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Abstract

This intent of this thesis is to probe deep into hidden and rigid structures, which regulate gender and sexual minorities in the Canadian Forces. We will see the development of hegemonic military masculinity from its early stages in nation building to its current gender and sexual structures in a post-911 era.

My personal narrative experiences as a radicalised, sexual minority in the Canadian Forces provided me a point of departure in understanding the underlying lived experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, two-spirit, queer or questioning (LGBTQ) service members. In preparing this thesis current serving members, Defence offices, and leading academics were investigated, LGBTQ legislation and military policies were researched, and case study interviews were conducted in order to understand the key and underlining structures, which regulate gender and sexual identity in the Canadian Forces.
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For all of those who not only gave up their lives in service of Queen and Country, but also their pride. “Lest we forget.”
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Chapter 1: Theorising Sexuality

From the very first heartbeats in a mother’s womb the initial question that most expecting couples are asked is: “is it a boy, or is it a girl?” Thus the importance of assumed gender identity begins even before the onset of birth. The cultural understanding of gender and sex is perhaps one of the most important social regulators as it develops our gender and sexual order. A person’s gender continues to influence future interpersonal interactions from what colour to paint a child’s bedroom, to what toys they play with, how to walk and talk. Over the course of time their repetitive behaviour develops into a series of cognitive perceptions of relationships drawing some objects closer than others. In this chapter we will be tracing the steps of some of the world’s leading academics in sexuality deconstructing the regimes of knowledge and structures that regulate them. We will be using Sara Ahmed’s Queer Phenomenology in order to approach the matter of compulsory heterosexuality from a counter heteronormative approach looking at how heteronormativity is used as a means of power in Canadian military culture expressed in language, behaviour and sexuality. Lastly, we will revisit the matter of sexual identity by using another, less popular means of analysis on what I call homophobia theory by providing an alternative men’s perspective of why perceived notions of homophobia develop, how they can be misleading, and used as a tool to belittle and oppress good versions of hegemonic male culture. Only by understanding alternative theories on sexuality, how it intersects with formal and informal power structures, and how it is interpreted by cultural hegemony can we better understand the fluidity and continuum of gender and sexual identity.
Transgressing Heteronormative Sexuality: *Sciencia Sexualis* to Queer Phenomenology

The origins of sexual discourse can be found in the contributions from the shamans, priests, and priestesses of early civilization, to the theologians of Medieval Times to the modern day sociologists in an effort to try and understand what gender and sexuality are, how we embody them and how gendered bodies relate to one another. Alternative explanations as to why or how men could possibly love each other in the same manner as a man and a woman have opened up a new possibility of seeing love (or sexual attraction) outside the heterosexual bipolar narrative. With the medicalisation and psychiatric development of the ‘homosexual’ as a new category of research and analysis, scientists embarked on a mission to at least attempt to understand the Greek concept of *agape* love and sexual incarnation in male bodies. “While maintaining that the aim of love is sexual union, Freud argues that other loves, while diverted from this aim, share the same libidinal energy that pushes the subject toward the loved object.”¹ Though the onset of homosexual study mostly came from a perceived fear, confusion or medical curiosity, it did provide visibility and helped (through opposition) to contribute to the fostering of a political therefore legitimacy as a ‘people’, or identity. For the first time, homosexual attraction was beginning to be seen a natural, an alternative form of sexual expression. Freud provided the very beginnings of social sciences discourse on homosexuality in a more objective and scientific manner. That is to say homosexuality was beginning to be approached as something that was not necessarily malicious, sinful or an immoral form of temptation, but instead as a variance in the natural development of human beings. Freud’s

opening of sexual dialogue in pedagogy paved the way for authors to revisit sexuality from a post-structural perspective allowing for alternative approaches to gender and sexual studies.

**Foucault’s Sexual Analysis**

Foucault further developed post-structuralist discourse and analysis on sexuality and how it has been historically used as a tool for control and power. In his *History of Sexuality*, Foucault offered alternative analysis on the economic, political and scientific development of sexuality over the course of the last three centuries. What he highlighted was how the bourgeoisie, church and sciences that led to the construction of gender as a means of production and socio-political regulation used mechanisms. This heterosexual regime of knowledge has been deeply rooted in the knowledge of heterosexual identity, perspective, and interests which secures privilege and purpose by means of it’s own perceived gender order. As such we can see sexual identity developing as a political project and not necessarily one of personal choice. After all, no one ‘chooses’ to be different, unwanted, weird or strange right?

