includes some attention to homosexuality, *Man Vibes: Masculinities in the Jamaican Dancehall*, Hope summarizes current anti-homosexual legislation in the Anglophone Caribbean in a particular section of the book.¹⁶⁶ Notably, Trinidad and Tobago outlaws sex between men and sex between women, with up to ten years imprisonment for men, and five for women.¹⁶⁷ The Bahamas has similar legislation, also explored above with reference to Alexander,¹⁶⁸ outlawing same-sex sexual activity for both genders, with up to twenty years imprisonment as punishment,¹⁶⁹ although Alexander makes the important proviso that such a maximum sentence is reserved for sex considered to have taken place in public.¹⁷⁰ Hope reports that Jamaica retains the British colonial “Offences Against the Person Act 1864,” modeled on earlier English legislation, which, as discussed above, outlaws buggery (effectively between men, but also technically includes heterosexual anal intercourse) and gross indecency (explicitly between men).¹⁷¹ This is returned to in greater detail in Chapter Five. After usefully distilling this anti-homosexual legislation in the Anglophone Caribbean, Hope paraphrases M. Jacqui Alexander, writing, “based on their inscriptions of citizenship, Caribbean states are represented as heterosexual.”¹⁷² Hope thus makes a clear connection between legislation in the Anglophone Caribbean and the notion of sexual citizenship. Heterosexist legislation in this
context provides anti-homosexual dancehall music with a backdrop of legitimacy. Hope goes on to highlight the importance of fundamentalist Christianity in Jamaica in providing “ideological encouragement” for heterosexism, including within dancehall music discourses.¹⁷³

Taking Hope’s two contributions together, it can be observed that contemporary attitudes towards homosexuals, particularly in Jamaica, significantly hinge on visible or public gay and lesbian identity and the perceived violation of gender norms, in addition to perceived improper or non-reproductive sex. They also occur within a neoliberal context, result from a colonial history, and have legislative and religious underpinnings. Overall, Hope’s discussion of the construction of gender norms in dancehall music includes and carefully examines the important topic of homosexuality in Jamaica. However, there is a lack of focus on queer citizenship overall in Jamaica, and its negotiation by LGBTQ Jamaicans, that calls for a more self-consciously socio-political approach to assessing queerness in Jamaica. It will therefore be useful to return our attention to homosexuality in Jamaica overall, and its everyday negotiation beyond dancehall music and its societal reverberations.

Some attention to these aspects of the Jamaican context can be found in Our Caribbean: A Gathering of Lesbian and Gay Writing from the Antilles. In this volume, editor Thomas Glave brings LGBTQ-identified writers of fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and memoir from throughout the Caribbean and the diaspora together in one translated volume of work. The result is an important anthology that contributes to ending some of the silence surrounding homosexuality in the region.¹⁷⁴ While the writings in the anthology are diverse, they are united in exploring queerness and the Caribbean. The selections are particularly valuable regarding the lived experiences of gays and lesbians in the Caribbean and the Caribbean diaspora and in terms of listening to queer Caribbean voices and representations. For example, in “On Homophobia and Gay Rights
Activism in Jamaica,” Lawson Williams writes that it is “a badly kept secret that Jamaica has a perceptibly vibrant gay population.” He writes about the cool reception of J-FLAG in 1998, and explains this in terms of the sudden visibility of homosexuality represented by the onset of public gay rights activism. He confirms the existence of a common perception among both straight and gay Jamaicans that such public and political visibility upsets a “balance” in how Jamaican society has traditionally managed homosexuality through confining it to the private sphere; in the case of the gay or lesbian Jamaican, maintaining this “balance” is critical to survival as a productive member of society in spite of one’s sexual orientation. Williams ends his concise piece with a clarion call to address the issue of homosexuality in Jamaica now, since he views the violence and other problems in Jamaican society to be interconnected with the issue of the treatment of homosexuals.

Williams’ contribution is particularly valuable in terms of attending to gay and lesbian social movement activism vis-à-vis the mention of J-FLAG, in highlighting the existence of a diversity of opinions on homosexuality in civil society, and in reflecting the queer experience of Jamaica. Once again, however, a more systematic investigation of queer citizenship in civil and political society needs to take place. Such work must disentangle the many legal and societal factors that structure sexual citizenship. As well, the analysis could benefit from greater attention to transnational factors, such as Jamaica’s sexual construction by Northern nation-states, and how the country positions itself on the issue of homosexuality vis-à-vis nation-states such as Canada within a neocolonial context. Such a contextual approach to queer citizenship in Jamaica is advanced in Chapter Five of this dissertation, though it is still offered in a provisional fashion. Taking stock of queer Jamaica is advanced as a means of deconstructing Canada’s caricature of “homophobic Jamaica.” Now that sexuality and queerness has been explored with more direct
reference to the Caribbean and Jamaican context, this chapter turns now to briefly examine the
Canadian context, which is more centrally dealt with in the next chapter.

**Lesbian and Gay Rights and Regulation in Canada**

Various angles of what has been broadly conceived of as “sexuality politics” have thus
far been considered with an eye to engaging the contributions and limitations of existing
scholarly literature vis-à-vis the theoretical approach taken to elaborate homohegemony. Because
homohegemony is identified in the Canadian context, it is necessary to return to this domestic
level of analysis. While this will be the central focus of the next chapter, a brief literature review
of existing scholarly contributions pertaining to gay and lesbian rights and regulation in Canada
is first in order.

The work of Miriam Smith, Gary Kinsman, Patrizia Gentile, David Rayside, Carl
Stychin, Mariana Valverde, Alan Sears, Tom Warner, Martin Cannon, Rinaldo Walcott, Andil
Gosine, Wesley Crichlow, Sara Lamble, and Viviane Namaste,¹⁷⁸ taken together, can be seen as
representing much of the scope of queer studies’ coverage of Canada’s treatment of LGBTQ
people, both historically and contemporarily. In terms of gay and lesbian identities specifically,
some scholars tend to focus on gay and lesbian history in Canada post-1969 (the year of
Canada’s partial decriminalization of same-sex sexual activity) as a developing story of rights
gains, while others place the emphasis on historical and continuing gay and lesbian regulation.

Smith’s seminal work on *Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United
States and Canada* falls into the former category. Some of her published journal articles, and
especially a more recent chapter, engage issues of gay and lesbian citizenship on a more
substantive and negotiated level, and in terms of a broader range of concerns related to queer
activism and identity at different levels of government.¹⁷⁹ Smith is still broadly focused,
however, on assessing gay and lesbian rights and recognition by the state, and on taking stock of
gay and lesbian rights progress. Kinsman’s work on gay and lesbian regulation (he broaches other identities in the LGBTQ acronym as well, but to a lesser extent), particularly his seminal *The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada*, is a good example of the latter category. Overall, Kinsman is focused on the regulation of homosexuality. These two scholars and their commonly cited texts are fairly representative of the two main approaches to explaining lesbian and gay history in Canada: queer politics through the prism of rights, and queer politics through the prism of regulation.

Before returning to Smith and Kinsman, the work of David Rayside will be helpful for establishing a basic chronology of some of the major advancements in gay and lesbian rights that have indeed taken place over the post-1969 period. A more detailed temporal context of many of these historical developments is offered in the next chapter. Rayside, like Smith, is mainly concerned with the “public” recognition of gay and lesbian rights and relationships in Canada and the US, as well as with explaining the differences between the two countries. In addition to the focus on institutional differences, however, Rayside looks at elements of culture, mainly religion, in explaining different “family regimes” in the two countries. Like Smith, Rayside agrees that a certain trajectory of liberalization is important. That is, before moving on to antidiscrimination measures, and certainly before moving on to recognition of same-sex relationships, sodomy and/or buggery laws, criminalizing consensual same-sex sexual activity, must typically first be dispensed with. In this vein, Rayside says of the 1969 partial decriminalization of same-sex sexual activity in Canada, “though discriminatory elements remained, allowing police to continue targeting gay sexuality, the legislation reduced a legal impediment to the political recognition of same-sex relationships” in Canada.

Rayside outlines the lengthy path to the nearly equal public recognition of same-sex
relationships in Canada, which can be seen as representing near legal equality. Key moments include: anti-discrimination protections at the municipal level beginning in the early 1970s\(^ {\text{183}}\); pioneering sexual orientation discrimination legislation in Québéco in 1977\(^ {\text{184}}\); sexual orientation discrimination legislation in many other provinces in the 1980s, as a result of the way the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was eventually interpreted to include sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination\(^ {\text{185}}\); public same-sex relationship benefits at the municipal and provincial/territorial levels beginning in the late 1980s\(^ {\text{186}}\); court rulings in the early 1990s, for example, an Ontario appeal court ruling in 1992 that the Canada Human Rights Act should be interpreted to include sexual orientation\(^ {\text{187}}\); the extension of same-sex benefit plans for government employees by additional provincial and territorial governments beginning in 1991, as a result of court and tribunal rulings\(^ {\text{188}}\); and the British Columbia NDP government’s first “legislative recognition of same-sex relationships in Canadian federal or provincial politics” via redefining “spouse” in healthcare legislation in 1992, which was not primarily the result of pressure from court rulings.\(^ {\text{189}}\) These changes were followed by: the significant recognition of *de facto* (also known as “common law”) opposite-sex relationships throughout the 1990s\(^ {\text{190}}\); the modification of private sector benefit plans to include same-sex couples beginning in the early 1990s and nearly completed by the late 1990s\(^ {\text{191}}\); eventual clarity from the Supreme Court of Canada (and agreement with lower courts and tribunals) that sexual orientation constitutes a prohibited ground of discrimination in 1995\(^ {\text{192}}\); the extremely significant Supreme Court ruling in *M. v. H* (1999),\(^ {\text{193}}\) that gay and lesbian couples would have to be treated the same as *de facto* opposite-sex relationships in “law or public policy”\(^ {\text{194}}\); subsequent provincial/territorial and eventual federal redefinition of “spouse” to include common law same-sex relationships in the late 1990s and early 2000s, which was very controversial federally under the Liberals, who used
the term “common law partner” rather than “spouse” so as to “calm protests within their ranks”\textsuperscript{195}; the extension of adoption rights to same-sex couples in Canadian provincial and territorial jurisdictions beginning in the mid-1990s and ramping up in the late 1990s and early 2000s after the \textit{M. v. H} court ruling\textsuperscript{196}; and the installation of a civil union regime in Qu\textae bec, since “family law embedded in the Civil Code did not extend as much recognition to \textit{de facto} couples as was the norm in the rest of Canada.”\textsuperscript{197} Finally, Canada witnessed a series of favourable provincial court rulings on same-sex marriage, inaugurating legal same-sex marriage in Ontario and British Columbia in 2003, and in Qu\textae bec and a number of other jurisdictions in 2004,\textsuperscript{198} and the eventual passage of same-sex marriage legislation by the federal Liberals in 2005 after an initial period of delay, marking the enactment of cross-national same-sex marriage recognition.\textsuperscript{199}

Interpreting Rayside, one can observe that this history basically represents the path toward near legal equality, and the related notion of equal sexual citizenship for gays and lesbians. One can see that in most cases governments were spurred on by the courts, and were therefore either forced or strongly encouraged to act by court and tribunal rulings. Yet, court rulings were not uniformly positive or proactive, and it took the Supreme Court some time to catch up with the decisions of lower courts and tribunals. This was partly a result of judicial review naturally taking time to make its way to the level of Canada’s highest court. Yet, the Supreme Court also sent confusing and less than definitive signals on the inclusion of sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination in the Charter in the early 1990s;\textsuperscript{200} this was after the question had already been decided by lower courts and tribunals. In any case, the Charter and its equality rights provisions represented a powerful opportunity structure for leveraging the courts, the legislatures, municipalities, employers, and citizens themselves to
increasingly view gay and lesbian discrimination and relationship recognition through the liberal frame of human rights.

As mentioned in Chapter One, however, legal equality has not yet been completely achieved for lesbian and gay citizens, in spite of Rayside’s assertion that “across Canada, by the end of the 1990s there was no longer much legal room (if any) to discriminate formally against same-sex couples.”

Rayside mentions that the unequal age of consent law for anal versus other forms of sexual activity and intimacy remains in the federal Criminal Code. He points out that this legal distinction in the age of consent has twice been ruled unconstitutional by appeals courts (at the time of his writing in 2008), but that the rulings do not apply cross-nationally. He does not, however, refer specifically to the anal sex law, section 159 of the Criminal Code, which is the separate provision that contains the age of consent for anal sex. The anal sex law systematically prohibits gay and bisexual men from legally engaging in penetrative sexual intercourse until eighteen (two years later than the age of consent for other forms of sexual activity). Significantly, section 159 of Canada’s Criminal Code also contains the 1969 prohibition on anal intercourse where more than two persons partake or are present. This is legally considered public sex, in addition to sex where the act actually occurs in a public place.

Thus, anal sex is legally treated differently than other forms of sexual activity not only in terms of age of consent to sexual activity but also in terms of prohibitions on group sex. Further, a conviction for anal intercourse can theoretically result in a prison sentence “not exceeding ten years,” which is the same theoretical prison sentence for a conviction of buggery in Jamaica (to be explored in Chapter Five). The key here is that Canada’s law on anal intercourse still resembles the partial decriminalization contained in the reforms of 1969, with anal intercourse not being legalized so much as certain exceptions to the prohibition on anal intercourse having
been added at that time, and only slightly modified since then. The exceptions within section 159 decriminalize anal intercourse “between husband and wife” in private, and between any two consenting persons eighteen or older in private. This is, again, so long as “more than two persons [do not] take part or are [not] present.”

It bears reiterating that a similar proscription on group sex does not exist for vaginal sexual intercourse.

David Tanovitch, writing in 2010, clarifies that section 159 has been ruled unconstitutional based on the equality rights provision of the Charter (Tanovitch foregrounds the finding of age discrimination, but Garth Barriere writes that court rulings deeming the law unconstitutional have also found that the law discriminates based on marital status and sexual orientation) in five provinces: Ontario, BC, Québec, Alberta, and Nova Scotia. Yet, as mentioned, the law remains in the Criminal Code and in effect in other Canadian provinces and territories. The Supreme Court has neglected to offer a definitive ruling on the constitutionality of the Criminal Code’s regulation of anal sex in terms of equality rights based on age, to say nothing of the statute’s constitutionality in terms of equality rights based on sexual orientation. In addition, although Parliament amended Canada’s age of consent law to provide exemptions for those who are close in age when it raised the age of consent from fourteen to sixteen in 2008, it left the anal sex law, with its unequal age of consent for anal sex and prohibition on anal group sex, intact. It is significant, therefore, that these reforms, ostensibly to address the issue of age discrimination in terms of the heavier burden the age of consent law has placed on adolescents and teenagers, do not actually address the violation of equality rights based on age within the anal sex provision itself. The violation of equality rights based on sexual orientation within section 159, for example, the unequal prohibition on gay group sex, is likewise not addressed. Therefore, formal inequality for gay and bisexual men specifically remains enshrined in law.
This has not been without practical consequence. There were anal sex charges laid in Canada as recently as 2004 in BC; these charges were brought after section 159 was ruled unconstitutional in that province in 2003 as a result of the overturning of a 2001 anal sex conviction. The ruling that section 159 was unconstitutional occurred the very same year as the legalization of same-sex marriage in that province. Anal sex charges have also been brought after the statute was ruled unconstitutional in Ontario.

In sum, the statute governing anal intercourse retains the basic contours of the 1969 partial decriminalization and remains in effect in some Canadian jurisdictions, though with a highly uncertain constitutional status. Such an immensely contradictory legal reality of the benevolent liberal extension of near legal equality through same-sex marriage, amidst the ongoing illiberal partial criminalization of anal intercourse, is very difficult for a lesbian and gay rights approach to these issues to explain except in terms of a legal anachronism rendered along the lines of a footnote. Likewise, Stychin’s understanding of sexual citizenship would be hard pressed to explain such a contradictory relation of sexual citizenship status in a postmodern nation. The concept of homohegemony fully entertains, and indeed theorizes, the existence of such contradictions both within and between political and civil society. Old laws do not simply disappear when new laws are added or existing laws amended. They have to be actively excised by legislatures or struck down by courts. Long held cultural attitudes that the laws reflect, in this case pertaining to the relative stigmatization of different types of sex, do not simply vanish once strides in sexual citizenship are made. These benevolent liberal/illiberal contradictions are endemic to the advance of homohegemony, which is simply a contemporary concatenation of Canada’s sexual citizenship history. They are not adequately acknowledged or explained by the gay and lesbian rights approach.
Returning to the gay and lesbian rights frame so as to draw from it further, in *Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada*, Miriam Smith sets out to explain the vast differences between lesbian and gay rights in Canada versus the United States. Her point of departure is that differences in cultural values between Canada and the US, even where such differences may exist, cannot account for the incredibly rapid diffusion of comprehensive gay and lesbian rights legislation in Canada and the incremental and uneven progress on gay and lesbian rights in the US over the course of the past few decades. Smith argues that the political institutions of the state matter in explaining these differences:

The legacies of previous policies as well as political institutional differences play a structuring role in this policy area, creating obstacles to policy change for the US lesbian and gay movement while providing institutional opportunity for the gay and lesbian movement in Canada.

Smith is engaged in a small-\(n\) comparative study of Canada and the US, based on a “most similar systems” logic, and employs the methodological approach of historical institutionalism. Smith is able to shed light on the differences in the diffusion of lesbian and gay rights legislation in the two countries by revealing very different opportunity structures for the lesbian and gay rights movement in each country.

Smith points to the following three institutional differences between Canada and the United States that are particularly relevant in explaining policy variation on gay and lesbian rights: “the impact of policy legacies”; jurisdictional differences in federalism and “differences in the role of the courts”; and the separation of powers versus fusion of powers, and resultant differences in political party organization. She contends that, although the courts are pivotal in lesbian and gay rights struggles, it is not enough to look at jurisprudence in isolation, as many
scholars have done. This is because in the policy area of lesbian and gay rights, and by implication other policy areas, it is the interaction between the courts and other institutional variables that makes or breaks opportunity structures for the lesbian and gay rights movement. Judicial decisions exist in a dialogue with the other levels and branches of government. The effect is that other institutional features have tended to stymie, in the United States, or consolidate, in Canada, judicial decisions on lesbian and gay rights.

Smith’s discussion of policy legacies is central to her argument. In short, she writes, “past policies are institutionalized in ways that influence current debates.” Summing up Smith’s argument on policy legacies, the discursive context enabled by a “removal” of “homosexual sexual conduct between consenting adults twenty-one years of age or older . . . from the Criminal Code” – although, as shown above, this is not a completely accurate description of the partial decriminalization that took place – and the existence of the Charter represented a more favourable opportunity structure for lesbian and gay rights in Canada than in the US.

Smith provides an account of, in effect, the legal context of how Canada came to be homohegemonic in the post-1969 period via legal developments. She does not, however, consider the ideology surrounding “gay and lesbian rights,” and therefore obscures some of the contradictory, including exclusionary, features of the contemporary gay and lesbian rights landscape. This also manifests in a lack of attention to consent and contestation in civil societal spaces.

Smith’s work is a comparison between Canada and the US, but it can also be read as a story of the internal development of gay and lesbian politics in each case country. Smith gestures in the direction of homohegemony in the Canadian context when she writes the following in the Conclusion of her contribution:
The promotion of the rights frame in Canada is increasingly tied to national projects in both English-speaking Canada and Quebec. In English-speaking Canada, same-sex marriage is increasingly seen as a marker of Canadian tolerance when compared to the US . . . In the field of public discourse, it has become more difficult for same-sex marriage opponents to openly vaunt the superiority of heterosexuality. The popularity of the Charter of Rights and the rights frame it promotes have solidified a new legal regime for same-sex couples, which has become a source of national pride for a substantial majority . . .

The hegemonic nature of lesbian and gay inclusion is here alluded to by the use of the words, “substantial majority.” The problem with this observation is that it points in the direction of nationalism and hegemonic sexual ideology without explicitly naming or exploring these dimensions. Smith takes us to the point of near legal equality, but does not systematically observe the full implications of this development, not least in terms of substantial exclusions of sexual and other forms of citizenship that continue, particularly in civil societal spaces.

By way of contrast, the work of Gary Kinsman in *The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada*, and also his co-authored work with Patrizia Gentile in *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation*, conceives of Canadian queer history as one of ongoing “heterosexual hegemony” as part of the modern Canadian state formation. Kinsman’s extensive descriptive historical account traces queer history in Canada all the way from settler colonization up until the contemporary moment, although he does not deal with developments post-2000 in depth. His work links considerations of sexuality with gender, and to a lesser extent race and colonialism, and contextualizes both of these in the capitalist mode of production and the imperatives of ongoing processes of modern nation-state formation of the capitalist
Kinsman is deeply suspicious of the 1969 reforms and subsequent liberal rights gains. He concedes that there have been beneficial advances in light of the Charter, but is always quick to point out that these were fought for by queer activists, and that liberal reforms have resulted in new forms of regulation that have set the stage for subsequent struggles. In a 2001 contribution, he refutes the notion of Canada as a “queer nation” and argues forcefully against LGBTQ identification with the Canadian state. Heterosexual hegemony continues, according to Kinsman, in terms of the regulation of homosexuality and its linkages to patriarchy, colonialism vis-à-vis Quebec and First Nations, and racism.

The limitation of Kinsman’s work is a failure to appreciate the full implications of the benevolent liberalism of the homohegemonic moment. Like Smith’s gay and lesbian rights narrative, the body of his scholarship also refuses to admit the full implications of the contradictory benevolent liberal/illiberal sides of the conferral of selective sexual citizenship rights for lesbians and gays, simply from the perspective of the opposite paradigm. In clinging to a paradigm of heterosexual hegemony and sexual regulation, he is unable to appreciate the extent of the changes to the national imaginary on sexual citizenship for some gays and lesbians that have in fact taken place. Notably, this also translates to a blind spot in terms of observing new “others” who have been constructed as a result of this shifting spectrum of inclusion/exclusion. Moreover, his focus on continuing regulation in societal spaces in spite of legal advances arguably obscures the contradictory extent of the regulation that continues in the heart of juridical government, as with the anal intercourse law.

Smith’s gay and lesbian rights narrative and Kinsman’s homosexual regulation narrative would both benefit from an embrace of the homohegemony frame. Smith’s rights focus and
Kinsman’s fixation on regulation are each accurate, if narrow. They can be interpreted as reflective of the dual moments of benevolent liberalism/illiberalism that exist in a tension that characterizes homohegemony as an ideology in formation, or development, and indeed after its realization. Both significant advances in sexual citizenship and significant ongoing and novel exclusions, and the relationship between these two dynamics, must be adequately appreciated. The next chapter shows in greater detail how the theoretical framework of homohegemony can put the important narratives of Smith and Kinsman in conversation, in order to tell the story of post-1969 LGBTQ history in Canada as one of homohegemony in a gradual process of formation, and its eventual realization in the post-same-sex marriage moment.

This chapter has shown that homohegemony has something to say in the context of a range of existing scholarly literature. While this literature informs the development of the concept of homohegemony, including its relationship to Jamaica as a constructed other, in important ways, it has been suggested that the theoretical framework advanced in this project also offers specific advantages that can overcome existing scholarly lacuna and limitations. Now that this dissertation has shown that homohegemony has something to say about media discourses on heterosexism in Jamaica, and that it has something to say in the context of scholarly literature, it will turn next to showing that the framework has something to say about Canada’s queer history.
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Chapter Four. Into the National “Self”: Reconstructing Canadian Queer History Through Homohegemony

The illiberal construction of Jamaica as a homophobic other, described in Chapter Two, would not be possible without the prior internal ideological development of Canadian homohegemony in civil and political society. It is this largely internal process of the development of Canadian homohegemony as a national sexual ideology that is the focus of this chapter. While the relative inclusion of gay and lesbian citizenship that homohegemony describes does not truly become “hegemonic” until the legal and symbolic arrival of same-sex marriage, homohegemonic ideology can be viewed as being in formation far before this point in time, advancing unevenly in historical developments of benevolent liberalism/illiberalism directed toward the gay and lesbian minority.

More specifically, in this chapter, the theoretical framework of homohegemony puts the historical narratives of Smith and Kinsman, introduced at the end of the last chapter, together in conversation. Smith’s focus on gay and lesbian rights within state institutions speaks to the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony, while Kinsman’s focus on gay and lesbian regulation speaks to the illiberal moment of homohegemony. Extending homohegemony back to earlier historical developments in gay and lesbian politics enables this chapter to conceive of the period under consideration as a shifting tension between rights and regulation, and benevolent liberalism and illiberalism.

In effect, Smith and Kinsman each speak to a different part of homohegemonic ideology. The concept of homohegemony, including the notion of homohegemony in formation, is therefore able to describe the post-1969 period as having witnessed an expanding and deepening understanding of gay and lesbian citizens as included in the national imaginary. Such rights have
been premised, however, on continuing and new forms of exclusion representing “illiberalism” directed at gays, lesbians, and constructed others. This chapter will begin with Kinsman and Smith’s respective treatments of the 1969 partial decriminalization of consensual adult same-sex sexual activity, a chronological and symbolic marker of the beginning of homohegemony in formation. The chapter will then proceed to show homohegemony in formation with reference to local surveillance and national security campaigns against gays and lesbians, followed by a focus on anti-discrimination measures. Further, it will attend to advancements in relationship recognition, culminating in same-sex marriage. Finally, ongoing illiberalism in the form of regulation and exclusions of LGBTQ people and others during the homohegemonic era – after same-sex marriage – will be considered. Each moment of incipient homohegemony in the history considered, as well as the contemporary homohegemonic moment, is marked by inclusions and exclusions. This wider image of contradictory sexual citizenship is best captured by combining insights from the paradigms of Smith and Kinsman. The critical engagement with and reformulation of these paradigms within this chapter will rely mainly on Smith’s *Political Institutions and Lesbian and Gay Rights in the United States and Canada,*¹ and Kinsman’s *The Regulation of Desire: Sexuality in Canada,*² as well as his co-authored work with Patrizia Gentile, *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation.*³

There have indeed been massive changes in terms of who is imagined as a sexual citizen in the Canadian nation corresponding to a more than limited extension of rights by the state. These changes must be recognized. Nevertheless, legal changes have been selective, and premised on moments of illiberalism in terms of specific exclusions of LGBTQ people and others within and exterior to the nation-state. Contemporary exclusions are evident in the continued construction of gays and lesbians as a perpetual minority, and therefore unthreatening
to the heterosexual majority. Exclusions are also observable in the fact that advances in sexual citizenship have not equally applied to all LGBTQ people, and have insufficiently excised the criminalization of gay sex from the legal structure. Thus, important legal and civil societal advances on lesbian and gay inclusion have not dispensed with ongoing systemic heterosexism and other oppressions in the Canadian nation-state, and have occurred alongside the imagination of new others.

**From Formal Heterosexism to Homohegemony: Homohegemony in Formation**

The 1969 reform of the Criminal Code of Canada is addressed by both Kinsman and Smith, and is widely and accurately seen as a formative moment in gay and lesbian rights in Canada. Kinsman and Smith each provide important context to the 1969 reform.

Kinsman demonstrates that liberalizing the laws related to same-gender sex was not a simple or straightforward process. The reform also had a number of historical antecedents. One important aspect to this political context, as cited and discussed in Kinsman, were the Kinsey psychological studies. These major US studies documented sexual practices in a way that contributed to a number of new views regarding sexuality, with mixed effects in terms of advancing homosexual rights. As Kinsman summarizes, these views included: viewing homosexuality more in terms of sexual object choice rather than through the previous prism of “gender inversion”; viewing homosexuality as a “deviation” from the norm rather than as a “perversion,” which was an important distinction at the time; viewing some forms of homosexuality as not harmful to the public; and viewing some forms of homosexuality as better dealt with by psychologists, psychiatrists, and other medical professionals than the state. These studies were joined by the advent of sociological analyses that took a less blatantly normative view of homosexuality, studying homosexual subcultures along the lines of community formation, and as subject to the same sociological processes that have attended the formation of
other types of communities.

Such studies and discourses, taking place within or impacting the Canadian context, are early indications of homohegemony in formation in Canadian civil society. These events mark the beginnings of an inclusive attitude towards homosexuals, albeit one that does not go beyond advocating for their “toleration.” The notion of treating gays and lesbians humanely or justly, including medically rather than criminally, can thus be seen as having developed first within civil society. These ideas were first taken up by opinion leaders and academics in Canada, laying the groundwork for later shifts in political society.

This approach to what might be called “inclusion as toleration” was not yet popularly conceived of in terms of “gay and lesbian rights.” It was, however, conceived of within a broadly understood human rights paradigm, in which the individual freedoms of homosexuals were to be minimally acknowledged. An important part of the context leading up to the 1969 reform consisted in the agency of homosexuals and lesbians themselves, in forming communities and organizations and advancing human rights arguments to anyone then willing to listen. Kinsman points out that gay and lesbian community formation was partly enabled by capitalism’s creation of “low-status jobs around which there was relative indifference towards homosexuality.” Some gays and lesbians did therefore “come out” in the sense of more openly fighting for both private and public spaces, and in terms of asserting a more visible homosexual identity at this time. Changes in the structure of the economy, including increasing urbanization and the growth of a large service sector, “meant that homosexual men could escape [to an extent] the family and religious regulations that were still strong in rural areas.” Reading an earlier section of Kinsman’s contribution, it can be observed that these were extensions of some of the same economic and social processes that first opened up the possibility for the development of urban
homosexual subcultures in the late 1800s and early 1900s.\textsuperscript{10}

Kinsman explores the formation of “homophile organizations”\textsuperscript{11} in Toronto, Vancouver, and Montréal, in many cases allied with or otherwise influenced by homophile organizations in the United States. These organizations facilitated lesbian and gay community building and laid some of the groundwork that would lead to legal reform. They produced publications, organized lecture series, and so forth. While the organizations did not lead a popular education campaign, they did meet with government officials and exert some influence in advocating for the civil liberties of homosexuals,\textsuperscript{12} even in the context of the deeply heteronormative and heterosexist nature of the Canadian state at that time. Homophile organizations sometimes had radical roots, but adopted a strategically accommodationist approach. Accepting the dominant paradigms of homosexuality as a medicalized condition and arguing for limited legal reforms consistent with the de-criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual activity, the organizations maintained that not all homosexuals posed a “risk” to the public. This assuaged the fears of pedophilia that comingled with the dominant paradigm of homosexuality at that time. This positioning placed homosexuality as a “congenital” condition for a fixed minority of the population that could be better dealt with by the psychiatrist, doctor, or clergyman, rather than the criminal justice system. The modern fight for gay and lesbian rights and the attempt to normalize homosexuality would only later come to characterize the gay and lesbian liberation movements in Canada, the US, and other mostly Northern countries.

Kinsman relates that there were significant changes to those parts of the Criminal Code pertaining to same-gender sex from 1953 to 1954. First, “the revised code applied buggery [sodomy] only to acts between humans, separating it from bestiality, although they remained part of the same section.”\textsuperscript{13} As well, “‘gross indecency’ was broadened from a male homosexual
offence to cover ‘everyone who commits an act of gross indecency with another person.’”

Gross indecency remained, however, undefined. Kinsman writes that it continued to be used mainly to criminalize the same-sex sexual acts of men, but it now technically covered “indecent” heterosexual and lesbian sexual acts as well. Kinsman notes that this departed from the situation in the United Kingdom where gross indecency “continued to apply only to male homosexual acts,” as it had in Canada up until this point. Finally, “‘criminal sexual psychopath’ [later renamed ‘dangerous sexual offender’] legislation was also expanded to include ‘buggery’ and ‘gross indecency’ as ‘triggering’ offences, and this would have very serious consequences in the future.”

Another aspect of the context leading up to the 1969 reform was the English “Wolfenden Report.” Kinsman shows how the Wolfenden Report had an indirect yet significant influence on Canadian laws pertaining to sexuality and gender. The Wolfenden Report resulted from a committee struck in 1954 in the United Kingdom to “investigate the ‘nauseating subject’ of male homosexuality and prostitution.” The main contribution of the report centred on the distinction between “public” and “private” morality, which Kinsman explains are abstract and arbitrary constructs, made real and selectively applied by the liberal state. For the purposes of this discussion, it is notable that the Wolfenden Report emphasized the point that “there exists a private morality which should be free of direct legal intervention.” This notion was applied by the report to male homosexual sexual activity occurring in private between consenting adults. Homosexual sexual activity as such would not be legalized, but it was proposed that men’s same-gender sex occurring in a private context, as then understood, be decriminalized and handed over to the jurisdiction of the medical establishment. This specifically included psychiatric institutions. Consensual sex in a washroom stall, in a military barracks, and so forth, was not to
be considered “private” under this formulation.

The report did not challenge “heterosexual hegemony.” It did, however, reformulate hegemonic discourses and set the context for legal reform. Kinsman writes that this reformulation “had certain progressive consequences and presented new opportunities for gays, lesbians, and others.”22 The reforms recommended by Wolfenden were also tied to reforms in the regulation of women’s bodies, the two issues of male homosexuality and women’s sexual autonomy having been legislatively linked since at least the late 1800s in the United Kingdom and Canada.23 In England, recommendations pertaining to prostitution were implemented immediately, but the liberalizing components dealing with homosexuality were not adopted until 1967, and not in Scotland and Northern Ireland until the 1980s.24 Kinsman cites Bland, McCabe, and Mort as writing that “[Wolfenden] is ‘permissive’ in that it opens up an area of private, individual ‘consent’ while maintaining if not tightening its control of the public manifestations of ‘irregular’ sexual conduct.”25 Kinsman points out in this respect that in England the conviction rate for homosexual offenses actually increased in the aftermath of the 1967 reforms.

The Criminal Code and 1969 Reform: Private Sexual Citizenship

With some of this important global and national historical context established, it is now possible to properly consider the Criminal Code reform, as conveyed by Kinsman. This will be done with an eye toward establishing the beginnings of homohegemony in formation. In 1964, New Democrat Member of Parliament (MP) Arnold Peters attempted unsuccessfully to introduce a private member’s bill that would have decriminalized adult homosexual sexual activity in private.26 Nevertheless, the homophile movement and its ideas were making some political headway, as evidenced by the fact that Peters did have some connections with homophile organizing in Canada.27 However, it was the Everett Klippert judicial saga, including the Supreme Court of Canada decision, that dramatically changed public debate regarding the just
treatment of gays and lesbians in Canada.

By way of background to the Supreme Court decision, it will be helpful to briefly step outside of Kinsman’s account. Everett George Klippert, a mechanic, had been charged and had pled guilty to four counts of gross indecency in the Northwest Territories in 1965. While Klippert was in prison serving out his sentence, the Crown applied under provisions of the Criminal Code mentioned above to have Klippert declared a dangerous sexual offender. As part of the hearing of the application, the evidence of two psychiatrists who had had an opportunity to assess Klippert was heard. While it was agreed that the evidence indicated that Klippert had only ever engaged in sex of a consensual nature and posed no sexual danger, the issue that the decision turned on was the evidence that Klippert was likely to reoffend with other consenting males. Within the meaning of the Criminal Code, this was enough to have him successfully declared a dangerous sexual offender in 1966. Klippert was therefore subject to a sentence of “preventive detention” on this basis. His counsel appealed to the Court of Appeal for the Northwest Territories but his appeal was dismissed. Klippert was subsequently granted leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, which, in a ruling in 1967, essentially agreed with the lower court that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kinsman puts this decision into the greater context of legal reform:

Ten years after the release of the Wolfenden Report and after the British government had adopted its recommendations on homosexuality, the Supreme Court of Canada majority affirmed a judgment which virtually deemed all sexually active homosexuals “dangerous sexual offenders.” A gay man convicted of gross indecency and likely to commit this act again was liable to be incarcerated for life regardless of whether the act was committed with a consenting adult in private.
The Klippert case clearly signalled that someone who had engaged in consensual same-sex sexual activity in private could in fact be “incarcerated for life” via the “dangerous sexual offender” legislation that had been introduced in the 1950s.\(^{31}\) The irony is that absent the fairly recent dangerous sexual offender legislation there may have been no outcry, as the enforcement of ordinary buggery and gross indecency legislation had not provoked a similar public and political reaction.

