Welcome to the inaugural edition of the APSA Sexuality & Politics newsletter. We’ve been an organized section for fewer than three years at this point, but recent events certainly illustrates the salience of our work. In the United States, the question of federal funding for abortion has swallowed the health care debate; abortion likewise played a prominent role in Justice Sotomayor’s confirmation hearings. The marriage equality map altered dramatically. Iowa became the first Midwestern state to institute marriage equality, following a decision by the state’s court of last resort. Legislatures in Vermont, New Hampshire, and the District of Columbia formalized marriage equality while their counterparts in New York and New Jersey voted marriage reform down; Maine’s legislature passed a marriage equality bill only to have it overturned at the ballot box. The Obama administration explicitly banned federal employment discrimination based on gender identity. And, of course, political sex scandals played out prominently yet again. South Carolina Governor Mark Sanford survived an impeachment attempt; Senator John Ensign (R-NV) resigned his position as Chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee.

The intersection of sexuality and politics has likewise played out prominently beyond American borders recently. As in the United States, the marriage equality map altered. Norway and Sweden embraced full sexual orientation. They’ve provided us with a lot to consider – and do! In addition to panel chair Rick Valelly’s remarks, this newsletter features articles from Margot Canaday, Stephen Engel, and David Rayside.

RICK VALELLY (panel chair): I was thrilled with the panel because it showed that APD and the development of the politics of and the struggle for gay rights are connected – though making the connection requires APD to adjust. APD is very much premised, implicitly, on rigidly distinguishing the public and the private – what with its focus on bureaucratic, presidential, judicial, and congressional development. Its attention to party
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marriage equality. As I write this message Portugal appears poised to join them. Tierra del Fuego became the first Latin American jurisdiction to issue a marriage license to a same sex couple, narrowly squeaking out Mexico City, which will begin issuing licenses in March 2010. The socio–political situation facing LGBT people in several other nations contrasts sharply. A measure that would impose the death sentence for homosexual behavior has been introduced in the Ugandan legislature and appears likely to pass. The Rwandan Parliament will soon consider a change to Rwanda’s penal code which would criminalize homosexuality with a punishment of five to ten years. Two Malawians were arrested for holding a traditional engagement ceremony—some reports identified them as gay men while others report that one member of the couple identifies as female and the other as male.

The Sexuality & Politics Section provides a vibrant scholarly home for political scientists interested in exploring the myriad of ways that sexuality and politics intersect. These topics represent only a fraction of the work that we do exploring the political dimensions of sexuality. I haven’t even mentioned such topics as the use of sexual violence as a weapon of war, the social control of reproduction beyond abortion, the problem of human trafficking, and, well, you get the picture.

As one of APSA’s newest sections, we have a lot of institutional building to do. This newsletter is part of that process. It will, we hope, will add significant value to your section membership, by bringing you interesting features, highlighting recent and forthcoming scholarship, and alerting you to upcoming conferences, funding opportunities and the like. It’s also a way for us to brag on our members. Be sure to check out the Shout Out section on page 16. And while I’m on the subject of shout–outs, I’d like to correct an oversight. Our most gracious newsletter editor, Julie Novkov, somehow managed to omit her receipt of APSA’s 2009 Ralph J. Bunche award for her book Racial Union (University of Michigan Press, 2008). The Bunche Award is given annually for the best scholarly work in political science that explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Finally, the newsletter is a way to us to communicate about important section matters. Here are three things for you to consider. First, the Section has created a Best Conference Paper Award, to be given for the best paper exploring sexuality and politics presented at the previous year’s APSA. Unlike many other paper awards, this one comes with a cash prize of $100 and a spiffy plaque. More information about the deadline and submission process can be found on page 16.

Second, it’s not too early to begin thinking about selecting Section officers for next year. The most important position to fill is that of Program Chair for APSA 2011 (San Francisco). Under Section bylaws, the person selected to be Program Chair for a particular year simultaneously serves as Vice–President for that year and automatically serves as President for the subsequent year. That means that the Program Chair for APSA 2011 will be the President for APSA 2012 in New Orleans. We’ll devote a subsequent edition of this newsletter to the 2012 siting controversy. We’ll also have two openings on the Executive Committee (two–year term) and an opening for a new newsletter editor. So think about it.

Finally, on membership: to maintain our status as an organized section, we must number at least 250 members. We are not quite there yet, and although we’re still within our grace period, I’d really like to see our membership comfortably surpass the minimum in the very near future. Organized section status not only guarantees us panel allocations, it signals the importance of sexuality studies to the wider discipline, gives emerging scholars an easy way to find a community of peers, and enables us to converse amongst ourselves. Immediate past–President Greg Lewis is the Membership Outreach coordinator this year and we are contacting lapsed members for renewal as well as reaching out to APSA members work on the political implications of sexuality. If you know people who fit this description, please help us by recruiting them as section members! (Yes, it’s true. We do recruit.) Membership is a mere $7 per year, making us one of the best deals in town.

My best wishes to you all for a healthy, happy, and productive new year.

Ellen Andersen is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Vermont.
system development also smuggles in the public/private distinction. It does pay attention to the public use of public power to enforce invidious distinctions according to race and gender, and to a lesser extent between indigenous populations and the white settlers who conquered the territory that now makes up the United States. But again the public/private distinction is honored. Thus the emphases that come naturally to sociologists – a respect for cultural politics, an appreciation of performance, a recognition that sexual orientation can be publicly reinforced, the artifactuality of large parts of the private sphere – none of this comes easily to APD scholars. Indeed, unlike parts of the political science profession that come to thinking about individuals and their attitudes and behaviors as second nature, APD’s heavy institutionalism is, to an extent, actually hostile to the study of gay rights – though not in any self conscious way.