The attitude of the financial and political elite became “motivated by one basic concern: to ensure population to reproduce labour capacity, to perpetuate the form of social relation: in short, to constitute a sexuality that is economically useful and politically conservative”². We can see the progression of sex being used as a tool to control the masses dating back to the early Victorian Period where the bourgeoisie elite, the church and later scientific inquisition on sexuality developed psychiatry of something

---

they called the ‘homosexual’ subject. In Foucault’s chapter ‘Scientia Sexualis’ (or sexual science) brings us back to the psychiatric construction of the homosexual subject:

“The nineteenth century homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of 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. It was everywhere present in him: at the root of all his actions because it was their insidious and indefinitely active principle; written immodesty of his face and body because it was a secret that always gave itself away”.  

Sexuality as a social category has warped our understanding of sexuality from it being an unlabeled unregulated interaction to an absolute bipolaric practice of authors West and Zimmerman’s ‘doing gender’. Foucault’s analysis on sexual diversity required further development, in order to better explain why this development of a new type of human subject came about - an explanation as to why sexuality shifts and changes, a readjustment from the biological determinate to an investigation of environmental factors that engineer a personage. A new pedagogy was needed in order to understand the multiplicity of how human beings orient themselves to other bodies, and why this type of sexual ‘queerness’ to current standards has been regulated by hegemonic heteronormativity.

Adrienne Cecile Rich: Compulsory Heterosexuality

The impact of *scienza sexualis* on the analysis of same-sex relations has led to the bipolaric categorization of a fluid and ever-changing aspect of the human psyche. “The emergence of the term ‘sexual orientation’ coincides with the production of “the homosexual” as a type of person who “deviates” from what is neutral.”⁴ The application of the scientific method in psychiatry to the medical research of what a homosexual was became a means of targeting people who commit this ‘abomination’ to the ‘natural’ gender order and therefore became a threat to the nuclear family, state and church. The homosexual category ultimately became the “the expression of such desire as social and familial injury, or even as the misdirection of grief and loss.”⁵ It also represented an end to lineage, an end to patriarchy, unnatural within the perceived notions of genetic and social identity and biological reproduction. Since the medicalisation of the homosexual subject as an ill mentally unstable personage, the institutional influences of Judeo-Christian values incarnated that theory in the political jurisprudence on institutions and by default social values.

Academics such Adrienne Cecile Rich’s concept of ‘compulsory heterosexuality’ led scholars to further deconstruct the manner in which gender and sexual minorities are oppressed and controlled. Rich argues that:

“The cluster of forces within which women have been convinced that marriage and sexual orientation toward men are inevitable – even if unsatisfying or oppressive – components of their lives. The chastity belt; child marriage; erasure of lesbian

existence (except as erotic and perverse) in art, literature, film; idealization of heterosexual romance and marriage - these are some fairly obvious forms of compulsion, the first two exemplifying physical force, the second two control of consciousness.”

Compulsive heterosexuality therefore regulates gender roles vis-à-vis behaviour and intellectual manipulation as a result of the systematic and institutionalised heterosexual propaganda, replication and development of a compulsive heterosexual personage. In order to maintain this compulsive heterosexual gender order, collective efforts in protecting those values are exercised whenever possible.

“Labeling some men queer was a way of defining the limits of manliness. After queers were rejected from the club, those who remained – unmarked – qualified as candidates for the category of real man. Fags were not men; women were already not-men. Naming women fags would have had no meaning.”

This is why still to this day, no matter how socially progressive or politically correct a state is, the homosexual figure still continues to be seen as unstable and unwanted. Academics of the late ‘80’s and early ‘90’s were able to develop a counter normative Queer theory that offered alternative explanation of gender identity, sexuality, and how it related to all other structural forms of power and production, at last an alternative, counter-normative dialogue was brought forth. Queer Theory has since expanded into other disciplines such as politics, social work, psychology, sociology,

---


education and many other fields, which offered new perspective and insight on socio-political discourse

**Sara Ahmed: Perspectives on Sexuality (Queer Phenomenology)**

The HIV/AIDS scare of the 1980’s led to the ‘homosexual’ subject being thrust into the public spotlight allowing for social debates and inquisition of something that was still little understood in mainstream heteronormative culture and hidden under a thick layer of societal oppression and shame. By the early 1990’s social constructivists further expanded gender and sexual discourse. There was more to sexuality than its bipolaric cultural stereotypes of male, female, penetrator, penetrated, heterosexual or homosexual, ext. Gender and sexual identities were just as diverse in possibilities as that of possible embodiments and expressions in performance. The understanding of why ‘Queered’ bodies are perceived as strange or unwanted needed a more consolidated approach, one that used a more objective phenomenology that looked at how objects are pushed away or drawn closer. Queer Theorists such as Sarah Ahmed who drew on the School of Queer Theory, developed new tools for Queer analysis, one which offered a new multi-dimensional approach to understanding sexual and gender diversity, an alternative way of *knowing and being* instead of *being* and *knowing*.