Tommy Douglas, leader of the New Democratic Party at the time, reacted to the Supreme Court’s rejection of Klippert’s appeal with a request that the government set up a commission similar to the one that produced the Wolfenden Report in the UK.\(^{32}\) It was in this context that then Liberal Justice Minister Pierre Trudeau “expressed approval for more liberalized laws.”\(^{33}\) The media reaction to the Klippert case, though by no means condoning or normalizing a still very othered homosexuality, also expressed disagreement with the decision. There was also public surprise that someone who engaged in consensual sex could be incarcerated for life, and the hegemonic media response seems to have taken the position that not all homosexual sex should be a criminal offence.\(^{34}\)

Using the notion of homohegemony in formation, it can be concluded that the media and the politicians joined the medical and psychiatric establishments, the criminal law experts,\(^{35}\) some churches and church organizations,\(^{36}\) and the homophile movement in a civil societal understanding of the need to extend very limited citizenship rights to gays and lesbians in the form of private sexual citizenship. Based on the media outcry that Kinsman details, a majority of the Canadian public seems to have been surprised that the Klippert decision was consistent with Canadian law, however deviant Klippert’s behaviour was then considered to be.\(^{37}\) Trudeau uttered his now famous line that “the state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation” during the
ensuing political debate on legal reform. Reform of the same-gender sex law was proposed by Trudeau at this time, although notably it would not occur for two more years.

The reform in 1969 was an important element of the Liberal Party’s new ruling coalition, with Trudeau, now Prime Minister, at the helm. This new hegemonic bloc in formation was captured by the notion of the “Just Society.” The discourses surrounding the “Just Society,” a term expressly used by the Liberal Party under Trudeau, capture the benevolent liberal moment vis-à-vis gays and lesbians. Both Kinsman and Smith demonstrate that this notion was connected to a much broader modernization project and a progressive English-Canadian nationalism that found expression in other social issues, such as divorce law reform, the repeal of capital punishment, and the carefully circumscribed legalization of abortion. In effect, various others, including classes of criminal, vulnerable, or marginalized people, were incompletely shifted from the jurisdiction of the law to the jurisdiction of the medical professions and other organizations in civil society. The liberalization of social policy at the time also served as a way of incorporating some elements of the social democratic and progressive movements in Canada into a progressive nationalism led by the Liberal Party, while blocking and deterring significant challenges to capitalism.

However, it is not necessarily accurate to read the Canadian liberalization and the British liberalization in the same way. The Canadian liberalization must be interpreted in the context of the “Just Society,” and speaks to the beginnings of an ideology about gay and lesbian, among other minorities, inclusion in the national imaginary through a benevolent liberal extension of private sexual citizenship, a citizenship confined to the bedroom to be sure, but one to be defended by the Prime Minister himself in a context that Canadians today commonly regard as the moment when Canada “legalized homosexuality.” The “permissive” British partial
decriminalization can be read as a liberalization consistent with the Wolfenden approach; after all, legal reform in this context was very directly resultant from Wolfenden.\textsuperscript{43} The Canadian partial decriminalization, though influenced by these discourses, can be additionally interpreted as a benevolent liberalization in light of the context of the “Just Society.”

Trudeau’s proposed legislation concerning the de-criminalization of “buggery and gross indecency for private acts between consenting adults”\textsuperscript{44} eventually passed in the House of Commons, inaugurating a narrow private sphere of permitted homosexual activity, and a wide public sphere of proscribed homosexual sexual activity. Kinsman explains that this private/public institutionalized divide would set the parameters for future battles over gay and lesbian private and public space, including raids on gay and lesbian bars and bathhouses that would become widespread and highly coercive in the 1970s and early 1980s.

Miriam Smith’s account corroborates the significance of the 1969 reform and identifies much of the same historical context leading up to it as Kinsman. When it comes to the more immediate “spark” for the reform, Smith also refers to the Klippert case, stating:

Partially in response to the public outcry over the Klippert case as well as to advocacy work by ASK [a Canadian homophile organization] and by lawyers’ groups such as the Canadian Bar Association, the federal government in 1967 followed the lead of Britain in tabling a bill to decriminalize homosexual acts between consenting adults twenty-one years of age or older.\textsuperscript{45} Smith also mentions the Wolfenden Report as being “influential in Canadian legal thinking” at this time.\textsuperscript{46} The influence of the Kinsey studies is noted as well.\textsuperscript{47} Smith concurs with Kinsman that Wolfenden was explicitly heterosexist and that it in no way suggested a normalizing or legitimizing of homosexuality; on the contrary, in some ways it suggested the attempt to
formulate more effective ways of “steering men who had sex with men . . . into heterosexual relationships.” In other words, like Kinsman, Smith maintains that Wolfenden and the reforms in its wake did not represent a threat to the heterosexist status quo. Smith cites Kinsman and A. M. Smith, writing that, “Wolfenden . . . was aimed at producing the ‘good’ homosexual who would confine sexual activities to the private realm, without disrupting heteronormativity.”

Yet, the fact that the nation-state could even now conceive of a “good” homosexual citizen was significant, and suggests an important development at the level of hegemonic ideology pertaining to sexuality, within the progressive nationalist context of the “Just Society.”

Rather than merely marking the removal of a legal impediment to future gay and lesbian rights, or a “stage in the evolution of Canadian human rights,” as Smith contends, 1969 can be read as containing the same inherently benevolent liberal/illiberal tension that fundamentally characterizes a contradictory homohegemony today. This is particularly the case since the basic contours of the partial decriminalization of anal sex, including the ban on group sex and unequal age of consent in this context, remain in place in Canada’s Criminal Code as of 2014. 1969 represents the beginning of an ideology about gay and lesbian inclusion in the national imaginary corresponding to the benevolent liberal extension of sexual citizenship rights. Yet, such inclusion took place within highly illiberal limits at the time, as it was premised on continuing and novel forms of exclusion and regulation.

Post-1969: The High Cost of Sexual Citizenship: Illiberal Public Regulation

Exclusions of gays and lesbians continued after the 1969 reform in explicit forms of regulation, through national security and local surveillance state apparatuses targeting LGBTQ people. This continuing regulation can be understood in terms of homohegemony. Limited inclusion of some gays and lesbians corresponding to private sexual citizenship was premised on continuing, and indeed even amplified, illiberal exclusions and regulation in the realms of both
juridical government and civil society. Benevolent liberalism created a new category of “good” gays and lesbians to be tolerated, but this meant that the state could be even harsher in some cases towards those queers who fell outside of the sexual citizenship frame, such as it was at the time. This could include gays and lesbians who were not normative in terms of gender performance, gays and lesbians in low-status jobs or marginal spaces, transgender folk, or any gays or lesbians who failed to follow the extreme privatization of their sexual identities called for by this newly “inclusive” imagining of gay and lesbian “belonging.” Significant exclusions were experienced by queers who were constructed as threats to national security and public order. It is the illiberal moments of 1969 and its aftermath, another side of homohegemony in formation, that this section will now consider.

Kinsman shows how in the 1940s and 1950s, American and Canadian homosexuals were seen as potential “communists” or vulnerable to being blackmailed in the context of the fight against communism in the Cold War. Anti-communist and anti-homosexual witch hunts are well known to have taken place in the United States, but they occurred in Canada as well. According to Kinsman, hundreds of homosexual civil servants “lost their jobs for ‘security’ reasons in the late 1950s and early 1960s.”

As one example, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) policy was to “fire all known homosexuals.” The persecution of homosexuals serving in the RCMP was most intense in the 1950s and 1960s. It slowed down considerably in the early 1970s after the 1969 reform, “but, at a lower intensity, it continued until [the 80s].” The “homo-hunt” was reduced in intensity in the civil service in the 1960s, reflecting the changing attitudes at the time, which posited that homosexuality was not a choice for some individuals, and that not all homosexuals posed a “security risk.” However, the RCMP “held to its view that all homosexuality was a
criminal offence and a character weakness,” and developed special interrogation techniques to
detect homosexuality, including “the measurement of pupils while showing the subject pictures
of naked men.”60 In addition, “until 1986, the RCMP Security Service regarded homosexuality as
a ‘character weakness’ and maintained a strict anti-gay hiring policy.”61 In spite of a benevolent
liberalization in some areas, signalled by the extension of private sexual citizenship, certain
notable illiberal areas were thus legally permitted to continue to operate vis-à-vis the regulation
of homosexuality. Military, police, and bureaucratic spaces of the state were chief among them.
As the hegemonic state bloc was still in formation, the ideological commitment to a “Just
Society” did not yet require anything close to resembling legal equality for gays and lesbians. In
fact, maintaining strict heterosexist norms through coercion and the armed apparatuses of the
state ensured the cautious transition to partial and conditional rights for selected gay and lesbian
citizens.

Kinsman notes that the Canadian immigration act of 1952 barred “homosexuals” as a
status group, viewing them as potential “subversives.”62 This was a departure from Canadian
law’s tendency to regulate homosexuality by criminalizing same-sex sexual activity. Officially
prohibiting homosexuals from immigrating to Canada was not reformed until 1977.63 This again
speaks to the limited toleration of some homosexuals at the time; clearly, immigrant
homosexuals were not included among this embryonic class of sexual citizens. This is also
suggestive of how longstanding legally formalized heterosexism, representing illiberal
exclusions of gays and lesbians in the heart of political society, persisted after the 1969 reform.

In The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation, Kinsman and
Patrizia Gentile document systematic “national security campaigns against queers” that took
place until into the late 1980s and early 1990s, particularly within the military and the RCMP.64
According to Kinsman and Gentile, liberalizing arguments, including those couched in the equality rights language of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, would eventually be successfully directed at these institutions in order to address legal inequality. This would end the official war on queers, though not the unofficial regulation of LGBTQ people in these spaces.  

Understanding this process as homohegemony in formation foregrounds a gradual shifting of the meaning of benevolent liberalism, as the scope of selective citizenship rights extended by the Canadian state was progressively enlarged in response to social movement activism and a favourable opportunity structure represented by the Charter. Social movements, challenging hegemonic heterosexism, pointed out the stark contradictions between emerging moments of liberal benevolence in certain state and societal spaces, and continuing and amplified illiberalism. They effectively influenced the state to extend more citizenship rights in an effort to “save” the sexual ideology in formation.

Kinsman examines how regulation occurred at the local level of political society as well, in terms of what might be called a local surveillance state apparatus. This occurred mostly in the form of police surveillance and disruption of the gay and lesbian community. Raids on bars and bathhouses led to the increased criminalization of gays and lesbians in these important autonomous spaces of community, turning them into politicized spaces. Gays and lesbians were charged with “indecent acts” constructed as having taken place in public, and under provisions pertaining to the violation of “bawdy-house” legislation. This legislation “had initially been drafted to deal with houses of prostitution,” yet had been subsequently expanded to include establishments kept or resorted to for “acts of indecency.” Kinsman explains that, by the late 1970s through to the early 1980s in major Canadian cities, “the police began to use the bawdy-house law systematically against gay establishments.” Further, in Toronto, from 1982 to 1983,
“more than six hundred men were arrested in washrooms for homosexual ‘offences.’” The coercive arm of the state, in Gramscian terms, continued heterosexist regulation even as the ideological hegemony of limited gay and lesbian inclusion was advanced. The resulting contradictions between benevolent liberal and blatantly illiberal moments led to significant opposition to the national security and local surveillance state apparatuses in civil society, led by the significant mobilization of the gay and lesbian movement. In fact, it was police brutality during this period, with the catalyst being a police raid of various bathhouses, that mobilized Toronto’s first modern gay pride demonstration in 1981. The lesbian and gay movement at the time was able to initiate a national conversation and normalize homosexuality to a degree unforeseen by the earlier homophile movement, using the excesses of police repression during a supposedly “liberal era” to illustrate the need for change.

Another significant source of illiberalism after the 1969 reform was evidenced in the context of the HIV/AIDS epidemic and crisis. Many gays had to fight for their lives. Homosexuals also had to fight against a renewed attempt to stigmatize their identity based on a conflation of homosexuality and disease. Such a conflation has a long history, dating back to the medical model of homosexuality and its elaboration by sex psychology and sexology in the late 1800s and early 1900s. The HIV/AIDS epidemic also provided an impetus for community formation and the coming together of lesbians and gays at the grassroots level in the face of an inadequate government response and new forms of medical regulation. It further provided a rallying point for the reform of health insurance plans, both public and private, to include same-sex partners, and spurred on the fight for other measures of equality impacting lesbians and gays. Against a trend toward a more assimilationist or accommodationist politics within the gay and lesbian community and movement extant at the time, the HIV/AIDS epidemic and crisis...
revived forms of radical “queer” activism in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Gays and lesbians fought back against state and societal illiberal exclusions in the context of HIV/AIDS. Difficult compromises have at times had to be made in this process due to a public health establishment interested in the “containment” of the virus from the “general public,” a general public constructed and represented as heterosexual.

This section has demonstrated that public illiberalism, as documented by Kinsman via the frame of regulation, continued in significant ways after the 1969 reform, largely as a condition of the private sexual citizenship benevolently extended by said reform. Conceiving of this period as a tension between benevolent liberalism and illiberalism that prefigures the homohegemonic moment explains how the state, when faced with the exposure of these blatant contradictions by social movement activism, was strongly influenced to act in order to preserve an unfolding ideology of inclusion of gays and lesbians. Homohegemony thus continued to advance as a state ideology in formation, as patently illiberal areas of the state’s regulation and exclusion of homosexuality were gradually addressed and selective citizenship rights slowly extended. It is back to the benevolent liberal moment that this chapter now turns.

Anti-Discrimination Measures: Sexual Citizenship for a Status Group

The period of transition from hegemonic heterosexism to homohegemony included a long period of major contradictions between the extension of selective sexual citizenship rights, marking moments of benevolent liberalism, and ramped up sexual regulation, marking moments of illiberal exclusion. This demonstrates the uneven process through which a new hegemonic ideology forms, consistent with a Gramscian framework. Yet, it is also a reminder that these basic tensions do not simply cease once an ideology becomes hegemonic, which will be discussed at the end of this chapter. This section will sketch the next major development in citizenship rights for gays and lesbians after the 1969 reform, which consisted of prohibitions on
sexual orientation discrimination at the provincial/territorial and federal levels of government. Such prohibitions represented an expansion of sexual citizenship beyond the private realm and into the realm deemed “public.” This occurred through state recognition of sexual orientation as a constitutionally protected minority social group or status group, a prohibited ground of discrimination deemed to be analogous to the ones expressly included under the “equality rights” provisions of the Charter. Such sexual citizenship went beyond the bedroom, but did not go as far as affirmative state measures to publicly recognize relationships. They can therefore be viewed as somewhat of a midpoint between the 1969 moment and the near legal equality represented by the same-sex marriage moment. Moreover, the onset of anti-discrimination measures inscribed in law was coterminous with many of the illiberal developments outlined above, namely the coercive targeting of queers in the context of national security and local surveillance, and indeed the “moral panic” surrounding HIV/AIDS. By the time of relationship recognition in the late 1990s and early 2000s, these most obvious bastions of political and civil societal illiberalism vis-à-vis gays and lesbians had been significantly addressed. Before this, however, these sources of obvious illiberalism continued contradictorily alongside anti-discrimination measures.

Returning to reading Smith’s historical account, a further benevolent liberal extension of selective citizenship rights for gays and lesbians can be observed with respect to a significant human rights achievement for homosexuals in Canada after the introduction of the Charter in 1982. As suggested, this was in the form of prohibitions on sexual orientation discrimination both provincially and federally. Québec had already included sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination before the Canadian Charter, in its own provincial human rights legislation in 1977. Smith’s institutional history illustrates that provincial and federal human
rights commissions were instrumental in the process of legally prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination. Smith explains that:

Over the period from 1951 to 1977, human rights commissions were established in every Canadian jurisdiction as bureaucracies charged with implementing provincial and federal human rights policies, adjudicating human rights complaints, especially complaints of private discrimination by employers and landlords, and educating the public about discrimination and human rights.84

These commissions were set up before the Charter, and were partly a way of addressing the enforcement of human rights in a traditional Westminster parliamentary context lacking judicial review. Smith notes that the “human rights commission template in Canada left the investigation, mediation and redress of grievance entirely to the commission, which litigated on behalf of the complainant.”85 In other words, these were arms-length government bureaucracies designated to implement human rights. This eventually included gay and lesbian rights through the securing of sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination in provincial human rights legislation based on an interpretation of the Charter. This has subsequently been broadened to explicitly include gender identity and expression in select Canadian jurisdictions; Egale Canada points to this being the case in only the Northwest Territories, Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia, in their 2013 press release on the topic.87 Smith writes that while some of the commissions’ work on human rights, for example on anti-racism, was of a more symbolic nature, on the issue of gay rights “the commissions eventually played an important role in intervening in public debates about lesbian and gay rights and in advocating the inclusion of sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination.”88

Smith argues that the human rights commissions “constituted a state elite that had an
interest in the expansion of human rights protections,” and that “the establishment of a human rights commission gave state-sanctioned support to the discourse of human rights.” The fact that the state established these commissions strongly indicates the benevolent liberal extension of selective citizenship by political society. Yet, such an expressly statist orientation also indicates that such benevolence could be extended within illiberal limits constituting significant exclusions. A notable limit in this regard, in addition to the practices of coercive regulation discussed above, was public relationship recognition. Operating basically on the border between political and civil society, the human rights commissions can be further interpreted as a means of incorporating the lesbian and gay movement and other social movements, bringing the struggle for human rights into political society. This had a mixed effect on the lesbian and gay movement, mainstreaming and arguably co-opting a social movement that had previously represented more radical potential under gay and lesbian liberationism and lesbian feminism.

At the same time, “state-sanctioned support” for human rights in general, and gay and lesbian rights in particular, had the effect of opening wider spaces in civil society (for example, the workplace) for expressing openly gay and lesbian identities, and represented a limited inclusion of gays and lesbian sexual citizens in the national imaginary in way that went beyond the 1969 reform.

Kinsman’s 1987 discussion of the 1980s devotes very little attention to the subject of anti-discrimination measures. In connection with this development he writes, “sexual orientation protection does nothing in and of itself to dislodge institutionalized heterosexuality in social, family, and other State policies nor to stop sexual policing.” However, this important human rights development cannot be so easily dismissed or subsumed within a regulatory liberalism. Perhaps sensing this, Kinsman devotes a great deal of attention to addressing the issue of sexual orientation’s “reading into” the Charter and the movement toward a degree of legal equality for
gays and lesbians in his 1996 volume and in his co-authored work with Gentile. He concedes that the reading of sexual orientation into the Charter and the resultant anti-discrimination measures, and even incipient relationship recognition measures by 1996, represented “at least a partially different pattern of State formation.” He goes on to assess that, “at the same time, there also exists an extension and intensification of certain forms of sexual policing and censorship directed against us [queers].”

Rather than interpret these measures as reflecting a “partially different pattern of State formation,” extending homohegemony back in time reveals merely a shift in the benevolent liberal/illiberal dynamic that has been in play since 1969. Anti-discrimination measures reflect the gradual increase in the scope of selective sexual citizenship rights extended to lesbians and gays, a development that occurs alongside continuing and new illiberal exclusions. Certainly the benevolence on offer under these measures is more pronounced than that associated with the 1969 reforms, but, observed in the light of homohegemony, it does not represent a new ideology or associated ruling relations.

Kinsman also inadequately appreciates the gravity of these measures and their import for understandings of lesbian and gay citizenship. He usefully explains that the situation inaugurated by the Charter has brought “abstract” and “formal” equality for gays and lesbians in some respects, but that substantive equality is lacking, observing that “our [queers’] rights as ‘private’ individuals are recognized, while our real social and material differences . . . our erotic pleasures and the gender of those we love, are still not recognized as valid and equal.” He goes on to say that this contradictory situation represents a legacy of the limitations of the 1969 reform, in which a “decriminalization” rather than “legalization” occurred around same-sex sexual intercourse, as argued above. Finally, he speculates that this “limited individual formal equality” might make it possible for “those of us who are not too ‘queer’” to be integrated into
“respectable straight society,” but within the fundamental framework of the “social practices of heterosexual hegemony.” While Kinsman is correct here in many ways, particularly in terms of the contradictory continuation of the criminalization of certain forms of gay sex that continues even today, in 2014, he underestimates the ability of the recognition of sexual orientation under the Charter, and especially of full relationship recognition in the late 1990s and early 2000s that was an extension of this process, to result in a change of “social consciousness” around sexual citizenship and the national imaginary. That is, the movement toward legal equality is, and has been, a powerful signifier of citizenship and a symbolic statement of inclusion in the national imaginary. This shortcoming of Kinsman’s analysis is rooted in a lack of appreciation of the full significance of the benevolent liberal moment. Sexual orientation discrimination protections are not merely abstract or formal. To an individual gay or lesbian person, having such measures in place could mean the difference between being fired from their workplace or not. Likewise, relationship recognition, though still admittedly abstract in terms of not necessarily condoning the morality of same-sex relations or homosexual identity, represents a significant step in terms of substantive equality for gays and lesbians in addition to an institutionalization of equal sexual citizenship. The divide between legal equality and substantive inequality, or between formal equality and social practices in civil society, that Kinsman sets up is therefore a false dichotomy, as legal changes can and do lead to changes in attitudes on gay and lesbian rights and relationship recognition in societal spaces. This is in addition to changes in the way the nation conceives of its membership. Attitudinal change resultant from legal change has been well documented by J. Scott Matthews on the issue of same-sex marriage in Canada. In short, Kinsman implicitly recognizes the benevolent liberal moment and its capacity of selective inclusion for some gays and lesbians. He recognizes its connection to legal equality. Yet, he
forecloses the notion that this represents a change to the contents of sexual citizenship and the contours of the national imaginary, one that moves substantially beyond a merely abstract equality for those whose lives are materially impacted by these legislative changes. While it is true that substantive inequality resultant from systemic heterosexual hegemony is not dislodged, symbolic heterosexual hegemony as a citizenship superstructure, protected by political institutions, is in fact significantly undermined by this advancement. Legal changes in turn help to symbolize a new sexual citizenship superstructure, which has substantive and societal effects.

In contrast to Kinsman, in connection with the discussion of sexual orientation discrimination, Smith writes that “from the very moment of the Criminal Code reform of 1969, the [gay and lesbian] movement was identified with the very definition of what it is to be Canadian (at least outside of Québec), namely human rights as defined by the Liberal Party, led by Pierre Trudeau.” Here, the opposite problem of Kinsman’s overly pessimistic account is illuminated, in the form of an account that is overly optimistic, verging on celebratory. Smith is advancing this claim in contradistinction to the less favourable federal partisan political opportunity structure with which the US lesbian and gay movement found itself faced over the same period, and this must be kept in mind. Nevertheless, Smith’s influential account could read as if gays and lesbians were commonly imagined as significantly included in the Canadian national community in 1969. Smith’s analysis grasps the importance of gay and lesbian rights as a state project. As shown, however, with reference to both Smith and Kinsman, there was in reality a more complex dynamic of conditional and circumscribed inclusion. Meaningful inclusion for gays and lesbians that marked them as equal members of the Canadian nation developed gradually, and unevenly, and only after considerable social movement activism. This occurred over the course of decades.
Returning to Smith’s chronology of prohibitions on sexual orientation discrimination, provinces (other than Québec) added sexual orientation discrimination to their provincial human rights legislation after the adoption of the Charter, and particularly after its interpretation by the human rights commissions and lower courts as including sexual orientation as a ground of discrimination “analogous” to those specifically enumerated in its equality rights section (section 15). Section 15 did not come into effect until three years after the new constitution was brought in, in 1982, in order “to give governments time to bring statutes and legislation into line with the new provisions.”\textsuperscript{101} During this time, the government formed an equality rights sub-committee under the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Issues. Significantly, after this committee reported back to the Progressive Conservative government, the government responded that “it would interpret section 15 of the Charter as including sexual orientation.”\textsuperscript{102} Further, it stated that it would change legislation and otherwise reflect the fact that sexual orientation was a prohibited ground of discrimination in federal jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{103} These historical facts are cited by Kinsman and Gentile as well.\textsuperscript{104}

This dissertation reads this development as indicative of homohegemony in formation. The Progressive Conservative government at the time – one of the two political parties that led to the founding of the current, more socially conservative, Conservative Party of Canada\textsuperscript{105} – supported treating sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination under the Charter. This took place in spite of the fact that some members of the government caucus were opposed to this action. This development attests to the emerging status of homohegemony as an ideology consented to by actors in political society in addition to civil society by that time period. Yet, there was nevertheless over this period a reluctance on the part of the federal government, both from the Progressive Conservatives in terms of recognizing sexual orientation discrimination,
and later among Liberals in terms of formalizing sexual orientation discrimination protections at the federal level, to initiate the extension of selective sexual citizen rights absent judgments by the Courts that were cast in the equality rights obligations of the Charter. These governments consented to the courts, but were previously ambivalent if not opposed to the additional extension of sexual citizenship rights. This can be interpreted in the context of homohegemony in formation as a widening agreement with the ideology of gay and lesbian inclusion, but not necessarily agreement on the specific sexual citizenship rights to be extended. The ambivalence about further citizenship extensions to gays and lesbians captures the clear comingling of the benevolent liberal and illiberal moments. This was a tension observable more clearly at that time, before the decisive advancement of homohegemony.

**The Homohegemonic Turn: Sexual Citizenship as Formal Equality**

The move toward full relationship recognition for same-sex couples in the late 1990s resulted in near legal equality for lesbians and gays, and paved the way for same-sex marriage and the homohegemonic moment. Smith observes that “While lesbian and gay rights struggles from the late 1960s to the 1990s focused on the rights of the individual, the late 1990s saw a shift of the legal and political terrain [in both Canada and the US] from the rights of the individual to the rights of couples and families.” She further elaborates on the conditions of possibility for this shift, namely the sociological fact of more “out” gays and lesbians living in relationships, including with children. Certainly, relationship recognition signals a greater form of public or political acceptance and therefore inclusion of gays and lesbians in terms of sexual citizenship. It is here that a decisive turn to homohegemony after decades of formation can be observed.

Smith views the “transition to same-sex marriage” as having taken place through the “recognition of co-habiting same-sex couples.” This occurred through court cases in the late 1990s, culminating in the *M v. H* Supreme Court decision, which established that co-habiting
same-sex couples should be accorded the same legal status as co-habiting opposite-sex couples.” From this legal equivalency, it was therefore not a significant legal or ideological leap to a ruling on same-sex marriage. The climate for a positive ruling on same-sex marriage was also facilitated by positive rulings confirming sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination by the Supreme Court of Canada. The significant point with respect to homohegemony is that the folding of gays and lesbians into the national imaginary started to occur before the Charter, and the interpretation of the Charter by judges and legal experts occurred in an ideological climate that was already in transition towards homohegemony. Institutional factors must be set within their ideological context. Gesturing at this larger ideological climate, Smith writes:

The evolution of lesbian and gay policies in Canada depended not only on the decisions of courts, but also on the broad political support for these rights and the reluctance of governments to challenge “Charter values,” given their association with (English) Canadian nationalism. Moreover . . . gay rights opponents were shut out of the centralized and elite-driven dynamics of policy change in this area.

The problem with this assertion is that there was not always “broad political support” for particular gay and lesbian rights, as Smith’s contribution points out regarding same-sex marriage in the 1990s. An alternative explanation, inclusive of Smith’s account, is that the political class and the population supported the notion of inclusion of gays and lesbians via the gradual extension of selective sexual citizenship rights, but not gay and lesbian rights tout suite or tout court. Specific gay and lesbian rights became barometers of benevolent liberalism only once interpreted by the courts in light of the Charter, and agitated for by the lesbian and gay movement and its allies. The courts can here be seen to have fulfilled an active ideological, in
addition to institutional, function in the formation of homohegemony. Contextualizing “rights” and “regulation” within an ideological understanding of gay and lesbian inclusion, as described by homohegemony, represents a more expansive explanation of Canadian queer history over this period.

Smith notes that Canadian courts moved very quickly from the decisions of the late 1990s concerning sexual orientation discrimination and the recognition of common law same-sex marriage into same-sex marriage. She documents that with one exception, the province of Alberta, the provinces and the federal government largely did their best to live up to the *M. v. H.* ruling by amending and adjusting their statutes as legally required. This certainly reflects, as Smith identifies, institutional pressures, but it is not reducible to this factor alone. Consistent with homohegemony in formation, the substantial provincial and federal consensus, rather than contestation, in the aftermath of *M. v. H* indicates the at once institutional and ideological character of strides in sexual citizenship in the Canadian context. Gay and lesbian inclusion was being newly interpreted as requiring legal equality. This was expressive of a new hegemony. Illiberal exclusions were not eliminated but were becoming decidedly much less visible, and less prominent in the overall balance of civil and political society.

Legal action on same-sex marriage was under way by the year 2000 in the provinces of Québec, British Columbia, and Ontario, which represent Canada’s three most populous provinces. Crucially, the Ontario court case was based on the right to religious freedom of the church that had conducted the same-sex marriages, the legality of which was in dispute, in addition to the equality rights of gays and lesbians. The fact that religious freedom was a major part of the framing of the argument to allow same-sex marriage in Canada, and that a particular church was a main supporter of the case, indicates the importance of emerging consent
to gay and lesbian inclusion as equal sexual citizens in civil society. This is reminiscent of the building of support among opinion leaders in civil society, including within influential segments of organized Christianity, before the 1969 reform.

The first court decision in favour of same-sex marriage came in Ontario in 2001. The next came in Québec in 2002, followed by British Columbia in 2003. Smith notes that, “in all three provinces, the courts left the federal and provincial governments a two-year period to bring their legislation into line with the constitutional requirements of the Charter.” The waiting period was eventually ruled against in Ontario, and then in BC in 2003, and this marked the commencement of legal same-sex marriage in Canada. Smith explains that these different decisions resulted in a patchwork of sub-national jurisdictions in terms of provinces and territories where same-sex couples could be legally married and jurisdictions where they could not. At the same time, more cases were coming down the pipeline, and the challenges in other provinces and territories were seen as “highly likely to be successful” given that there had only been one decision against same-sex marriage in a British Columbia lower court in 2001.

The federal government had the right to appeal these decisions, but, as with previous decisions on sexual orientation discrimination and relationship recognition short of marriage, it instead took the ideology’s lead and consented to them. Homohegemony, now long in formation, was finally coming into its own as truly hegemonic in light of the near legal equality of gay and lesbian citizens inaugurated by same-sex marriage in Canadian jurisdictions. By June of 2005, “eight provinces and one territory had recognized the right to same-sex marriage through litigation.” As Smith explains, these decisions had implications for the federal government, since marriage was under federal jurisdiction and because Canada has a unified court structure. It was during the advancement of this favourable provincial legal action that the federal Liberal
government drafted legislation for same-sex marriage, and decided “to ensure that the legislation was constitutional by undertaking a reference case on its constitutionality to the Supreme Court of Canada.” While the Supreme Court never ruled that same-sex marriage was constitutionally required, it being largely a moot point in light of provincial and territorial decisions, it did rule that same-sex marriage was constitutional, was within the jurisdiction of the federal government, and that it did not offend religious freedom.

Smith documents the 2005 debate on same-sex marriage, when Liberal Prime Minister Paul Martin spoke in favour of the legislation, referencing the Charter, the protection of minority rights, and Canadian national identity in his remarks. Thus, same-sex marriage was cast by the government as extending protection to a minority social group – extending selective citizenship rights in the benevolent liberal tradition – even as it signalled the acceptance or imagining of gays and lesbians as equal sexual citizens. The problematic implication here is that one could accept gays and lesbians as equal sexual citizens, on grounds of accommodating a minority interest, without personally or morally agreeing with the legitimacy of same-sex marriage, or even homosexuality. In fact, this is largely the way the government framed the issue by emphasizing both the right to same-sex marriage and religious freedom to oppose the solemnization of same-sex marriage within particular denominations in government communications and indeed in the legislation.

This can be interpreted as yet another manifestation of benevolent liberalism within illiberal limits imposed by a liberal minority rights frame. The importance of religious freedom to a liberal democratic form of government is central, and religious freedom will by its very nature run up against other constitutionally protected rights. However, the tying together of same-sex marriage and the religious freedom of those who oppose it by the Canadian state is
emblematic of the fundamental tension between benevolent liberalism and continuing illiberalism since 1969. The considerable tension of 1969 continues in a less visible fashion in the same-sex marriage moment, merely consisting of a different balance and configuration of benevolent liberalism and illiberalism. Simply put, gay and lesbian rights were framed in a way that demanded a significant nod to those who morally opposed it. The aim here is not to discount the significant reform involved in the benevolent liberal moment represented by same-sex marriage but rather to point out same-sex marriage’s Canadian construction in terms of continuing limits corresponding to illiberalism, exclusions that would continue to operate in religious and other institutions in civil society.

In the debate, Paul Martin referenced his own previous opposition to same-sex marriage based on his Roman Catholic faith. This can be interpreted as an effort to “sell” the legislation to those who did not personally support same-sex marriage, but who could nevertheless get behind extending this next, and ostensibly final, measure of benevolence to the gay and lesbian minority. This indicates that the inclusion of gays and lesbians in 2005, much as in 1969, did not necessarily entail a fully recognized normalization of homosexuality and homosexual relationships so much as their abstract inclusion in the national imaginary. The abstract inclusion represented by 2005 events was however much fuller than what could have been envisaged in 1969, with much greater basis in normalization and further implications for substantive equality. The Conservative opposition, while opposing the legislation, supported civil unions and domestic partnership arrangements, “already . . . recognized in the provinces in the wake of M v. H.” Similar to previous developments in the extension of lesbian and gay citizenship rights, initial ambivalence and divisions (Liberal and Conservative alike) on moving forward with the specific “right” of marriage, but widespread consent to the newly interpreted requirement of
sexual citizenship, can be observed. That sexual citizenship would now be required to take the form (if not the exact contours) of legal equality for lesbians and gays was not in dispute.

Support for specifically terming this requirement of near legal equality “marriage” would rapidly move from being merely majoritarian to truly pervasive over the subsequent few years, as the legality of same-sex marriage rights functioned symbolically for a lesbian and gay citizenship that was constructed as equal and widely consented to in civil society. Yet these disagreements at the margins of near legal equality at the time of the onset of the homohegemonic moment in Canada underscore the contradictory nature of even hegemonic ideologies.

The relation of tension between benevolent liberalism and illiberalism can be observed within same-sex marriage in terms of how it was cast and balanced with moral, including religious, opposition, yet the relation of tension can be more significantly observed with respect to the contrast between the near legal equality represented by same-sex marriage and the ongoing and new forms of illiberal exclusion of queers and others.

**Ongoing Illiberal Exclusions and the Construction of New Others**

The important achievement of near legal equality for gays and lesbians in the same-sex marriage era marks the culmination of a long process of homohegemony in formation that began in 1969. Legal equality, and equal sexual citizenship, is now commonly seen as having been granted to gays and lesbians. Yet, illiberal exclusions of gays and lesbians – even normative gays and lesbians, and even in juridical government – and the exclusion of longstanding others continues. New others, building on historical stereotypes, have also been invented. While homohegemony’s illiberal moment is perhaps less visible than when the ideology was in formation, it is indicated in a variety of ways, some of them consistent with the past and some of them novel.