So, I wanted this panel to be in Politics and History in order to shake up APD. The exceptional sophistication and power of the discussions by all of the panelists whom I invited – Margot Canaday, who brilliantly used simple ideas from Hugh Heclo in order to understanding the straight state, Steve Engel, whose work in the development of Studies in American Political Development, facilitated an exceptionally subtle discussion of the methodological challenge that comes with bring APD and the politics of gay rights together, David Rayside, who spoke with off the cuff brilliance and deep knowledge of the comparative politics of gay rights in Canada and the US, and Priscilla Yamin, who sketched profoundly original discussion of the comparative politics of marriage across time in American political history – made the roundtable a great success.

The questions and the engagement of the members of the audience showed that a rather special intellectual experience in fact was happening. The comments afterward confirmed my sense of that. It turns out that the Social Science History Association has asked all of us to hold the roundtable again at its meeting in 2010. That too suggests that there was something of a Wordsworthian "spot of time." Hopefully we can recapture it in Long Beach.

Rick Valelley is Professor of Political Science at Swarthmore College.

Remarks at APSA 2009: Politics, History, and Sexuality

By Margot Canaday

In my paper, I discussed the potential of a coalition of political scientists and historians might consider. In brief they are:

1) The need for a longer temporal view.

Historians of sexuality often look at the state through the lenses of McCarthyism. They write about a state that suddenly becomes aware of homosexuality after
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World War II and moves immediately and forcefully to repress it as the Cold War takes hold. I think this is coming onto the scene much too late. The state’s anti-homosexualism is not a switch that is suddenly flipped on in the 1950s, it rather unfolds across the twentieth-century on the slow and steadily moving conveyor belt that is American state-building. If we get on board earlier in that process, say around 1900, then we can account for the way that states must, to borrow Hugh Helco’s great formulation, “puzzle before they power.” So consider that when an immigration inspector named Marcus Braun wrote a memo for the head of the Immigration Bureau alerting him to [quote] “a new species of undesirable alien”—perverts or moral degenerates—his boss noted his “keen satisfaction” in reading the report. And then he shoved it in the back of his desk drawer. The year was 1909. It would be almost half a century before state officials enacted a policy that explicitly barred homosexual aliens from entering or remaining in the country. But the years in between are not a regulatory dead-spot. They are years in which officials were steadily acquiring knowledge and experience and tools, shaping what they wanted to regulate. So that when the government finally decided at mid-century to create the exclusionary policies that explicitly targeted homosexuality, it could do so very quickly. This is one of the important stories we miss when those of us who study sexual regulation start thinking about the state only with the 1940s or the 1950s, or even later.

2) The need for a wider canvass.

As much as historians who write about the state like to assert that THE STATE “was not a monolith,” when it comes to the state’s relationship to homosexuality, we seem to know a lot about the military and a lot about the State Department but not much more. Historians often forsake breadth for depth, and there’s much to be said for burrowing deeply into any one institution. But we need to broaden the range of institutions that we burrow into, and we also need to look across institutions. When we do that, we will see how the desire to regulate moved around in an expanding state. And that it developed situationally in tandem with the state’s need to do something else—process newcomers, go to war, or distribute resources, in the cases I look at. Looking across institutions will show us how officials created and implemented policies in ways that were sensitive to the agencies they represented. There is a reasonably good chance, for example, that two soldiers who engaged in very public acts of sodomy in the early twentieth century would have been court-martialed for the offense. Yet consider that federal officials who ran Depression-era camps for transient men and boys had a “look the other way” attitude about homosexual behavior that occurred in that setting. “It seems to me,” wrote one official from the camp program, “that the homosexuality is incidental and should not be made too much of.” It simply would not do, she continued, “to boot [these men] out of the camps, and have them on the road from camp to camp, city to city.” So sex and gender nonconformity, then, figured in different ways across the bureaucracy, revealing a state that was not uniformly repressive, and where inter-agency conflict could, in fact, occur.

3) The need to think comparatively.

I think it is obvious that our historical understanding of queer citizenship and sexual regulation is greatly enhanced by a comparative analysis. There are many comparative questions to ask, but one of the most important is coming to terms with why the U.S. seems to be so different from other Western nations on these matters. We were virtually alone among Western democracies in carrying our sodomy laws into the 21st century, but the peculiarly homophobic nature of the U.S. government was apparent to observers even in the mid-twentieth century. Alfred Kinsey wrote about it in 1953. Not only was the United States “the only major power major power in the world that excluded homosexuals from its armed services and government employment,” the sociologist Donald Webster Cory wrote around the same time, but, Cory said, “the homosexual was the only individual who was punished
in this manner not only for any acts that may be indulged in but for [simply] harboring the desire to perform such activities.”

Now, I suspect APD’s emphasis on timing and on critical junctures may help resolve the puzzle that Kinsey and Cory posed about the fierce anti-homosexualism of the U.S. government. Homosexuality emerged in expert discourses only at the end of the 19th century (recall Foucault’s assertion about the emergence of the homosexual as a species during these years). Critically, then, the years in which scientific and popular awareness of the “homosexual” as a type exploded on the American continent were the years in which the federal government went from a fledgling to a full-service bureaucracy. That timing might explain why the American bureaucracy was so much more homophobic than its corollaries in Western Europe, where bureaucracies reached their modern form well before sexologists began talking and writing about homosexuality. Homosexuality was a novel concern in the years that the American bureaucracy took

“Homosexuality was a novel concern in the years that the American bureaucracy took shape. Is this why it was etched so deeply into our federal institutions?

4) The need to think about federalism

We need to think about both how America’s federal structure shapes the sexual citizenship we have here relative to other places, but also how our local, state, and federal governments may work together or at cross-purposes in policing sexuality. It is clear that federal regulation of homosexuality maps onto a more general pattern of growing federal involvement in social issues across the twentieth century. But federal officials did not simply assume tasks from their counterparts in state and local governments. Rather, they performed them in different ways. Whereas states and localities had mostly concerned themselves with policing homosexual behavior, it was the federal government that initially developed the tools to police homosexual status, the condition of being a homosexual person. It never did this in the abstract, but always as part of defining citizenship. “Who is a homosexual?” was the way the problem was phrased in immigration matters.