**Heteronormative Phenomenology**

Using a ‘Queer Phenomenology’ to deconstruct the oppressive heteronormative social construction of the homosexual subject could reorient people into understanding how heterosexual experiences and dynamics are sculpted and reinforced by repetitive experiences of knowing and being. Therefore, “orientations shape what bodies do: it is not that the “object” causes desire, but that desiring certain objects other things follow,
given how the familial and the social are already arranged." What we can therefore see is that formal and informal forces push or pull bodies into particular orientations, which over the course of time sculpt an identity based on the repetition of the familiar. The fear of the unknown, experienced sexuality, compulsive heterosexual imagery, propaganda, education and regulation of gender order have resulted in what we now perceive to be heteronormative culture.

One’s heterosexuality is not simply a matter of self-perceived identity as what we currently see in Western heterosexual culture, but the result of complex, overlapping, regulators that reinforce a particular form of truth as to what one is and how one is to be directed towards other bodies. Ahmed’s ‘Queer Phenomenology’ shows us that “sexuality would not be seen as determined only by object choice, but as involving differences in one’s very relation to the world-that is, how one “faces” the world or is directed toward it.” If sexuality can be seen as how one “faces” the world, or how one is “directed toward it”, then we can deduct that it is not static but can change directions, shapes, and degrees over time. It can also inhabit different faces at different times. It can be seen, and experienced in different ways within the limits of human physical, emotional and intellectual expression.

Ahmed’s application of Queer Phenomenology has led her to question the very notion of heterosexual as ‘normal’.

“I have already contested this assumption by suggesting that compulsion toward heterosexual intimacy produces social and familial resemblance. We can question

---

the assumption that desire requires “signs” of difference, as something that each body must “have” in relation to “another.”

Even if we were to approach “Queerness” from a biological determinist perspective we see that science indicates the genetic and biological diversity of human beings in practice and development. The possibility of emotional, intellectual or physical attraction between the same sex would not be an outrageous or unnatural option given the two mainstream sexes: male and female. Since human being are self-determinate, free to make our own choices on how we wish to express ourselves, free to experience male and female bodies from various forms of wholesome human possibility, the social and formal compulsion towards our current practice of heterosexuality would undoubtedly be unnatural.

We can accept hearing that homosexuality could be seen as unnatural, but the very notion or theory which juxtapositions that perspective is seen as heresy or utterly fictitious. This indicates how heterosexual values are so deeply entrenched in the very fibres of society, where heterosexual power can regulate societal dimensions on what theories and perspectives are true and which ones are not. The reorientation of objects towards those of the same-sex offer us alternative human experiences equally as enriching, meaningful and of importance to that of opposite-sex relationships.

“The intimacy of contact shapes bodies as they orientate toward each other doing different kinds of work. In being oriented toward other women, lesbian desires also bring certain objects near, including sexual objects as well as other kinds of

---

objects, that might not have otherwise been reachable with the body horizon of the social.”

Sexual contact is not the only aspect of same-sex relationships; there is also a homosocial (same-sex platonic) component that introduces bodies to one another in other meaningful ways, which are not of a sexual nature. Though homosocial relations can be understood within heterosexual terms (not sexual), its practice in that context is limited in that there is a lower level of feeling and intimacy within the heteronormative homosocial, therefore is kept superficial and inauthentic to the full expression of the possibilities of the homosexual. For example, within the heteronormative Western gender order, if a male is upset he might receive a stern handshake, if he’s lucky, a half hug from his male friend. The very fact that a male has feelings requiring nurturing attention is perceived as ‘weak’, ‘womanlike’ or homosexual. If the need of expression is required because of overwhelming emotion, it can only performed by the only type of authorised forms of emotional expression between men consistent with the parameters of a heteronormative homosocial relationship. These cultural heteronormative parameters regulate and limit same-sex relations (both sexual, platonic and other forms of relation), as well as control identity (gender roles).