Chapter One and Chapter Three both examined how legal equality has been incompletely
achieved even for the most normative of gays and lesbians symbolically folded into the national imaginary by same-sex marriage. Same-sex marriage has still not undone the anal sex law in Canada’s Criminal Code, which retains the basic contours of the 1969 partial decriminalization of same-sex sexual activity. In addition, legal definitions of indecency and obscenity based on community standards are arguably still inflected with a heterosexist interpretation, adding a further legal dimension to ongoing heterosexism. These are aspects of legal inequality in a common law legal system such as Canada that will be missed by looking to the statutes alone.

Likewise, Chapter One pointed out that the law of provocation, which is a mitigating defence for a charge of murder, recognizes by way of common law that a murder charge can be reduced to manslaughter if it is ruled that a “homosexual advance” on a heterosexual man reasonably leads to a loss of his “power of self-control.” What is sometimes referred to as the “homosexual panic defence” further points to the need to question constructions of the “reasonable person” in Canadian law as they are interpreted along heteronormative lines. Finally, legal inequalities remain in family law policy, and in the medico-legal sphere of blood donation policy, manifesting a clear continuity in the illiberal regulation of homosexuality in the context of HIV/AIDS in spite of recent marginal improvements to the policy.

Significantly, homohegemony continues to be conditioned by the context of settler colonialism. Predominantly white gays and lesbians, but sometimes also non-indigenous gay and lesbian “settlers” of colour, claim a settler citizenship that they feel has historically been denied to them. They do so in part by claiming a cultural identity based on what is argued to be their own indigeneity or “authenticity” as queers, which appropriates and displaces indigenous peoples in Canada and the wider North American context. They are thereby folded into the settler state in a relation of relative inclusion, while the active colonization of diverse First
Nations, including First Nations’ sexual and gender epistemologies, continues. This has occasioned such resistance as the recent “Idle No More” movement and protests.\textsuperscript{134}

Further, homohegemony is uneven across Canadian regions, including between urban and rural areas. For example, the work of Carl Stychin could be interpreted as suggesting that the province of Québec has its own particular homohegemonic ideology, attesting to provincial and national differences on gay and lesbian inclusion in Canada.\textsuperscript{135} In part because of its early leading role in gay and lesbian citizenship within Canadian federalism, and in light of its distinctive national identity, Québec has been referred to as a “queer nation.”\textsuperscript{136} Yet, Rayside convincingly shows that in spite of these early pioneering efforts and the development of an internal ideology with assumptions of a gay-inclusive polity, Québec began to lag behind many other Canadian jurisdictions by the late 1990s and early 2000s, in part because of its different legal structure.\textsuperscript{137} For example, this was notable in the province’s initial exclusion of parenting rights from its civil union regime in 2001, “at a time when court rulings were making clear that parental discrimination would be unconstitutional in Canada.”\textsuperscript{138} Socially conservative societal attitudes among some segments of the Québec population also found expression in derogatory public comments about the homosexuality of then Leader of the provincial Parti Québécois, André Boisclair, during the 2007 provincial election.\textsuperscript{139} Such exclusionary commentary was noticeably absent from public discourse in the 2014 Ontario election campaign that resulted in Kathleen Wynne’s election victory, Wynne being the first openly gay or lesbian premier in Canadian history.\textsuperscript{140} This analysis is not to suggest that Québec is more or less heterosexist than Ontario, but is simply meant to illustrate the unevenness of homohegemony across Canadian provincial and “national” spaces, as each province and territory has its own political and civil society that overlaps with those of other orders of government, including municipalities.
Another feature of the illiberalism that coexists with and conditions homohegemony is that it operates within the context of profound, and profoundly disturbing, continuing women’s inequality, otherwise known as the gender system of patriarchy.\textsuperscript{141} Women in Canada earn only 72 cents on the male dollar.\textsuperscript{142} Provincial and territorial legislatures, in spite of increasingly being led by women premiers over the past few years, still hover at 20 to 30 percent representation of women legislators, a sorry display of what the gender and politics literature refers to as the “descriptive representation” of women. Substantive representation is no better, and has arguably taken a hit since the achievement of women’s near legal equality, as funding for women’s groups and other social services that disproportionately impact women has been cut generally under neoliberalism, and more specifically under the current Conservative government. Some gay men have benefitted from benevolent liberal inclusion more than lesbians and bisexual women, given the intersecting gender oppression faced by these groups. The gains of some gay men have thus occurred alongside the continuation of entrenched patriarchal relations of ruling in the state and civil society.

Homohegemony’s selective citizenship rights as extended to gays and lesbians further indicate that not all “LGBTQ” people are included, or included to the same extent, both legally and societally. Simply stated, the “L” and “G” in the acronym are disproportionately more included in the law, society, and national imaginary, as is evidenced by this chapter’s almost exclusive discussion of legal and societal advances for homosexuals. Further, it can be argued that same-sex marriage, insofar as it opens up marriage to include two gender normative individuals of the same sex, curiously reifies the gender binary, making it more difficult to effect a more fundamental rethinking of gender itself as an institution separate from sex as biological facticity.\textsuperscript{143} Same-sex marriage can be seen in this light as a way of folding some gender
normative and middle-class gays and lesbians – the “respectable same-sex couple”\textsuperscript{144} – into the national imaginary, while drawing a new “imaginary line” outside of the “charmed circle” of sexuality, one that appears to stop short of gender non-conforming individuals, such as bisexual individuals (who destabilize the hetero/homo binary and in turn the gender binary), transgender people, and other queers.\textsuperscript{145} The struggle for “trans rights” in the post-same-sex marriage era puts this into context, indicating the illiberal exclusions of the homohegemonic moment. Explicit prohibitions on discrimination based on gender identity and/or expression have only recently been added to the human rights legislation of select Canadian provinces and territories.\textsuperscript{146} Transgender legal protections in federal human rights and hate crimes legislation were passed by the House of Commons in March of 2013, but, as the Senate has not yet passed the bill as of November of 2014, it has yet to become law.\textsuperscript{147} Expressly including such legal protections constitutes a form of public recognition that is significant for legal equality and the imagination of citizens as full members of the nation, as this chapter has shown with reference to sexual orientation.

Further, homohegemony operates within a racialized nationalism, a nationalism that is normatively white in spite of an official and ideological commitment to multiculturalism. Puar writes that under “homonationalism,” the postmodern cousin of homohegemony, the normative gay or lesbian citizen is typically imagined as white, just as the citizen of colour is usually imagined as heterosexual.\textsuperscript{148} Many Canadians do not readily conceive of a gay or lesbian of colour, or if they do, they imagine such a citizen in terms of a dominant Northern lesbian or gay identity or subjectivity, which is subtly constructed as normatively white. In other words, some segments of Canadian society may now be able to conceive of queers of colour, particularly in the context of the comingling of homohegemony and multiculturalism, but they are unlikely to
recognize the diverse sexual systems and meanings of queer of colour communities. In this formulation, contemporary gay and lesbian identity is not dislodged from its history, which is a history in which whiteness has been the norm. This means that gay and lesbian incorporation into the national imaginary, like women’s incorporation, has occurred along racialized lines in ostensibly multicultural Canada. In *Buller Men and Batty Bwoys: Hidden Men in Toronto and Halifax Black Communities*, Wesley Crichlow shows that there is a whole world of black same-sex (specifically male in his analysis) sexuality extant in Canada with its own language, largely outside of hegemonic gay and lesbian identity categories.¹⁴⁹ These citizens and their identities are illegible to homohegemony and represent racialized constraints to gay and lesbian sexual citizenship.¹⁵⁰

Homohegemony operates within the context of neoliberal state retraction of social welfare, and significant income inequality.¹⁵¹ The limited “sexuality liberation” on offer under homohegemony does not commonly include class concerns, or even social justice, as part of a more fundamental sexual emancipation.¹⁵² Contrary to the stereotype that all gays and lesbians have more disposable income than their straight compatriots, Alan Sears points out that in fact many of the trappings of proper gay and lesbian citizenship today are actually out of reach for many working class or poor gays and lesbians who cannot afford to buy into gay commercial culture.¹⁵³ In other words, the ability to partake of gay commercial culture, which now arguably includes queer tourism abroad,¹⁵⁴ contributes to marking one as a proper gay or lesbian citizen under homohegemony. That is, sexual citizenship is offered through both the state and civil society, and specifically through the marketplace, with meaningful sexual citizenship proving more difficult to access for those with lower earning and consumption power.¹⁵⁵ Queer citizenship, in addition to being complexly mediated by consumption power, is marked by
additional particular entanglements with economic inequality. Amidst the folding in of certain normative queer citizens by the state and significant segments of Canadian society, non-normative queers and queers from socially conservative segments of Canadian society continue to be cast out of their homes by their families. This contributes to the substantial over-representation of LGBTQ youth among the total populations of homeless youth in Canadian cities. For example, the Toronto-based LGBTQ organization Supporting Our Youth (SOY) estimates that LGBTQ-identified youth represent between 25 and 40 percent of the total population of homeless youth in the city of Toronto.156

Homohegemony exists within a continuing national security state apparatus and its related racialized and imperial ideologies. The works of Sherene Razack,157 and Kinsman and Gentile,158 indicate the disproportionate targeting of people of Muslim and/or Arab backgrounds and identities and their communities that has occurred in Canada, as in other states, in the post-9/11 era. Many white gays and lesbians have come a long way from being “enemy aliens,” as in the Cold War context, but homohegemony is entangled with a new national security state formation with new enemy aliens. The contemporary contours of state exclusions draw on illiberal Orientalist legacies of the past to define new enemy aliens as people of Muslim and/or Arab backgrounds. These renewed others are subject to processes of racialization and the illiberal suspension or curtailment of civil liberties in the context of a protracted international and domestic “war on terror.”159

Homohegemony has also occasioned the construction of homophobic other communities, cultures, nations, and religions along neocolonial and subtly racialized lines. Such constructions function as a counterpoint to the national “self” and take the form of sometimes well-meaning discourses about the need to “rescue” third world queers. This has already been theorized and
elaborated with respect to Jamaica in Chapter Two, and will be examined in greater depth in Chapters Five and Six. The theoretical framework of homohegemony is able to conceive of the construction of “homophobic Jamaica” as an extension of benevolent liberal/illiberal processes that began in 1969, with illiberal exclusion of an imagined sexual other significantly directed “outward” now that benevolent liberalism has found its expression in the imagined relation of full and equal gay and lesbian citizenship. The contribution of Andil Gosine describes the neocolonial and racialized dynamics of gay and lesbian belonging in Canada, including a brief discussion of the function of Jamaica for a gay-friendly Canadian national identity. He devotes particular attention to racialized and immigrant queer youth. He finds that in neocolonial circuits of sexuality, positioning themselves as gay now affords some would-be emigrants from the global South a degree of immigration currency in their quest to migrate to the North. This occurs, for example, in the context of claiming refugee status on the basis of home country sexual orientation persecution. Yet, in Canada, racialized and immigrant queer youth must negotiate neocolonial constraints to belonging in the Canadian nation premised on rigid and exclusionary forms of “modern” queer identity.\(^{160}\)

**Conclusion**

With the basic problem of homohegemony and the other having been set out in Chapter Two, and a critical engagement with relevant scholarly literature having been undertaken in Chapter Three, this chapter has situated homohegemony in relation to existing narratives of national developments in gay and lesbian politics in the post-1969 era in Canada. It has been shown that homohegemony, specifically its contradictory but interrelated elements of benevolent liberalism and exclusionary illiberalism, is able to put the paradigmatic “rights narrative” of Miriam Smith and the similarly influential “regulation narrative” of Gary Kinsman into a single story of homohegemony in formation and eventual entrenchment. Smith’s narrative mainly
speaks to the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony, while Kinsman’s narrative mainly speaks to the illiberal moment of homohegemony. Putting the “rights story” and the “regulation story” together demonstrates the developments in question as the unfolding of a contradictory relation of sexual citizenship and its imagination, a specific sexual superstructure in the queer Canadian context that this dissertation has termed homohegemony.

This chapter has shown how the benevolent liberal/illiberal moments of homohegemony in formation can be observed in the 1969 reform, the national security and local surveillance state apparatuses, and sexual orientation discrimination protections. It has further demonstrated that homohegemony can be observed more decisively with respect to relationship recognition, particularly same-sex marriage, given the implications of near legal equality for sexual citizenship. Homohegemony can be understood in each historical development in terms of a relation of tension between the extension of selective citizenship rights to the gay and lesbian minority in a benevolent liberal fashion, and ongoing and new expressions of illiberalism in the form of regulation and exclusion of gays, lesbians, and others. These are significant exclusions upon which significant inclusions are premised.

Homohegemony suggests an explanation of LGBTQ politics in Canada post-1969 and up to the present moment, a moment in which sexual othering is significantly directed outward. On a normative level, this chapter has suggested that assessments of modern LGBTQ politics in Canada need to soberly appreciate both significant changes to sexual citizenship that have taken place and their historical and present day imbrications with significant exclusion. Methodologically, this chapter has argued for the importance of an explanation to queer history that equally values institutions, civil society, and ideology, and crucially their interrelationships. This chapter has therefore posited that a neo-Gramscian understanding of the state is able to
interpret Canada’s modern queer history in a novel fashion that reflects a balance between institutions and society.

As the domestic history of Canada, which currently leads to the construction of Jamaica as a homophobic external other, has been addressed in detail, this dissertation will now turn to considerations of Jamaica. The following chapter will consider how homohegemony’s illiberal caricature of Jamaica breaks down in the face of a complicated empirical and experiential reality. It will thus consider the question: what happens to homohegemony’s construction of the homophobic other when Jamaica is viewed as queer?
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Part Two

Homohegemony Has Something to Show
Chapter Five. Queer Jamaica?

Part One of this dissertation demonstrated that homohegemony has something to say. The argument presented suggests that homohegemony has the capacity to explain Canadian civil and political societal discourses pertaining to the status of homosexuality in Jamaica. The types of discourses that are being uttered make sense in the context of homohegemony’s benevolent liberal/illiberal moments, especially in terms of the dramatic change from a longstanding illiberal fixation on the homosexual other within the nation, to an illiberal focus on homophobic other nations. It has further been demonstrated that the concept contributes productively in the context of a range of existing scholarly literatures. Finally, homohegemony has been offered as an alternative explanation for the advancement of lesbian and gay inclusion in the Canadian context. This has been a historical unfolding that is not reducible to either a stubborn “heterosexual hegemony,”¹ or to inevitable modernist progress on lesbian and gay rights. Rather, the ascension of homohegemony in the Canadian context has contained moments of benevolent liberalism that have developed alongside ongoing and new moments of illiberalism directed at LGBTQ people and others.

This chapter marks the beginning of Part Two, titled “Homohegemony Has Something to Show.” The objective of this section of the dissertation is to consider the concept in the context of experiential realities. There is a growing body of scholarship that engages with the topic of homosexuality in Jamaica, much of it by Jamaican activists and academics.² The dissertation’s foray into this terrain is intended to provisionally show that Jamaica is substantially queerer than Canadian civil and political societal discourses make it out to be, and to suggest some of the features of the regulation and negotiation of queerness in Jamaica. Theoretically, an applied Gramscian understanding of the state is employed as a window on the contemporary
contradictions manifest in the Jamaican sex/gender regime. This is an understanding of the state as “integral,” comprised of both political and civil society, and of their interrelationships.\textsuperscript{3} Such a state is characterized by coercive relations, but also by relations of consent to and contestation of various ideologies in civil society, including ideologies pertaining to sexuality and gender.\textsuperscript{4} This chapter continues to interpret Gramsci in a fashion that is informed by this dissertation’s engagement with queer and feminist scholarship, particularly that which pays attention to the ways in which multiple systems of oppression, identification, and resistance intersect and inflect one another.\textsuperscript{5} The state is therefore understood as not just civil and political society; intersecting identities of privilege and oppression are also central aspects of the fabric of the state, a state that can also be read culturally.

The chapters in this section rely heavily on data drawn from interviews with Jamaican queer subjects. Following influential feminist sociologist Dorothy E. Smith,\textsuperscript{6} as well as queer of colour/transnational queer scholars Carlos Ulises Decena\textsuperscript{7} and Martin Manalansan,\textsuperscript{8} the chapter engages with the politics of everyday life, what Manalansan refers to as “quotidian struggles.”\textsuperscript{9} According to Manalansan, everyday life contains the possibility of exposing “the veneer of the ordinary and the commonplace to lay bare the intricate and difficult hybrid negotiations and struggles between hegemonic social forces and voices from below.”\textsuperscript{10} Attention to people’s embodied knowledge about the politics of everyday life, in other words, can show how they engage and negotiate hegemony and state/societal ruling relations.\textsuperscript{11} In this sense, examination of this knowledge is well suited to the purposes of grappling with how LGBTQ people engage with homohegemony. In his discussion of queer studies in particular, Manalansan argues that there has been an “overvalorization” of “circuits and flows” of gay identity, “peoples,” and social movements “in the study of queer globalization and transnationalism.”\textsuperscript{12} He articulates that there
is a need to specifically focus on how diasporic queer subjects/queers of colour “apprehend and negotiate” these “cultural products.” Thus, he centres the “seemingly private and banal aspects of queer people’s lives” as a useful method for pointing to “the complexities of various intersections and borderlands of race, gender, class, and sexuality in diasporic and immigrant groups.” As Manalansan points out, focusing on everyday life may be particularly revealing when it comes to diasporic and/or queer of colour subjects because of the historically “vexed” nature of the private sphere for queers, as well as because of the crucial role of everyday life as a site for confronting, transforming, and translating estrangements brought about through migration from one system of desire to another.

Yet, this part of the dissertation proposes that the politics of everyday life can open a window to dimensions of sexual citizenship in addition to sexual subjectivity. Importantly, “social spaces” consistent with the politics of everyday life are particularly important to analyze with respect to queer citizenship in Jamaica, where sexual citizenship in “juridical government” is sorely lacking and where public forms of sexual citizenship in civil society also prove challenging. Along these lines, queer and African scholar Kathleen O’Mara argues that “citizenship by staking space” can be understood as a compensatory form of sexual citizenship found to varying degrees in many formally heterosexist neocolonial state contexts. As noted in previous chapters, such compensatory sexual citizenship by staking space has historically been significant in Canada and other Northern nation-states as well, albeit in the context of a markedly different colonial history and different relationships between political societal institutions and civil society.

In the context of this project, then, the turn to the “everyday” stands in as a crucial expansion, rather than diminution, of the notion of sexual citizenship consistent with the
expansive character of the Gramscian state. It is, furthermore, in everyday life that even formal
sexual citizenship rights like sexual orientation discrimination protections and same-sex marriage
are actually understood, negotiated, and imbued with meaning. Thus, there are important
Gramscian reasons to look to the politics of everyday life as a context and window on sexual
citizenship. Namely, the fact that the state “includes elements which need to be referred back to
the notion of civil society,”[^20] and expressly includes within its ambit questions of sexual
“regulation,”[^21] points to the significance of a Gramscian lens. This of course coincides with
varied feminist approaches that conceive of the politics of everyday life as thoroughly political,
and that concomitantly call into question the public/private divide on issues of
production/reproduction, citizenship/subjectivity, and so forth. The personal is indeed political,
and the politics of everyday life is an important context and window into the negotiation and
mediation of sexual citizenship.

The extent to which Jamaica is in fact complicated and queer indicates the degree of
sexual othering that is indeed taking place in and around the constructed image of “homophobic
Jamaica.” In this chapter, the voices and representations of LGBTQ-identified Jamaicans and
Jamaican-Canadians, drawn from interview field data, are rendered audible. This chapter relies
on original interviews and document analysis. Interviews were conducted with LGBTQ-
identified Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians in the context of uncovering lived experiences of
sexual citizenship in mostly civil societal spaces. Of the total sample of eighteen LGBTQ
participants, all but two identify as gay, lesbian, homosexual, or bisexual. One of the remaining
two participants identifies as a “queer woman,” and another identifies as “polysexual.” Twelve
are Jamaican citizens residing in Jamaica, and six are Jamaican-Canadians. In terms of the latter
group, four emigrated to Canada, and two were born in Canada to Jamaican parents. I have
ensured the participants’ anonymity, including by using pseudonyms and disguising potentially identifying personal information. NGO and legal document analysis has been conducted as part of the effort to explain legal structures and challenges to said structures within political society. An interview with lawyer and prominent Jamaican LGBTQ activist Maurice Tomlinson was also highly informative in this regard. In sum, this multidimensional approach represents a critical qualitative methodology intended mainly to trouble and complicate the constructed image of Jamaica, and to suggest some of the features of the structuring of queer citizenship in the process. The chapter is also inspired by my visit to Kingston, Jamaica in January of 2013, though the particular findings associated with this trip make their way into the dissertation by way of a conclusion, constituting the final chapter of the study.

The voices that are illuminated in the following chapters reflect a reality that has tended to be misrepresented or missed by others in Canadian and international discourses on homosexuality in Jamaica. The interviewees speak to a wider reality than that contained within the narrow ideological confines of Canadian and international discourses. What does listening carefully to the voices of LGBTQ Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians reveal about queerness and Jamaica that is elided by its international and Canadian “imaginings”? Through listening to Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians and reproducing a small sampling of their own reflections, as well as engaging in analysis of NGO documents and legislation, this chapter will demonstrate that the treatment of queer Jamaicans is not monolithic, as the homohegemonic discourse projects, but diverse. Experiences differ substantially between political and civil societal spaces, as well as within civil society. Notably, queer Jamaicans and their allies resist a formally heterosexist legal framework by challenging the “buggery” and “gross indecency” laws in the courts. Significantly, they also negotiate and claim veritable sexual citizenship in civil societal
spaces in spite of these laws, and they do so with a high degree of agency. This negotiation of sexual citizenship in the politics of everyday life is mediated by factors such as gender, race, class, and their intersections, as well as by geography and cultural forces such as a popular Christianity and also “dancehall” music. All told, the picture that emerges from LGBTQ Jamaicans’ own representations of their experiences, to the extent to which I can successfully relay these as an “outsider,” is one of a Jamaica that is much more uneven and queer than the constructed other of homohegemony. This is, however, not meant to obfuscate or minimize the substantial obstacles for LGBTQ citizens in Jamaica, not least of which are a series of regulatory and oppressive laws. Yet, there is a sense that emerges from the interviews that the nation-state might be in transition, as the contradictions between a coercive heterosexist political society and an increasingly open civil society are intensifying. There is indeed a sense of an untenable tension, straining the limits of the current ruling relations associated with sexuality.

The chapter will deal mainly with gay and lesbian sexual citizenship because of the self-identifications of the interviewees, and because of the characterization of Jamaica as “homophobic” under homohegemonic ideology. The discussion will, however, broach bisexuality, transgender, and other queer identities and practices as well, as the interview participants bring these up and as the regulation and rights of these different identities and practices are necessarily linked. The use of the term “queer” will at times be employed as an umbrella term for non-normative gender and sexual identities and practices, though this will be done with caution in order to remain mindful of the way the term is vested with connotations and meanings consistent with a Northern history of sexuality.

A Formally Heterosexist Legal Framework

Sexual citizenship for homosexuals in Jamaican institutional framings applies specifically to gay and bisexual men, as sexual acts between women are not proscribed by law. At first
glance, the presence of sexual citizenship appears to be bleak or even nonexistent, given the criminalization of male same-sex sexual activity in Jamaica. This does not mean that “being gay” is illegal. However, the continued criminalization of men’s same-sex sexual acts, in both private and public settings, is often interpreted within the society as a criminalization of homosexuality itself.\textsuperscript{30} For example, homosexuality is often linked with pedophilia and other sex crimes in the mindset of some segments of the population, and the legal context generally stymies efforts to normalize homosexuality.\textsuperscript{31} Criminalization also prevents the eventual move to further legal reforms such as sexual orientation discrimination protections.\textsuperscript{32} Just as in the Canadian and American cases, it is difficult or impossible to argue for sexual orientation protections when the intimate acts that significantly constitute that orientation are still criminalized.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, instead of being popularly perceived as a minority status group worthy of protection, gays and lesbians are commonly viewed either as criminals or as potentially engaging in illegal activity.

In terms of sexual citizenship, therefore, continued criminalization of same-sex sexual activity has far-reaching ideological and legal consequences beyond actual conviction and incarceration for buggery or gross indecency. It functions as a signal to the coercive apparatuses of the state, namely the police, as well as the rest of political society, civil society, the population, and not least to queer Jamaicans themselves, that homosexuals are not citizens as homosexuals since (male) members of this sexual orientation/identity are systematically not legally permitted to have sex, and since homosexual identity continues to be conflated or associated with criminality. As such, homosexuals are cast out of the state.\textsuperscript{34} As Mr. Johnson, a lawyer and activist involved in LGBTQ\textsuperscript{35} issues, observed:

Jamaicans perceive homosexuality as not only morally wrong but legally wrong, so we cannot, for example, as gay persons get justice from the police because you are
considered a criminal. They don’t get the distinction between “conduct” versus a “class crime”; it’s just a crime. So we cannot get justice from the police and the population knows that, so they believe they can attack us with impunity because the police are on their side.\textsuperscript{36}

Extending the theoretical legal construct of sexual citizenship developed by Carl Stychin,\textsuperscript{37} one might say that this does not represent a degree of sexual citizenship in even the limited sense of “toleration” that might follow the partial decriminalization of same-sex sexual activity in a given legal context. Continued criminalization also sends the signal that homosexuality is not normal,\textsuperscript{38} and is simply inconsistent with the Jamaican nation, often conceived of as a “Christian nation.”\textsuperscript{39} While this analysis based on the legal structure misses the complete picture of the sexual citizenship of gays, lesbians, and other queers in civil society, the links between political and civil society on this issue, even though complicated in neocolonial Jamaica,\textsuperscript{40} are significant. The continuation of the legal \textit{status quo} represents a veritable roadblock or “logjam”\textsuperscript{41} in moving forward on LGBTQ issues in the society at large.

A brief discussion of the legislation in question is in order, as many journalistic, NGO, and scholarly treatments of homosexuality in Jamaica gloss over these primary documents. To summarize the overall legal context, the current anti-male-same-sex laws in Jamaica exist in their unaltered British colonial form from 1864, are protected by a provision of the 1962 Jamaican Constitution with respect to “existing laws,” and are currently explicitly insulated from judicial review by the 2011 Jamaican Charter. The anti-male-same-sex legislation can be located in the British colonial legislation, “The Offences Against the Person Act,” which was retained along with other laws upon independence from the United Kingdom in 1962.\textsuperscript{42} As mentioned, the legislation dates from 1864.\textsuperscript{43} It is very similar to the Canadian buggery, gross indecency, and
“indecent assault on a male” legislation inaugurated in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and remaining little changed until the 1950s. This is not surprising given that Canada was also heavily influenced by English/British colonial law at this time.44 The striking similarity of even the wording and section headings between the current Jamaican legislation and historical Canadian legislation45 is a fact completely ignored by Canada’s construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” which tends to emphasize a Canada/Jamaica legal dichotomy, rather than a British colonial legal similarity, on this issue.

As explained by one of the two anonymous interview participants who are lawyers, the “saving clause in the 1962 constitution saves all laws that remain in their unaltered 1962 state. So you can repeal sections, but you cannot add or amend.”46 What this means is that the anti-male-same-sex sections of the Offences Against the Person Act remain on the books and in force in spite of being 150 years old. Moreover, the “Sexual Offences Act,” introduced in 2009, deliberately further “insulated” these anti-male-same-sex sections of “The Offences Against the Person Act.”47 Further entrenchment of heterosexist law is provided by the Jamaican “Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms,”48 introduced in 2011, which explicitly shields existing sexual offences laws, as well as laws dealing with abortion and “obscene publications,” from judicial review.49 The Charter further forbids state recognition of same-sex relationships in a section similar to constitutional amendments barring same-sex marriage in a variety of American states.50 The jury is still out, however, quite literally, on whether the broad principles of the Jamaican Charter, such as the right to privacy, can be successfully used to challenge the anti-male-same-sex laws, even though these laws are explicitly protected by a section of the very same Charter.51 That is, Jamaican LGBTQ activists and allies may be able to use the Charter against the Charter in their quest for legal reform.
The texts of the anti-homosexual legislation demonstrate the context. The first two laws of note are listed under the heading, “Unnatural Offences” and read as follows:

76. Whosoever shall be convicted of the abominable crime of buggery [anal intercourse], committed either with mankind [sodomy] or with any animal [bestiality], shall be liable to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for a term not exceeding ten years.

77. Whosoever shall attempt to commit the said abominable crime, or shall be guilty of any assault with intent to commit the same, or of any indecent assault upon any male person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof, shall be liable to be imprisoned for a term not exceeding 7 years, with or without hard labour.52

One can see here that the buggery law is technically not restricted to male persons. Yet, it is clear from the history of said legislation in the English and British colonial context, discussed in Chapters Three and Four, that male persons were/are effectively the target.53 Even the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights describes the buggery law in Jamaica as “[prohibiting] anal sex between men,” despite the fact that this is not explicitly stated in the legislation.54 The organization AIDS-Free World, in a “report on the human rights impact of laws in the Caribbean criminalizing same-sex behaviour prepared . . . and submitted . . . to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights,” explains that “buggery has become a synonym of same sex intercourse” in the Anglophone Caribbean, and that the laws have functioned to punish a “class” of individuals – men who have sex with men – engaged in the “conduct” of buggery.55 It is important to recognize that although buggery/sodomy legislation had long been in existence in British and other contexts by 1864, such legislation only took on a homosexual inflection or meaning in the latter half of the nineteenth century, when homosexuality as an “identity” was invented in the modern West.56 Thus, longstanding legislation that had its genesis in church law
was imbued with new meanings associated with the regulation of male homosexuality, and this is evidenced by the fact that such buggery/sodomy legislation was supplemented with more explicitly anti-homosexual legislation at this time. The target of regulation becomes transparent in the Jamaican legislation insofar as a reference to “indecent assault” in section 77 on “attempted buggery,” cited above, restricts its application to indecent assault on male persons. The gross indecency law, furthermore, explicitly restricts its application to male persons in even clearer language:

79. Any male person who, in public or private, commits, or is a party to the commission of . . . any act of gross indecency with another male person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof shall be liable at the discretion of the court to be imprisoned for a term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.

Like the Canadian and English cases historically, “gross indecency” here is undefined. It has, however, traditionally been interpreted in English and British colonial contexts to refer to sexual acts between men short of buggery. In the report by AIDS-Free World, gross indecency in Anglophone Caribbean legal contexts is understood as “any form of physical intimacy short of sex between males.” To summarize, anal intercourse, effectively between men (understood as sodomites and later homosexuals), and other forms of sexual activity, explicitly targeting men, are criminalized in the legislation. This is the case for private, as well as public, adult consensual activity.

Counter-Hegemony: Challenging the Laws

From this brief exposition and analysis of heterosexist law, it would seem as if the construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” though certainly ignoring the shared Canadian and Jamaican histories of anti-same-sex legislation, is otherwise accurate about the state of sexual citizenship for homosexuals in that country. Such an assessment of “homophobic Jamaica”
would, however, ignore the robust and varied efforts currently underway that resist a heterosexist citizenship regime in political society by challenging the laws. Drawing on a Gramscian framework, societal spaces offer queer Jamaicans more substantial opportunities to negotiate and claim sexual citizenship. Importantly, however, homosexual citizenship is being claimed even in the aforementioned heterosexist legal structure of Jamaican political society. The laws are currently being challenged with enough vigour that there is a potential of forcing the government’s hand. This is substantially facilitated by the fact that Jamaica is an electoral democracy. While highly illiberal features of Jamaica’s parliamentary system of government exist, not least including its coercive heterosexist laws, the basically liberal democratic character of Jamaica’s system of government affords opportunities for lobbying, challenging laws, social movement organizing at the nexus of civil and political society, and freedom of expression. As seen in the Canadian case historically, a “liberal democracy” can illiberally maintain a formally heterosexist and highly coercive legal framework. Yet, the existence of such a regime also provides a context in which political and civil societal counter-hegemony can develop within spaces that are free from direct state intervention in order to challenge that framework and its ideological underpinnings. Again, it bears repeating that a more robust claiming of queer citizenship is observable in Jamaica’s social spaces and everyday spaces in civil society, yet counter-hegemony in political society is a feature of the Jamaican queer context as well, and one that distinguishes Jamaica from authoritarian nation-states with similar international reputations for “homophobia.” Such legal challenges do not fit with the constructed image of Jamaica, a caricature in which the agency of Jamaican queers and LGBTQ social movements in Jamaica is rendered minimal, seemingly leaving only the capacity to flee, or facilitate flight, from the country.63
Jamaicans in the diaspora, including prominent Jamaican-Canadian LGBTQ activists like Maurice Tomlinson and Gareth Henry,⁶⁴ and Jamaicans residing fulltime in Jamaica,⁶⁵ are engaged in a variety of legal challenges to Jamaica’s laws. These challenges are also supported by International Nongovernmental Organizations (INGOs) like AIDS-Free World,⁶⁶ and Jamaican Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) such as The Jamaica Forum for Lesbians, All-Sexuals, and Gays (J-FLAG).⁶⁷ Some of these challenges are direct, while some are taking a more circuitous route out of legal necessity. All of these challenges, however, demonstrate the agency of queer Jamaicans to resist a heterosexist citizenship regime and claim sexual citizenship in political society.

Maurice Tomlinson, as Legal Advisor for Marginalized Groups for AIDS-Free World, is or has been involved in four of the challenges on behalf of that organization.⁶⁸ The heavy involvement of AIDS-Free World in efforts to repeal the laws in Jamaica and other countries underscores the fact that there are tight linkages between LGBTQ activism and HIV/AIDS activism and organizing in Jamaica.⁶⁹ For example, AIDS-Free World considers that a climate of “homophobia . . . drives men who have sex with men (MSM) deep underground, away from effective HIV and AIDS prevention, treatment, care, and support interventions.”⁷⁰ The organization goes on to point out that “the result is that the HIV prevalence rate among Jamaican MSM is about 32% as compared to a rate of 1.6% in the general population.”⁷¹ LGBTQ activism that works through HIV/AIDS organizing demonstrates a degree of resourcefulness in terms of dealing with an important issue that affects the health and quality of life of all Jamaicans. This also exemplifies a strategic orientation in terms of “fronting” LGBTQ issues through a veritable health crisis about which the public might be more sympathetic.⁷² A partial decriminalization of buggery and gross indecency, for example, might gain public support if it is framed as an effort
that could help with the fight against HIV/AIDS among gay and bisexual men. Such an approach
and strategy is not without risks, as this approach discursively links “homosexuality” and
“disease” in the popular understanding of male homosexuality. This could ultimately frustrate
efforts to normalize homosexuality.73 The linkages between hegemonic HIV/AIDS discourse and
the (re)medicalization of homosexuality have, of course, historically been strong in the Canadian
context and other contexts as well.74

The four legal challenges that AIDS-Free World has been involved in include a “TV
Challenge” that has already been heard; an ongoing Inter-American Commission on Human
Rights (IACHR) petition; an ongoing “Immigration Challenge” before the Caribbean Court of
Justice (CCJ); and, finally, a domestic court challenge to the buggery law.75 In the TV Challenge,
heard in May of 2013, AIDS-Free World challenged Jamaican TV stations for their refusal to air
an advertisement promoting respect for the rights of gay Jamaicans. The argument was that
refusal to air this paid advertisement violated provisions of freedom of expression guaranteed in
Jamaica’s 2011 Charter.76 It is noteworthy that among the reasons the TV stations offered for
their refusal to air the ad was “that airing such a video would constitute promoting an illegal
activity.”77 This is an example of how societal and attitudinal advances on gay and lesbian issues
via public service advertisements can be blocked by the legal “logjam” of continued
criminalization of men’s same-sex activity, and its conflation with homosexual identity. The
Jamaica Supreme Court ruled in favour of the three television companies that decided not to air
the 30-second ad.78 AIDS-Free World has decided to appeal the decision.79

Another legal challenge, though not a direct domestic constitutional challenge, concerns a
petition filed by AIDS-Free World in 2011 with the Inter-American Commission on Human
Rights (IACHR) “to challenge the Jamaican anti-sodomy law.”80 The petition was filed on behalf
of two gay Jamaicans who have requested public anonymity from the IACHR. AIDS-Free World and Tomlinson have been working “with Jamaican advocates and lawyers to collect and document evidence of human rights violations.” The crux of the petition is that “the anti-sodomy law violates the human rights protections found in the American Convention on Human Rights to which Jamaica is a signatory. These rights include the right to health.” The IACHR exists under the authority of the Organization of American States (OAS), of which Jamaica is a member. Part of the petition process involves proving that all “domestic remedies” to repeal the law have been exhausted, and this is why the domestic buggery law challenge, to be discussed below, was initiated. While the Jamaican government is not legally bound by IACHR decisions or recommendations, a finding that the buggery law violates human rights and a recommendation to reform the law could put pressure on the Jamaican government.