Even within a given agency, those who worked locally seem to have had a different response to that question than their counterparts in Washington. So while VA Headquarters, for example, mandated that soldiers discharged for homosexuality be excluded from the benefits of the 1944 G.I. Bill, local boards in charge of administering those benefits seemed reluctant to carry out the orders. This suggests the way that proximity may have mitigated homosexual exclusion—these were after all the sons (and more rarely the daughters) of these communities. Ironically, the entire reason VA benefits were administered locally was to enable Southern states to keep blacks out of veterans’ programs. So in thinking about federalism we will also want to think about how state policies pertaining to homosexuality are similar or different from state policies pertaining to race.

An APD-Perspective on Sexuality Politics in the United States, or Explaining the Schizophrenic Experience of the Contemporary Gay Citizens

By Stephen Engel

What would an APD–oriented assessment of sexuality politics in the United States, particularly one focused on the development, maintenance, and achievements of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and queer movements look like? Would it provide new insights into the history and capacities of these movements that have as yet gone unnoticed or under-theorized in the growing historical, political, and sociological coverage of sexuality politics?

At first glance, American Political Development (APD) approaches within political science connect naturally with the methods in existing historical and sociological evaluations of the LGBTQ movements. If APD’s central tenet is that “politics may be understood as shaped by time,” then APD clearly overlaps with much existing work in social movement studies from sociology. Yet, APD is not political history, and so its objective differs conceptually from detailing the historical development of the LGBT movements, which has been and continues to be admirably accomplished. So, how would a political development account of the LGBTQ movements proceed? What questions would it ask, and are those questions substantively distinct from what scholars have asked already?

Before addressing these questions, we must first assess the disheartening possibility that APD might not even be a fruitful approach for those interested in social movement and interest group politics. Take as a starting point Karen Orren and Stephen Skowronek’s description of what counts as a political development. When offering their non–teleological designation of a political development as a durable shift in governing authority, they also stipulate what does not constitute a political development: “The point is not to exclude . . . social movements. . . from their role in political development . . . it is to . . . identify changes and continuities in an ongoing organization of authority. Political development . . . is a historical variable to be registered against . . . the swirl of persons and movements bent on different outcomes.” For Orren and Skowronek, social movements are not in and of themselves political developments. Movements are the means to potential developments.

For a cultural and political movement like the LGBTQ movement, APD’s focus on durable shifts in governing institutions presents an incongruous perspective. Here the role of ideas as constitutive as opposed to epiphenomenal may be helpful since much the measurable change for the LGBTQ movements has occurred outside the purview of political institutions. And it is not clear that much has occurred (at the national level) that could be termed a durable shift in governance (and thus a political development) in favor of these rights.

But, that assessment cannot be quite right. My bookshelf holds many books on social movements that have appeared on college and graduate school APD syllabi. If movements as diverse as nineteenth–century populism, early twentieth–century labor, Christian–based conservatism, and black civil rights are all fruitfully analyzed through APD, then why should sexuality politics be any different? Rather, if a social movement is a process, a means to an end—the end being a durable shift in governing authority—then an APD approach to social movements asks a natural and important question. Has the movement achieved any of its objectives (and how do we know what these are?), and if so, how?

Put differently, APD’s core intellectual project, seeks to uncover whether, how, and with what effect durable shifts in governing authority have been achieved, and if they have not been achieved, why not. An APD scholar might ask whether any durable shift in how the
governance of people who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, or queer has occurred over time (for better or for worse), and how that change has occurred. This second part of the question—how has that change occurred?—holds the potential for pushing forward a new and different analysis of American LGBTQ politics precisely because it defines politics more broadly and in a discernibly distinct way from most other subfields within political science.

APD reorients the characterization of American politics from one defined by stability, stasis, equilibrium, or order to one defined by change, incongruity, and tension. The structure and processes of governance is comprised of multiple orders or “constellations of rules, practices, institutions, and ideas that hold together over time.” Any change to one such order fundamentally displaces and re-creates, but is usually not all encompassing. Such change leaves in place some pre-existing order and thereby provokes tension in the potential interaction of those institutions that are new and those already in place. Thus, the multiple orders that comprise a polity are potentially in tension. Efforts to resolve this tension, often conducted by political entrepreneurs, may produce durable shifts in governing authority.

Social movement theorists recognize the tension of multiple orders as spurring what they might call the “political opportunity structures,” which activists exploit to achieve their objectives. By introducing the concept of multiple orders, Orren and Skowronek have identified a source of opportunity that is internal or inherent to governance itself. Opportunity structures can be created by movement leaders themselves as they achieve some aims in one order, but leave other pre-existing orders in place; hence, policies generate politics as much as politics generates policies.

This perspective potentially improves on notions of path dependency in that many—though not all—rely on exogenous shocks to explain change; this shock disrupts and punctuates the path of history, provoking the possibility of a critical juncture and thus the creation of a new set of equilibrium paths on which to proceed. By contrast, the underlying framework that typifies APD, namely this notion of multiple orders existing in potential tension with one another or what Orren and Skowronek refer to as intercurrence, contains within it the seeds of change itself. The potential for change is inherent within the political structure if the existing tensions are artfully and strategically exploited by entrepreneurial politicians or other leaders.

This view of politics and political change raises questions when applied to the aims and accomplishments of advocates for gay and lesbian rights.

1. What multiple orders constitute sexuality politics (legal, health policy, employment, military, religious)?
2. Has any change in one order of authority relations occurred? If so how, and has that change created tension in other orders? And, related, if such tension exists, does it augur further change in the status of LGBTQ citizens?
3. What relevant entrepreneurs have spotted and exploited these tensions and what efforts have they made in resolving these incongruities? Which efforts have succeeded or failed, and why?
4. Has political development in Orren and Skowronek’s terms occurred within the realm of sexuality politics, particularly through the rights claims advanced by LGBTQ activists and their allies? If yes, what is it? If no, what has prevented it?