There is no doubt that humans are social animals requiring not only physical protection and support from their community but also emotional support. If we were to look at the homosocial within a heterosexual context, the prolonged embrace, or cuddling with another male friend is considered homosexual. Imagine the world we live in where the amount of seconds that a man embraces another man could indicate sexual

---

orientation. Despite the fact that there is no explicit sexual contact, the close proximity and expression of closeness and vulnerability is considered unacceptable or unwanted between heterosexually identified men, even if they perhaps might want, or indeed need or crave it themselves. A need to fulfill an emotional closeness to another man, much less fulfill a one time sexual ecstasy with another man is to become something completely alien, unwanted, perverse, and degrading. To desire male contact in any other way other than an aggressive manner (as we see in horseplay and contact sport) would just be considered ‘gay’. These rigid heterosexual frameworks oppress even its own, in order to maintain the illusion of heterosexual normality limiting the human spirit to know other forms of human experience even if there is no actual sexual contact at all.

Heteronormative arguments that there are boundaries as to what is sexual and what is not (such as that of an embrace or cuddling with another man) continue unquestioned and are reproduced in a wide variety of ways both socially and within formal institutions. Using Queer Phenomenology as a tool of analysis can explain a wide range of contentious sociological phenomena such as understanding how relationships and sexuality are practiced and perceived within social settings as well as more formal ones. What better example is there then by tackling what is perhaps perceived to be one of the most heterosexual institutions in Canada - the Canadian Forces (CF).

**Military Sexuality**

As we have seen earlier in this chapter, orientations are what directs us to objects, and how we perceive ourselves in relation to other objects. Looking into the microcosms of alpha-male culture and structures of the Canadian military is one way of assessing compulsory heterosexuality. Sociologists have become more and more apt at entering
into particular communities of study to research the narrative experiences of the objects of study; however this task has become substantially more challenging when communities are isolated and under totalitarian control. This is perhaps why the identity of being military has fascinated and intrigued people for over the millennia. The stories and legions of great warriors continue to resonate with people even after thousands of years. Regretfully, the stories and contributions of military homosexual and bisexual men over history have been strictly hidden, replaced or even reinvented for the self-delusion of current heteronormative society. Heteronormative history, especially its perception of military history has always silenced and marginalised the contributions and successes of great our great Queer heroes such as Achilles of Troy, Alexander the Great, Abraham Lincoln, Michelangelo, or even more contemporary national heroes such as Oliver Sipple the gay man who saved U.S. President Gerald Ford’s life after an assassination attempt, or Mark Bingham, a gay, all-American rugby player and successful businessmen who led the charge to bring down the plane meant to crash into a Capital building during the terrorist hijackings of 9/11. Men who have sex with men (MSM) have been constantly marginalised, and erased from visibly only allowing a heteronormative perception of the hero figure usually consisting of a white, alpha-male, masculine, muscular, heterosexual personage, a fictitious representation of an ideal figure. The very fact that there have been periods of time where MSM were not considered a transgression does indicate that in fact absolute attachment to the same-sex or both can be ‘normal’. Sexual attraction is the results of push and pull forces within one’s socio-cultural environment. In recognising the oppression of Queer heroes, we recognise the importance of the Queer subject in society instead of maintaining an inaccurate, incomplete recording of history.
Heteronormative Military Imagery

Military sexuality does of course share common similarities with that of the civilian population in that gender roles still continue to regulate function. The iconography of returning War Heroes at military bases throughout NATO serves as a celebration and confirmation of the success of the tribal protector returning home from glorious battle. We see the arrival of the broken and changed man, yet still able to maintain masculine composition, and the women who stayed at home with children, eagerly awaiting his return. We see the newsreels of women wiping their tears, running into the arms of the patriarch, children running into the arms of their father crying: “Daddy! Daddy!” This moving depiction is a celebration of the heteronormative nuclear military family and is the incarnation of compulsive heterosexual culture. In reality we know that ‘Private Johnny’ might have had a little too much fun on leave in Thailand that he does not want his wife to know about, and the good old ‘ball and chain’ might have been banging ‘Sgt Bloggans’ while her husband was on operations overseas. However like in the civilian world, we do not dare speak publically about how the notion of the institutionalised, monogamous, heterosexual, nuclear, childbearing couple might be an idealistic fantasy. If we look at heteronormativity from a Queered Marxist approach, hetero-nuclear families reproduce and maintain the future labourers of society. Therefore we can see why military heterosexuality is celebrated and depicted in all its historic glory in current services, benefits, media, policy, health service, family centres and community events. It continues to be the expected norm within military communities and bases across the country; that soldiers are overwhelmingly and should be, heterosexual. If they are Queer, then their identity and lifestyle should be kept away from the (heteronormative)
workplace. The Queer soldier undoubtedly still remains as a paradoxal figure in military communities.