The more direct, constitutional challenge to the buggery law in Jamaica that has been initiated concerns the fact that, “in 2012, a young gay Jamaican, Javed Jaghai, along with his friends, were evicted from their home, as the landlady claimed that because they are gay, they would engage in illegal activities on the premises.” AIDS-Free World is representing Mr. Jaghai “in the first ever domestic challenge to the Jamaican anti-sodomy law,” arguing that a “proper interpretation” of the new 2011 Charter would mean that the law can no longer be applied “to the private acts of consenting adults.” The case is expected to be heard later in 2014. An appeal could end up at the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (JCPC) in the United Kingdom, which remains the final appellant court for certain matters in Jamaica. While the potential for an eventual British decision against the buggery law would obviously represent a favourable outcome legally, it could also result in backlash to such a neocolonial “legalizing [of] battymanism” in Jamaica.
Finally, there is a much less direct challenge in process, in 2014, that nevertheless concerns Jamaica, as Jamaica cannot be separated from the Anglophone Caribbean context more generally. This challenge concerns the immigration laws of Belize, and Trinidad and Tobago, which are the only two countries in the western hemisphere that “legally bar the entry of homosexuals.” Given that Tomlinson is a Jamaican national, and given that Jamaica is a member of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), he and AIDS-Free World are challenging the immigration laws before the Caribbean Court of Justice (CCJ) on the basis that these laws are restricting the “free movement within the region” to which he is entitled, and are infringing his right to equal treatment as a “national” of the region. Significant to the case, and to the Jamaican context, is the fact that the Jamaican government has refused to present the complaint on behalf of Tomlinson. The Court has therefore granted “special leave” to hear the case. While the challenge is directed against Belize and Trinidad and Tobago, the case has the potential to also put pressure on the Jamaican government for its anti-gay legislation.

As is clear from the number and range of legal challenges, and the number of actors and organizations involved, homosexual Jamaicans in the diaspora and in Jamaica are boldly challenging heterosexist laws with a great deal of agency and inventiveness. Significantly, the line between transnational and national action to change or repeal the laws cannot be as easily drawn for Jamaica, not least because of Jamaica’s entrenched history in regional and British legal structures, as well as the importance of transnationalism in immigration and family patterns over decades. It should further be noted that in addition to these challenges on the “judicial side” of political society, J-FLAG and other organizations in Jamaica have been involved in efforts to lobby the Jamaican Parliament and Cabinet to repeal anti-homosexual legislation and secure protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation. Thus, even in political
society where sexual citizenship is most circumscribed, gay and lesbian Jamaicans resist hegemonic legal structures and claim homosexual citizenship for themselves. They negotiate complicated and multi-layered legal frameworks and treaties to leverage the Jamaican government to accede to change. This is a veritable counter-hegemony in political society on the issue of homosexual citizenship. Mr. Lees, an LGBTQ activist with J-FLAG, emphasized that the “laws versus culture” debate surrounding effecting change in Jamaica is a false dichotomy. He advocates for a simultaneous top-down, or legal, and bottom-up, or cultural, approach to claiming homosexual and other forms of queer citizenship in Jamaica. Mr. Lees thus indicated the importance of negotiating and claiming sexual citizenship in both major parts of the integral Jamaican state, where clearly the legal battle in political society, though daunting, has an important role to play.

**Sexual Citizenship in a Queerer Civil Society**

While the caricature of “homophobic Jamaica” is surely troubled by attention to counter-hegemony in political society, it is in civil society and in the political spaces of everyday life where one observes a range of queer citizenship that truly shatters the constructed image. Such queerness also demonstrates a divergence between the political and civil societal component parts of the Gramscian state, a divergence that destabilizes understandings of Jamaica as a homophobic monolith. Here, this chapter adopts an intersectional and cultural approach that touches on some of the significant factors and forces that mediate queer citizenship within civil society. In the next section, each of these factors is more explicitly addressed in turn.

When interviewees were asked to assess how “gay friendly” Jamaica is on a scale from 1 to 10, with ten being the least gay friendly, the average response indicated was 7. The most frequently occurring or modal response was also 7. The key point in connection with this finding is that the average response of 7 indicates a more gay-friendly reality in Jamaica than many
Canadians would expect based on the caricature of “homophobic Jamaica.” This limited finding certainly strays from the characterization of Jamaica as “the most homophobic place on Earth.”

In terms of qualitative significance, it is notable that two participants, one a Jamaican-Canadian who lived a considerable portion of her life in Jamaica before emigrating, and the other a Jamaican residing in Jamaica, refused to answer the question on the basis that it was overly simplistic or impossible to answer. Ms. Melville, a professional, and a political activist, explained why she refused to “rate” Jamaica:

I get what you are trying to do but here’s my thing. There’s no such thing as a “homophobic country” and there’s no such thing as a “non-homophobic country.” There are moments and there are expressions of homophobia, there are homophobic people within a country, within any given country. In a moment where we are aware of the way that discourse is being used to disguise other things, in a moment where we are aware that racial shit is still playing into the ways that we deal with sexual identity, I will not have a discourse on a homophobic country versus a non-homophobic country because there is no such thing.

When a follow-up question was asked about whether rating a country on “LGBTQ inclusion” would be a less problematic way of going about it, Ms. Melville replied:

That falls within the same thing. I think if you were to do that, you’d have to be more specific and parse it out in terms of LGBTQ inclusion by the state versus people’s experiences on a day-to-day basis in social spaces. Because the state in Jamaica, it’s very strange. To the Jamaican public the state gives the impression that it’s very homophobic. They play around with that come election time when . . . they need people to validate them. They need people to see them as a strong Jamaican government, so they play
around with homophobia. They also, depending on the mood of the moment, play around with accepting homosexuality. So it’s kind of hard to tell where the state stands. You have to parse it out. Is it the state? Is it how the state presents or performs its identity? Or is it your experiences in social spaces? 101

Ms. Melville’s call to “parse out” the state, in addition to revealing that political society itself is contradictory and performative, suggests the importance of an explanation regarding the negotiation of homosexual citizenship in civil society.

Indeed, the interview responses confirm the notion of a much queerer civil society in Jamaica. A few illustrations of a range of queer negotiations in Jamaican civil society further exemplify this central finding. While some of these illustrations are not typical or generalizable, they are not even intelligible within the epistemological boundaries of homohegemony and the constructed homophobic other.

**Cross-Dressing at KFC**

In the first example, Mr. Budding happened upon an open display of nonconforming gender expression. He recounted this everyday queer citizenship observation as follows:

I was in Montego Bay maybe about four years ago and I saw a guy, he was a cross-dresser, who was in the middle of Montego Bay on a weekday afternoon, traffic going by. He had his hair and makeup, and so forth. And a bunch of them [cross-dressers] were under some palm trees dancing next to a Kentucky Fried Chicken! And nobody said anything! I was a little shocked because I didn’t expect to see it in public like that. So yeah, it’s different in places like Montego Bay . . . 102

Mr. Budding’s example is one of gender non-conformity rather than homosexuality specifically, but the two are often linked in popular understandings. Male homosexuality is often associated with effeminacy, and is stigmatized and oppressed on the basis of this perceived violation of
heteronormative masculinity.\textsuperscript{103} Such a linkage is obviously not just the case in the Jamaican context, but in a variety of settings marked by rigid gender and heterosexual/homosexual binaries, where proper gender performance is seen to flow from sex as biological fact, and legitimate (heterosexual) sexual desire is viewed as a “natural” part of gender.\textsuperscript{104} The Jamaican context, however, contains the additional feature that male homosexuality is seen as a particular affront, and direct threat, to “black masculinity” in the context of the hetero-patriarchal neocolonial state.\textsuperscript{105} Given the heavily gendered construction of male homosexuality in Jamaica,\textsuperscript{106} the general rule of less acceptance of gay men who are read as more feminine,\textsuperscript{107} and the difficulties that some segments of the population have not with homosexuality \textit{per se} but with public manifestations of gayness,\textsuperscript{108} the example of these males dancing as women outside of the KFC is all the more daring, subversive, and surprising.

The fact that this occurred in a tourist area is also significant, as participants have indicated that there is more room to negotiate and claim various forms of queer citizenship in tourist areas.\textsuperscript{109} Finally, it should be noted that Mr. Budding was under the impression that these people dancing “were connected with people who could defend them. So it was understood within the community that you might not like what these people are doing but you really can’t touch them, so just leave it alone.”\textsuperscript{110} This latter factor, who you know and your community ties,\textsuperscript{111} helps to explain the ability of queer Jamaicans to claim public forms of sexual citizenship in working-class and lower-class spaces.

In a related discussion that provides additional context, Ms. Halperin spoke particularly to the situation of males presenting as women. This interviewee indicated that she is familiar with members of the transgender community in Jamaica, and suggested that successful claiming of queer citizenship as a transgender person hinges greatly on being able to pull off your gender
presentation, such that “if you don’t look like a man, it’s not an issue.” Therefore, it is notable that the individuals dancing in front of KFC, whether self-identified as transgender persons or not, may be placed on a “gender queer” continuum. What can be concluded is that such queer public revelry in front of a fast food restaurant does not comport with the constructed image of Jamaica as an aggressively homophobic, “third world” nation.

A Lesbian’s Heaven and Gay Central

In another exchange, this one with Mr. Fox, another queer citizenship scene was described. Mr. Fox talked about a place where lesbians actively claim sexual citizenship:

There is one strip club in Jamaica in particular called Palais Royale. It’s between New Kingston and Halfway Tree, and it’s a lesbian’s heaven. I kid you not. Because the butches [more masculine lesbians] go to Palais Royale on weekends. There was also this club called Taboo, a strip club, and lesbians would be there. Lesbians are the biggest spenders in those clubs! You will see a few men outside but the majority of the clientele at Palais Royale for instance are lesbians.

While Mr. Fox is not lesbian-identified, he is well-acquainted with many lesbians in the New Kingston area. Here, he speaks to a reality in which it is fairly common knowledge, at least among segments of the population, that these particular strip clubs are significantly lesbian social spaces. Clearly, some lesbians are claiming sexual citizenship in public spaces in civil society in the form of bars and strip clubs. These are private establishments, but clearly outside of the purely private sphere of the home. Mr. Fox also mentioned that “you will see the lesbians walking down”; this indicates a certain public visibility outside of the establishments that spills out onto the street. While one must be careful not to interpret this contextual feature of queer citizenship in Jamaica as reflecting an earlier stage of a Western history of homosexuality and lesbianism, anyone familiar with the history of the Stonewall Riot in New York, and the
significant history of gay and lesbian community formation in bars and other commercial establishments,\textsuperscript{115} will appreciate the political import of being able to publicly congregate in these types of spaces. This is particularly the case when more formal citizenship opportunities in political society are lacking. The example of butch lesbians out in public as lesbians, negotiating a theoretically heterosexual (and potentially sexist) space in the form of a strip club and navigating it to their advantage, indicates everyday counter-hegemony and homosexual citizenship in Jamaican civil society.

This particular example also hinges significantly on the fact that lesbians are not as legally policed and generally not as intensely culturally policed, based on their sexual orientation, as gay men in Jamaica.\textsuperscript{116} However, butch lesbians in particular can be harshly regulated if they are perceived as a threat to masculinity and patriarchal privilege.\textsuperscript{117} The example also hinges on class issues related to the spending power of the lesbians in question that enable a degree of homosexual citizenship. This is in turn related to issues of race insofar as there continues to be a correlation, though not as clear-cut as in the classically colonial past, and with many exceptions, regarding class privilege and a lighter skin tone in Jamaican society.\textsuperscript{118} In this example, one is left to wonder at the intersecting racial and class identifications of the butch lesbians in question, and whether they were afforded a greater degree of homosexual citizenship on the basis of being “uptown, lighter-skinned, prettier hair butch lesbians.”\textsuperscript{119}

Geographical location also enters into this and other examples. For instance, Ms. Halperin spoke of different levels of tolerance for homosexuals in Jamaican society depending on place:

In Jamaica, it is mostly based on the geographical location you are in. So there are areas of Jamaica that are basically zero tolerance of it. If you come to Kingston, they will say it
is the norm there. Kingston and Montego Bay, those are the “gay central” areas. They’ll always say that. They will say it is tolerant.120

Given that a central feature of the ascribed image of Jamaica is its constructed universal and monolithic culture of intolerance towards gays and lesbians, this language of gayness as the “norm” in the urban centres, and of Jamaicans in certain areas of the country as “tolerant,” clearly demonstrates the unevenness of the situation in its lived material reality. This combined with Mr. Fox’s example of “a lesbian’s heaven,” sheds light on the existence of a fair degree of homosexual citizenship in some social and geographical spaces in Jamaican civil society.

**Other Ways to be Gay and a Queer History**

Some of the interviewees directly engaged the construct of “homophobic Jamaica,” deconstructing it according to a queerer reality. Ms. Melville and Ms. Stewart both made the point that there have always been “gay” and “lesbian” Jamaicans, including many prominent members of society, for example in the academic and arts scenes.121 While it was not always termed or announced publically, these individuals, including neighbours, family members, and friends,122 were commonly known to be gay or lesbian.123 This finding points to the historical presence and contemporary persistence of ways of being “homosexual” or practicing same-sex relationships outside of a public gay or lesbian identity. Part of this includes not having to “come out” or announce your sexual orientation in order for your identity to be known.124 These are realities of homosexual citizenship that will surely be missed, or that may be assessed as “less advanced,” when looking for the exact same types of public visibility associated with gay and lesbian identity in a contemporary North American context. Ms. Melville underscored this point when she related the following in response to whether “pride marches” and similar public demonstrations would be useful in the promotion of LGBTQ rights in the Jamaican context:

I’m not really sure. I’m not really sure that a pride parade or a demonstration or another
form of public visibility is what is needed. I don’t know if it’s something that is necessarily useful to the Jamaican context, and here is why: we’re not necessarily a place that does parades. The one parade that happens in Jamaica is Carnival. So this type of public visibility and creating the spectacle, we don’t have that. We don’t have protest marches. We block the road and burn a car . . . You cannot carry something to a country that has no history of that. Did the suffragettes march up and down the street asking for the vote? Yes. In North America there is a history of marching with your placards . . . we don’t do that here.\textsuperscript{125}

This analysis of the need for an indigenous or contextual queer movement in Jamaica, in order for such organizing to register with the populace, underscores the fact that an absence of the types of public visibility expected of LGBTQ movements in North America does not necessarily mean a lack of homosexual or other forms of queer citizenship in Jamaica.

Yet, there have been and continue to be forms of gay and lesbian public visibility, such as the ones mentioned at the outset of this section, more familiar to a North American frame of gay and lesbian identity. There is also an extensive queer Jamaican history that “homophobic Jamaica” ignores. Ms. Stewart mentioned, for example, the presence of a “thumping gay scene” in the Kingston area in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{126} It became clear from listening to a number of participants, Ms. Stewart and Ms. Melville in particular, that Jamaica has experienced a number of historical, overlapping “moments” when it comes to the regulation of homosexuality. Their combined responses gesture at the fact that the more pronounced association between heteronormativity and nationalism, and also among patriarchy, nationalism, and blackness, appears to have occurred in the context of nation-state formation post-1962, after a history of slavery and colonialism; in the context of reacting to the greater public visibility of gays and lesbians in
North American society (for example, in the media) and within Jamaican society; and, finally, in the context of an anti-imperialist national posturing or backlash in response to international/Northern pressure promoting LGBTQ rights in Jamaica.¹²⁷

**Transitions in Contemporary Homosexual Citizenship**

Many of the interview participants¹²⁸ indicated that Jamaica is actually in a new “moment” concerning homosexual citizenship, a moment in which there is a greater degree of acceptance and tolerance of homosexuals and homosexuality in certain social spaces, and among certain segments of the population. This moment can be contrasted with the late 1990s and early 2000s, discussed earlier in this dissertation in connection with Donna Hope’s analysis of dancehall music. Ms. Stewart mentioned that a great deal of this new moment has, in her view, been driven by generational change. She referred to the under twenty-five-year-olds in Jamaica, who are advancing a shift in attitudes concerning homosexual citizenship, as the “post-Queer as Folk/L-Word generation,” here referring to two prominent queer North American television programs.¹²⁹

The contemporary context was described by Ms. Melville as a “being out” moment in which “gay people are claiming space in the public arena, the Jamaican public arena, with little regard for the rest.”¹³⁰ This is a moment where gays and lesbians are finding ways of being both proud gays and lesbians, and proud Jamaicans. A notable indication of this counter-hegemonic cultural shift can be observed in J-FLAG’s “We are Jamaicans” video campaign, which seeks to call into question the often oppositional relationship between queerness and membership in the Jamaican national community, in effect to claim homosexual citizenship as Jamaicans.¹³¹ In Ms. Melville’s view, such a pursuit of the good gay life is not, however, a possibility for many working-class and lower-class (“downtown” in the Kingston context, contrasted with “uptown” or “midtown”) Jamaicans. However, there are, as indicated above, alternative forms of
negotiating and claiming queer citizenship outside of a public gay or lesbian identity that may sometimes be accessible in even these social spaces.

Ms. Stewart expressed frustration at some of the discourse concerning “homophobic Jamaica” set from the outside, including that perpetuated by Northern academics, human rights organizations, and “countries like Canada, England, and the rest of North America.”132 She implicated some diasporic activists in disseminating some of this discourse as well. This is an important point that serves as a reminder that LGBTQ Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians, including those in the interview sample for this study, speak from a variety of social and ideological standpoints. They also sometimes have conflicting views on how to advance the movement. This diversity further troubles the notion of a monolithic queer experience. While Ms. Stewart made sure to emphasize the validity of the diasporic LGBTQ perspective, she argued that some of the discourse is outdated and not reflective of the changes that have occurred on the ground in Jamaica in the last fifteen years.133 Ms. Melville similarly critiqued international discourses about “homophobic Jamaica,” set in conjunction with diasporic activists with greater access to the media than Jamaicans living in Jamaica. She was critical of the tendency of such discourses to ignore the voices of “Jamaicans who are making lives for themselves as gay Jamaicans in Jamaica. The gay Jamaican who says ‘yes, it’s difficult, but I have a life.’”134 The corollary of this omission is the problematic way in which such discourses tend to focus on and generalize the story of the most vulnerable or oppressed LGBTQ Jamaicans.135 This lack of balance in Canadian media coverage, for example, leads to the common sense understanding that leaving Jamaica and presumably migrating to Canada is a prerequisite to coming out into a modern gay or lesbian identity and to claiming gay or lesbian citizenship. To summarize, then, the discourse on “homophobic Jamaica” ignores Jamaica’s complex queer history, as well as
recent advancements in the negotiation and claiming of homosexual citizenship in civil society by some Jamaicans in Jamaica who are able to “live happy homosexual lives” in various civil societal spaces in spite of obstacles.\textsuperscript{136}

This section has explored homosexual and other forms of queer citizenship negotiated and claimed in Jamaican civil society. Some of the illustrations of queer Jamaica contained in this section are clearly not generalizable; however, the mere fact of their existence elaborates a “positive” conception of queer citizenship in Jamaica in contrast to the ideological tendency, a tendency that informs much academic writing on LGBTQ rights, to take inventory of queer citizenship in the Jamaican context by focusing on its absence or aberration from some anticipated norm. As well, just as illustrations of queer citizenship in Jamaica are not universal, neither are particular instances and expressions of heterosexism that are commonly marshalled in precisely this fashion of universalization in Canadian news media discourses about “homophobic Jamaica.” While Jamaica’s civil society and everyday political spaces are indeed much queerer than political societal spaces as indicated in the heterosexist legal structure, negotiating and claiming homosexual and other queer citizenship in Jamaican civil society can still be challenging and is mediated by the intersecting and inflecting identities of class, gender, and race. These factors are themselves set within a geographic and cultural context.\textsuperscript{137}

\textbf{Class, Gender, Race, Christianity, and Dancehall}

Thus far, this chapter has argued that resistance to heterosexist laws in political society in the form of counter-hegemony and a more substantial range and depth of queer negotiations of sexual citizenship in civil society together demonstrate that Jamaica is both queerer and less monolithic than meets the eye of homohegemony. The chapter now turns to a more explicit and focused consideration of how queer citizenship is structured in civil society by class, gender, race, a popular cultural Christianity,\textsuperscript{138} and dancehall music.
Sexual Citizenship and Class

Many of the participants indicated the importance of socioeconomic class – “uptown,” “midtown,” or “downtown” in the Kingston context, referring to areas of the city, social spaces and/or individual class status – in determining the degree of homosexual citizenship that may be claimed in Jamaican society. The interviewees spoke of the importance of not simply one’s socioeconomic position, but, additionally, how others perceive one’s class status based on the social spaces one inhabits. Social capital is thus an important part of this formulation of class. Jamaica is a highly classed society, not least because of the legacies of plantation slavery and colonialism, and, more recently, neoliberalism and neocolonialism. Class is also correlated with constructions of race owing to this historical legacy. In addition, class tends to be interpreted in an intersecting racialized fashion in the sense that people commonly conceive of an upper-class person as having a brown rather than a black skin tone, among other markers of “biracial” or “mixed-race” ancestry. Class status, inflected by understandings of race, but also independent of race, looms large in queer Jamaicans’ capacities and strategies to negotiate sexual citizenship. When asked whether gay, lesbian, and bisexual Jamaicans can sometimes live with their same-sex partners if they inhabit middle- and upper-class social spaces, Ms. Halperin had the following to say:

Yes, this is true. The middle class to upper class . . . nobody really recognizes, and most people assume it’s okay in the upper class or the middle class. In the lower class, they kind of have less tolerance.

Mr. Goodman highlighted that class matters, and that it interrelates with place. He made the following point in response to a question about whether Jamaicans ever tolerate homosexuality based on a belief in privacy, even though they might not personally agree with it:

It really depends on where you live. You mentioned uptown, and in general the further
you go uptown, the less people say anything. Even if they have a personal problem with it, they are less likely to say anything. It’s more of a class thing than anything else, because there are people in rural areas who get chased out.\textsuperscript{143}

It should be noted that Ms. Halperin also mentioned the difficulty of being gay or lesbian in rural areas, specifically stating “they’ll beat you.”\textsuperscript{144} Ms. Melville spoke to a more complicated picture of homosexuality and rural spaces. She emphasized that there are ways of being “homosexual” outside of a public gay or lesbian identity, some of which might reasonably be assumed to exist in rural areas, but which might not be readily visible.\textsuperscript{145} In any case, it can be concluded that class structure looms large in the negotiation of homosexual citizenship in civil society, but it is further differentiated by urban or rural contexts, the presence of tourist areas, and the cultures of particular urban contexts like Kingston. It was notable in the interviews that a view was shared that the higher up the class scale, independent of geographic location, the more social space there is for the claiming of sexual citizenship as a gay or lesbian person. There is a degree of privacy and tolerance of homosexual citizenship that class status tends to afford.

One can still be gay or lesbian in working-class and/or lower-class spaces. It might simply be harder to live with one’s partner, or to be seen publicly with one’s partner. Ms. Melville explicitly connected this to the privacy issue when she mentioned the ability to live a life of relative privacy in the middle and upper class, contrasted with the often communal nature of working-class and lower-class living conditions.\textsuperscript{146} While class is an important factor in terms of the capacity to negotiate homosexual citizenship, it is important to recognize that people in upper-class circles can still, of course, manifest anti-homosexual attitudes.\textsuperscript{147} As well, people in working-class or lower-class spaces can manifest very tolerant and accepting attitudes. For example, Mr. Jack, who identifies as being from a lower-class, rural background, related that he
has received a great deal of acceptance of his bisexuality from his family members. Mr. Goodman also brought up the example of people living in Downtown Kingston who can in fact sometimes be “out” as gay via the protection they receive from their social circle. This is significant as Downtown is ostensibly a more heterosexist social space with less room to claim homosexual citizenship. In speaking of this, he related:

Yes. I have seen it. And it’s usually the ones [referring to gay men] who are very loud and very aggressive. And I think what happens is these communities have a very interesting sense of loyalty. So it’s like: “Ok. You are from my community, that’s the most important thing, and then everything else is secondary.” So they would protect their own [gays] and they would probably ignore their own [gays]. But at the same time if I was to go in the community, I would be a target because I am not from that community. You know, I was talking to a friend about this very issue, and she said their thing is “yes, you’re a battyman, but you’re our battyman.” So it’s almost as if the community is more important than the sexuality in their eyes.

**Sexual Citizenship and Gender**

Gender is another powerful determinant of the capacity to negotiate homosexual and other forms of queer citizenship in Jamaica. In an interview with Mr. Markson, I asked whether being gay is viewed as not being a “real man” among some segments of the population in Jamaica. He responded:

That’s what persons think. You have a lot of gay persons who are all feminine, and that’s where the problem comes in. The ones who act masculine are accepted because no one knows if they are gay or not.

When asked whether lesbians have it “easier” than gays in Jamaica, as well as about the differences between more masculine- and more feminine- presenting lesbians, Mr. Markson
offered the following reflection:

Yes. They do have it easier. The ones who behave manly can have problems, but the ones who don’t, you don’t really know if they are a lesbian. But men don’t really care about lesbians. Persons don’t care if two ladies are kissing.\cite{151}

It should be noted that Mr. Markson has had to negotiate his bisexuality within the context of a competitive men’s sports team, a context over-determined by heteronormative masculinity in many global contexts. When asked if he felt that he had to hide his sexuality among his teammates, he responded: “they don’t know because they are not interested. Like all of us on the team are close friends, but they are not interested in what I do or whatever, we are just there as a team.”\cite{152} What comes across here is that a gay, bisexual, or lesbian Jamaican with a normative gender performance can negotiate their sexual orientation with greater ease than someone with a nonconforming gender performance, or someone who is perceived to bring their sexual orientation into the public sphere. It is also clear from these comments that, on the whole, lesbians or bisexual women are able to claim a public visibility as lesbians with greater ease than gay or bisexual men; women’s same-sex intimacy is often simultaneously less threatening to, and eroticized by, hetero-masculinity within the hetero-patriarchal neocolonial Jamaican sex/gender regime. Identifying as being from “downtown,” Mr. Markson’s insistence that you can be gay in downtown circles as long as you “act manly” and pursue a strategy of keeping your sexual orientation private,\cite{153} is important in terms of underscoring how gender interrelates with class.

Ms. Halperin, who lives with her same-sex partner whom she wants to eventually marry, was asked if it is typically possible for someone living in Jamaica to be seen as a “real man” if people know that he is gay. She responded flatly, “no.”\cite{154} When asked the same question pertaining to women, she offered the following more complicated reflection:
The thing is, where females are concerned, they don’t have much issues with them, especially the ones that we call “femme” [more feminine-presenting] because they still look like a woman and they still act like a woman. Whom they have issues with, though, are the ones who identify as male, or rather dress like a man.155

When asked whether male homosexuality is regulated differently than lesbianism from a cultural standpoint in Jamaica, Ms. Halperin made the following observation: “Yes it is. You see the thing . . . I think the issue that most Jamaicans have is that where two females are concerned, they don’t see it as ‘nasty.’”156 Ms. Halperin use of the word “nasty” here underscores that male homosexuality stands in as a greater threat to both morality, coinciding with the widespread perception of Jamaica as a “Christian nation,”157 and masculinity, than lesbianism. Yet, she also states the important proviso that more masculine presentations of lesbianism can and do appear as threatening to men and to a dominant frame of masculinity. Recalling here the additional oppression that women face as women, it can be concluded that lesbians do not have it “easier” than gay men. Ms. Halperin further noted that it is harder to be an ally of the gay and lesbian community if one is a man than if one is a woman, since the perception is that if a man is “okay” with homosexuals, “then they are going to say that . . . you are probably one or you are indulging in it.”158 It was mentioned earlier that Ms. Halperin also connects successful claiming of transgender citizenship to the ability to “pull off” one’s gender identity. In sum, then, successful claiming of queer citizenship hinges on whether one is gender normative, as well as on whether one is a gay man or a lesbian. Gender identity/presentation can also impact the perception of whether one is bringing their sexual orientation out into the public.

The differential claiming of homosexual citizenship based on whether one is gay or lesbian is important to acknowledge, not least as Canadian news media constructions tend to
focus exclusively on the experiences of gay men and to generalize these to the situation of homosexuals *tout court*. Again, this misses the gendered dimensions of homosexual oppression in Jamaica in general, and the presence of some very public lesbians in Jamaica in particular. Differences in queer and homosexual citizenship based on gender reveal a degree of public queerness and queer divergences not anticipated by notions of Jamaica as simply “other” to Canada on the issue of homosexuality. In addition to the lack of the construction of lesbians as a threat to the neocolonial heteropatriarchal ruling relations relative to gay men, including sometimes the eroticization of lesbianism and thus the subsuming of lesbianism within heteropatriarchy, some of this dynamic of sexual citizenship curiously seems to depend on butch lesbians accessing a degree of patriarchal privilege in certain social circles and locales; while contradictory, depending especially on place, this curious finding is no less worthy of consideration than gay men’s access to greater sexual citizenship than lesbians in some North American spaces based on patriarchal privilege. When asked whether there is ever a sense of camaraderie between butch lesbians and heterosexual men, Ms. Melville had the following comments:

Yes. Oh Yes! A lot of men have this one butch friend or several butch friends and they all “hunt” together. And the way that they unite is that, “we’re all on the same team: love pussy.” The butch will say it to them and they’re like, “how can you be gay?” And the butch will be like, “you’ve had pussy, right?” And the man will be like, “ya.” And the butch will be like, “you love it, right?” And he’s like, “ya.” And then she’ll say, “well why wouldn’t I love it?” And they’ll be like, “ya good question! Why wouldn’t you love it?!?” I mean there’s a camaraderie. They don’t necessarily see her as a threat or the threat is diffused by the pack mentality . . . and this is not all settings, but in those types of
groups there’s a certain type of misogyny that they unite around.\textsuperscript{159}

Asked the same question about butch lesbians and heterosexual men in Jamaica, Ms. Halperin agreed that heterosexual men and butch lesbian women are sometimes friends, but added that this might depend greatly on geographical location, stating that such friendships are probably more common in Kingston.\textsuperscript{160}

\textit{Sexual Citizenship and Race}\textsuperscript{161}

While all of the interviewees agreed on the significance of class and gender in the negotiation of sexual citizenship in Jamaica, race was a more contentious topic. Participants like Ms. Halperin indicated an overall lack of influence of race when it comes to the claiming of homosexual citizenship in Jamaica, with the notable exception of whether someone gay is also perceived to be foreign or from “abroad.” When asked whether it is accurate that people could potentially have the same problem with someone of a relatively lighter skin tone being gay as with someone of a relatively darker skin tone, so long as they were both Jamaican, Ms. Halperin responded as follows:

Exactly. What I would say though is that they won’t have as much of an issue if you are an “international person.” Like you don’t have the Jamaican accent, then you are a tourist, so you can bring it [homosexuality] here. They won’t treat you badly. They don’t see you as a gay Jamaican, they see you as a gay person, so they won’t actually be that way towards you.\textsuperscript{162}

Here, Ms. Halperin speaks to a reality in which “race” does not impact on the negotiation of sexual citizenship of gay and lesbian Jamaicans apart from the perception that someone is not Jamaican/is foreign. However, since that foreign tourist is more often than not white, there is a racial dimension of homosexual citizenship even in this case. There is also a class dimension, as the “international person” is understood to have a degree of social and economic capital that puts
them more in line with middle- or upper-class Jamaicans.

The interviews revealed that race has diminished as a determinant of social mobility in the post-independence period, and indeed it would be hard for it not to have diminished relative to the colonial era. There is a common perception that today’s Jamaica is more classist than racist, and this is consistent with the multicultural national motto “out of many, one people.” However, there were others in the sample who articulated that it is precisely because of the common perception that race no longer matters in Jamaica that it is difficult to “think through” the ways in which race does in fact impact the sexual citizenship negotiations of queer Jamaicans. Ms. Melville articulated a sense of frustration with the lack of acknowledgement of the relationship of race to homosexuality in Jamaica. She also highlighted that just as popular perceptions of class are racialized, popular understandings of race continue to be linked to perceptions of class, and both race and class are further associated with perceptions of foreignness. Specifically, I asked Ms. Melville whether it is more permissible for white Jamaicans, even if they and their parents are from Jamaica, to be gay, lesbian, or bisexual, as well as whether it is more permissible for tourists. She responded as follows:

Ya, it’s more permissible for uptown white Jamaicans, it’s more permissible for uptown Jamaicans who tend to be light-skinned. . . . They will tolerate it more in those places. And it’s not about race explicitly, but it is about race. Because a lot of Jamaicans still think about Jamaica as a black country. So when they are thinking about “Jamaican” they are thinking about black people. So yes, it is about “the national” and Jamaicans don’t do that [homosexuality]. But if they were to do the work and think a little bit further through it, it would be that black people don’t do that, our people don’t do that. So even the Indian people in Jamaica, they are thought of as thinking like Jamaicans, which is
thinking black. Even though a lot of the ways that African Americans think, Jamaicans don’t identify with that. But Jamaicans, we don’t very often deal with race. We deal with class but we don’t very often deal with race. So ya, Jamaicans don’t do that, that’s not a thing that Jamaican people do, but uptown and light-skinned and tourists, they can do that because they are foreign-minded.164

There is thus a class and racial dimension to membership in the normative Jamaican nation, such that even those within Jamaica may be more or less understood as normatively Jamaican based on these identifications, and may be more or less tolerated in and around homosexuality as a result. Ms. Melville here underscores that climbing the class ladder in this neocolonial context is simultaneously climbing away from the popular masses that constitute the common sense national community, understood subtly as black. Climbing the class ladder, including metaphorically all the way out of the country into the global North, is also a climb into territory conceived of as increasingly foreign. The colonial legacy means that the upper class is simultaneously valorized and contrasted with authentic Jamaican identity. The element of contradiction and tension is seen in the fact that some of the people perceived as less normatively national – for example, uptown Jamaicans with light skin or tourists – are more, rather than less, privileged in and around queer citizenship. Ms. Melville went on to advance a significant reflection concerning gayness and black masculinity:

Gayness is a threat to masculinity. It’s a threat more to black masculinity. They are less concerned with it being a threat to white masculinity. It’s a threat to black masculinity because the black man cannot show weakness, and having come out of the colonial context and the struggle for emancipation after slavery, the struggle for independence and the struggle to build a strong nation, a strong Caribbean nation, a strong black nation, the
black man must be strong. We are not in a position where our men can afford to be weak because we have to fight – we are still in a fight – and we need our men to be strong, and the gay man, in that he submits to another man, is weak.