These questions suggest that sexuality politics is ripe for study from an APD perspective. Sexuality rests at the core of personal identity; yet, it has also been ruthlessly managed by public rules, customs, ideas, and institutions, a.k.a. orders. Changes have occurred within each of these orders, positioning them in conflict with others and thereby potentially exposing further tension and impetus for further socio-political change.

To put my claim concretely, I sketch brief answers to each of these questions. First, with regard to the
various orders linked to sexuality politics, note that sexual identity has been regulated by the legal system (consensual homosexual acts were criminalized in the United States until 2003, same-sex marriage is recognized by only 6 states [Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Iowa, and Maine]), by the medical field (homosexuality was considered a psychological disorder until 1973 and AIDS re-triggered the damaging culture frame of homosexuality as disease), by religion (open homosexuality is considered a sin in much non-reformed Judeo–Christian tradition), through employment practices (no federal employment non-discrimination act applies to sexual orientation or gender identity; eight states ban discrimination based on sexual orientation and thirteen states and the District of Columbia ban discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity), and by the military (the institutionalization of the closet occurred with the passage of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell in 1993). In other words, multiple orders of governance are implicated in the question of how sexuality politics has changed over the course of American history.

The APD scholar should recognize that the bundle of LGBTQ rights and social changes sought reflect discrete aims, each with correspondingly different groups operating on their behalf, each encountering different ranges of popular acceptance or approval, each demanding a different strategy that could trigger change in one or more but not all of the orders that are implicated in the governance of the gay citizen, and thus each with distinct degrees of achievement, obstruction, and outcome. Recent scholarship recognizes this. Variations on these rights track across state laws as well as public opinion—on the whole the public appears more accepting of lifting the military ban or ensuring nondiscriminatory policies in employment than in having the state provide for gay adoption or same-sex marriage.

Disaggregating the movements into the individual issues pursued and the various venues in which interest groups pursue them grounds a deeper interrogation. That kind of interaction may provide empirical evidence that tension among changing orders that regulate sexuality politics actually exists, and that achieving change on one order may have unanticipated effects on the dynamics of another related order. By disaggregating the movements’ objectives and achievements along these multiple orders, we see what the status of a durable shift in governing authority as regards sexual orientation and gender identity might look like. We have, in other words, isolated the state of political development on this issue from the gay citizen’s perspective. And that state is entirely schizophrenic.

Changes toward LGBTQ equality are undeniable: homosexuality is no longer viewed as a psychological disorder, the Supreme Court has defined homosexuality as an identity rather than an act—which could be construed a step towards rights recognition—and it has made clear that gays and lesbians cannot be discriminated against without rational basis. But certain long-sought changes have not occurred. The ban on gays and lesbians serving openly in the military remains in effect. Federal-level employment discrimination protections have not passed. And, while 2009 has born witness to an expansion of state-recognition of same-sex marriage, that recognition has come in states that do not have statutes or constitutional amendments already in place that prohibit such recognition. Thus, when considering the second question as to whether the multiple orders that regulate an individual’s politico–sexual identity are in tension, the answer is undeniably yes. In short, according to activist scholar Urvashi Vaid, “Despite the recent burst of media attention, the mainstreaming of homosexuals has not resulted in the marginalization of the prejudice we face.”

If Vaid’s assessment in 1995 is accurate, change since
then is undeniable. But this change has left the unequal status of gay and lesbian Americans all that much more pronounced. For an APD scholar, that tension should produce new politics. And who leads the charge for these new politics? Here, the role of the movement and policy entrepreneurs becomes critical. Change has been uneven, not only for structural reasons, but as part of deliberate as well as unanticipated and adaptive movement strategies to target different venues. The APD scholar should grapple with organizations' identifications of the core issues that define the movements and why. Has their organizational structure changed over time? Has their membership changed over time? Has their funding structure changed over time? If any of these changes have occurred, how might any of them influence how their message and tactics have changed over time? And, how do these groups interact with one another? Do they each occupy a niche, or are they competitive with one another, attempting to edge each other out in a competition for scarce resources?

The fourth and final question of whether a durable shift in authority governing sexual identity and politics has occurred has no clear answer. In a sense, one durable shift is obvious. Open homosexuals are no longer criminals for the mere fact of being openly homosexual. The change in legal status has profound ramifications. Yet, as far as other rights and markers of equality are concerned, a durable shift is in question. Marriage status, since it governs so much of the individual's relationship with the state, is a rich arena in which to assess the status of development. In those states that recognize same-sex marriage, the potential for a durable shift in citizen–state relations exists. In states where same-sex marriage is banned, the status quo is least susceptible to change. For states that have some other recognition, e.g., civil unions or domestic partnerships, the status of development is profoundly unclear. On the one hand, some change has occurred: gays and lesbians now have access to state rights, benefits, and responsibilities that could not be accessed before. On the other hand, civil unions maintain the traditional notion of marriage, creating a system that forces gay relationships within the political structure rather than altering it. This situation of “fit” may undermine the potential for more deeply rooted and profound political development that same-sex marriage could entail in the future.

The prospects for equal rights achievements at the federal level also appear mixed and somewhat unpredictable, suggesting that the state of the gay citizen may remain schizophrenic, with durable shifts in some orders of governance and stasis in others. This uncertainty is magnified by the wave of institutional entrenchment of discrimination through twenty-nine states' constitutional amendments banning same-sex marriage. This trend ensures that unless some states arduously overturn these amendments, a majority of states will never recognize gay marriage without federal intervention. At most there will be only about twenty-two. If policies are sticky and repealing constitutional bans is inherently more difficult then getting them passed in the first place, then the decline of the culture wars is not the hopeful sign it may at first appear to be for LGBTQ rights advocates. Beyond the marriage issue, while shifts in public opinion indicate the broader public's support for employment non-discrimination, freedom to serve openly in the military, and inheritance and partner benefits, disconnects between public opinion and public policy exist. The Democratic ascendance in Congress and the White House could herald opportunity—the trans-inclusive Employment Non-Discrimination Act was recently introduced in the Senate, and Senator Gillibrand of New York has advanced a moratorium on “Don't Ask, Don't Tell,” and Senate majority leader Reid wants to repeal it altogether. Changes in these orders highlight the incongruities and tensions with other orders—primarily relationship recognition—that remain. Yet a clear and forceful advocate of LGBTQ rights—on the scale of what LBJ ultimately served for civil rights in the mid-1960s—has not emerged.