**Homoeroticism in the Military**

In order to expose the social conservatism around sex in the Canadian military, we will deconstruct the linguistic, behavioural and erotic aspects of military sexuality from a Queered perspective. We can see the power that language plays in the formation and reproduction of heterosexual assumptions and social standard. By understanding the expression of heteronormativity in language, behaviour and spaces we can see how the formal and informal are able to regulate sexual expression.

**Language**

There is a longstanding development of an engendered linguistic morphology in the military where inanimate objects are feminized such as the usage of female pronoun in English referencing ships as “she” or “her”. Furthermore, other languages have reflected a more deeply rooted usage of gender in objects such as in the Romance languages’ uses of “le train” (masculine) or “la fountain” (feminine) - which could be interpreted as the masculine, loud, dirtiness of the train and the feminine, quite, beauty of the fountain. We can find military examples of a similar linguistic phenomena occurring consisting of the usage and deployment of military terms, names and phrases that even from within a military perspective can seem comical. The reason for this amusement would stem from the irony of military terms sounding homosexual. For example, the application of war could be understood within a sexual context in the interplay of domination and submission. Phrases such as “penetrating defenses”, “firing off rounds”, “cocking handle” are only a few of the professional terms used not only at work, but also used as
colloquialisms to express sexual matters. Sexualised sounding language used in a sexual matter within a professional environment is typical in the military; it paves the way and reinforces preconceived hegemonic heteronormative and misogynistic culture. For example “the Sgt is going to have his boot up my ass”. Here we see that a “boot” enables imagery quire similarly to P.N.P., kink, or fetish where the one who has the boot that symbolises military power, unwillingly plunges his black, leather boot into the orifice of another man deemed week or subordinate. At times this type of military language is interpreted by some feminists as “rape culture” when in fact it can be in relation to something that perhaps has absolutely nothing to do with rape or women, but can be seen as offensive. However, the idea of penetration is constantly in the minds of service members, where like women, the enemy is seen as weak, a threat and requiring domination.

In the Navy, ranks such as Seaman, Able Seaman, Leading Seaman, and Master Seaman are designations for rank, and if one day a member becomes really, really lucky, they can become a Coaxing. These terms do bring comedic relief as a result of erotic imagery that can drawn from internal insecurities or as a platform to even acknowledge the existence of homoeroticism but only as prescribed in a belittling and unwanted manner.

Inclusive/Exclusive Language

Though we have seen the promotion of inclusive language in civilian workplaces in the West; however it has not however, been able to substantially break through the compulsive heterosexual military culture. Inclusive language means using neutral terms in order to not assume sexuality or relationship status. This means using words such as
“partner” instead of “wife” or “husband”. It means calling one’s platoon “troops” instead of “boys”. It is asking a new work colleague “are you in a relationship with anyone”, instead of “do you have a girlfriend?” It means not promoting or showing distaste for any alternative gender or sexual minority as well as other forms of identities such as race, religion, culture, language, ability, ext. We can still incorporate inclusive language even within a hyper-masculine context such as a Sargent saying to his all-male infantry platoon “boys make sure you bring a rubber this weekend for the ladies you intent to court” to “troops, make sure you bring a rubber for those ladies and gentlemen you intent to court”. Using inclusive language in the workplace removes assumptions on intrinsically personal and intimate aspects of a co-worker, which can remove stigmas and stereotypes overall. It allows for the possibility of a paradigm shift change of attitude towards invisible minorities, which allow for a more empathetic, understanding and supportive interaction instead of a cultural policy based on tolerance alone.

**Behaviour**

The production of heteronormative behaviour and its entrenchment into military culture is undeniable. Repetitive language and topics of conversation develop into a linguistic cultural morphology of expression that reinforces individual and collective behaviour. People in positions of formal leadership and authority at any level in the CF, who only discuss and glorify only heterosexuality allow for the promotion of heterosexuality as an accepted, and wanted thing, something that war heroes, soldiers must be. This is how they ‘do’ gender in the military. Instructors who graphically discuss their sexual conquests over women, who talk about their wives and children openly and positively propagate heterosexuality not only as the norm, but as something that must be acquired -
an expectation for soldier-hood. The fact that cisgender male homosexual or bisexual instructors do not, or do not feel comfortable equally discussing their own sexual conquests over other men in the same manner would seem to indicate a double standard in military socio-cultural equity. Therefore it is important to understand the various aspects of exclusive and inclusive behaviour.