Ideologies of race, then, intersect with gender and sexuality superstructures, impacting upon the everyday sexual citizenship negotiations of individual queer Jamaicans. While one’s perceived “race” – or perhaps more properly one’s position on the continuum of race – may not in every case factor into an individual gay or lesbian Jamaican’s experiences of the negotiation of sexual citizenship, the popular understanding of Jamaica as a black nation in the African diasporic and neocolonial context influences ideologies of sexuality and gender in the wider Jamaican state/societal context.

Back at the individual level of analysis of queer Jamaicans and “race,” John Williamson also spoke of a complicated racial landscape. Given his own ethnic background as someone who self-identifies as “black” but who has Chinese and European heritage as well, his identity suggests that many Jamaicans who self-identify as “black” actually have more complicated ethnic ancestries. He explained that a gay man with a light skin tone would likely have more freedom to negotiate public homosexual citizenship given the interrelated factors of blackness and masculinity. He succinctly offered the following intersectional analysis: “If you are blacker, more Jamaican, you are expected to be more masculine, more heterosexual.” He went on to talk about the “pass” that a tourist might receive on their homosexuality, associated with their tendency to be white, as well as commonly perceived as foreign and wealthy.

Ms. Stewart mentioned that many black/Afro-Caribbean-identified Jamaicans actually have “mixed heritage.” She also pointed out that just as class is racialized, race is classed:

I tell people a lot that we don’t have so much of a race issue as we have a class issue. So
you will take for granted that if you meet a Chinese or Asian-identified or “Asian-physically-apparent” person, you would immediately assume that they are uptown without even knowing their income level, their job status, education level, place of residence; you are easily put into the category of uptown. However, with that, if you have a darker-skinned Asian person, they can be considered as not uptown.

In terms of how race impacts homosexual citizenship more specifically, Ms. Stewart offered the following analysis:

If you’re a stereotypically Afro-Caribbean/Afro-Jamaican, you cannot be gay, it’s not right. It’s more permissible if you are mixed with something. Now I don’t know if that has something to do with aesthetics, in terms of what people imagine.170

Ms. Stewart went on to mention that this aesthetic racial imagery and imaginary means that it is viewed as somewhat of an “insult” for more Afro-Caribbean looking people – based on skin tone and other physical markers of “race” – to be gay or lesbian than for more mixed, typically lighter-skinned individuals. This lends itself to the notion that tolerance of homosexuality is based in conceptions of both black masculinity and black femininity that, like class, structure membership and normative belonging in the Jamaican nation. While these interpretations of race, class, and gender are complex and contested, they show that all three factors and their interrelationships mediate the sexual citizenship negotiations of homosexual and other queer Jamaicans. Therefore, not only does civil society diverge from political society, but within civil society there are marked discrepancies in the capacity to negotiate and claim queer citizenship based on these less formal structures of the integral state. In general, the more middle or upper class, and possibly, the more “foreign”, the more gender normative,171 and the lighter the skin tone, and again, possibly, the more foreign, the more social spaces available for the claiming of a
public gay or lesbian identity as part of the everyday practice of sexual citizenship.

The interviewees indicated that there appear to be more sexual citizenship spaces available for lesbians than gay men given the particular threat of gayness to masculinity in general, and to black masculinity in particular. However, these general findings obscure the many exceptions that may even constitute the rule in some geographical and/or class locations, such as butch lesbians who openly unite with heterosexual men, flamboyant downtown gay men who are able to obtain protection by people they know, and alternative ways of being “homosexual” or enacting queerness (for example, MSM) in Jamaica that get missed by a fixation on a frame of public gay and lesbian identity.

Beyond these multiple intersecting identities and the ideologies surrounding them, the negotiation and claiming of queer citizenship in civil society is mediated by cultural variables. This chapter will now briefly address two salient ones: Christianity and dancehall music.

**Sexual Citizenship and Christianity**

In response to a question asking about the main “source” of negative attitudes towards homosexuality in Jamaica, specifically whether such attitudes stem from the laws, the church, or dancehall music, Mr. Markson weighed in as follows:

I would say basically from the church because they go into the Bible and they quote that two persons of the same sex should not be involved in relationships, so I guess that’s where it all comes from . . .

When I asked Mr. Goodman whether the laws or culture have a larger role to play in popular attitudes concerning homosexuality, he emphasized religion but also brought up the necessity of legislative change:

I think it’s based in religion in that a lot of people use religion for their objections [to homosexuality], if you go down to the root of it. However, I think in terms of a solution,
there needs to be some form of legislative change. Yes, people might hold these beliefs, but if they are not sanctioned by the legislation, then we will have a chance to change certain views, and so forth. But if at the end of the day the government is sanctioning this kind of homophobia, then I find that there is very little that one can do. I’ve heard the arguments. Because of course when you use religious arguments, it’s easy to poke holes in them! And then once you start poking holes in it, they counter with “so and so is illegal, so you shouldn’t be breaking the law” or “you should be arrested” or some crap like that.  

Mr. Goodman implicitly asserts here that religion provides much of the ideological justification for currents of heterosexism in existence among segments of the population in civil society. Backed up by the coercive relations of political society, a popular cultural Christianity operates to gain consent to the (hetero)sexual status quo. The important point, then, is that the influence of religion and religious arguments, specifically Christianity, is a significant civil societal factor impacting homosexual citizenship. Many of the interview participants cited Christianity and/or its interpretation as a major contributing factor to contemporary heterosexism in Jamaica.

Mr. Miller noted that there is great deal of internal variation in terms of Christianity in Jamaica, with a “code of silence” characterizing the discussion of homosexuality in “traditional churches” like the Catholic and Anglican faiths, and overt disapproval of homosexuality voiced in more “fundamentalist,” including nondenominational, churches. Mr. Budding underscored that a socially conservative interpretation of Christianity has had a direct impact on the legal status quo in the form of the Lawyers’ Christian Fellowship, “a group of Christian lawyers and their allies.” This attests to the interrelationships between civil and political society, interrelationships that can extend beyond ideological influence and into actual
lobbying relations.

Mr. Johnson considered that it was in the 1980s that some of the local Jamaican churches began to change in favour of a more overt disapproval of homosexuality, and cited the transnational influence of US fundamentalist televangelists, including within Jamaican evangelism.\(^{177}\) He recalled painful personal memories of his family listening to and watching the televangelists, and of the Christian “rhetoric” against homosexuality that intensified at this time in Jamaica.\(^{178}\) This corresponds to the general timeline signalled above in terms of the greater international and Jamaican visibility of public gayness in this period, including in the context of the onset of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and the corresponding intensification of heterosexist state/societal regulation in Jamaica and other global contexts.\(^{179}\) Such public gay visibility and corresponding state heterosexism played out in a particular way in Jamaica’s neocolonial and culturally Christian\(^{180}\) context, including by viewing homosexuality as an “import” to Jamaica.\(^{181}\) As suggested above, heterosexism as a feature of Jamaican nationalism probably took on a more decidedly anti-imperialist meaning once gay rights began to advance in Canadian and other Northern contexts. It was suggested, especially by Ms. Stewart and Ms. Melville as discussed above, that this reactionary heterosexism perhaps described an earlier “moment” in Jamaica than the contemporary reality, and that it was never total, nor was it able to dispense with other ways of being homosexual or negotiating queerness. In the contemporary period, the influence of Christianity is not one-sided. In his interview responses, Mr. Lees spoke to LGBTQ activism and initiatives that have partnered with people from faith-based organizations.\(^{182}\) As well, Rastafari culture and beliefs continue to be significant, grounded in a belief system that Ms. Stewart maintained could more productively advance gay and lesbian inclusion given its indigeneity and cultural currency in the Jamaican context.\(^{183}\) In addition to those brought about by the influence
of Christianity, heterosexist attitudes among some Jamaicans have been reflected in and reinforced by certain dancehall music.

**Sexual Citizenship and Dancehall Music**

An ambivalence surrounding the “problem” of dancehall music among the interview participants reflects the tensions and contradictions of the current context of Jamaican sexual citizenship and Canadian state homohegemony. While many of the participants acknowledged the historical role of dancehall music in clamping down on queer citizenship and in projecting misogyny as well, they tended to express a degree of ambivalence about its role in the contemporary moment and about the ways in which anti-dancehall sentiment gets taken up in Canadian and international discourses. For example, when asked about dancehall music, and specifically whether Canadians should boycott dancehall music containing “homophobic” lyrics, Mr. Markson stated the following:

No. Nothing wrong with our dancehall music. You have for instance some dancehall artists who say stuff and whatever. I mean dancehall music is good . . . you have the dirty version of the song and you have the clean version; you can buy CDs and listen to the clean version. Persons are just saying stuff to make money, they are just saying stuff to make their records sell.184

Mr. Markson here makes the important points that dancehall music has emerged as an important niche in the economy, and that one cannot easily separate issues of sexuality from issues of social justice and economic fairness.

Mr. Lees explained that some of the outside discourse surrounding dancehall music has taken on new meanings and has not kept pace with changes in the domestic Jamaican context, and thus adds to the more general point mentioned above about Jamaica being in a new, queerer moment. He first situated dancehall music historically when he stated:
Somewhere around the late 80’s and 90’s, there was this turn towards being so homophobic. And so largely through dancehall music there was protestation and contestation of what seemed to be a challenge to what people thought was Jamaican national identity, and a sort of defence of heteronormativity.\(^{185}\)

Mr. Lees then complicated this point, however, noting:

But I think now things are changing some more . . . I think boycotts of music events with dancehall artists, for example, have played an important role but they are problematic and they can also have serious backlash. So if they are going to be undertaken, it has to be in close partnership with local actors because of how delicate our position is in the society. These are not the things we [speaking about J-FLAG] will readily support anymore. So, for example, a boycott of tourism, we wouldn’t support that. Likewise music events, even though back in the day we were very supportive of “Murder Music” campaigns, but we no longer support these campaigns because they have evolved and taken on a whole different sort of persona by itself that we cannot support. We have various views around what they now represent . . . \(^{186}\)

Here, Mr. Lees indicates that dancehall music has been a repository of, and contributor to, heterosexism in the past, but he also speaks to important changes that have occurred in both dancehall music and Northern discourses about dancehall music.

On her part, Ms. Melville pointed out that, as an art form, dancehall music is a reflection of values in wider circulation in Jamaican society and should therefore not be turned into a scapegoat for explaining heteronormativity and heterosexism among some segments of the population in Jamaica.\(^{187}\) Such comments echo those of Mr. Markson, indicating that dancehall music has been an important source of economic and cultural empowerment for many in the
context of painful neoliberal economic policies. Finally, Mr. Goodman reflected on the contradictory nature of dancehall music, in which trappings of non-normative gender presentation – for example, men sporting “tight pants or glitter or bright-coloured clothing” – combine with “hyper-masculine behaviour” in public performances that could be described as queer.

Like the influence of religion, the influence of dancehall music has not been monolithic or mono-causal. Rather, particular artists and songs (for example, Buju Banton and the song, “Boom Bye Bye”) were identified by many participants as having contributed to a heterosexist climate of sexual citizenship in civil society, in part because of dancehall music’s important role in contemporary Jamaican popular culture more generally.

Conclusion: Queer Divergences and Directions

This chapter has deconstructed the Canadian construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” illustrating that Jamaica is both queerer and less monolithic than common sense Canadian and international constructions would suggest. The chapter has attempted to trouble the ascribed ideological image by telling a different, queerer side of the story, while also paying attention to realities of heterosexism in the Jamaican context. It has been argued that Jamaica is not a homophobic monolith because of the agency of queers in political society to robustly and publicly challenge heterosexist laws, because of the range of structured queer negotiations and claiming of sexual citizenship in civil societal and everyday political spaces, some of which are rather substantial, and because of the divergence between political and civil society on the score of homosexual and other queer citizenship. In the course of advancing this argument, the chapter has argued for the relevance of a neo-Gramscian understanding of the state and civil society for understanding sexual citizenship and its negotiation. The chapter has also suggested, in a provisional fashion, some of the ways in which queer citizenship is legally, intersectionally, and...
culturally structured in political and civil society in the Jamaican state context.

This argument has been advanced through NGO and legislative document analysis, as well as through interviews with LGBTQ-identified Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians. One limitation of this analysis has been its overemphasis on homosexual citizenship, though the chapter has attempted to gesture at a broader spectrum of queer citizenship insofar as the different identities within “LGBTQ” are truly linked in terms of regulation and resistance. It has also gestured at sexual identities and practices that might escape an LGBTQ paradigm, though more research needs to be done on this point.

Finally, the chapter has suggested that the Jamaican state is in a contradictory relation between formally heterosexist laws and currents of culture on the one hand, and an increasingly public homosexual reality in certain civil societal and everyday political spaces on the other. There is a sense of sober hopefulness that Jamaica may be in transition to a new moment of queer sexual citizenship conceived of within a Jamaican frame. The contradictions, the hope, and the need to continue to cut through national ideologies surrounding queer exclusion and inclusion alike were captured well by Mr. Lees:

There are countries that are far more homophobic than Jamaica, and the fact that there are lots of changes happening here makes me optimistic . . . A significant minority of the population thinks the government is not doing enough to protect LGBT people now; but Western or local media are not necessarily changing the narrative to present a more nuanced perspective.191
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Chapter Six. Looking in, Coming in, and Coming Out in Canada

Setting Out

The previous chapter demonstrated the argument “negatively,” documenting a divergence and depth of queer citizenship in the Jamaican nation-state that undermines the illiberal construct of “homophobic Jamaica.” This suggested the highly ideological nature of the construction of Jamaica, as anticipated by the theorization of homohegemony. This chapter turns to a “positive” demonstration of homohegemony, considering how LGBTQ Jamaicans “look into” Canada, imagining it as inclusive of gay and lesbian citizenship. It also addresses how LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians negotiate the dual “benevolent” liberal and illiberal moments of homohegemony in Canada. In other words, homohegemony, as an ideology of relative inclusion of gay and lesbian citizenship in the Canadian national imaginary, is considered as it is imagined by Jamaicans as well. This attests to the transnational, specifically neocolonial, expanse of this national superstructure. Then, documenting the negotiation of homohegemony via attention to the lived experiences, reflections, and perspectives of LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians in Canada, this chapter reveals a much more contradictory relation of sexual citizenship in reality. LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians are queerly included as sexual citizens in the context of homohegemony, experiencing both moments of significant benevolent liberal inclusion and moments of exclusion. In terms of the latter, these represent the continuing and new manifestations of illiberalism upon which homohegemony’s benevolent liberal conferral of selective sexual citizenship rights is premised. These exclusions occur along lines of race, gender, class, neocoloniality, national origin, and sexuality, with the latter corresponding to continuing exclusions of LGBTQ people.

Many of the exclusions that the interviewees expressed are not specific to the Jamaican-
Canadian LGBTQ experience; the participants’ experiences of the benevolent liberal and illiberal moments, therefore, illuminate contradictions of queer citizenship of a more general nature. Seated at the site of maximum contradiction vis-à-vis contemporary Canadian homohegemony, namely in terms of its novel exclusionary relationship to constructed homophobic others, the participants are well positioned to produce knowledge about the inclusionary and exclusionary state and societal practices that have attended the folding in of gays and lesbians as equal sexual citizens in the national imaginary. This assumption is consistent with a feminist methodology, which views certain subject positions, for example, those that are multiply constituted, characterized by hybridity, and/or multiply oppressed, as having a degree of epistemological privilege when it comes to the production of knowledge about relations of power. However, a manifestation of illiberalism that is specific to the LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadian experience consists in being confronted with the caricature of “homophobic Jamaica” within hegemonic Canadian society and mainstream queer spaces. This analysis views sexual citizenship to be conditioned by state and societal “ruling relations,” based in other intersecting oppressions, in which, for example, selective gains in sexual citizenship take place in the context of continued heteronormativity, patriarchy, racism, neoliberal capitalism, nationalism, and neocolonialism. As a new status of citizens is folded into the nation by the state, other groups remain cast out, and new others are constructed. This also means, as the interview testimonies attest, that the construct of “sexual citizenship” is itself graded, differentially experienced based on its interaction and imbrication with multiple intersecting identities of privilege and oppression.

Methodologically, this chapter will continue to draw from interviews conducted with LGBTQ Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians. The discussion integrates the responses of LGBTQ Jamaicans residing in Jamaica into the narrative’s account of the way in which homohegemony
is queerly imagined, figuratively “looking in” to Canada. It also engages with the reflections of LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians to show how Canada is queerly experienced, “coming into” Canada and “coming out” in terms of a range of newly experienced identifications in the Canadian context. To capture the texture and complexity of these experiences, and to address the qualitative data drawn from a small sample, part of the chapter relies on an ethnographic presentation. The notion of negotiating sexual citizenship within an expansive, Gramscian-based conception of the nation-state will here be deployed again in the Canadian context.

Looking In

In the course of assessing Canada, many of the interview participants imagined what it would be like to migrate to Canada, and to live openly in Canada as a queer person. Looking into homohegemony from Jamaica is therefore connected to considerations of migration to Canada for many LGBTQ Jamaicans. Looking in can be seen as an example of “transnational yearning,” an affective dimension of transnationalism. When LGBTQ Jamaicans living in Jamaica figuratively look into Canada and imagine what the country is like on the score of queer inclusion, they evidence a common sense understanding of Canada as an extremely gay-friendly nation, and even as a “gay mecca.” They make this assessment based on knowledge of legal and societal developments regarding gay and lesbian rights and inclusion in Canada. The reality of homohegemony, as a sexual superstructure of the Canadian nation-state, is thus demonstrated by the fact that it is immediately recognized and affirmed outside of Canada’s borders. It is particularly significant that homohegemony has “buy in,” or significant consent, in Jamaica given the ideology’s problematic entanglement with the illiberal construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” and the neocolonial character of the Canada/Jamaica relationship. In other words, their responses suggest not merely that Canada has an international reputation for gay friendliness, though certainly they do suggest this, but that Canadian homohegemony casts a long neocolonial
transnational shadow. While in the previous chapter LGBTQ Jamaicans were shown to implicitly and explicitly queer and otherwise trouble the “homophobic Jamaica” caricature, here there is a suggestion that they affirm the understanding of the Canadian nation as inclusive of gay and lesbian citizenship.

Ms. Halperin, who identifies as lesbian, was asked whether LGBTQ Jamaicans tend to think that Canada is “gay friendly.” She responded: “They view Canada as a gay friendly country. I have a lot of gay friends who migrated to Canada.” When queried further about whether LGBTQ Jamaicans with such an understanding of Canada distinguish between Canada and the United States on the issue, she indicated:

They distinguish between them because I think they feel safer going to Canada because . . . in the United States there are still areas of the United States where if you go there, they are still going to beat you [for being gay or lesbian]. I don’t know of anyone who has gone to Canada and said they have encountered homophobia in any way; at least not any of my friends who are there . . .

Significantly, the United States is Jamaicans’ number one migration destination, as well as their contemporary “foreign” cultural reference. Distinguishing Canada from the US on lesbian and gay inclusion thus speaks to the forcefulness of Canadian homohegemony as an ideology. When asked if she would consider moving to Canada, and whether such a decision to migrate would be motivated at least in part by a desire to live more freely as a lesbian, Ms. Halperin responded: “Yes. I have actually thought about coming to Canada, visiting Canada, seeing if I would actually love the country. But based on my friends and everything, I would go to Canada . . . Because I would feel free to be me.” Clearly, Ms. Halperin and her social circle view Canada as a particularly gay-inclusive country, causing Ms. Halperin to mull over the possibility
of living freely as a lesbian in Canada. While the next section will show that such “freedom to be me” is selective and circumscribed, and entangled with other oppressions, it is notable for the purposes of this chapter that Canada is here being imagined externally to have inclusive homosexual citizenship based on certain freedoms afforded to gays and lesbians. This is significant in that it is the same metric that marks homohegemony domestically.

The responses of Mr. Goodman revealed a similar understanding of Canada. Mr. Goodman, who identifies as gay, was also asked whether LGBTQ Jamaicans commonly think of Canada as “gay friendly.” He responded as follows:

I know a lot of LGBT persons look to Canada as the place that they would like to go, over the US because of the freedoms that they enjoy. Because the United States is nowhere near as homophobic as Jamaica but homosexuals still don’t enjoy certain benefits in the US. You can’t get married in every US state, and so forth . . . So Canada is more of an ideal. 18

The assessment of Canada as an “ideal” migration destination for LGBTQ Jamaicans was very closely connected in this case to an understanding of Canada as containing ideal queer citizenship. This notion is based on significant knowledge of certain freedoms and benefits that gays and lesbians enjoy cross-nationally in the Canadian legal context. This is consistent with the frame of homohegemony, in which selective citizenship rights benevolently conferred by the state register an understanding of gay and lesbian citizens as included in the Canadian nation. Also consistent with homohegemony, this implicit analysis of sexual citizenship was linked by Mr. Goodman to the existence of same-sex marriage in Canada and its cross-national absence in the United States. When asked a follow-up question about whether he would consider migrating to Canada, and if this would be at least partly motivated by his sexual orientation, Mr. Goodman
responded: “Yes. I would. And yes, it’s because of the fact that Canada is gay friendly.” Mr. Goodman here takes Canada’s gay inclusiveness as a fact, speaking to the influence of Canadian homohegemony within the LGBTQ community in Jamaica. Considerations of migration to Canada, which take place within a neocolonial context and relationship more generally, in which out-migration to the North is a fact of life for many Jamaicans, are here seen to be further mediated by the homohegemony of the metropole.

Ms. Stewart, who identifies as bisexual and as an ally of the LGBTQ community, provided the following response when asked whether LGBTQ and “non-LGBTQ” Jamaicans tend to think of Canada as gay friendly: “Oh honey, it’s a wonderful world for gay persons. That’s where you want to go. It’s the holy mecca [laughs]. . . . and seriously, that’s what it is. You’re gay, and you’re having a dark time? Go to Canada. Go to Canada.” While the first part of this quotation was spoken in jest, Ms. Stewart can then be seen to have made the more serious point that Canada really does represent a refuge, even a shining light, for Jamaican LGBTQ people who are facing discrimination. This is a benevolent liberal reality of Canadian homohegemony in a transnational frame. Ms. Stewart was also asked whether Jamaicans tend to think of Canada differently than the US or Britain on the issue of perceived gay friendliness. She advanced the following analysis:

Yes. They do. Maybe more similar to Britain than the States. But for Jamaicans who are of a particular education level, they see Canada as more open-minded, the laws are better, you can go and live a good life. Some of these things you can still do in the States but Canada is just better. I mean, it’s colder [laughs] but it’s better . . . you will have an easier life.

When asked for clarification on if non-LGBTQ Jamaicans, though difficult to generalize, have a
perception of Canada as gay friendly, Ms. Stewart replied: “Oh ya. Everybody. That’s what Canada is.” The tone of this response, specifically her emphasis on the word “is,” seemed to indicate both that Jamaicans take Canada being gay friendly as a fact, and view gay friendliness as constitutive of Canadian national identity. It must be mentioned, however, that other participants, for example, Ms. Halperin, introduced above, disagreed with the notion that non-LGBTQ Jamaicans distinguish between Canada and the US on issues of gay rights. She maintained that many Jamaicans instead tend to lump them together, along with other Northern countries, in an overall category of “foreign” or “abroad” on this and other issue areas. That said, Ms. Stewart’s point is still well taken, that at least among certain more educated segments of the non-LGBTQ Jamaican population, Canada does have a particular reputation for being gay friendly. This is based on knowledge of Canada’s legal reality for gay and lesbian people, and a belief that Canadians are “open-minded.”

Mr. Lewis, who identifies as bisexual, when asked about Jamaicans perceiving Canada as gay friendly, corroborated the response of Ms. Stewart, above. He observed that “most Jamaicans think Canada is like a safe haven for the LGBT community.” He went on to assess: “Most gays, lesbians, or bisexuals that I have spoken with think they want to migrate to Canada.” Mr. Lewis’ answers again point to the understanding of Canada as a refuge for those members of the LGBTQ community who are faced with the more intense, including violent, forms of oppression extant within Jamaican civil and political society. Mr. Williamson, who identifies as gay, said Canada is “seen [by gay Jamaicans] as a very accepting place for gays.” The use of the word “accepting” points to an understanding of homosexual inclusion in Canadian political and civil society. He stated, further: “I have a gay friend who got political asylum, or refugee status, for being a gay Jamaican. Just the conversations I hear when I’m in Jamaica.
suggest that most gay Jamaicans think of Canada very positively.”

Mr. Williamson’s response helpfully brings attention to the fact that one can seek refugee status in Canada for reasons of a “well-founded fear” of home-country persecution based on one’s sexual orientation. Knowledge of this particular migration route is consistent with the more general understanding of Canada as a “safe haven.” Mr. Goodman and Mr. Lewis indicated that most members of the LGBTQ community in Jamaica are aware of the ability to seek refugee status in Canada based on sexual orientation persecution.

Ms. Melville offered the following analysis when queried about the existence of a common perception among LGBTQ Jamaicans that Canada is gay friendly:

Definitely. There is definitely that perception that Canada is gay friendly, definitely gay friendlier than Jamaica, most likely gay friendlier than the US. As well, that Canada is the saviour of the imperilled gay communities of the third world . . . That Canada has open borders and they take in all the gays that nobody else wants in their country. So ya, that’s pretty much the perception. And we do know people who have done the refugee process. So it’s not just stories that are being told in a vacuum. We know it as well. Everybody knows somebody who knows somebody who has been impacted.

Ms. Melville here brings up an extremely important point, also brought up by Ms. Stewart, as discussed above, that although there is a mythology surrounding Canada as gay inclusive, this is based in certain realities of people’s lived experiences of which especially LGBTQ Jamaicans are aware. Such narratives and experiences generate a ripple effect. The ripples of this benevolence envelop those who have successfully claimed refugee status based on their sexual orientation. This reflects Canadian homohegemony as an imagined relation corresponding to real sexual citizenship rights, including refugee programs that extend such rights transnationally. This
allows homohegemonic ideology to be felt beyond Canada’s borders, particularly in the global South. Canadian homohegemony, specifically its benevolent liberal moment, is thus palpable in Jamaica’s queer community.

Ms. Melville implicitly made another point about homohegemony when she recounted a conversation that she had had with her ex-girlfriend: “I actually started learning about Canada through my ‘ex’ when she proposed to me! And she was the one who was like, ‘Oh we can go to Canada and we can get married.’” The sexual citizenship right of same-sex marriage enters into how LGBTQ Jamaicans conceive of Canada as sexually inclusive, consistent with same-sex marriage as a symbol of egalitarian gay and lesbian citizenship within the nation-state. The perception of Canadian homohegemony among LGBTQ Jamaicans sometimes provokes the desire and imagination of migration, as occurred in the case of Ms. Melville’s ex-girlfriend.

Ms. Melville also assisted this analysis when she explained that, although there exists a diversity of opinion on Canada’s relation to queerness depending on the segment of the Jamaican population to which one is referring, making it impossible to generalize, “a lot” of the heterosexual Jamaican population do understand Canada as gay friendly; the particular reputation of Canada as a “gay mecca” exists specifically among members of the queer community. What is more, heterosexual Jamaicans have varied opinions about gay inclusion in Canada, ranging from an attitude of “your country, your business” but with disapproval of legal reform in the Jamaican context, to people who wish to emulate some gay and lesbian rights via legal reform, to those who view gay and lesbian inclusion in the Canadian context as a sign of national inferiority, contrasted with Jamaica’s superior moral standing.

When speaking about migration via seeking refugee status, Ms. Melville implicitly connected it to homohegemonic ideology:
The refugee program, which makes Canadian borders particularly permeable for LGBT people from the third world, does a lot to set the discourse around Canada within the LGBT community in concert with organizations on the ground that have actively functioned to get LGBT Jamaicans into refugee programs. That was their way of seeking rights for Jamaicans, to get them into refugee programs.\(^{38}\)

Ms. Melville indicated, further, that she personally knows many LGBTQ people who would not attempt to claim refugee status, particularly because these individuals do not want to paint Jamaica in an overwhelmingly negative light in this regard.\(^{39}\) They would rather find another way to migrate, for example as a skilled worker.\(^{40}\) Mr. Reed, who identifies as bisexual, is an example of this phenomenon.\(^{41}\) While he expressed a desire to migrate to Canada at some point so that he can take advantage of the sexual citizenship right of same-sex marriage and simply “live better,” he said he does not want to take the extreme migration route of claiming refugee status.\(^{42}\) This is not to suggest that some LGBTQ Jamaicans do not face dire circumstances that necessitate filing for refugee status in Canada or other countries, but the suggested lack of personal interest in this migration path among many LGBTQ Jamaicans, and the preference to use standard immigration channels, is a significant finding. It is a reminder that although Canada is viewed as particularly gay friendly, or even as a “gay mecca,” Jamaica is viewed and experienced as substantially queerer than meets the Canadian construction, with a degree of room to claim and negotiate queer citizenship.

It should be noted that while most of the understanding of Canadian homohegemony was expressed in the interviews in terms of Canada in general, owing no doubt in part to the manner in which the questions were posed, some participants singled out Toronto specifically. These interventions underscored the function of Toronto in Canadian homohegemony, cast within a
neocolonial frame. For example, Ms. Snow assessed Toronto as “the gay capital of the world.”\textsuperscript{43} This is significant, insofar as it implicitly points to the fact that migration to other cities in Canada may not present the same opportunities. Moreover, even migration to Toronto from Jamaica and the negotiation of queer citizenship in that context are not as easy to navigate as some of the ideology would suggest. This will be returned to in the discussion of homohegemony’s illiberal exclusions.

Mr. Goodman provided additional context. He indicated that the general Jamaican population, beyond the LGBTQ community, does not mention Canada very often when referring to gay and lesbian issues. He speculated that this is because Canada has already legalized and cemented same-sex marriage, whereas the ongoing and contentious US battle for same-sex marriage tends to be the primary international referent for the current discussion of gay and lesbian issues in hegemonic Jamaican civil and political society. Mr. Goodman advanced a reflection that implicitly identified the textured context of Canadian homohegemony when he stated the following:

> Our discussions here in Jamaica, outside of the LGBT community, refer more to the US than anywhere else. The US is our closest reference and it’s a big topic in the US, and it’s not as big of a topic in Canada since I think . . . I don’t know how long ago you passed gay marriage . . . but it’s almost as if you guys are past that phase. So America is just now debating it and we are taking our cues from them . . . So it’s not that people don’t care about Canada and LGBT issues, but they just don’t mention it outside of the LGBT community.\textsuperscript{44}

Mr. Goodman further observed that some Jamaicans committed to the heterosexist legal \textit{status quo} prefer not to mention Canada in public discourse for strategic political reasons, since
“Canada proves that society won’t fall apart if the laws are changed in favour of gay and lesbian rights.” This was echoed by Mr. Johnson, who stated that Canada represents a particularly “confusing” place for this segment of the Jamaican population, as a context in which an embrace of LGBTQ rights has not lead to “destruction.” Canada is therefore sometimes strategically left out of hegemonic public discourse on lesbian and gay rights by those who would argue that moving forward on these rights in Jamaica would lead to calamitous outcomes for society.

There is also a comparative context regarding migration options for the general Jamaican population. Canada was thought of by all interviewees as gay friendly, and by a large majority of interviewees as extremely gay friendly and inclusive of gay and lesbian citizenship. Only a few of the Jamaican interviewees residing in Jamaica did not regard Canada as “gay friendlier” than the United States; instead, these few interviewees regarded both countries as very gay friendly. However, other migration concerns related to cost and Canadian immigration policies relative to the US and Britain also were reported to enter into LGBTQ Jamaicans’ decisions to rank Canada at the top of the list of desired migration destinations. These included the belief that Canada is underpopulated, needs and welcomes immigrants, and/or is in an expansionary economic phase that requires workers, sentiments commonly expressed in the interviews. Contrasting Canada with the United Kingdom specifically, Mr. Goodman observed: “I just know that it’s harder as an LGBT person to get to Britain, as a Jamaican in general to get to Britain, especially now. It used to be easier but now it’s a lot harder in terms of visa restrictions and all of that.”

Mr. Fox, who identifies as homosexual, claimed that “most if not all” of the LGBTQ community in Jamaica “believe that Canada is very gay friendly, very.” He proceeded to elaborate, with notable sarcasm: “Everybody wants to go to Canada or England, run away, you know, because life is going to be so much better there.” He did acknowledge, however, that this
“provides some level of hope . . . for LGBT people . . . They are like ‘Okay, if things don’t work out in Jamaica, I can go to Canada, I can go to the UK, and start a life.’”51 He noted that he “[knows] quite a few people who have done that.”52 When asked about whether LGBTQ Jamaicans would prefer to migrate to Canada, the UK, or the US, Mr. Fox answered:

Canada, most definitely, because it’s cheaper to go to Canada than the UK. Canada is also easier to access. It’s easier to get your permanent residence in Canada than it is in the UK. And that has a lot to do with the fact that Canada is underpopulated [laughs]. So they welcome people there. Whereas in the UK you have to go through quite a lot to get the permanent residence, so people will more than likely gravitate towards Canada. I know quite a few people who are looking to do that.53

When asked about the US also representing an attractive migration destination for LGBTQ Jamaicans, Mr. Fox observed:

Ya, it would, but the thing about it is, like I said, if you are trying to do it legally [laughs]. Which is something we all think about in terms of whether legally or not. If you want to do it legally, it’s Canada. You can apply to be a skilled worker, that kind of thing. It’s also easier to go to Canada than it is to the US because to get a US visa is apparently very difficult.54

This qualitative data echoes data of a more quantitative nature discussed in Chapters One and Three that evidenced decreasing West Indian migration to the United Kingdom relative to North America in recent decades, and the notable increase in Jamaican migration specifically to Canada in the 1990’s, defying a generally decreasing trend in the flow of Jamaican migrants to the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada over the course of the past few decades.55 Other indicators are revealed in the phenomenon of “double lap” migration to Canada, in which
Jamaican citizens first migrate to the United Kingdom, only to subsequently relocate, often with their families, to Canada. The point of note, then, for the present discussion, is that the desire to migrate to Canada rather than to the US or Britain, as expressed by the interviewees, is not merely based on Canada’s reputation for being a particularly gay-inclusive country. One might say that the transnational desire of many LGBTQ Jamaicans to migrate to Canada occurs in the context of a comingling of the influences of homohegemony and multiculturalism, in which the two factors, including the way they find practical expression in laws and immigration policies, together enter into considerations of migration.

This chapter has thus far considered how LGBTQ Jamaicans understand and imagine Canada on the issue of lesbian and gay inclusion. It has engaged with opinions about Canada as a possible queer migration destination, since understandings of Canada on this issue are caught up with yearnings of migration for some, but by no means all, LGBTQ Jamaicans. While beliefs, understandings, and ideas about Canada and gay and lesbian inclusion could be deterministically inferred from particular citizenship rights, immigration policies, refugee programs, or migration statistics, this data compels consideration of the ways in which laws, policies, programs, and migration are conceived of and imagined by LGBTQ Jamaicans. Along these lines, it has been argued here that homohegemony is an ideology about inclusive gay and lesbian citizenship in Canada that makes its presence felt in Jamaica’s LGBTQ community, and, to a lesser but still notable extent, in hegemonic Jamaican society. LGBTQ Jamaicans have an understanding of Canada as homohegemonic, in the sense of it having inclusive sexual citizenship for gays and lesbians. This is understood in terms of specific sexual citizenship rights such as same-sex marriage, and corresponding civil societal attitudes of “gay friendliness.” Homohegemony can, further, be seen as entering into the desire to migrate, or at least consider migrating, to Canada.
The notion of Canada as a “gay mecca,” with Toronto as a global gay capital, speaks to the neocolonial dimensions of the ideology, in the sense of Canada being at the centre of this constellation of global gay power relations.