The political status of the gay citizen exhibits schizophrenia. Many contradictory and incongruous elements and overlapping orders are in tension, but the structural situation appears ripe for what Orren and
Skowronek would consider to be a lasting and comprehensive political development. Still, the situation is less clear regarding the agents necessary to bring about that development. Institutional and entrepreneurial barriers to any durable shift in the authorities that govern the lives of LGBTQ citizens remain in place; yet, at the same time, some observers believe that the struggle for LGBTQ rights is nearing its end and inevitable success. In short, if government is a “matrix of authority relations” then those aspects of governance that regulate the sexual lives of American citizens are not currently in sync. They may not be to the extent that altering one order could alter the status of another and so–on such that no comprehensive equilibrium is achieved. That abstract point aside, the range of current outcomes on the array of LGBTQ rights struggles suggest that not only would an embrace of the methods and questions associated with APD facilitate a comprehensive account of sexuality politics in the United States, but also that the lexicon and objectives that characterize APD would be clarified and enriched by taking on sexuality politics as a serious area of deserved inquiry.
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Bringing Sexual Diversity In

By David Rayside

The modesty of scholarly attention to the politics of sexual diversity is still striking. To be sure, there has been impressive growth – in breadth and depth. The field of U.S. constitutional law and courts is one example, where much good work has been published. The issue of marriage has also received a fair bit of academic attention within the discipline, even if it took a long time for more than a handful of political scientists to recognize its political importance. There has been a long-standing corps of political theorists interested in sexuality, even if their work is rarely viewed as part of the theory mainstream.

In most fields, however, interest in the politics of sexual orientation and gender identity has been slight, even where the relevance is obvious. International Relations? Comparative Politics in general? The politics of Latin America, East Asia, South Asia, Africa – for that matter Canada – how much scholarly work has been aimed at exploring the changing politics of sexual difference in those settings? How much recognition has been given to the potential of using this as a lens through which we might learn about the deployment of “morality,” the role of religion in politics, the mobilization of democratizing interests from the margins, and the transmission of ideas across borders.

When work is published on sexual diversity, it is still often relegated to the lesbian/gay or gender section of the bookstores, to the occasional isolated section (very isolated) on sexuality in a course syllabus, or to interdisciplinary courses outside Political Science departments. This work is rarely integrated into the core of the discipline’s treatment of theory, of public policy, of electoral and partisan politics.

I have some particular perspectives on how we should bring sexuality in. I am a comparativist, and believe in the importance of comparison for
understanding politics in general, and the politics of individual countries – including the United States. American Americanists rarely take comparison seriously, either because they have enough to handle just understanding the complexity of their own setting, or because they believe in U.S. exceptionalism. When they do compare the U.S. to other settings, they sometimes pose questions that are too framed by American experience alone.

Deploying sexuality as a lens through which to explore American peculiarities as well as similarities to other systems has great untapped appeal. The risks of distorting the lens by grounding work too deeply in U.S. experience – for example by over-rating the comparative import of the marriage question or by underestimating the distinctiveness of the American congressional system in shaping activist formations – remain substantial. There is also a widespread tendency among Americanists engaged in the study of sexuality to over-generalize the political gains made by queer advocates in Europe and Canada.

Comparisons beyond the “west” must take even greater care in exporting U.S. models uncritically, and especially in assuming the applicability of a particular form of “identity” politics that is most fully evident in North America and parts of Europe. That hardly means rejecting completely the possibility or appropriateness of lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender identities outside the west, as some post-structuralist scholars argue, but it most certainly requires recognition of the importance that cultural, religious, and regional “settings” make in shaping sexual difference.

The other point I wish to emphasize is the importance of intersectionality. This gets lots of rhetorical attention, and many activist groups in the west and other regions have made serious efforts to diversify their appeals, their membership, and their leadership. Queer theorists have also addressed the urgency of recognizing the blurriness of boundaries and the cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, and class diversity among those who do not define themselves as heterosexual. But empirical political science has only scratched the surface. For reasons of indifference, lack of data, or fear of offending, most western scholars (in North America and Europe) avoid questions of racial difference when they talk of sexual diversity, or they avoid questions of sexuality when they talk about race.

In countries with substantial number of immigrants and/or significant ethno–racial minorities, how much serious scholarly attention has been paid to the play of sexual diversity within them, and to the relationships between “minority” queers and majority LGBT worlds? I mean serious attention – not simplistic and underexamined claims about the whiteness or middle–classedness of the queer world in the west.

Careful examination of points of intersection is becoming especially urgent because in parts of Western Europe there are increasingly strident political and media voices characterizing some minority groups as incapable of full integration to “western” values on the basis of supposedly conservative views of sexual diversity. You do not need many fingers to count the number of scholarly treatments of this kind of politics, and especially those that fully engage the complex realities that lie behind them. We need more analytical attention to the ways that sexual difference plays out in immigrant and marginalized communities, driven neither by marginalizing stereotypes nor by fear of giving offense.

In the process of bringing sexual diversity in, I would like to see more attempts to speak across theoretical categories. A good deal of the terrific work done under the aegis of queer theory or other post–structuralist frames operates in a world completely separate from the political science mainstream. There are in fact important lessons to be learned on the bridge that crosses between these separate intellectual worlds. Queer theoretical analysis is capable of asking difficult and important questions about what constitutes transformative change, and what doesn’t. Empirical social scientists (qualitative and
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quantitative, positivist or ethnographically non-positivist) can provide a corrective to some of the sweeping empirical claims that emerge from that theory.

There are also lessons that can be learned about the “west” from exciting new queer developments in the global south, and analytical questions posed in western scholarly networks that can be fruitfully posed elsewhere. The American case can be used to illuminate some aspects of queer-related development elsewhere, particularly with respect to race, immigrant, and social movement organization. The challenges to heteronormativity in other regions of the world can be used to illuminate both what is commonplace and particular about the American case.

David Rayside is Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto and past Director of the Bonham Centre for Sexual Diversity Studies.

FEATURE: The University of Toronto’s Bonham Centre for Sexual Diversity Studies

About the FEATURE column: In each issue, we hope to highlight an innovative professional institution that addresses sexuality and politics. Please contact the newsletter editor (Julie Novkov) if you would like your program, book series, institute or other institution to be discussed in a future edition of the newsletter.

By David Rayside and Brenda Cossman

The Mark S. Bonham Centre co–hosted a reception at the 2009 APSA meeting for members of the Section and the LGBT Caucus. Many who were there, and even more of those who could not be part of the event, know little about the Bonham Centre.

The Sexual Diversity Studies (SDS) undergraduate program was launched in 1998 as a Minor, and without any funding from the University of Toronto. This was a difficult time in Ontario, with the provincial government having recently cut all education spending. So from the beginning we needed to develop a fundraising plan – something quite rare for such ventures in Canada.

In subsequent years, as the program developed a Major and then a Specialist program (the first in Canada to do so), students flocked to us, and we regularly got reported on by the campus and off–campus media as one of the exciting new developments on this huge university campus (now about 60,000 students). The fact that the University of Toronto is widely perceived as relatively traditional and slow–changing made our growth that much more remarkable.

In fact, Toronto is a pretty ideal place for this kind of program. The city itself is pretty queer friendly, and the ethno–racial–religious diversity here has few if any parallels around the world. The research resources centred in the U of T library system are remarkable, and historical work on sexual diversity benefits from the close proximity of the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives (one of the largest such archives anywhere).

Our growth since those modest beginnings has been amazing. This year, we have 140 students...
registered in one or another of our undergraduate programs. We have over ten of our own courses about evenly balanced between the social sciences and humanities (including those on lesbian issues, trans issues, HIV/AIDS, politics, literature, legal regulation, Canadian queer culture, and of course theory). These attract many many non-SDS students.

A year and a half ago, we inaugurated a “collaborate” graduate program (M.A. and Ph.D.) – one which entails students being admitted to a “home” unit (Political Science, English, Medieval Studies, Criminology, Women’s Studies, etc.) and then signing on to our interdisciplinary program. In this short time, enrolment has grown to about 20 students. There are also about 30 academic units that are formally partnered with our graduate program – more than for any other of the many collaborative programs at the U of T.

In an external review conducted over a year ago, Paisley Currah argued that “SDS is among the finest undergrad sexuality programs in existence.” A survey conducted this year by SDS itself suggested that only two other research-intensive universities in the world have undergraduate programs on the scale of SDS, and only one or two others have a graduate program in our league.

We still face huge challenges, not unlike all other such programs. We are only at the baby stages in acquiring a stable faculty complement – a classic challenge for new interdisciplinary programs. There are about fifty faculty members across more than 25 disciplines and faculties across the University who have a significant research interest in sexual diversity. However, we do not yet have explicitly SDS appointments. We do have three faculty members whose teaching involvement in SDS is embedded in their appointments, and we are hoping in the next year or so to begin offering positions more formally–shared with other academic units. This is a slow process, and the financial times are not great, but SDS is widely seen within the University as a kind of model for energetic growth.

We are pitching for more internal resources, but the overall constraints on university funds will make growth on this front a continuing struggle. We have raised over $2 million in endowments (the largest single donation coming from Mark Bonham), but we will have to continue energetically pursuing more external support.

In November 2010, SDS will be hosting a networking conference co-sponsored by the Centre for Lesbian and Gay Studies at the City University of New York. This will bring together representatives from other sexuality centres and programs across Canada and the United States, to share ideas about how to expand, where to innovate, how to secure support, and ways to cooperate. CLAGS and SDS hope that this will lead to the formation of an ongoing North American research network, similar to the networks CLAGS has sponsored in other parts of the world. Paralleling this will be a workshop on workplace inclusiveness, bringing together academics, NGO representatives, and representatives of major employers across North America that have stood out for their LGBT inclusiveness.

David Rayside is Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto and past Director of the Bonham Centre. Brenda Cossman is Professor of Law at the University of Toronto and Director of the Bonham Centre.
Studying Identity in an APD Framework

By Priscilla Yamin

What role does identity play in American political development? And how should we study it? APD does not generally center identity in its endeavors. Some work by scholars such as Kevin Bruyneel, Victoria Hattam, Joe Lowndes, Eileen McDonagh, Carol Nackenoff, Julie Novkov, Gretchen Ritter, Rogers Smith, Rick Valelly and others do, but the work largely addresses the development of state institutions over time. One way to deal with this is to add identity as an area of study in APD. Another way is to understand APD methods of analysis as already identity-based.

Consider marriage politics as a case. Instead of asking how struggles over same-sex marriage relate to an APD framework, we might study marriage as an explicitly political institution itself. This approach overrides the dichotomy between institutions and identity, so that we can see how institutions and political orders are themselves cultural formations. In other words, understanding institutions as identity-based transcends the split between the study of culture, discourse and identity on the one hand and politics, order and institutions on the other. By seeing how marriage functions politically at critical junctures in American political development, I illustrate how sexual identity and sexual practices stabilize institutions and orders, particularly when questions of inclusion are at stake.

Focusing on sexual identity and gay citizenship expands American political development tools to include questions of culture, identity, language and the political meaning of social practices, as well as illustrating how sexuality and sexual identity matter in politics, for state-building and notions of citizenship. At the same time, an APD framework contributes to understanding identity by exploring the way institutions shape notions of identity categories, tracing the political deployment of identity and examining how sexual identity itself changes over time in relation to political imperatives.