Like the imagination of inclusive sexual citizenship for gays and lesbians within Canada, the LGBTQ Jamaican participants’ understanding of this relation of Canadian homohegemony focused mostly on sexual citizenship rights and corresponding societal attitudes, and largely missed ongoing illiberalism. Yet, these are exclusions upon which such significant and celebrated inclusions may be seen to depend. It is to the benevolent liberal and illiberal realities of homohegemony, as they are negotiated in the Canadian context by Jamaican-Canadians, that this chapter now turns.

**Coming in, Coming out: Queer Citizenship under Homohegemony**

This chapter will now pivot into a sustained engagement with the manner in which each of the six Jamaican-Canadian interview participants has negotiated the benevolent liberal and illiberal moments of homohegemony in Canada. Four of the participants migrated from Jamaica, while two were born in Canada to Jamaican-born parents. In terms of race, all identify as “black” in the Canadian context, and the majority also used either the terms “person of colour” or “racialized.” The use of the identifier “Afro-Caribbean” is also indicated.57 One of the Jamaican-Canadian interviewees, Ms. Brooks, pointed to having a relatively light skin tone, which sometimes contributes to the incorrect assumption that she is “biracial.”58 Another of the participants, Mr. Budding, pointed to the presence of both Indian and Chinese backgrounds in his multiracial family tree. The participants are differently situated in terms of sexuality. Four identify as gay, one as bisexual, and one as queer. Four identify as men, and two as women. The participants range in age from early 20s to early 40s. They also range in terms of occupations and degree of queer activism. In short, though this is in no way a representative sample, the
participants reflect a fairly broad swath of LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadian identities, experiences, and values, given the small sample size.\textsuperscript{59} In spite of these differences, the participants were united in attesting to negotiating queer citizenship in Canada and experiencing both the benevolent liberal and illiberal moments of homohegemony vis-à-vis sexuality and a range of other identifications. Some participants spoke more to benevolent liberalism than illiberalism, and vice versa, but it is noteworthy that they all spoke to both. The participants also underscored how sexual citizenship is itself differentially experienced in Canada based on how sexuality intersects with other identities and their regulation, in terms of gender, race, class, national origin, and neocolonialism. The next section will touch on these intersections and the way they structure queer citizenship in the Canadian context in the course of showing how each interviewee has experienced the contradictory dual moments of homohegemony. The imagination of Canada as inclusive of gay and lesbian citizenship by Canadians and Jamaicans may here be seen to give way to the more contradictory and queer sexual citizenship experiences of Jamaican-Canadians.

\textbf{Coming in, Coming Out: Homohegemony’s Benevolent Liberal Inclusions}

\textit{Mr. Johnson}

Mr. Johnson, who identifies as gay, is a landed immigrant who has lived in Toronto since 2012. He previously lived in Edmonton, Alberta, to attend university. He is a lawyer and prominent international Jamaican LGBTQ activist. When asked what he would highlight about the negotiation and experience of his gay identity in Canada, he offered the following response:

I suppose the most important thing for me is knowing that there is legal recourse if something were to happen, and that’s a very distinct thing that mentally I get, perhaps emotionally I’m not used to yet. For me, not only as an attorney but as a rational individual, I like the fact that there is recourse if someone were to do something to me. It
doesn’t mean I put myself in harm’s way, but at least I feel more comfortable in that regard. I also like the fact that . . . my church here [Metropolitan Community Church] is very important to me . . . The fact that I can actually worship openly is very important to me; it’s something I haven’t been able to do as an authentic gay Christian for over 14 years because I just couldn’t deal with the hypocrisy and having to suppress my identity. 60

Mr. Johnson’s discussion of “legal recourse” alludes to a legal framework in Canada in which sexual orientation is explicitly included as a prohibited ground of discrimination in federal and provincial/territorial human rights legislation, 61 as well as in federal hate crimes legislation. 62 More generally, it speaks to a juridical reality that he implicitly contrasts with the Jamaican context, in which gay and bisexual men in particular are associated with criminality rather than considered sexual citizens who are afforded legal protection. Mr. Johnson’s discussion makes clear the connections between the laws and his everyday experiences, and evinces his genuine appreciation of the state’s benevolent liberal extension of selective citizenship rights, which results in gays and lesbians feeling they have the protection of the law in everyday life. In addition, Mr. Johnson’s discussion of being able to openly worship as a gay man in a queer-friendly church is strongly suggestive of the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony in Canadian civil societal spaces. In previous chapters, it has been demonstrated that civil societal spaces are of central significance to homohegemony, and it has been shown how this has included organized religion in the Canadian context. Mr. Johnson’s comments, taken together, reveal the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony in juridical and civil societal spaces alike.

Mr. Johnson was also asked to reflect on his experience of being someone of Jamaican
background and nationality in the Canadian context, both in hegemonic society and in the mainstream LGBTQ community. As part of his response, he advanced the following observation: “I don’t find there are a lot of negative stereotypes around Jamaicans in Canada. I don’t think . . . I haven’t experienced any. It’s generally very positive for me. People have thought about my country in terms of the music, the food, the weather.”

Here, Mr. Johnson signals a lack of prejudice or discrimination on the basis of Jamaican nationality, and makes the important proviso that this assessment is based on his personal experience. This lack of manifest illiberalism in terms of “negative stereotypes” about Jamaicans, at least in the lived experience of Mr. Johnson, evidences a citizenship structure, of which homohegemony is a part, with a degree of benevolence or openness to immigrants, in this case those from the Jamaican context. He points instead to certain understandings of Jamaica on the part of Canadians in terms of Jamaican culture and weather, representing what he sees to be fairly benign markers of distinction.

However, it is noteworthy that familiarity with Jamaica on the part of Canadians he comes into contact with is still limited to stereotypes and common of views of the Caribbean in Canada’s neocolonial imaginary; while not representing blatantly negative stereotypes about Jamaica, the subtle illiberalism of these comments is evident. This will be returned to in the next section.

More clearly illustrating his experience of the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony as a sexual citizenship ideology specifically, it is significant that Mr. Johnson is married to his Canadian husband, following a wedding that took place in Toronto. Mr. Johnson’s experience of the benevolent liberal moment is here demonstrated by his having accessed this ultimate and symbolic sexual citizenship right that marks gay and lesbian inclusion in the Canadian national imaginary.

As previewed above, one can observe the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony
in the ability of LGBTQ people to claim refugee status in Canada on the basis of a “well-founded” fear of home-country persecution based on sexual orientation, as well as gender identity, though the latter is less definitively integrated into refugee law. Though Canada’s refugee programs contain legal, institutional, and systemic exclusions that specifically negatively impact LGBTQ people, to be explored in the next section, the fact that they integrate sexual orientation into the assessment of home-country persecution is nevertheless significant. Yet, this was not the migration path adopted by Mr. Johnson. As he explained,

I did not want refugee status, even though I qualified for it, because my mother is very ill and I did not want to be banned from going back to Jamaica. My husband was very annoyed because it [refugee status] would have been an immediate thing but we went through the regular process. I must say that the Canadian High Commission, they were very cooperative. When they heard I had to leave, they expedited things for me.

Though he did not seek refugee status in Canada, immigration authorities took the persecution he was facing in Jamaica based on his sexual orientation into account in expediting his immigration file. Mr. Johnson’s experiences of coming into Canada and coming out Canadian demonstrate legal and civil societal benevolent liberal inclusions of gay and lesbian citizenship.

Ms. Brooks

Ms. Brooks, who identifies as bisexual, is a dual citizen of Canada and Jamaica. She works as a project manager, and is involved in queer activism. She has lived in Canada for twenty years, representing all of her adult life. She maintains ties to Jamaica, however, regularly traveling back to visit family there. Ms. Brooks came to Canada to attend university at age seventeen, first living in Kingston, Ontario, and eventually settling in Toronto where she currently resides. She has found herself increasingly drawn to activism related to bisexuality and sex positivity.
Ms. Brooks provided insights on ongoing illiberalism under homohegemony, balancing these with commentary on the significance of the benevolent liberal moment in her own life. For example, she has a positive overall view of Pride Toronto, which she expressed in the following excerpt:

Pride is important to me because it’s probably the only time when someone who is body positive and sex positive . . . can walk down the street and be public and not have anyone question it. There is something about being able to be myself in public and not have people question it. During Pride we are all okay with each other because we are celebrating [laughs].

This statement celebrates the public character of the annual event, Pride Toronto, and the openness it affords for non-normative gender and sexual identities/practices. This experience extends beyond gay and lesbian identities during the temporal and spatial context of the celebration. The ability to claim public space is an important aspect of sexual citizenship. Pride Toronto is a significant claiming of public space for historically non-normative sexual citizens, and Ms. Brooks highlights here its ongoing potential in terms of deepening subversion and transformation. Crucially, Ms. Brooks also registers that the queer community does not always get along so well outside of this major celebration. While no panacea, Pride Toronto is nevertheless highly significant to Ms. Brooks’ experience and negotiation of sexual citizenship in Canada.

Ms. Brooks’ participation with a contingent of bisexual women activists in the annual Dyke March, and her relatively recent involvement with what she indicated was the first official participation of the Metropolitan Community Church of Toronto in this march, have also been positive experiences, carving out and claiming sexual citizenship for women and bisexuals
within mainstream queer institutions. Such participation is implicitly critical of hegemonic LGBTQ rights discourses for not being transformative or queer enough, troubling the sexual citizenship structure they reflect. However, the very ability to engage in such important criticism is occasioned by the homohegemonic moment and its opening up of public spaces for the expression of sexual subjectivity and the claiming of sexual citizenship.

Ms. Brooks has also sought to remain connected to her Jamaican and Caribbean identities. She was a member of “Songs from the Island,” a musical group she describes as being “kind of like Canada’s version of the Jamaica folk singers.” Ms. Brooks spoke about this participation in largely positive terms, saying, “I loved it. It was fantastic and I got to sing music from my childhood and things like that.” Echoing Mr. Johnson, discussed above, Ms. Brooks has evidently found a degree of openness in the Canadian context in terms of her ability to be both Canadian and Jamaican-identified. Significantly, Ms. Brooks has also negotiated hegemonic Canadian spaces outside of queer and Caribbean spaces in Toronto, and has felt a degree of inclusion in those as well. Speaking of her overall experience in Kingston, Ontario, when attending university upon first migrating to Canada, Ms. Brooks observed, “It can be a small city but I loved it.” She expressed that, coming from a rural and relatively upper-class background in Jamaica, her transition to Canada in terms of culture shock was actually eased by the midsize city of Kingston and the “bubble” of her university life.

Rounding out this chapter’s discussion of Ms. Brooks’ experience of homohegemony’s benevolent liberal inclusions, the following was her response when asked to identify one prominent positive experience in terms of her sexual orientation in Canada:

I guess what’s foremost in my mind is my ability to, living in Toronto in particular and being a “city of Toronto person” . . . like not the GTA [Greater Toronto Area] or Oakville
... is being able to marry my partner and go to these stupid wedding shows [laughs] and do all of those things and have people not bat an eye.  

Here, the experience of inclusive sexual citizenship is spoken about in terms of the citizenship right of same-sex marriage. This is not merely an abstract right. Ms. Brooks localizes her experience of same-sex marriage in the Toronto context, and in the ability to attend the public spaces of wedding shows. The benevolent liberal conferral of selective sexual citizenship rights is experienced as an inclusion into nation and community, in the most mundane of activities – in both its joys and frustrations – that most middle-class heterosexual Canadians and Jamaicans alike take very much for granted.

**Mr. Budding**

Mr. Budding, who identifies as gay, has lived in Canada on a permanent basis since 2005. He came to Canada as a skilled immigrant, and has lived in Hamilton, Kingston, and Ottawa, all in the province of Ontario. He became a Canadian citizen in 2012, and also retains his Jamaican citizenship. He works as a lawyer. Highlighting the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony, he spoke to the negotiation of his sexual orientation in Canada, and contrasted this with his experience of negotiating sexuality in Jamaica, as well as during a relatively short period of time in Barbados:

> It is much easier in the Canadian context to deal with my sexual orientation. I have always been out to people I have worked with, with the people I have gone to school with here, and it’s never been an issue... It’s not something that I have had to deal with here and I think that is probably the most striking difference between being black/gay/immigrant here and being black/gay and living in Jamaica.

This statement highlights that the experience of sexual citizenship is conditioned by the experience of other identities, such as being black and being an immigrant. Mr. Budding here
implicitly refers to the intersectionality of his indivisible identities, with the spoken insertion of the “slash” making clear that these identities are experienced in an integral fashion. Notably, it is the experience of that component of his identity corresponding to sexual orientation that has constituted “the most striking difference” between Mr. Budding’s negotiation of his intersectional identity before and after coming into Canada. In this case, coming into Canada has allowed Mr. Budding to live with relative ease as an “out” gay man. The fact that his sexual orientation has been something of a non-issue in the Canadian context speaks to the normative status of gay and lesbian citizenship in Canada. The ability to be openly gay in the workplace and other spaces in civil society clearly corresponds to advances in sexual citizenship under homohegemony. This statement reminds us that laws against discrimination based on sexual orientation, discussed in Chapter Four, have contributed to these important shifts in popular attitudes.

Mr. Budding’s reflections were further suggestive of benevolent liberalism in highlighting his marriage in Canada, and the way it has been received in Canada and transnationally. His husband, who he described as “Caucasian,” reportedly enjoys a “cordial relationship” with Mr. Budding’s family members in both Canada and in Jamaica. Same-sex marriage can here be seen again to characterize the experience of sexual citizenship upon coming into Canada.

Sometimes the experiences of benevolent liberalism and illiberalism were reported as tightly intertwined. This makes sense given homohegemony’s theorization in terms of selective sexual citizenship inclusions taking place precisely on the condition of illiberal limitations and exclusions. Mr. Budding’s appraisal of heterosexism in Canada clearly evidenced the comingling of the benevolent liberal and illiberal moments:
Depending on where you are, you will get people who will look at you oddly . . . you could see their facial expressions change if there is any sort of PDA [public display of affection] going on between two men or two women. I’ve never ever heard anybody, except in jest, which is bad in and of itself, but not with any overt malice, make derogatory comments. I’ve been in the US and I’ve seen and heard that . . . I’ve been at the receiving end of that. So from that perspective, I’d say that Canadian society is much better at restraining their views on that. So you might see it in their facial expressions, but they will rarely verbalize that . . .

Mr. Budding’s observation in this passage is primarily one of taking stock of the benevolent liberalism of the Canadian context on the score of queer inclusion, as contrasted with the United States. The Canadian context is one in which people may not always approve of homosexuality or homosexual relationships, as is evidenced in disapproving facial expressions, but is also one in which people are “much better at restraining their views.” This represents at once significant benevolent liberalism consistent with the tolerance of the homosexual minority, and ongoing illiberalism in the form of moral disapproval of homosexuality. The latter indicates the incomplete normalization of homosexuality and same-sex relationships. It might seem contradictory to classify people restraining heterosexist views as benevolent, but the fact that this occurs on a hegemonic scale in Canada is a major achievement, and notably one that makes a qualitative difference to Mr. Budding’s life as compared with his experiences in both Jamaica and the US. However, the classification of this as a manifestation of benevolent liberalism underscores the illiberal, exclusionary limits of queer citizenship in Canada, where notions of normative gay and lesbian citizenship coexist with the incomplete normalization of homosexual subjectivity among segments of the Canadian population.
Ms. Jacobson

Ms. Jacobson, who identifies as queer, is a Canadian citizen who was born and raised in Canada to Jamaican-born parents. She is a university student who resides in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). When asked to reflect on being a “person of colour” in Canada, Ms. Jacobson spoke to a mostly inclusive experience. It should be noted that it was explicitly stated in this question about race: “feel free to use another term [besides ‘person of colour’] if you wish to.” Ms. Jacobson reflected on her experience of race and racialization as follows:

I think being a person of colour in Canada, I wouldn’t say it’s easy, but it’s becoming less difficult with people of colour being in different positions in politics, in everyday life, and so forth. So I feel very much empowered by the people of colour who have been able to become strong professionals, politicians, and be very visible . . . So I don’t encounter a problem. There are very few instances, can probably count on one hand, how many times I have felt bad about my racial identity. And the older I get, the more it’s like water off a duck’s back.

Ms. Jacobson emphasized her own experience of the benevolent liberal moment of Canadian multiculturalism in stating: “In terms of racism in Canada, my experience has been minimal, which has been overall a positive experience living in Canada.” These comments were along the same lines as Mr. Budding’s, in which there was a reported lack of encounter with overt or explicit discrimination in civil societal spaces. In Mr. Budding’s case, he referred to a lack of explicit forms of discrimination based on sexual orientation, whereas Ms. Jacobson highlighted a lack of overt discrimination based on race. Both of these experiences are consistent with benevolent liberal forms of citizenship, where the rough edges of oppression in terms of formal inequality and legalized discrimination are significantly, albeit incompletely, addressed, but where more subtle and systemic structures of oppression remain firmly in place. It is noteworthy
that Ms. Jacobson is more rooted in the Canadian context than the interviewees considered thus far, as a Canadian who has spent all of her life in Canada. Her Canadian, rather than Jamaican, national origin likely enters into the way in which she is or is not racialized, perhaps contributing to her more “positive” or inclusive experience as a person of colour in Canada by softening the degree to which she finds herself racially othered.

Ms. Jacobson, like Ms. Brooks, volunteers for Pride Toronto. She attends Pride annually and counted it as a very positive experience in spite of some of the racialized dimensions of the queer community, which she also mentioned. She also offered a self-reflexive account of how her own social and political location has resulted in a largely favourable experience of her intersecting identities as a queer woman of colour in Canada, of Jamaican background:

In terms of my own experience as a queer woman, it’s very different simply because I am feminine-presenting. . . So I go under the radar most of the time; until I actually talk to people they don’t even realize [that I am queer]. I haven’t had a bad experience, very few instances where I . . . fear for being present anywhere. . . There have been so many strong black women before me who were very confident in themselves, so I feel comfortable being that person. On the queer side, maybe not so much, but if anyone has anything to say to me I don’t have any problems with lashing back or speaking up for myself. So I think my experience in Canada as a queer woman has been positive, and I keep it on a need to know basis, you know?

This excerpt indicates that part of Ms. Jacobson’s inclusive experience as a self-identified queer woman is to be attributed to her largely normative gender presentation, specifically being “feminine-presenting.” This presumably allows her to “pass” as straight in many circles, enabling the strategy of being selectively out and contributing to a feeling of safety in everyday
life. Here again, the benevolent liberal and illiberal moments of homohegemony are inextricably linked; the inclusion of gender normative queer citizenship marks a boundary, one that excludes gender nonconforming, including transgender, queer individuals from sexual citizenship. This is evidence of benevolent liberalism in Ms. Jacobson’s own lived reality, while suggestive of the illiberal, exclusionary limits of queer citizenship under homohegemony. Advances in gay and lesbian citizenship have occurred within the context of stubbornly persistent and highly regulatory gender norms, set within a patriarchal gender system.

Ms. Jacobson’s negotiation of being a queer woman of colour includes the challenges and opportunities associated with fashioning a simultaneous or hybrid identity on the “borderlands” of Jamaican and Canadian nationality.89 She is quite proud of her Jamaican background and remains connected to, and interested in, the Jamaican context, but mentioned that she has not had a very “direct” experience of Jamaica apart from occasional family visits, and emphasizes that in terms of citizenship, she is “Canadian only.”90 Thus, Ms. Jacobson’s negotiation of queerness and race takes place in the context of perceptions of both normative gender and nationality.

Mr. Pratt

Mr. Pratt, who identifies as gay, similarly spoke to a mostly favourable experience of his intersectional identity that evidences the benevolent liberal side of homohegemony.91 He has lived in the GTA, as well as in Ottawa to attend university. Like Ms. Jacobson, he has lived in Canada all his life, as his parents emigrated from Jamaica before he was born. Also like Ms. Jacobson, he is a university student. When asked to identify any negative experiences about negotiating his sexual orientation in Canada, Mr. Pratt remarked: “I have not had any real negative experiences that I can think of off the top of my head.”92 This can be contrasted with subtle exclusions, which Mr. Pratt discusses in the next section. For this section’s purposes, it is worthwhile to consider that one of the difficulties Mr. Pratt identified with being black, of
Jamaican background, and gay, is the encounter with a patronizing assumption that his life must be particularly difficult:

I wouldn’t necessarily see anything as negative in terms of the way that I am treated here. I just think that it’s interesting that people take a step back and say, “Well you’re not part of just one minority, you are part of two, and that must be really difficult.” I just don’t really have that many problems . . . I don’t really face anything terrible.  

Mr. Pratt’s statement offers a reminder that people experience their complex identities in ways that are substantially more holistic, rather than discrete, than commonly suggested within a minority liberal rights frame. The statement also suggests an injunction to take seriously the benevolent liberal moment of homohegemony, specifically as it relates to the experiences of some queers of colour. Stating that he has not faced “anything terrible” could be interpreted as representing his effort to undermine hegemonic discourses in Canada, not least in progressive and academic circles, that would reduce him and other queers of colour to the positionality of the multiply oppressed victim. In addition, it is possible to observe here how Mr. Pratt’s experience of relative inclusivity is connected to his social and political location. He, like Ms. Jacobson, is firmly rooted in the Canadian context and has not navigated the immigrant experience, or issues associated with nationality/national origin, in connection with his negotiation of race and sexuality.

Mr. Miller

The last participant in this discussion of homohegemony’s benevolent liberal inclusions is Mr. Miller. He self-identifies as gay, and migrated to Canada in 2011 through a skilled and professional migration program. Following significant hardship in the Jamaican context resultant from heterosexism, including an intense struggle to reconcile his sexual orientation with his religious beliefs and a loveless opposite-sex marriage, Mr. Miller said of his experience in
Canada: “Compared to Jamaica, living here three years, it’s free.” This statement is consistent with the theorization of homohegemony as containing certain freedoms in terms of lesbian and gay citizenship rights, benevolently bestowed by the Canadian state. What is more, these freedoms are not just abstract but have impacted cultural attitudes, which are felt in Mr. Miller’s negotiation of civil societal and everyday spaces. When asked whether he has enjoyed himself living in Canada, Mr. Miller stated:

Yes, yes. And I have met people, and I’ve seen people hold each other’s hands. . . . These are things that you cannot do in Jamaica. The laws surrounding homosexuality, it’s much more relaxed and much more accepting of the homosexual lifestyle and stuff like that. So those are the main differences.

Mr. Miller’s statement speaks to familiar themes of public gay and lesbian identity and a degree of open queer citizenship in the Canadian context, in the spaces where sexual subjectivity meets sexual citizenship. Mr. Miller also implicitly underscores here a toleration and normalization of homosexuality that has occurred as homohegemony’s benevolent liberal moment has advanced and been consented to in civil societal spaces. He makes a direct connection in this passage between legal realities corresponding to gay and lesbian citizenship rights and hegemonic gay-inclusive attitudes in Canadian civil society. These are features negotiated in what he considers to be his own still “evolving” process of coming out in Canada.

Yet, there are also very different, exclusionary features of the homohegemonic context, not often noticed in the common sense understanding of lesbians and gays as equal and included citizens, but which the interview participants brought to light. These represent the illiberal side and context of homohegemony, and it is to a consideration of this significant juridical and civil societal reality that this chapter now turns.
Mr. Johnson was asked about being a person of Jamaican nationality and background in Canada, both within hegemonic society and the LGBTQ community. Noting his expression of a degree of openness in Canada to Jamaican nationality, discussed previously, he responded: “I would say that as a Jamaican, there is a lot of novelty . . . it’s still very exotic I suppose [slight laugh].” While such a constructed exoticism may appear at first glance benign, as in Mr. Johnson’s previous references to culture and weather, it indicates a neocolonial way of regarding the Caribbean, grounded in longstanding ideologies of racial, cultural, gender, and even sexual difference. In other words, understandings of a particular Caribbean or Jamaican exoticism play into producing and reproducing neocolonial relations.

Furthermore, Mr. Johnson reflected on the challenges of retaining his Jamaican identity as an advocate for LGBTQ rights in Jamaica from his social and political location in the diaspora. He continued to reflect as follows:

The issue that has been challenging for me of course is helping people rationalize why Jamaica, which has this reputation of being so warm, welcoming, and inviting, also has this virulent homophobia, which they have heard about and seen images of. They can’t reconcile this. And so, that has made it very uncomfortable sometimes in terms of being both a passionate Jamaican and also a passionate advocate for LGBT rights; it sometimes means I end up looking like I’m bashing Jamaica, which I’m not . . . I’m just trying to get my country to live up to its potential and its motto: “out of many, one people.” That’s what it’s like being a Jamaican here. Mr. Johnson’s response reveals that some Canadians understand being a “passionate Jamaican” and being a “passionate advocate for LGBT rights” in mutually exclusive terms. It is as if Mr.
Johnson must let go of his Jamaican identity in order to be intelligible within the frame of a modern gay identity in gay-inclusive Canada. Mr. Johnson is caught in the interstices of the notion that “queerness” and “Jamaican-ness” are antithetical. This is a consequence of common sense misunderstandings perpetuated in the context of cementing homohegemony in Canada, as well as reinforcing heterosexism in Jamaica. In this context, if he wishes to retain his identification as a passionate Jamaican, Mr. Johnson is treated as suspect as a properly queer Canadian citizen. As such, he fails to completely fit into the obligations of normative sexual citizenship in Canada, just as he fails to fit into the sexual citizenship status quo in Jamaica.

The other possibility that Mr. Johnson mentioned is that his critiques associated with LGBTQ rights in Jamaica may be popularly received in hegemonic Canadian civil societal discourses as “bashing Jamaica,” even if this is not his actual message or intent. This would presumably position him as a proper queer Canadian, while fulfilling the function of constructing Jamaica as the homophobic other. This is not to equate the two types of exclusion, but simply to suggest that homohegemony, specifically its illiberal construction of “homophobic Jamaica,” challenges queer Jamaican-Canadians to make themselves understood in terms of harbouring “pride,” as simultaneously an expression of Jamaican cultural and national identity and a dominant form of gay pride. This also reduces LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians’ relationship to Jamaica to the sole issue of LGBTQ citizenship status. In sum, having to let go of pride in one’s background, origins, and culture in order to access normatively queer Canadian citizenship – and perhaps even having to be seen as grateful for queer inclusion in Canada – represents an illiberal feature of coming in and coming out under a homohegemony that is experienced as exclusionary.

When asked for his perspective on how he would assess racism in Canada, Mr. Johnson replied:
It’s unclear, and I’ll tell you why. The only place I’ve ever been called a “nigger” was in Calgary . . . I’ve travelled the world over, and the only place I’ve ever been called that was in Calgary. But I don’t expect that in Toronto. In terms of Canada across the board, it’s difficult to say because racism includes Aboriginals and responses to Aboriginals, not only black people. 101

Clearly, though explicit racial discrimination in civil societal spaces is not a major problem specifically identified in this study’s findings, it nevertheless persists in everyday examples. In this case, Mr. Johnson reported being met with the most derogatory of racist terms found in the oppressive North American construction and regulation of blackness. This experience also highlights that racism is uneven across the country, and varies in form and intensity depending on the racialized group in question. In this respect, Mr. Johnson called to mind the long racist and imperialist history vis-à-vis First Nations, implicitly bringing attention to ongoing relations of settler colonialism in the Canadian context. 102 For LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians who are racial minorities, 103 the persistence of explicit, and more implicit yet systemic and harmful, forms of racial oppression constitute constraints on sexual citizenship. One’s experience of queer citizenship – of coming in and coming out in Canada – is not separable from the experience of these other identities. The interviewees reported the finding that improvements in the arena of sexual freedom that may result from migrating to Canada can be unexpectedly joined by diminished citizenship in terms of constructions of race and forms of racism that they had not experienced in Jamaica. This is not an attribute of the homohegemonic context that is often noted in Canada, nor in Jamaica’s queer community.

When asked if he spends time in the “gay village” in Toronto, and, if so, whether this has been a positive experience for him, Mr. Johnson responded: “I don’t like it in the winter [laughs].
In the summer, it’s different because I am not used to seeing public displays of affection . . . It’s not normal yet for me I suppose to see men and women of the same sex not only holding hands but kissing. That’s still awkward for me.”

When queried about whether he would consider going to the area referred to as “Little Jamaica” in Toronto, Mr. Johnson answered: “No. No that wouldn’t happen. Not yet anyway. I still do not feel sufficiently comfortable around Jamaicans . . . in Canada.”

It should be pointed out, however, that Mr. Johnson does regularly travel back to Jamaica and therefore engages with Jamaicans in Jamaica. Yet, he is “required to take a lot of security protocols” owing to the fact that he was subject to death threats in Jamaica based on being gay and being publicly identified with LGBTQ activism.

Summing up, the crucial point is that Mr. Johnson does not feel comfortable in both mainstream queer and mainstream Jamaican spaces in Canada. In terms of the former, it is because he is not comfortable with the public character of gay and lesbian identity and expression in Canada. In terms of the latter, Mr. Johnson is not prepared to engage, it was suggested, with currents of potential heterosexism among Jamaicans in Canada. It can be observed, then, that the experience of queer citizenship in terms of coming in and coming out can be marked by an estrangement or alienation from both queer and Jamaican spaces in Canada.

On the specific issue of coming out in Canada, Mr. Johnson explained: “As an LGBT activist in Jamaica, I was very conscious about my security, so I didn’t go out a lot. It frustrates my husband that I’ll be here for days and not go out. So he says I haven’t had my Canadian coming out yet, which is partly true.”

This comment is once again suggestive of a degree of estrangement from hegemonic conceptions of queer community and culture in Canada that conditions Mr. Johnson’s everyday experience of sexual citizenship in this context. This notion of having to come out as a discreet and separate process in Canada, in a particularly public
fashion in order to mark oneself as a queer Canadian, suggests the nationalist and rigid sexual citizenship on offer under homohegemony. Such an observation is supported in the work of queer theorists who stress that coming out is not unproblematically emancipatory, and can result in new forms of sexual and gender regulation. This is further supported in the work of postcolonial and queer of colour scholars that showcases the possibilities of same-sex identities and practices outside of dominant, Northern understandings of gayness and lesbianism.

Though he utilized standard immigration channels for his own migration to Canada, Mr. Johnson said of the refugee program, referring to the “In-Canada Asylum Program for people making refugee protection claims from within Canada”: “The only difficulty I have found with the refugee system, and I shared it with the Canadian High Commissioner, is that you almost have to be rich to be a refugee, because to get refugee status you must first get here.” Mr. Johnson went on to explain:

You need to prove you have ties to Canada, as well as that you are going back to Jamaica, to get a visitor’s visa to travel to Canada. Then, once you get the visitor’s visa, when you land at the airport in Canada, that’s when you claim refugee status. So you cannot approach the Canadian High Commission in your home country and say “I would like to get asylum in Canada.” So the people who are the most vulnerable . . . they can’t get visas because they have no “ties” to the country.

In follow-up conversations via social media with two members of the Jamaican LGBTQ interview sample, this difficulty of first obtaining a visa simply to visit Canada was indicated. Both stated that they would consider the refugee option as a last resort, and only if they could first obtain the necessary documentation to travel to Canada. While there is another refugee program for people seeking protection from outside of Canada, one must be “referred by the
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) or another referral organization or be sponsored by a private sponsorship group,” and “have the funds needed to support yourself and any dependants after you arrive in Canada,” if one is not selected as a government-assisted refugee or privately sponsored.\textsuperscript{114} Significantly, therefore, in no case is it possible to claim refugee status without either a connection to Canada or to a referral organization or private sponsor. The ideological work that the refugee option does for homohegemony exceeds its actual liberal benevolence. There are, significantly, numerous other exclusionary barriers to the refugee process of an explicitly legal and institutional, as well as more systemic, character. These include: the requirement to prove one’s sexual orientation, which needs to be documented in the context of an institutional framework reluctant to consider bisexuality as an equally “innate” sexual orientation as homosexuality or heterosexuality in terms of constituting a “social group”\textsuperscript{115}; the absence of a declarative judgment by the Supreme Court of Canada on gender identity as a “social group” for the purposes of determining home-country persecution\textsuperscript{116}; and the need to prove home-country “persecution” rather than mere “discrimination.”\textsuperscript{117} There were also changes to refugee law made in 2012 surrounding the designation of “safe countries” that could disproportionately and adversely impact LGBTQ claimants, and there are further systemic exclusions for LGBTQ claimants associated with a failure to recognize common law spouses and dependants within the ambit of refugee family reunification.\textsuperscript{118} Importantly, LGBTQ refugees fleeing persecution typically come from jurisdictions where formal marriage and adoption rights for same-sex couples are lacking.\textsuperscript{119}

\textit{Ms. Brooks}

Ms. Brooks spoke about coming into Canada to go to university, and suddenly finding herself among Canadian constructions and practices of race and racism. She described this experience as follows:
[being] on a campus where all of the Asian people hung out together, all of the black people hung out together . . . And to a large extent these were people who had come here earlier and had experienced racism more than I had at that point . . . I “got it” because I had heard stories . . . I was aware of racism, though very intellectually and I had never felt it. Those four years [of undergraduate studies] I learned to understand what people were talking about in terms of racism.  

For Ms. Brooks, coming into Canada was therefore an experience of coming into a very differently racialized social and political landscape, marked by relatively more bounded racial categories and communities, and these collective experiences manifested in palpable Canadian racism. She experienced these as exclusionary. It is significant that Ms. Brooks moved from a position of relative racial privilege in the Jamaican context as a “light-skinned black woman,” someone often perceived to being in a sense inversely racialized in ways consistent with blackness and a lack of white privilege. Though she is sometimes regarded by others as “mixed,” in the particular context of people registering surprise that she is from Jamaica, more often “what people see is a black woman,” not “a nice little mixed girl.” This experience of racialization has formed the basis of Ms. Brooks’ identification and politicization in terms of being a “black woman of colour” in both hegemonic Canadian society and within queer circles.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Ms. Brooks also illuminated issues associated with identifying as bisexual, non-monogamous, and sex-positive in the Canadian context. Ms. Brooks explained coming into her own unique brand of activism, and the frustrating path of feeling boxed into the binary, bounded, and normative forms of sexual identity and community that have in many ways formed the basis for queer citizenship gains in Canada. She expressed how
experiencing sexual and gender oppression has occasioned her politicization:

I am more of activist now than I probably ever was . . . it’s because I get shoved in a box that isn’t necessarily me. And it frustrates the hell out of me. Like, why can you not just accept what I say and not put me in a box that I don’t belong in? I identify as a polyamorous, kinky bisexual. And in those groups, there are various elements of mixing and not mixing. The queer folk among us who are not kinky don’t tend to mix with the straight folk except at a few rare parties, stuff like that. For me, being a non-monogamous person, it is interesting living in a monogamous society.\textsuperscript{129}

Ms. Brooks underlines here that the expansion of sexual citizenship that has occurred in homohegemony’s benevolent liberal wake has maintained exclusions of not only bisexuality, but also of what is deemed to be improper sex, commonly constructed as non-monogamous or deemed to not be “vanilla.”\textsuperscript{130} This experience highlights how some, mainly gay and lesbian, queers have been folded into a hegemonic sexual citizenship identity under homohegemony. The entrenchment of explicit sexual orientation discrimination protections and the institutionalization of same-sex marriage based on the constitutionally protected status of sexual orientation have served to simultaneously reify boundaries and binaries of sexual identity, gender,\textsuperscript{131} and monogamy. Such boundaries illiberally exclude those LGBTQ people who are too queer, deviating from commonly recognized sexual citizenship. These exclusions are juridical and civil societal in character.