This leads to my second point, which is that questions of sexual identity in the US have always been linked to other identity categories such as race, class, gender and nationality. We must look at the intersections when examining identity. An institutional framework offers a way to explore how identities emerge and intersect in institutions and change over time. Again using marriage politics as my example: As states across the country battle internally over same-sex marriage, often pitting constitutional referenda, courts, and legislatures against each other, academics and political actors grapple with the meaning of these institutional fights for the status of gays and lesbians.

Shifting the focus from the cultural contest over sexual identity to the political development of marriage itself reveals novel insights. Seen historically, the issues of same-sex marriage bear striking resemblance to prior contests over marriage, and demonstrate its central role in shaping the American polity. At critical moments of political change in the US, actors turn to marriage to resolve tensions and justify new political arrangements with regard to the political inclusion and social status of specific groups. These include ex-slaves, turn-of-the-century immigrants, poor mothers, and lesbians and gay men. In these moments, marriage itself has undergone intensive regulatory transformation as it temporarily stabilizes shifts that are perceived to threaten the “foundation of society” — to use a phrase that recurs with startling regularity across historic fights over marriage. One way to bring sexuality in is to analyze it in relation to the institutions and identities that help shape its political meaning and define it as a political status.

In my book, I approach marriage as a political institution similar to other formal governing institutions such as Congress or the presidency. As such, marriage circumscribes both the cultural meaning and concrete terms of citizenship.

Examining marriage as a political institution shows the significance of the status of sexual identity to notions of citizenship, order and belonging in US politics. I define marriage as a political institution along the lines laid out by Orren and Skowronek. Marriage establishes norms and rules, assigns roles to participants, sets boundaries marking those inside and outside the institution, and attempts to control those outside the institution as well as within it.
We can see Reconstruction as a founding moment for marriage politics in the United States by tracing the right/obligation tension in the institution as it pertained to struggles over black political inclusion in the decade following the Civil War. Here I compare anti-miscegenation jurisprudence to the newly gained right and federal encouragement of ex-slaves to marry. Reconstruction reconfigured the shape and scope of the American state. Freedmen’s Bureau agents, charged with the task of inculcating the former slaves with the precepts of American citizenship, imposed marital practices as part of “the duties and privileges of freedom.” For them, freedom and citizenship required heterosexual monogamy and patriarchal household where wives and children functioned as dependents. They expressed continual concern with what they saw as loose sexual and communal practices among ex-slaves. Such practices, if continued, would keep them unfit for freedom. These marriage policies were imposed during the same period that both southern and northern courts aggressively supported laws banning interracial marriage to protect and maintain “civilization.” While ex-slaves were being forced into one kind of marriage, they were legally prohibited from another. Comparing Freedmen’s Bureau practices to anti-miscegenation cases demonstrates how marriage both expanded and circumscribed black citizenship in the post-war era by controlling sexual practices.

Another example is the Progressive Era’s re-stabilization of national identity at a time of major social and political change – in this case nativist responses to the second great wave of immigration in the context of Progressive Era political imperatives. By the first decades of the twentieth century, judicial authority and nuptial privatism in marriage law had been partly displaced by a progressive notion of a “public interest” in marriage. In 1907, Congress passed the Marital Expatriation Act, which mandated that any American woman who married an alien immigrant lost her American citizenship. At the same time, nativist reformers, fearing that working-class immigrants would contaminate native racial stock, rallied for new regulations of marriage that prohibited certain...
marriages believed to threaten the integrity of the family and the nation. Consequently, state legislatures across the country passed a series of eugenic marriage laws that restricted who was eligible to participate in the institution of marriage. Meanwhile progressive nuptial reformers sought to standardize, regulate, and institutionalize marriage law. Taken together, these mobilizations of marriage established a progressive political order that included new immigrants politically and socially even while asserting new hierarchies that limited the scope of immigrant incorporation.

The 1960s inaugurated a crisis in American national identity, as questions of race, gender, and sexuality contested prior orderings of power. Marriage figured centrally as a symbol of civil rights victory in the Supreme Court’s striking down of anti-miscegenation law in the case Loving v. Virginia (1967). Marriage and sexual practices also became a controversial remedy for poverty and unrest in the black community for policymakers like Daniel Patrick Moynihan. And the emerging women’s movement contested marriage as a fundamental structure of patriarchal and heterosexual oppression. These interrelated challenges to national identity sparked in the 1960s congealed into “culture wars” in the 1990s. The right/obligation tension is again expressed through the Defense of Marriage and Welfare Reforms Acts, both passed in 1996: the statutes coercively regulate both mothers receiving state aid who allegedly refuse to marry on the one hand, and gays and lesbians who want to marry on the other. Both statutes were supported by an emergent Marriage Movement which portrayed both poor single mothers and same-sex couples as marriage offenders. These acts, I argue, were attempts to settle the social and political status of these two groups through sexual practices which had been opened up by the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s.

Finally consider the contemporary battles over same-sex marriage in relation to new forms of obligation rhetoric in regard to marriage – particularly in the Obama administration’s Fatherhood Initiative. Proposition 8 advocates, for instance, affirmed gay and lesbian social status in their political ads while drawing a bright line at marriage, arguing not against gay rights generally, but rather that the survival of the institution marriage required their continued exclusion from it. Obama, meanwhile, embodies the right/obligation dynamics of the post–sixties era himself by both opposing same-sex marriage and calling for marital responsibility, particularly in poor communities of color.

Marriage governs citizens and noncitizens by grounding inclusion (enforcing that the same heterosexual, monogamous expectations about family life apply to all) and defining the hierarchy of citizenship by exclusion (only particular people may marry). Illuminating the political contradictions of marriage forcefully reveals this paradox of citizenship. Marriage resolves cultural questions of national identity by determining new forms of political inclusion, exclusion, and social hierarchies. The cases sketched briefly here all elucidate the deep structure of marital and sexual politics in the United States. In each, a broad perception of a political and cultural crisis links to a crisis in marriage. The nature of the crises raises questions about the status of particular groups in relation to the nation. Repeatedly, marriage emerges as an important idiom through which to settle these questions.