An interesting aside to this interpretation is that Ms. Brooks is now engaged to be married, as discussed above. These criticisms of monogamy were voiced primarily in an earlier interview, in 2012. Although marriage and monogamy are commonly assumed to be mutually reinforcing institutions, in practice, many legally married couples often consent to non-
monogamous arrangements, transforming the institution of marriage in the process. In Ms. Brooks’ case, developments in her personal life may have moved her closer to normative forms and symbols of queer citizenship. A clear continuity, however, can be observed in her reflections on exclusions of bisexuality in contemporary Canadian queer citizenship, where she linked the issue of coming out to exclusions of bisexuality. Directly tackling the hegemonic paradigm of coming out, she stated: “As far as I was concerned, it was nobody else’s business.” When asked if this attitude about coming out may have been forged during her formative years in Jamaica, Ms. Brooks refused the assumption of the retention of “the baggage of tradition,” stating, “actually I think it’s more the fact that I identified as bisexual.” In a subsequent interview, Ms. Brooks critiqued the invisibility of bisexuality, subsumed within either heterosexuality or homosexuality depending on the gender of one’s partner. This extends to attitudes of “bi-phobia,” prejudice that she has experienced within the queer community. Thus, Ms. Brooks never had a “classic” coming out experience in Canada; rather, she had more of a moment when she had to become more visible in the queer community, as a result of her invisibility. She has therefore advanced activism that can be thought of as taking back and redefining bisexuality, a term she was initially uncomfortable with because of the assumption of only two genders.

Another illiberal exclusion is evidenced by the fact that Ms. Brooks experienced downward class mobility upon migration, a phenomenon that has been noted in queer migration scholarship. After identifying as upper class in Jamaica, she lamented that in Canada life can be very different: “It’s like it should be middle-class but it never really seems to be.” Ms. Brooks went on to explain how she left certain comforts of an upper-class lifestyle in Jamaica to come to Canada: “I’ve had countless conversations with my mother as to me buying a car, and
she can’t believe that I take public transit . . .”

Ms. Brooks spoke specifically to the difficulties associated with running up against the “homophobic Jamaica” construct as well. She critiqued the “mainstream media, with its focus on the murder rate in Jamaica,” and LGBTQ discourses, “with [their] message that Jamaica is evil.” She further interrogated hegemonic Canadian society for the common perception of how “awful” Jamaica is on issues of queer inclusion. In response, she stated: “You cannot generalize a whole people.”

Returning to Ms. Brooks’ participation in the group “Songs from the Island,” mentioned above in connection with the benevolent liberal moment, she noted that she eventually left this group because of an undercurrent of heterosexism, an experience she cited that limits her participation in the mainstream Caribbean-Canadian community in Toronto in general. Significantly, she alluded to the fact that attitudes within the Jamaican-Canadian community may be more socially conservative in some ways than those currently extant in Jamaica, in the sense that “most of the people who are active in the Jamaican-Canadian community are people who have been here 20 or 30 years . . . their ideas haven’t really changed. They have just kind of moved out into suburbia.” Thus, the exclusions of LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians are not solely the result of hegemonic Canadian society. Exclusions based on race and national origin in hegemonic and queer spaces can also be met with additional exclusions, based on sexual orientation, in mainstream Caribbean communities. This speaks to the unevenness of homohegemony in Canada. Depending on the community one inhabits, explicit forms of heterosexism continue. While the common sense tendency would be to single out ethno-cultural minority communities alone for this ongoing heterosexism, this is observable in majority-white communities in Canada as well, particularly those that exist away from large metropolitan areas.
centres and that are under the influence of social conservative ideology. This can be grounded in or enforced by certain religious practices, including fundamentalist and/or evangelical Christianity.145

Equally concerned about the exclusions within the mainstream queer community in Toronto, Ms. Brooks referred to common discourses within the Metropolitan Community Church (MCC) of Toronto:

No one is willing to admit the negative things that are there in the church... Like if you are a white gay man... hell just a gay man... you can say and do and be whatever you want. ... Try being a woman and doing that. ... It’s frustratingly difficult within MCC Toronto... MCC worldwide is a little different.146

In this passage, Ms. Brooks directs our attention to the hegemony of white gay men in particular, and gay men more generally, within institutions of mainstream queer culture. The gendered dimension of homohegemony’s selective sexual citizenship rights is foregrounded, pointing to the continued invisibility of lesbians and bisexual women as sexual citizens within queer institutions. Ms. Brooks spoke about feeling essentially “betrayed” by her church community, and thus departing from her participation in the choir, though she continues some of her involvement in the church’s music ministry in a more limited capacity.147 Critiquing the MCC in particular and the mainstream queer community in Canada more generally by extension, Ms. Brooks asserted: “I feel like it’s almost like they think we’ve conquered everything on queer issues here in Canada. But no, we have not conquered everything here.”148 This points to the celebratory discourse of homohegemony discussed in Chapter One, and the tendency to assume that LGBTQ inclusion is a fait accompli based on gay men’s, and some women’s, experiences alone. This then results in the decisive “flip” from a fixation on queer issues within Canada to a
fixation of queer issues elsewhere along unexamined neocolonial and racialized, and also
gendered, lines.

Exemplifying this turn to the “homophobic other,” Ms. Brooks cited queer religious
interventions that seek to do work on LGBTQ issues in certain countries like Jamaica, or that
single out “how horrible it is to be queer in x, y, and z country.” She connected this to the
colonial Christian past, stating: “There’s such a huge history of white Christianity going to these
countries and inflicting something that I am very cautious about these efforts.” That queer-
friendly LGBTQ churches, historically important platforms for sexual citizenship activism in
Canada, are now part of a colonial gaze toward allegedly homophobic nation-states is an
important and undocumented development in Christianity within Canadian history. It
exemplifies the homohegemonic turn and the way it builds upon previous colonial legacies in the
construction of “new” others, in this case a history of colonial Christianity and its penchant for
the conversion and saving of others. Ms. Brooks did not write off all of these interventions,
however, stating that she values the hard work that MCC does in refugee communities. She is
specifically perturbed by MCC, Amnesty International, and Egale, however, when they
are seen to operate as an “external force” attempting to “push” changes in contexts of the global
South on LGBTQ rights, in effect stating: “You should do things this way because it’s the right
way.” Ms. Brooks believes that these interventions are ineffective, serving mainly to “get a lot
of people very angry and resistant to you,” thus reproducing the same dangerous errors as the
colonial past. She praised Northern organizations and discourses that “do the ground work in
the countries in order to figure out how to bring about that change internally.” She further
believes that international or Canadian organizations addressing LGBTQ issues in Jamaica and
other countries of the global South must not “alienate” themselves from issues of poverty, gender
inequality, and violence of a more general character, in order to be effective and ethical.

In response to a question regarding the designation of Canada as “LGBTQ friendly,” Ms. Brooks indicated the dual benevolent liberal and illiberal moments when she stated: “Yes and no. Yes, in terms of we are very polite. And no, in terms of there is a lot of deep-seated hate, and we’re not doing a lot about it because we’ve achieved so many things, so now we have to go and rescue the rest of the world.”

She continued, referring to the Canadian context:

We’ve changed some laws but we have not changed how our population thinks . . . it is a slow process and I think for us to sit here and say that we have achieved the amazingness of being able to marry each other and we need nothing else, is a little silly . . . It doesn’t take into account that, yes, if you live a middle- to upper-class life in a big city, you might be okay, but even in Toronto there are still primarily gay men being assaulted all the time that we never hear about.158

Ms. Brooks here highlights the unevenness of the benevolent liberal advances associated with homohegemony, and critiques it for exclusions based on class and geography. The fact that limited legal changes have occurred without fundamentally changing heteronormative structures speaks to the selective and circumscribed character of queer citizenship, cast within a minority gay and lesbian rights frame rather than a majority transformation frame. Summarizing the benevolent liberal and illiberal moments on issues of race and racism, Ms. Brooks indicated that Canadians are “really, really, really good at not being overtly racist.”159 Rather, she said: “It is subtle. It is malicious . . .”160 Clearly, the homohegemonic moment and its folding in of sexual citizens is selective, circumscribed, maintains historical exclusions, and invents new exclusions that build upon historical legacies. Ms. Brooks’ reflections bring to light how this occurs within a heteronormative/heterosexist, racialized/racist, gendered/sexist, bi-phobic, trans-phobic, classed,
and neocolonial context. These exclusions, often subtle and systemic rather than explicit and legally formalized,\textsuperscript{161} are no less palpable to those who fail to fit into the “boxes” of normative queer citizenship. As well, it is their ubiquitous subtlety that makes them harder to name and change. In spite of these significant exclusions, Ms. Brooks exercises agency in dealing with these contradictions of LGBTQ experience in Canada with humour and with activism that attempts to “meld” various divides of orientation, nation, gender, and race.\textsuperscript{162}

\textit{Mr. Budding}

Mr. Budding did not identify racial barriers and racism in Canada as a major issue that he has faced. Nevertheless, he elaborated on his experience of racism in Canadian society. Notably, these reflections on racism were advanced in a section of the interview in which he was asked about his experiences within the mainstream, white LGBTQ community:

I have often had to deal with people who make certain assumptions about the fact that you are black; not a huge amount but there are the people who will offer money, or the people who will think that because you are black and you are an immigrant that somehow you are “easier” or you should be glad that they are willing to accept you. So I’ve had a few of those experiences, but they are by no means the large majority of my experiences here.\textsuperscript{163}

While Mr. Budding identified these experiences as limited in the context of his overall experiences in Canada, people presumably offering money for sexual services and associating blackness and/or being an immigrant with being more sexually or romantically available\textsuperscript{164} are significant forms of racism extant in the queer community. They connect to a wider context of oppressive historical constructions of Caribbean women, and more recently men, in terms of sexual labour and hypersexuality.\textsuperscript{165} They also take place within the context of the exoticization, sexualization, and objectification of black men and their bodies within hegemonic queer
Different racial constructs and stereotypes manifest in different experiences of racism for other racialized groups within the dominant queer community. In the case of Mr. Budding, racism impacts his experience of sexual citizenship, as it emerges within the very spaces opened up by homohegemony and among its most normatively queer citizens.

Mr. Budding also has confronted the familiar exaggerated view of heterosexism in Jamaica, which he described:

I think the images of Jamaica that people see here as far as it relates to LGBT issues are overwhelmingly negative ... I think what it misses for the most part are the nuances that exist on the ground. Notwithstanding that the criminalization of men’s sexual activity is a real thing on the ground, I think depending on where you are situated in Jamaican society it is entirely possible for you to live your life as a gay man, with some reservation. So it’s almost certainly not as open as Canada, yet much freer than people would assume that a gay man could live his life in Jamaica ...

Mr. Budding’s discussion of black gay spaces in Canada, with which he is familiar, indicated another experience of sexual subjectivity and community in Canada: “I’ve found that in the GTA and Hamilton black gay men are much more likely to be closeted. Not always on the ‘downlow’ or whatever, but basically their homosexuality is much more private.” When asked to elaborate, Mr. Budding related:

I attribute it to the cultural underpinnings of the black community; it tends to be more religious, more conservative. A lot of the people I mentioned feel that what goes for a white gay man or an Asian gay man is certainly not the same thing that goes for a black gay man. And so, the “Church Street party scene” [referring to the gay village in Toronto] is not theirs. I have a friend in Hamilton and every year we have a barbeque on
Labour Day weekend, and there are gay men from as far away as Montreal and Windsor. Everybody gathers there, but at the end of the day it’s very different from what I’ve known among my white gay friends or my Asian gay friends. It’s really, really different. I am part of a biracial couple, and my partner, coming as he does from a very different background, does not necessarily see things as I see them. Whereas I might be more understanding of people who want to be private with their sexuality, he thinks it’s not necessary: “It’s Canada. Why do you have to do that?”

There are resonances of Mr. Johnson’s personal discomfort with the public character of the queer community in Canada in Mr. Budding’s careful observation of certain black gay spaces in Canada. This discomfort with the public nature of hegemonic queer identity and community, the influence of social conservatism based in religion and some forms of black nationalism in black and Caribbean communities, and the mandates of black masculinity lead some black gay men to carve out alternative forms of community of a more “private” character. Yet, there is a degree of openness noted here that confounds the notion of being in the closet, or on the “downlow.” Like Mr. Johnson’s white Canadian husband, Mr. Budding’s white husband also finds this lack of public gay identity and community perplexing. The point, then, for the purposes of this chapter, is that hegemonic forms of queer citizenship may not even be directly relevant to these alternatives modes of being gay, revealing the racialized character of queer citizenship and community in Canada. Queer citizenship is in this sense conditioned not by whiteness per se, but by white normativity. The diverse sexual epistemologies of queers of colour are not part of the common sense understanding of the type of sexual subjectivity upon which sexual citizenship is constructed. This ideological homogenization is notable, and elemental to hegemonic state practices, and it is consistent with the homohegemonic moment of the Canadian state and civil
society. More concretely, queers of colour who live in, and with, alternative forms of sexual subjectivity and community may not be well represented in queer institutions that advocate for or mediate the sexual citizenship demands and needs of LGBTQ Canadians.

Significantly, the implicit attempt to construct queer of colour communities and individuals as backward or still conceptually in the Caribbean, or as not taking full advantage of Canadian liberal benevolence, tends to reify neocolonial and racialized constructions of homohegemony and the other, in addition to demonstrating the rigidity of sexual citizenship under homohegemony. This is seen in the context of negotiations involved in some interracial same-sex marriages or partnerships. Both Mr. Budding and Mr. Johnson’s social and political locations in terms of race and national origin render them more sympathetic than their spouses to the invention of different or hybrid forms of gay identity and community upon coming into Canada. Mr. Budding believes that, in these communities, ways of negotiating sexuality from the Caribbean continue in the Canadian context, albeit in transformed ways that are more open given the benevolent liberal context. As well, he noted important differences, depending on generational divides in the Caribbean diaspora in Canada:

The ones who were born and raised here and went to school here and did everything here, and who are also younger, are much more open. You will find them on Church Street, and you will find them at the clubs, and it’s no different from other ethnicities in Canada. Those who weren’t born here, weren’t raised here, as well as those over thirty, totally different. That’s not their scene.\textsuperscript{173}

This statement indicates that the sexual citizenship on offer under homohegemony is differentially accessed by black queers and queers of colour based on age and first-generation versus second-generation immigrant status. Mr. Budding further related that there is a sense
among some black gay men that mainstream gay spaces are not “their spaces” because the people who primarily occupy those spaces “do not understand what [they] have to deal with” in black communities.\textsuperscript{174} This speaks to the majority-white and national character of hegemonic queer spaces in Canada, but it also speaks to a power relation within these spaces, in which the experiences of those of the majority define the norms of community, identity, and normative citizenship. Furthermore, it highlights a lack of solidarity in mainstream queer spaces with black queers and queers of colour around issues of racism that affect their communities. Mr. Budding thus calls for the formation of multiracial queer communities and alliances based on relations of solidarity and democracy between white queers and various queer of colour communities, in which LGBTQ people might separately organize on specific issues, but would come together on issues of common concern, thus resisting the centring of the white queer experience.\textsuperscript{175}

\textit{Ms. Jacobson}

It was shown earlier in this chapter that Ms. Jacobson had largely positive things to say when asked about the negotiation of being a person of colour in Canada. However, she differentiated between being a person of colour in mainstream Canadian society, and being a person of colour within the mainstream queer community:

Being an LGBT person . . . in the queer community and being racialized . . . we’re not so visible in that arena, it’s harder for people to be aware. It’s like no, queer people aren’t just white gay men [laughs]. There’s a whole spectrum of people and I think that until the multifaceted and multidimensional personalities, and so forth, are shown in our media and our art, it’s going to remain this way. So I find that much more difficult than being in the mainstream world.\textsuperscript{176}

Ms. Jacobson addressed specifically exclusions based on being a part of the Jamaican diaspora in Canada:
I kind of ignore people’s stupid questions. If they are asking about things in Jamaican culture of which I am not aware, then I just say that I am not aware, but there are always going to be assumptions about you based on your appearance, so I kind of take it on a case by case basis. So I kind of just ignore it, and if someone has a genuine question about my hair, because it’s locked [referring to dreadlocks], or where I’m from, and I say “here” and they say where are your parents from? . . . I explain that it’s really not that direct of an experience . . . for me . . . of Jamaica.\(^\text{177}\)

This reflection points to a common experience of Canadians of colour who are asked where they are from, even if they, their parents, and perhaps even their grandparents are from Canada.\(^\text{178}\)

The double standard of asking people of colour where they are from in a way that is disproportionate to querying white Canadians in this fashion reveals the subtle ways in which Canadian identity is conceived of as normatively white, with white as the default position of being read as a Canadian citizen. Ms. Jacobson disrupts this narrative by stating that she is from “here” or stating that she is not aware of certain features of the Jamaican context of which people expect her to be aware. Thus, even as a second-generation immigrant who presumably fits into normative constructions of citizenship to a greater degree than those who straddle two nationalities, Ms. Jacobson fits incompletely into normative constructions of Canadian citizenship. This is not simply based on race, but also on perceived national origin. This occurs despite the fact that she has spent all of her life residing in Canada, and has a combined total of a few months as a visitor to Jamaica.

Ms. Jacobson expressed frustration at what she implicitly perceives to be the hegemonic Canadian viewpoint that Jamaica is generally an “unsafe environment [for LGBTQ people] regardless of where you live,” and that LGBTQ people essentially “run away” from Jamaica to
Northern countries. Ms. Jacobson noted sarcastically: “There is no way [for a queer person] to even stay to change the laws or the society, because it’s just gotten to the point of so much danger.” Further, although Ms. Jacobson said that she has “always been very accepted in the gay village in Toronto” based on her racial identity, she was nevertheless of the opinion that there is a degree of “underlying” racism in this space. However, her attention has been mostly on biphobia and transphobia within the LGBTQ community, and continuing heterosexism in mainstream Canadian society. Ms. Jacobson thus highlighted both continuing heterosexism in the homohegemonic moment, as well as underlying racism, biphobia, and transphobia within mainstream queer spaces that represent systemic exclusions from substantive queer citizenship in Canada.

**Mr. Pratt**

Returning to Mr. Pratt, also firmly rooted as a Canadian national, it is worth considering how he answered a question regarding his experience of being a person of Jamaican background in Canada:

I’m going to start with saying that being a racialized person in Canada, it differs from place to place, not necessarily in a negative way. But in the Toronto area, growing up there, I guess people assume the more stereotypical black role or personality to be on you, whereas in Ottawa people expect you to be like Haitian. I feel like there’s no stigma towards black people in Ottawa for the most part. People just assume you are French, and that’s not necessarily a bad thing. Whereas in Toronto, I open my mouth to speak and people are kind of like: “Oh, he’s well-spoken and that’s strange. He doesn’t talk like regular black people.”

Here, Mr. Pratt emphasizes different constructions of blackness depending on one’s geographical location in Canada. He points specifically to English versus French Canadian constructions of
blackness regarding different patterns of Caribbean migration. This is further connected to
different histories of regulating race and ethnicity, and of British versus French imperialism.
These historical legacies are both present within Canada. It is noteworthy that Mr. Pratt
recounted that, when in English Canada’s ostensibly multicultural hub of Toronto, he
experienced more pronounced racialized stereotypes based on blackness. These stereotypes
assumed him to be uneducated and not well-spoken, associating blackness with markers of
inferiority and completely ignoring the comparatively highly educated character of immigrants
from the Caribbean in general, and Jamaica in particular.¹⁸⁴

Though Mr. Pratt finds that racism in Canadian society and in the mainstream queer
community are not major issues for him personally, he attributed some of this to his own
particular comfort with mainstream, white society, observing:

I typically don’t hang out with people of my own race . . . It just didn’t really work out
that way. I grew up around white people, and the way that I experienced being racialized
back home was like you need to be a certain way if you’re black, and I don’t really fit
into that because I hang with a lot of white people. I talk like a “white person.” I’m
putting that in quotations there. So I don’t know. I just never really hung out with any
other black people.¹⁸⁵

It should be noted that Mr. Pratt’s comfort in hegemonic, normatively white Canadian society
may partly relate to his relative lack of “fit” into forms of black community based on his sexual
orientation. For example, he described his parents and other family members as “incredibly
homophobic,” something that he believes delayed his coming out process.¹⁸⁶ Though he has
since come out to his family, he described a lived reality, particularly with his mother, in which
his sexual orientation or dating life are still not discussed, and in which he does not feel
While it is true that such attitudes occur across all demographics of the Canadian population and in families reflecting many different ethno-cultural backgrounds, in Mr. Pratt’s case, this experience of heterosexism and possibly of constructions of masculinity may be related to his alienation from the black community, conditioning his relative comfort in hegemonic Canadian and mainstream queer spaces. As with Ms. Jacobson, his sense of belonging in hegemonic, normatively white spaces is likely also the result of a sense of confidence and efficacy that comes from being of Canadian national origin.

In response to a question about race and racism, Mr. Pratt mentioned an additional sexual citizenship barrier: he tends to date white guys, but “not every white guy likes black guys.” He stated further: “I don’t run into the issue all that often but it’s definitely a thing that I’ve noticed.” He interpreted this experience to be related to different aesthetic preferences. Yet, even aesthetic preferences are a complicated product of the influences of hegemonic ideologies of race, gender, sexuality, class, and their interrelationships. In a citizenship structure in which relationship status looms large in marking one as an equal sexual citizen, with the married same-sex couple representing the norm or ideal of queer citizenship, racialized exclusions sometimes perpetuated by, in this case, white gay men in the dating arena amount to a degree of exclusion from queer citizenship. Obtaining equal queer citizenship within the queer community is therefore the product of a complex negotiation of multiple intersecting oppressions and privileges, exemplifying the continuation of these power relations in Canada more generally.

Mr. Miller

To complete this chapter’s discussion of homohegemony’s illiberal exclusions, a return to the experiences and reflections of Mr. Miller is in order. In spite of identifying the “main differences” between Canada and Jamaica as his experience of a greater degree of freedom surrounding his sexual orientation in Canada, which should not be minimized, Mr. Miller pointed
out vis-à-vis his migration experience that “there are also drawbacks.” He explained this as follows: “The fact that there is racism. It can sometimes be a racial preference, but it can also be a situation where it’s a deep-rooted racism . . . it is here.” Thus, informal forms of racism operate in a pernicious and firmly entrenched fashion, not without connections to and bases in legal structures and their enforcement, in spite of the significant, albeit incomplete, reform of legal structures most clearly associated with formal racial inequality in the Canadian context.

In his relatively short time in Canada, Mr. Miller has experienced such everyday racism and it has negatively affected his dating life.

In terms of coming out in Canada, Mr. Miller remarked: “I haven’t gotten to the point where I tell my friends I’m gay. Certain people know but I am, basically, I think in an evolving mode because I am trying to find my true identity through all of this.” He hinted at how discretion was required around his homosexuality in Jamaica to guarantee his security and professional advancement, and indicated that it is hard to cede these ways of managing his sexuality. Yet, there was an implicit assumption in his response that previous ways of negotiating his sexuality were less evolved ways of navigating homosexual identity. This is an assumption that may be interiorized through homohegemony’s elevation of a particular “modern” form of public gay and lesbian identity and community as the norm and prerequisite for constructions and claims of queer citizenship. Coming in and coming out in Canada have been both liberatory and exclusionary for Mr. Miller. It has been an immersion in a context in which equal sexual citizenship has been impossible to access, based on factors such as race and national origin. The disjuncture between the ideal of queer citizenship, as projected within Jamaica’s LGBTQ community, and its actualization, is in fact something that even the most “normatively queer” of sexual citizens will experience given continuing heterosexism in the homohegemonic moment.
Yet, those outside the queer citizenship norm, in different ways and to varying degrees, are particularly vulnerable in terms of experiencing these illiberal exclusions of the homohegemonic context, and are well positioned to elucidate these contradictory dynamics.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has argued that homohegemony is imagined in particular ways by LGBTQ and other Jamaicans who “look in” to Canada. It was evidenced that this understanding of an ideology of relative inclusion of gay and lesbian citizenship in the Canadian national imaginary corresponds to specific knowledge on the part of LGBTQ Jamaicans about the benevolent liberal extension of selective sexual citizenship rights, notably same-sex marriage, to gay and lesbian citizens in the Canadian legal context. This corresponds with the attribution of gay-inclusive attitudes to Canadian civil society. Further, this chapter has shown how this understanding of Canada, much like understandings of homohegemony domestically, elides a more complicated and contradictory reality of the interrelationship of state and societal practices of both benevolent liberalism and illiberalism.

Same-sex marriage rights in Canada, and their cross-national absence in the United States, were consistently indicated in terms of how LGBTQ Jamaican interviewees imagine Canada as gay inclusive, much as in the domestic context of homohegemony. Thus, Canadian homohegemony casts a long neocolonial shadow, with Canada taking on the role of a “gay mecca” or metropole. The LGBTQ Jamaican interviewees’ experiences, however, are a reminder that this understanding and imagining of Canada, like the homohegemonic moment domestically, is rooted in certain benevolent liberal realities. A certain transnational benevolence is offered through Canada’s provision as a potential refuge for LGBTQ Jamaicans facing persecution. Yet, Canada’s refugee programs were also shown in this chapter to contain harmful deficiencies and exclusions of LGBTQ people of a formal, institutional, and systemic character,
exemplifying the contradictions of homohegemony.

Through attention to the lived realities and reflections of LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians who have come into Canada and come out in terms of a range of new identifications, this chapter has demonstrated significant benevolent liberal inclusions in terms of queer citizenship, as well as significant exclusions that also characterize the homohegemonic context. These are exclusions based on race, national origin, gender, neocoloniality, class, and indeed sexuality that qualitatively impact the experience of the construct of sexual citizenship, as well as constructions of Canadian citizenship more generally. Thus, homohegemony’s significant benevolent liberal advances in lesbian and gay citizenship were evidenced to occur in the context of ongoing and new exclusions of LGBTQ people and others. The interviewees’ experiences illuminate exclusions of queer citizenship in Canada that do not uniquely impact LGBTQ Jamaicans. It has been their contradictory locations, particularly at the nexus of this novel exclusionary relationship between Canadian homohegemony and “homophobic Jamaica,” that has enabled them to shine a light on continuing exclusions representing illiberalism that condition and contextualize significant sexual citizenship gains.

This chapter has sought to balance the stated significance of benevolent liberalism and illiberalism within a neo-Gramscian frame. Such an approach has been able to bring attention to real gains in sexual citizenship in juridical government and the experience of these rights and other manifestations of inclusion in civil society and in the politics of everyday life, while also looking to civil society and everyday experiences to observe less formalized exclusions of a systemic and often subtle character. The framework is also able to note the persistence of exclusions of a formal and legal character in juridical government that contradictorily linger alongside significant, commonly more visible, sexual citizenship gains. The interviewees’
accounts of these dual moments of benevolent liberalism/illiberalism and of their contextualization in juridical government, civil society, and the relationships between juridical government and civil society, lend credence to the notion that homohegemony is an inherently contradictory ideology of the integral Canadian state, one that now includes an illiberal relationship vis-à-vis Jamaica. Finally, the interviewees suggested ways forward in terms of forging alliances based on sexual solidarity that expand and transform sexual citizenship within an intersectional approach to identity and liberation.

This chapter has aimed to illuminate understandings and negotiations of homohegemonic Canada, through the standpoints and experiences of queer Jamaican and Jamaican-Canadian citizens. Homohegemony has been shown to be a real state ideology composed of benevolent liberal and illiberal moments; it has been further demonstrated that this Canadian superstructure can be observed in a neocolonial context. Specifically, the broad context of Canadian homohegemony is inclusive of Jamaica.

By way of a conclusion, this dissertation returns to the Jamaican context. I locate my own trip to Jamaica as a queer Canadian citizen, using data derived from fieldwork to augment the argument that Jamaica is both queerer and less monolithic than is commonly understood in Canada. In addition, the final chapter summarizes the basic argument of homohegemony and the other, and suggests activist implications of the argument in terms of replacing problematic national sexual othering with the praxis of transnational sexual solidarity.

Notes

1. It bears repeating that liberal “benevolence” continues to be put forward as an ideological construction and not as a fact. The very existence of homohegemony’s illiberal exclusions, often representing the boundaries or limits of selective and circumscribed LGBTQ inclusion, should give us pause about the “benevolence” of the Canadian state/society on LGBTQ rights and inclusion in practice. This is particularly the case since the Canadian state did not voluntarily extend selective sexual citizenship rights to LGBTQ people “from on high”;
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these were extended only as a result of robust social movement activism “from below” over the course of many decades, and as a result of corresponding shifts in public opinion, as detailed in Chapter Four. The term “benevolent” does, however, point to a pervasive ideological construction in which it is commonly perceived – not least by LGBTQ Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians – that sexual citizenship rights have been generously granted by the Canadian state acting on behalf of a Canadian nation that is inclusive of lesbians and gays. This chapter endeavours to take these perceptions and experiences of liberal “benevolence” seriously, particularly as the interviewees contrast the “benevolence” of Canada with the American and Jamaican contexts, because these perceptions and experiences point to the fact that there have in fact been significant queer inclusions in Canada that must be noted. On the other hand, ongoing and novel illiberal exclusions are also taken seriously as the limits and conditions of such “benevolence,” significant exclusions that must also be noted.
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Chapter Seven. Kingston to Kingston and Transnational Sexual Solidarity

In the preceding discussion, homohegemony has been theorized as a distinct ideology of relative inclusion of gay and lesbian citizenship in the Canadian national imaginary, in which the state extends selective citizenship rights, culminating in near legal equality, to the gay and lesbian minority in a benevolent liberal fashion. These rights are premised, however, on serious moments of illiberalism in terms of specific exclusions both within and external to the nation-state. It was theorized, furthermore, that once homosexual inclusion becomes hegemonic at the national level, symbolized by same-sex marriage rights and the corresponding move to the imagination of gays and lesbians as equal sexual citizens, new others are simultaneously invented and imagined exterior to the ideal-typical national community. Such illiberal othering contains as prominent features strong and subtle forms of neocolonialism, racialization, and deeply problematic discourses of rescue, regardless of intent, of third world queers.

It has been a central contention of this dissertation that one such “novel” other brought into being by the homohegemonic moment, though occurring in the context of longstanding historic relations resembling colonialism and contemporary relations of neocolonialism, is “homophobic Jamaica.” The modern fixation on the homosexual other within Canada has, under conditions of contemporary homohegemony, turned to focus on homophobic other nations, communities, and cultures “exterior” to Canada. This represents a major change in the Canadian nation-state’s regulation of sexuality. This tendency to construct homophobic other nations as sexual others only makes sense once homosexual inclusion is rendered observable, however selective, circumscribed, and contradictory, as hegemonic. The illiberally constructed homophobic nation serves as a foil to a newly hegemonic sense of gay-inclusive national community. Constructions of Jamaica typify this phenomenon, representing a significant
“homophobic other” in the context of Canada’s gay-inclusive national imaginary.

This dissertation has sought to pivot between Canada and Jamaica, and between imperial and national levels of analysis, to demonstrate the argument that Canada has become homohegemonic, that this corresponds to and is premised on both benevolent liberal inclusions and illiberal exclusions, and that one manifestation of the latter can be seen in Canada’s constructed image of Jamaica. The construction of “homophobic Jamaica” has a basis in real practices and experiences of heterosexism in juridical government and civil society in Jamaica, and their reporting in the media, but it is ultimately an ideological operation, marshalled in the service of entrenching the still relatively new sexual superstructure of homohegemony in Canada. The Canadian state’s embrace of a dominant ideology of gay and lesbian inclusivity, while denigrating other nation-states as outside of this dominant ideology, typified in the case of Jamaica, also operates in a context of capitalizing on homohegemony globally. Homohegemony involves generalizations, distortions, exaggerations, and elisions, and occurs in the context of historic (neo)colonial and racial stereotypes. Jamaica is both substantially queerer and less monolithic in terms of the sex/gender regime than the caricature would suggest, particularly in civil society and “everyday” political spaces.

By way of a conclusion, this chapter will provide a brief summary of the sections and chapters of this dissertation. It will then turn to draw from my own notes from the field, where I travelled from Kingston, Ontario to Kingston, Jamaica as a queer Canadian subject and a visitor to “queer Jamaica,” representing an alternative understanding of Jamaica that is inclusive of a wider reality than that contained in the “homophobic Jamaica” construct. Some significant anecdotes relate to my observations as a normatively queer Canadian citizen – white, gay, cisgender, perceived as middle-class, professional, and largely gender normative – in Jamaica.
My queer experiences and negotiations in Jamaica indicate a very different space than the othering suggested by homohegemonic ideology.

The chapter, and the dissertation, concludes with a consideration of implications of the argument in terms of the need to attend to building alliances based in transnational sexual solidarity.

Where We’ve Been

In “Part One: Homohegemony Has Something to Say,” the suggested contributions of homohegemony as a theoretical concept and framework were demonstrated in the context of discourses about Jamaica, and in the context of relevant scholarship. This part of the dissertation drew upon media analysis and an extensive review of various literatures.

In “The Problem of Homohegemony and the Other: Canadian Media Constructions of Jamaica as a ‘Homophobic Other,’” the basic problem of homohegemony/the other was set out through a detailed consideration of media constructs. The argument demonstrated how Canadian civil and political society illiberally construct Jamaica as universally homophobic, as a means of cementing its own newly hegemonic gay-inclusive ideology.

In “Critical Literature Review and the Need for Homohegemony,” the dissertation engaged with related scholarship with a view to considering both the contributions and limitations of such work. Addressing notable lacunae, the chapter further demonstrated the need for “homohegemony” as a theoretical framework, inspired by both contemporary contributions and the classic work of Antonio Gramsci. Such a concept is attuned to the fundamentally contradictory current moment of queer citizenship.

In “Into the National ‘Self’: Reconstructing Canadian Queer History Through Homohegemony,” the theoretical framework was applied to the history of LGBTQ inclusion/exclusion in Canada. The period considered spans from the time of the partial
decriminalization of same-sex sexual activity in 1969, through to the contemporary post-same-
sex marriage moment. The chapter interpreted Canadian queer history post-1969 as a story of
homohegemony in formation and eventual realization. The argument integrated the distinctly
different narratives of Miriam Smith and Gary Kinsman to illustrate how homohegemony
emerges out of a history of shifting benevolent liberal inclusion of gay and lesbian citizens via
the extension of selective citizenship rights. Such inclusion has been and continues to be
premised, however, on certain limits, conditions, and exclusions representing the illiberal
regulation of LGBTQ citizens and constructed others.

In “Part Two: Homohegemony Has Something to Show,” the dissertation moved to
deconstruct the illiberal caricature of Jamaica discussed in the first chapter in the light of
material and experiential realities. This part of the dissertation drew from field interviews and
document analysis. It then demonstrated the existence of the sexual superstructure with reference
to how it has been inclusively imagined and more contradictorily experienced by LGBTQ
Jamaicans and Jamaican-Canadians.

In “Queer Jamaica?,” the deconstruction of “homophobic Jamaica” was considered in
depth, showing that Jamaica is substantially queerer, and less monolithic, than the constructed
image would suggest. The neo-Gramscian framework, combined with a theoretical appreciation
of the politics of everyday life, indicated grounds to distinguish between a formally heterosexist
legal framework in political society that has been subject to modest contestation, and a civil
society with more robust opportunities for the contestation, claiming, and complex negotiation of
queer citizenship in social spaces. This negotiation of queer citizenship in civil society was
shown to be intersectional, cultural, and geographical, structured by factors such as gender, race,
class, Christianity, dancehall music, and location.
Finally, in “Looking in, Coming In, and Coming Out in Canada,” the Canada/Jamaica binary was reversed to consider how LGBTQ Jamaicans imagine Canada on the issue of gay and lesbian inclusion. LGBTQ Jamaicans’ reflections demonstrated that the notion of gays and lesbians as included in the Canadian national imaginary is something widely shared beyond Canada’s borders. This is a national ideology that is widely accepted as common sense within the very nation-state constructed as “homophobic other” along neocolonial lines. The chapter then moved to depict how the experience and negotiation of intersectional sexual citizenship on the part of LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians evidences a much more contradictory reality, putting into focus the significant benevolent liberal inclusions and serious illiberal exclusions that together characterize the homohegemonic context.