I suggest that the control of sexual behavior and identity historically has been key to resolving broader political questions of citizenship, inclusion and belonging in American political development. Not all of these cases concerned gay or lesbian identity in particular, but they demonstrate that sexuality is critical in ways that are largely under-examined in political science, and within APD specifically.

Using APD tools in combination with identity theory, we can trace the mark of sexuality in US politics and institutions and see it as a critical factor in important moments in US history. In other words, sexual orientation and identity are social and political constructions imbued with power relations. Focusing on sexual identity can provide a way to understand how power is expressed and politics produced in American political institutions. In the process we can expand what we mean by a political institution.

Priscilla Yamin is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Oregon. Her book manuscript Nuptial Nation: Marriage and the Politics of Civic Membership in the US (tentative title), is under advance contract with University of Pennsylvania Press, American Governance: Politics, Policy and Public Law series.
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SECTION PAPER AWARD NOMINATIONS

The Best Conference Paper Award is given for the best paper exploring sexuality and politics presented at the previous year’s APSA Annual Meeting. Self-nominations are welcome, as are nominations from panel chairs and discussants. Membership in the Sexuality and Politics section is not a prerequisite. The deadline for submission is March 1, 2010. Nominated papers must be submitted to each Award Committee Member by March 1, 2010, either by mail or electronically as a .pdf attachment.

Award Committee Chair:
Alesha E. Doan, University of Kansas
adoan@ku.edu

Award Committee Members:
Mark Blasius, Graduate Center, City University of New York
mblasius@gc.cuny.edu

Steve Sanders, an associate with Mayer Brown in Chicago, represented Pottawattamie County, Iowa, in the oral argument of Pottawattamie County v. McGhee before the United States Supreme Court.

Rogers Smith (University of Pennsylvania) has been selected to deliver the 2010 Pi Sigma Alpha lecture at APSA.

Scott Barclay (University at Albany, SUNY) is serving as a program officer for the National Science Foundation’s Law and Social Sciences program for 2009–2011.

Stephen Engel is now an Assistant Professor at Marquette University.

Charles Gossett has taken a new position as Dean of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies at California State University, Sacramento.

Gregory B. Lewis (Georgia State University) and David W. Pitts (Georgia State University) were awarded the LGBT Caucus’s Bailey Prize for the best paper for their paper “Representation of Lesbians and Gay Men in Federal, State, and Local Bureaucracies.

Section Members’ News

Upcoming Conferences

Western Political Science Association
April 1–3, San Francisco

PANEL: Situating State Action in the Context of LGBT Politics
Paper presentations by Jeremiah Garretson, Elizabeth Cooper, Scott Barclay and Daniel Chomsky, and Susan Mezey. Chair Susan Mezey, Discussant Jonathan Parent.

PANEL: Revealing the Hidden in the Creation of Sexual Identity
Paper presentations by Jean Williams, Michael Fortner, Anna Ball, and Patrick Ireland. Chair Nancy Wadsworth.

PANEL: Retheorizing Sexuality
Paper presentations by Joshua Goldstein, Thomas Null, Christina Doonan, Joseph Fischel, and Ryan Reed.

PANEL: Lesbian and Gay Identity in Comparative Perspective
Paper presentations by Natasha Bingham, Runa Das, and Stacy Hunt. Chair Runa Das.
Upcoming Conferences

Midwest Political Science Association
April 22–25, Chicago

PANEL: Sexuality, Construction, and Representation
Paper presentations by Wilfred Reilly, Joseph Fischel, Shawn Schulenberg, and Ben Bishin and Tony Smith.
Chair Gordon Babst, Discussant Kenneth Sherrill.

PANEL: Progress and Backlash on LGBT Rights
Paper presentations by Laura Moyer and Matt Castello, Jessica Loyet Gracey, Christopher Burnett and William Salka, Edward McMillin, and Emily Gill.
Chair Phyllis Farley Rippey.

ROUNDTABLE: Robert Bailey’s Gay Politics, Urban Politics a Decade Later
Participation by Jason Pierceson, Cathy Cohen, Jeffrey Edwards, Kenneth Sherrill, and Susan Mezey.

PANEL: Sexuality, Gender, and American National Politics
Paper presentations by Elizabeth Sanders and Deondra Rose, Julie Novkov, Heather Yates, Richard Valelly.
Chair Robert Mickey, Discussant Pamela Brandwein.

CITE AS “SEXUALITY AND POLITICS NEWSLETTER, VOLUME 3, ISSUE 1”

This is the official newsletter of the Sexuality and Politics Section of the American Political Science Association. The newsletter is currently produced twice per year by the Sexuality and Politics Section. Back issues of the newsletter may be located on the website for the Sexuality and Politics Section; this website will eventually be housed on APSA’s server but is temporarily housed at http://www.albany.edu/~jn293713/sexpolitics.

All ideas for content and newsletter communications should be directed to Newsletter Editor Julie Novkov (Professor of Political Science and Women’s Studies, University at Albany, SUNY) at jnovkov@albany.edu.

SEXUALITY AND POLITICS GOVERNANCE

President: Ellen Ann Andersen, University of Vermont

Vice President and 2010 Program Chair: Paisley Currah, Brooklyn College, CUNY

Treasurer: Jason Pierceson, University of Illinois, Springfield

Membership Outreach: Gregory Lewis, Georgia State University

Executive Council:
Alesha E. Doan, University of Kansas (2008-2010)
Charles Anthony (Tony) Smith, University of California, Irvine (2008-2010)
Ryan Muncy Combs, University of Manchester (2009-2011)
Shawn Schulenberg, University of California, Riverside (2009-2011)