Moving from the analytical to the reflexive, some reflections of my trip to queer Jamaica will now be advanced in order to provide further insight into this study.

Notes from the Field: From Kingston to Kingston

I took travel notes of my ethnographic observations, during a ten-day trip to Jamaica in January of 2013. These observations occurred mostly in the Greater Kingston area, but I travelled through or spent time in four of the fourteen parishes (the Greater Kingston area itself spans two parishes) and two of the three historic counties. Time spent in the Greater Kingston area included the following locations: Downtown, New Kingston, Liguanea, Halfway Tree, Vineyard Town, and Papine. Time spent outside of the Greater Kingston area included Portmore, Spanish Town, and Ocho Rios. These ethnographic observations derived from spending all of my time with LGBTQ Jamaicans in a variety of public and private settings, as well as from a visit to the Jamaica Forum for Lesbians, All-Sexuals and Gays’ (J-FLAG) former headquarters in New Kingston, at which time I met staff members and conducted an informal interview with a program coordinator of that NGO.
During my first night not far from New Kingston, I found myself on a beautiful patio at a hotel called Mayfair in a social space that would definitely be classified as “uptown.” I was with a group of at least eight gay, lesbian, and bisexual men and women who were from either the middle class or upper class; included in the group was a white gay-identified man known within the gay community, who has lived in Jamaica his whole life. He has long blonde hair, and regularly wears women’s clothes, though he would not identify as transgender. A few of the lesbians at our table were also visibly “butch.” While there was a man sitting at a table nearby who evidenced clear discomfort – mainly in terms of facial expressions – at the obviously queer spectacle unfolding at our table on the patio that night, I distinctly recall us making light of the situation and continuing to chat comfortably. There was a desire to push the boundaries a bit and make this man even more uncomfortable, in a subversive act of claiming space. In any case, none of the other patrons stared or otherwise registered disapproval at this very public group of gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and gender nonconformists. This was my initiation into queer Jamaica, and I was just getting started.

I stayed in Halfway Tree, in a modest apartment in a gated complex that would be classified as being “midtown,” or middle-class in the Kingston context. The first day I was there, I noticed that the two gay men I was staying with – roommates, not in a relationship – were watching the popular, if dated, US sitcom Will and Grace. I found out that this is a popular show among members of the LGBTQ community in Jamaica, and we watched a few episodes while I was there. There was another gay man who stayed with us, who I was told had had to leave his home as a result of his sexual orientation.

During my time at the apartment complex, we walked quite a bit in the surrounding area, visiting public spaces like banks, parks (Emancipation Park), restaurants, grocery stores, a
furniture and appliance store, historic sites (Devon House), and a distinctly uptown coffee shop where lighter-skinned Jamaicans and particular apparel were immediately evident upon entry. These walks spanned the Halfway Tree and New Kingston areas. Most of the everyday social spaces we visited during these walks would be considered “uptown” or “midtown” contexts, yet given their public and accessible character, many were also locales in which people from all social classes mingled. This is significant, as it is more of a feature of an uptown lifestyle to travel by car rather than on foot or via public transportation, mainly to establishments of a more private or exclusive nature. That was, for example, how we travelled from our midtown apartment to such uptown social spaces as Mayfair, a bar in Vineyard Town (with an uptown atmosphere and clientele even though Vineyard Town is a lower-class neighbourhood that is not geographically located in uptown), a mall in Liguanea (where we had a chance encounter and meeting with the current Executive Director of J-FLAG), and an LGBTQ “lime” or relaxed party at a private apartment on the outskirts of Papine, close to the neighbourhood of Mona (Papine itself is a lower-class neighbourhood but the apartment was located near what would geographically be considered uptown, in addition to having uptown attendees and an uptown vibe), near the University of Technology (UTech).

We also drove by car to a number of ostensibly midtown and/or public social spaces in the Greater Kingston area and in Portmore. Further, we visited a diner near Ocho Rios with a more rural or working-class feel and customer base, outside of the major tourist area. It is notable that social class, in some ways more than actual socioeconomic status, significantly mediated my experience of “queer Jamaica,” including the night on the patio recounted above. Yet, as Ms. Stewart pointed out in a debriefing of my trip: “Even if you weren’t hanging out with I guess our class [she identifies as middle-class in terms of income, but upper-class in terms of how others
perceive her], you may have had somewhat of a similar experience . . . The stares probably would have been more obvious; you might have overheard one or two words spoken under people’s breath.”

This is consistent with this study’s findings that class status, including as it intersects with race and perceived foreignness, significantly mediates the experience of queer citizenship in Jamaica, making the negotiation of public queer citizenship more difficult the lower down the class ladder one goes. There is a range of agency, however, for the negotiation of queer citizenship in even downtown and rural areas that is in a sense doubly unanticipated by the construct of “homophobic Jamaica.”

Other queer experiences in Jamaica included: a male police officer stopping myself and three other gay/bisexual men I was travelling with for speeding en route to Ocho Rios, only to offer to tear up the ticket in return for the phone number of my Jamaican friend who was driving, and a possible date with him (an experience with male police officers that he has had more than once, as his boyfriend was quick to inform me); being at a 24-hour Burger King in Liguanea at approximately 4:00 in the morning (after the lime), and witnessing the camaraderie between “butch” lesbians, in this case a friend of a friend, and very “macho” heterosexual men in the parking lot; being at a fairly busy public beach in Portmore, Hellshire, with six gay, lesbian, or bisexual-identified persons without a care in the world as to sexual orientation; sharing in the lime, mentioned above, where twenty to thirty lesbian, gay, and bisexual people (about one third women, and two thirds men, with myself being the only one there who would be considered “white” and “foreign”) mixed, mingled, and danced to a range of American and Jamaican music, including dancehall; and walking into a fully staffed J-FLAG headquarters in New Kingston, finding a dedicated team of paid employees and volunteers hard at work on LGBTQ advocacy and crisis intervention. But if my tourist-oriented visit to Jamaica offered a number of perhaps
queerly inclusive moments, there were also moments of heterosexism. Upon landing at
Kingston’s Norman Manley International Airport, I had to go through customs. I was questioned
by an official about whom I was visiting. As I was visiting a female contact in Jamaica’s
LGBTQ community, I told the customs official her name. When he asked what my relation was
to this individual, I stated that we were friends. My story did not seem to register with him, but
perhaps he was merely curious. He proceeded to ask if she was my girlfriend. Noticing that the
border being policed was not just the border of a nation-state, but also one of heteronormativity
and hegemonic masculinity, I responded in the straightest way I knew how: “Hopefully by the
end of the trip she will be my girlfriend!” This comment was received with an enthusiastic “ya
mon!” At this point, any concerns about the purpose of my visit appeared to have been
sufficiently allayed. In this instance, it is hard to say how much of the customs official’s
questioning was merely based on inquisitiveness; all I know is that the gruff line of questioning
and skepticism about my visit to see a female friend dissipated at once when I feigned a jocular
heterosexuality.

Other experiences of heterosexism included a man yelling out “batty!” at me as I ran
down the beach in Ocho Rios. I was unaccompanied at the time. The man was probably in his
early twenties, and was walking in the opposite direction with a group of men and women about
the same age. Upon speaking to some of the participants in this study about the experience,
including the men who accompanied me to Ocho Rios that day, they assessed that in this case the
comment likely posed little threat, and that it could have been a joking insult meant to impress
and entertain his friends, along the same lines as how Canadian youth will sometimes say
“you’re so gay” as a comedic way to put down their ostensibly straight buddies. The
acceptability of such public derision, however, reveals continued heterosexism and
heteronormativity. As well, it is unclear to what extent my race and/or perceived foreignness, and more specifically my clear outlier status from normative Jamaican black masculinity as I ran down the beach in swimming trunks, entered into the experience. In any case, though I felt slightly taken aback at the man yelling a derogatory word for gay (a short form of “battyman”) at me, I did not feel physically threatened.

At other times in public spaces, I and my queer acquaintances found ourselves on the receiving end of stares. It is important to underline here that this was a rare occurrence. It was notable, however, at one fast food restaurant in Portmore, when I was with a group of other LGBTQ people. This was the same group which had just negotiated sexual citizenship seamlessly at a public beach, and yet, at the restaurant, we were met with significant stares from other customers, both in the parking lot and inside.

Toward Transnational Sexual Solidarity

These experiences, and the argument advanced in this dissertation, suggest that there is considerably more ground for understanding a certain commonality of queer experiences in Canada and Jamaica than commonly perceived. Without minimizing substantial differences between the complex experiences of queer citizenship in Canada and Jamaica, there is also a basis for transnational sexual solidarity.

The substantial differences were registered throughout the course of this dissertation, particularly in terms of legal structures, including the criminalization of men’s same-sex sexual activity, legislative sexual orientation discrimination protections, and formal relationship recognition. For example, while containing notably similar wording to Jamaica’s buggery law, Canadian anal sex legislation contains a number of amendments or “exceptions” that substantially alter its meaning, and has been ruled unconstitutional in a number of Canadian jurisdictions in spite of remaining formally on the statute books. However, it might prove useful
to consider both sets of legislation directly in order to note similar wording based in a shared British colonial history, but also significant differences in the legally formalized status of heterosexism in Jamaica and Canada; heterosexism in the former context appears as a coercive part of an overall heterosexist legal framework, while heterosexism in the latter appears as a vestige of previous legislation and a reminder of the contradictory context out of which significant legal reforms have advanced. The Jamaican legislation reads as follows:

Whosoever shall be convicted of the abominable crime of buggery, committed either with mankind or with any animal, shall be liable to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for a term not exceeding ten years.¹⁰

The Canadian legislation begins much like the Jamaican statute, only to reveal its continued basis in the significant, though still partial, 1969 decriminalization of men’s same-sex sexual activity:

Every person who engages in an act of anal intercourse is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years or is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction. Exception: subsection (1) does not apply to any act engaged in, in private, between (a) husband and wife, or (b) any two persons, each of whom is 18 years of age or more, both of whom consent to the act. An act shall be deemed not to have been engaged in in private if it is engaged in in a public place or if more than two persons take part or are present.¹¹

Thus, taking note of the caricature of Jamaica and its function for Canada does not minimize the significance of attending to an analysis of heterosexism in Jamaica; on the contrary, attention to deconstructing “homophobic Jamaica” can assist in advancing a more nuanced, contextual analysis of the Jamaican state and societal context. Such analysis should
ultimately prove much more fruitful in producing effective and ethical interventions into issues of queer inclusion in Jamaica and other contexts of the global South.

This is also true for the homohegemonic context, an ideological designation that attends to the national imagination of significantly inclusive gay and lesbian citizenship without positing this as the whole picture, as this dissertation has demonstrated. To this end, homohegemony has been shown to be inherently contradictory. While notable and visible advances in especially gay and lesbian citizenship have been documented in Canadian political and civil society, significant exclusions of both a legally formalized, and more often systemic, character have also been shown with reference to experiential realities. In terms of the latter, this has been observed in the context of the complex everyday negotiation of largely subtle yet systemic and firmly entrenched relations of privilege and oppression in civil societal spaces, experienced as serious continuing constraints on queer citizenship.

As mentioned in Chapters One and Four, Ontario’s recent (June 2014) election of Kathleen Wynne as Premier represents Canada’s first openly gay or lesbian provincial or territorial premier, in addition to Ontario’s first elected woman Premier. It also marks the election of the world’s first openly gay or lesbian head of government of a jurisdiction as populous of Ontario. Sexual orientation was largely a “non-issue” during the election campaign, with the media, Wynne’s campaign, and other political leaders preferring to focus the frame of identity on the novelty of gender, including the fact that two major party leaders vying for the Premiership (the other being Andrea Horwath of the New Democratic Party) were women. Wynne’s sexual orientation was largely, but not entirely, unspoken in spite of being publicly known. Her spouse, however, briefly joined her on stage and was included in Wynne’s victory speech, which strongly alluded to sexual orientation. That Wynne is the first woman
Premier of Ontario, however, attracted considerably more attention.

The political tactics and public reception of the Wynne campaign were revealing in terms of the contradictions of homohegemony, both in terms of what was said and what was silent. The lack of public discourse about Wynne’s sexual orientation was exemplary of these contradictions. There was a perceived need and political strategy to downplay her minority sexual orientation relative to her gender in order to win high office. Yet, the lack of negative attention directed at Wynne’s sexual orientation and the fact that it was not a stumbling block to her election as Premier certainly represent significant advances in inclusive lesbian and gay citizenship in Canada. Wynne’s victory suggests significant sexual citizenship gains in Canada, benevolently conferred upon certain normative gays and lesbians for whom high political office is no longer a barrier. Notably, Wynne is white, largely gender normative, married to her same-sex partner, and carries considerable class privilege. At the same time, her victory points to the serious limitations and exclusions of the homohegemonic moment, indicating continuing exclusions of non-normative queer citizenship, and the incomplete embrace or normalization of homosexual subjectivity/identity. In terms of the latter, some of the silence around sexual orientation in the campaign indicates a continuing invisibility of lesbianism in Canada, including subsuming it within gender and failing to treat it seriously as a sexual orientation, relative to male homosexuality.

Wynne’s election as Premier of a province of 13.5 million residents therefore exemplifies significant advances in sexual citizenship for certain gays and lesbians along lines consistent with a hegemonic notion of gays and lesbians as full and equal sexual citizens. It may even contribute to the further imagination of Ontario, and Canada, as having inclusive gay and lesbian citizenship. However, the manner in which the victory took place in particular, in that it is truly
possible that many Ontarians who voted for her were unaware of her lesbian status given the consensus of various opinion leaders in civil society and political actors to not discuss the issue, strongly suggests subtle yet entrenched illiberal limitations and exclusions of queer citizenship as well, which contradictorily continue a decade after the onset of the homohegemonic moment.

Mapping the contours of homohegemony and the other ultimately exposes, rather than reifies, the ideology surrounding homosexual inclusion and exclusion that has built up in Canadian civil society as a result of legal advances, to reveal more complicated and unstable realities in and in between Canada and Jamaica. The instability of homohegemony in the global North is perhaps made more evident in terms of the impact of transnational civil societal activist networks, based in an ethics and praxis of queer solidarity within particular homohegemonic ideological contexts like Canada. Such activism critiques the illiberal exclusions of homohegemony, including the construction of homophobic others, from within a contested national imaginary. These critiques in effect argue for a re-imagination of the contours of sexual citizenship along lines consistent with transnational queer solidarity. This type of activism can similarly be advanced among constructed “homophobic others” in order to effect legal and civil societal reforms in ways that de-link queer activism from the perpetuation of relations of neocolonialism.

An unexplored implication of this project’s naming and elaboration of homohegemony and the other, perhaps significant for future research, concerns the complex process of thinking through what a movement based in transnational sexual/queer solidarity, both scholarly and activist, might look like. Such a movement could span civil societal and everyday queer activism in Jamaica, Canada, and in between.

In connection with imagining such a movement, we might draw inspiration from the
vision of transnational feminists such as Chandra Talpade Mohanty and M. Jacqui Alexander. Alexander considers that “feminist solidarity crosses state-imposed boundaries.” Mohanty articulates that “rather than assuming an enforced commonality of oppression, the practice of solidarity foregrounds communities of people who have chosen to work and fight together.” She proposes that solidarity so defined, rather than problematic assumptions of “sisterhood,” also “constitutes the most principled way to cross borders – to decolonize knowledge and practice anticapitalist critique.” Furthermore, both Alexander and Mohanty suggest working towards the vision of a “feminist democracy which is global in scope . . . based on anti-colonialist, socialist principles.”

Transnational sexual solidarity should, therefore, work within the context of alliances and coalitions, for example, between “Northern” and “Southern” queers, based on mutuality and respect for difference, rather than assuming an exact commonality of interests premised in a singular queer identity. Such a movement must also continually strive to understand and appreciate the relationships between different yet similar contexts, including colonial and neocolonial power relations. It is in the context of such a democratic movement that specific solutions and programmes can hopefully be found to advance formal and substantive queer inclusions at all levels of political community – local, regional, national, supranational, transnational, and international – in careful ways that are not predicated on substantial exclusions. It is hoped that the conversations contained within and opened up by this dissertation can contribute in a small way toward movement in this direction.

Notes

1. This dissertation does not contend that “homophobic Jamaica” is the only, or even the primary, “other” constructed by homohegemony, nor does it contend that homohegemony would be unable to entrench itself
without a constructed image of Jamaica. Rather, Jamaica stands in and is produced as a prominent homophobic other, particularly at the nexus of Canada/Jamaica in the Greater Toronto Area but also more generally in progressive English Canadian nationalism, in which Toronto is influential. Future research may address additional constructed homophobic others, in different contexts of othering. One might say that the neocolonial relationship that describes Canada/Jamaica, and likely other pairings of homohegemonic Northern nation-states and homophobic Southern others, is but one significant context of othering.

2. Homohegemony proposes that the pairing of the words “normatively queer,” while revealing in terms of the contradictions that attend to queer inclusion in Canada, is no longer a citizenship oxymoron.

3. The designation of “professional” is, however, debatable for any PhD candidate.

4. Dorothy Smith, _The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology_ (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987); Dorothy Smith, _Institutional Ethnicity: A Sociology for People_ (Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press, 2005).

5. I would like to acknowledge “Mr. Goodman” for graciously helping me fill in some of the gaps in my memory and travel notes in follow-up conversations on social media and via Skype.


7. Airing from 1998 to 2006 on NBC, the show was created by Max Mutchnick and David Kohan. Starring Eric McCormack, Debra Messing, Megan Mullally, and Sean Hayes, _Will and Grace_ was “one of the first shows to feature an openly gay lead character . . . after the recently ended _Ellen_ on ABC.” See Josh Bell, “‘Will and Grace’ Profile,”_About Entertainment_, http://tvcomedies.about.com/od/classicomediess/p/willardandgrace.htm.

8. Ms. Stewart (Teacher), recorded Skype interview and transcription by author, May 2013.

9. Presumably already noting a car full of men, the police officer also did a bit of a “double take” once he saw the white guy in the back seat.


14. Ibid.; Belgium’s population is about two million less than Ontario’s, and Iceland and Luxembourg, the other states to have had an openly gay or lesbian elected head of government before Ontario, have populations significantly less than Ontario’s. See Central Intelligence Agency, “Belgium,” _The World Factbook_, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/wfbExt/region_eur.html.

15. Loriggio, “Sexuality a ‘non-issue’ during Wynne’s election campaign”; Tepper, “Ontario takes pride that gay premier’s win taken in stride.”


19. Himani Bannerji, _Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism_ (Toronto: Women’s


23. Ibid.


25. As an example of a specific issue area where such an approach is highly relevant, consider LGBTQ youth homelessness in urban centres in Canada and Jamaica. There are certainly differences in the experience of being a homeless LGBTQ-identified youth in Toronto, Canada versus Kingston, Jamaica. Homeless LGBTQ youth in the New Kingston area are known to commonly face extreme forms of violence and ostracism. Yet, the fact that the problem of LGBTQ youth homelessness is significantly shared between Canada and Jamaica should provide a basis for tackling the issue in a spirit and praxis of transnational queer solidarity. Such an approach to this issue would recognize the more general importance of advancing substantive forms of equality for queers who find themselves in diverse institutional settings.
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Interviews

LGBTQ Jamaicans


Mr. Lees. LGBTQ activist with J-FLAG. Interview by author. May 2013. Recorded Skype interview, transcribed by author.

Mr. Lewis. Interview A. College student. Interview by author. May 2013. Recorded Skype interview, transcribed by author.

Mr. Lewis. Interview B. College student. Interview by author. August 2014. Written interview over social media.

Mr. Markson. Student. Interview by author. May 2013. Recorded Skype interview, transcribed by author.

Mr. Reed. College student. Interview by author. May 2013. Recorded Skype interview, transcribed by author.

Mr. Williamson. Graduate student. Interview by author. May 2013. Recorded Skype interview, transcribed by author.

2. Interviewees’ names have been changed in order to protect their anonymity. Occupations have sometimes also been slightly altered. The sole exception to these alterations is international and Jamaican LGBTQ activist, Maurice Tomlinson.


*LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians*


Mr. Johnson. Interview C. Lawyer and LGBTQ activist. Interview by author. February 2013. Recorded Skype interview, transcribed by author.

Mr. Miller. Architect. Interview by author. August 2012. Recorded interview, transcribed by
author. Kingston, Ontario, Canada.


Appendix A. Recruitment Email

Dear (insert name of organization),

I am doing a study on homosexuality in Canada and Jamaica for my PhD thesis in Political Studies at Queen’s University, Kingston Ontario. Part of the study involves conducting interviews with self-identified lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) Jamaican-Canadians. Participants must be 18 years old or older, and may be first- or second-generation Jamaican-Canadians who have lived in Canada for at least 6 months. Interviews will last for approximately one hour and will take place in Toronto.

If your organization is aware of anyone who fits these criteria and would like to participate, then it would be appreciated if you could pass this notice on to them so that they can get in touch with me about participation in the study. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's University policies.

Many thanks for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Kyle Jackson

Doctoral Candidate, Political Studies

Queen’s University, Kingston Ontario

kyle.jackson@queensu.ca
Appendix B. Information and Consent Form for LGBTQ Jamaicans

LGBT inclusion in Canada and Jamaica

Researcher: Kyle Jackson, Doctoral Candidate, Political Studies, Queen’s University
kyle.jackson@queensu.ca
Social Science and Humanities Research Council Award Holder

The aim of the research project is to explore how self-identified LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) Jamaican-Canadians and Jamaicans (as well as those who have romantic relationships with the same gender but do not self-identify as LGBT, are not “out,” etc.) feel about the status of homosexuality in Jamaica and Canada. This part of the study focuses on negotiating “sexual citizenship” or “LGBTQ citizenship” in Jamaica – with all of its possibilities and challenges. This will be done by interviewing and recording you, the participant, for approximately 1 hour, as you answer questions related to the topic. The questions are completely open-ended. There are no right or wrong answers. The questions are an opportunity for you to explore your life-history and identity, as well as for you to share your views on this important topic. Simply answer as many questions as you feel comfortable answering. Your electronic signature below is meant to confirm that you understand the expectations and requirements of you.

Risks: there are no known risks associated with today’s interview. In the unlikely case of a breach of confidentiality or anonymity, there is a risk that you could be “outed,” which may be riskier for you, as someone residing in Jamaica, then for Jamaican-Canadians residing in Canada. All efforts will be made to ensure that this does not happen.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. Your signature below is meant to confirm that you understand this.

The interview will be recorded for accuracy. I will ask your permission (on the consent form below) to record the conversation.

Only I will have access to your name and contact information in the off chance that I need to contact you later.

Anything you say during the interview could be quoted or paraphrased in the published final product. Anonymity will be ensured as much as possible by using an alias in place of your name, as well as by making necessary changes to some of your information to make you less identifiable. For example, if you are a politics student currently enrolled in university studies, I may change my written account about you to read that you are a sociology student. I may also change your age by a year or two to further protect your anonymity. There is still a chance, however, that if friends or family read the book they might guess that the alias is you. By signing below, you confirm that you understand this. Again, you have the right to refuse to participate at any time, including after this interview. You may withdraw all of your information anytime up until the dissertation is completed. You may request a copy of the dissertation once it’s completed, before it goes to the department for assessment.
I will not share your personal information or contact information with anyone, and will destroy all of this information as well as audio files and transcripts, once the project is complete.

The research results will be published as part of my Political Studies thesis for the PhD that I am currently undertaking, which may end up becoming a book. If an excerpt from your interview or a discussion of an aspect of your story is included in the final product, it will be available for other academics and students in politics, gender studies, sociology, etc. to read and benefit from. It is possible that other academics will then cite some of this information in their own publications in the future. It is nevertheless a small, mostly academic audience who are likely to read the finished product.

Your signature below confirms that you understand that any questions about study participation may be directed to me, Kyle Jackson, at kyle.jackson@queensu.ca. As well, any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or (613) 533-6081.

This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's University policies.

I, the participant, have read this letter of information, have had any questions answered to my satisfaction, and will keep a copy of this letter for my records:

Name: __________________________
Date: __________________________
Signature: ______________________

By initialling this statement below:
_____ I am granting permission for the researcher to use a tape recorder.

Thanks for your participation!
Appendix C. Information and Consent Form for LGBTQ Jamaican-Canadians

Homosexuality in Canada and Jamaica

Researcher: Kyle Jackson, Doctoral Candidate, Political Studies, Queen’s University
kyle.jackson@queensu.ca
Social Science and Humanities Research Council Award Holder

The aim of the research project is to explore how self-identified LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) Jamaican-Canadians feel about the status of homosexuality in Jamaica and Canada. The study is interested in your perception of homosexuality in Canada versus Jamaica since you have a connection to both countries. The goal is to shed light on the relationship between the two countries in and around issues of homosexuality. This will be done by interviewing and recording you, the participant, for approximately 1 hour, as you answer questions related to the topic. The questions are completely open-ended. There are no right or wrong answers. The questions are an opportunity for you to explore your life-history and identity, as well as for you to share your views on this important topic. Simply answer as many questions as you feel comfortable answering. Your signature below is meant to confirm that you understand the expectations and requirements of you.

Risks: there are no known risks associated with today’s interview.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. Your signature below is meant to confirm that you understand this.

The interview will be recorded for accuracy. I will ask your permission (on the consent form below) to record the conversation.

Only I will have access to your name and contact information in the off chance that I need to contact you later.

Anything you say during the interview could be quoted or paraphrased in the published final product. Confidentiality will be ensured as much as possible by using an alias in place of your name, as well as by making necessary changes to some of your information to make you less identifiable. For example, if you are a politics student currently enrolled in university studies, I may change my written account about you to read that you are a sociology student. I may also change your age by a year or two to further guarantee your anonymity. There is still a chance, however, that if friends or family read the book they might guess that the alias is you. By signing below, you confirm that you understand this. Again, you have the right to refuse to participate at any time, including after this interview. You may withdraw all of your information anytime up until the dissertation is completed.

I will not share your personal information or contact information with anyone, and will destroy all of this information as well as audio files and transcripts, once the project is complete.
The research results will be published as part of my Political Studies thesis for the PhD that I am currently undertaking, which may end up becoming a book. If an excerpt from your interview or a discussion of an aspect of your story is included in the final product, it will be available for other academics and students in politics, gender studies, sociology, etc. to read and benefit from. It is possible that other academics will then cite some of this information in their own publications in the future. It is nevertheless a small, mostly academic audience who are likely to read the finished product.

Your signature below confirms that you understand that any questions about study participation may be directed to me, Kyle Jackson, at kyle.jackson@queensu.ca. As well, any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or (613) 533-6081.

This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's University policies.

I, the participant, have read this letter of information, have had any questions answered to my satisfaction, and will keep a copy of this letter for my records:

Name: ___________________________
Date: ___________________________
Signature: ______________________

By initialling this statement below:
_____ I am granting permission for the researcher to use a tape recorder.

Thanks for your participation!
Appendix D. Semi-Structured Interview Schedule for Jamaica Site

1. What is your name? Please spell it.
2. Do you give permission to be interviewed as per the information and consent letter? Do you give permission to be tape recorded?
3. Any questions about this interview?
4. What is your age?
5. What is your occupation?
6. How do you identify in terms of sexual orientation?
7. Do you identify in terms of gender identity: as a man, woman, or as a transgender person?
8. How do you locate yourself in terms of class? For example, uptown, downtown, working-class, etc.
9. Where do you reside in Jamaica? Where is your family from?
10. Are you black, white, Chinese-Jamaican, or other? If other, please specify.
11. Have you travelled to any other countries? Do you have family members who live in other countries? Where?
12. Do people know you are ____? (Example, gay.) Do you plan to tell more people? Why or why not? What does being “out” mean to you?
13. Are you married? If so, does your spouse know that you are engaging in same-gender relationships? Describe how your relationship works.
14. Is getting married in spite of being lesbian, gay, or bisexual a common way of dealing with sexual minority status in Jamaica? Describe the pros and cons to these arrangements.
15. Do you think Jamaica gay-friendly? Explain. Would you ever use the term “homophobic” to describe the culture in Jamaica? What do people mean by “homophobia”?
16. Do people like to speculate about who’s gay in Jamaica?
17. Have things gotten better or worse for gays and lesbians? Do you think they will get better?
18. Do you feel like a “full Jamaican (citizen)” even though you are_____.
19. Do LGBTQ and other Jamaicans think that Canada is gay-friendly? Do they approve of this or disapprove? Does the “average Jamaican” make a distinction between Canada and the US when it comes to gay rights, or not? Does the average LGBTQ person make such a distinction? What about distinguishing between Canada and the United Kingdom when it comes to “gay-friendliness”?
20. Is it possible for someone living in Jamaica to be seen as a “real” man if people know he’s gay?
21. Is it possible for someone living in Jamaica to be seen as a “real” woman if people know that she’s a lesbian?
22. Are lesbians and bisexual women treated differently than bisexual and gay men?
23. Are more “effeminate” gay men treated differently than more masculine gay men?
24. Are more “butch” lesbians treated differently than more feminine lesbians?
25. Is it different for bisexuals than gays and lesbians?
26. Do most Jamaicans think that “being black” means “being straight”? Is it more permissible for white Jamaicans to be gay/lesbian/bi? Is it more permissible for tourists?
27. Is it easier to be openly LGBTQ in “uptown”? What about in “midtown” and “downtown” spaces? (Adjust to a more general question about class status for participants outside of Kingston context.)
28. Do you know of any transgender Jamaicans?
29. What’s the main source of Jamaica’s treatment of LGBTQ people? The laws, the church, dancehall music or something else?
30. What’s the most important thing that needs to be done in order to make Jamaica a better place for LGBTQ people?
31. Are you hopeful that the current Prime Minister and her government will make things better for LGBTQ Jamaicans?
32. Is being “homophobic” part of what it means to be Jamaican? Is it part of a national identity? A large part or a small part?
33. Do you think people in Canada should boycott Jamaican tourism until the situation for LGBTQ people in Jamaica improves?
34. Do you think people in Canada should boycott “homophobic” Jamaican dancehall music until the situation for LGBTQ people in Jamaica improves?
35. Do you think countries like Canada should put political pressure on Jamaica and other Commonwealth countries that retain laws against homosexual sex? For example, should foreign aid be tied to improvements for LGBTQ Jamaicans? Could outside interference cause a backlash among the general population? Would it still be worth it in spite of the backlash?
36. Have you or someone you know ever experienced physical violence as a result of your sexual orientation?
37. Do you plan to stay in Jamaica? If not, would you move to live more freely as a _______ person? Would you consider moving to Canada?
38. Have you heard of J-FLAG? Do you think it’s doing a good job? What could it do better? Are there other organizations that fight for LGBTQ issues that you are aware of?
39. Have you heard about the legal challenges pertaining to LGBTQ rights in Jamaica that have taken place recently or are underway? (For example, petitions before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the challenge to Jamaica TV for censorship of gay Jamaicans, the challenge to Trinidad and Tobago’s immigration law barring homosexuals, the challenge to Belize’s immigration law barring homosexuals, the current domestic challenge to the buggery law based on the constitutional right to privacy.)
40. Would you advocate “pride parades” as a way of fighting for LGBTQ rights in Jamaica? Why or why not?
41. Have you heard about the “We Are Jamaicans” campaign? Do you think it has the right idea about how best to change the situation?
42. Is work to combat and address HIV/AIDS an important part of the gay rights movement in Jamaica? Are there any downsides in terms of achieving gay rights by working so closely with the HIV/AIDS organizations?

43. What’s one thing about lesbian, gay or bisexual culture in Jamaica that might surprise people from the US, England or Canada?

44. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the least gay-friendly, how gay-friendly would you say Jamaica is?

45. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the least gay-friendly, how gay-friendly would you say Canada is?

46. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the least gay-friendly, how gay-friendly would you say the US is?

47. Anything that I’ve missed or that you would like to add?

48. Thanks for your time!
Appendix E. Semi-Structured Interview Schedule for Canada Site

1. What is your name? Could you please spell it?
2. Do you give permission to be interviewed as per the information and consent letter? Do you give permission to be tape recorded?
3. City: Ottawa, Toronto or Kingston
4. What is your age?
5. Occupation?
6. In terms of sexual orientation, how do you identify?
7. In terms of gender identity, how do you identify?
8. How would you categorize your “class status” in Jamaica? How would you categorize your “class status” in Canada?
9. Where in Jamaica are you or your family from? How much time have you spent in Jamaica and where?
10. If born in Jamaica, when did you come to Canada? Where have you lived in Canada? Citizenship status (for example, dual) and path to citizenship?
11. How did you or have you experienced your sexual orientation in Jamaica? Did you “come out” in Jamaica? Are you “out” in Jamaica?
12. Did you “come out” separately in Canada? If so, describe. Does your family accept your sexual orientation?
13. Can you identify one positive experience regarding your sexual orientation in Canada?
14. Can you identify one negative experience regarding your sexual orientation in Canada?
15. Can you identify one positive experience regarding your sexual orientation in Jamaica?
16. Can you identify one negative experience regarding your sexual orientation in Jamaica?
17. What’s it like being a person of Jamaican background in Canada? What’s it like being a person of colour (feel free to use another term) in Canada? An LGBTQ person in Canada? An LGBTQ person of colour in Canada?
18. How would you describe the cultural and gender composition of your friendship circle in Canada?
19. If applicable, how would you describe the cultural and gender composition of your friendship circle in Jamaica? How do you navigate these differences?
20. Do you have relationships (romantic or based in friendship) with fellow Canadians of a Jamaican background? Partnerships with people of different backgrounds? How do you navigate these differences?
21. How do most Canadians view Jamaica’s reputation on LGBTQ issues? How do you view it?
22. How do most Jamaicans view Canada’s reputation on “gay-friendliness”? How do you view it? How do members of the LGBTQ community in Jamaica view it?
23. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the least gay-friendly, how gay-friendly is Jamaica?
24. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the least gay-friendly, how gay-friendly is Canada?
25. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the most racist, how would you rate racism in Canada?
26. If you refused to answer the rating questions, do you wish to explain?
27. Do you agree with Canadians boycotting dancehall music containing “homophobic lyrics”? Why or why not?
28. Do you agree with a tourism boycott of Jamaica until improvements are made on LGBTQ issues? Why or why not?
30. What should Canadians do, if anything, about LGBTQ rights in Jamaica?
31. Do you ever go to the “Gay Village” in Toronto? (Gay bars in other cities.) How would you explain the positive and negative elements of this location? How do you navigate these spaces?
32. Do you ever go to “Little Jamaica” in Toronto? How would you explain the positive and negative elements of this location? Caribbean-Canadian social spaces in general? How do you navigate these spaces?
33. Most important steps forward in terms of LGBTQ issues in Jamaica? Cultural or legal?
34. Have you heard of “J-FLAG”? (If not, provide brief background information for context.) What do you think about it? Have you heard about the legal challenges pertaining to LGBTQ rights in Jamaica that have taken place recently or are underway? (Petitions before Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the challenge to Jamaica TV for censorship of gay Jamaicans, the challenge to Trinidad and Tobago’s immigration law barring homosexuals, the challenge to Belize’s immigration law barring homosexuals, the current domestic challenge to the buggery law based on the constitutional right to privacy.)
35. Are you familiar with the “We Are Jamaicans” video campaign? (If not, provide brief context.) What do you think about it? Are there any similar campaigns that you are aware of?
36. What do you think about the role of HIV/AIDS activism and work as it relates to LGBTQ activism and work?
37. What do you think about the role of religion in LGBTQ issues in Jamaica? Canada? In the diaspora? For you personally?
38. Any comments on LGBTQ issues in other Caribbean countries? LGBTQ issues in any other countries you have visited?
39. Any other comments? Anything I may have missed that you would like to speak to?
40. Thanks for your time!
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