**Exclusive Behaviour**

Exclusive behaviour consists of the public and clear practice of heterosexual interests and the exclusion or distaste of Queerness whether formally or otherwise. It is any behaviour that overtly glorifies heterosexuality publically, openly, formally, redundantly, that depicts heterosexuality as the norm, implied, or the standard. Inclusive behaviour means being considerate of others through physical practices of interpersonal relations.

Exclusive behaviour is male course mates all going to the ‘rippers’ Friday night completely ignoring the fact that their gay male or heterosexual female course mates might not feel comfortable attending that social event which they would like to be included to build a sense of shared comradery.

**Inclusive Behaviour**

To have inclusive behaviour within a military context means being proactive in the efforts of ensuring that LGBT service members can feel as if they are part of the team, normalising Queerness and placing it on equal terms with heterosexuality. Such efforts can range from heterosexuals showing a positive interest in meeting the same-sex partner of a peer service member, going for a beer at the local gay bar with one’s platoon mates before hitting a heterosexual bar or standing up against homophobic attitudes and behaviour in the workplace. Inclusive behaviour brings heterosexual and homosexual
subjects into a more enriching and more trusting relationship ideal for the development of 
Espirit de Corps, teamwork and comradery. There is no doubt that much can be done by 
heterosexually identified service members to ensure that gender and sexual minorities are 
visibilised, celebrated and valued in the same manner as heterosexuals within a military 
masculine culture.

Homoerotic Military Spaces

The imagery conjured up of the cissgender heterosexual male body as being fit, muscular, 
and full of sexual vigour, does play a role in the erotic expression of military sexuality. 
We have already seen the bipolaric usage of engendered and sexualised language and 
behaviour, which can negatively impact gender and sexual minorities as well as other 
minorities in the military. We can also see how military spaces are queered by forcefully 
uncovering male sexual vulnerability for other men to see. The lack of privacy and 
forceful confinement encourage comradery, emotional integratedness, and mutual 
support. Being ‘on course’, in the ‘shacks’ and ‘on ops’ are not only some of the most 
important periods in a soldier’s or officer’s career but also it is a time where members are 
the most sexually charged. This military restriction on movement results in service 
members knowing their peers quite well, learning their strengths, vulnerabilities, 
interests, behaviour, tendencies, ext. Despite of a sense of closeness that service members 
share, homosexual acts or relationships are avoided. Regardless of sexual identity, all 
service members endure moments of much needed sexual release, which occur in toilets, 
showers, porto-potties, cots, and bunk beds across the military.

Despite of eating, showering, sleeping, working and spending social time with 
one’s military peers, sex is the one thing that is not shared between male soldiers except
while sexually demeaning women in threesomes for example. Male service members can share the same women; however they could never share themselves which each other despite of emotional, intellectual and physical attractiveness and closeness to their male friends. Erotic spaces show us where, when and how sexuality is regulated in the military. There are three main erotic spaces where sex occurs on Canadian Forces bases around the country: the toilet, bunk, and the shower.

**The Shower**

For starters, there are the obvious open showers, which are the key portal to the world of homoeroticism. There is no escaping it, fit, young, boisterous men, wet and naked, their vulnerability exposed for all to see. It is common for these showering soldiers to sneak in glares and peaks when they think no one is looking. Other times these men’s penises noticeably become excited at which point in time the aroused male tried to hid it, and others pretend as if they did not notice. Homosexual men in the military are not easily aroused in a shower setting in that they have access to men by virtue of their self-accepted sexual identity as well as understand the social ramifications of looking at peers naked in the shower especially if they are openly gay.

**The Toilet**

As we already know, washrooms have traditionally been a homoerotic space within civilian gay culture. Likewise, it is quite commonplace that male service members masturbate on the toilet. At times men can be seen with a porno magazine entering a toilet stall, other times spots of wet ejaculate can be noticed in the cubical floor, other times I myself have found young men panting, and shaking as they masturbated in the
stall next to me. I can even recall one time in Wainwright Alberta, a male medic colleague of mine and I found a service member naked, passed-out drunk with a blanket and porno magazine in a toilet stall. We tried to wake him up, yelling at him, even throwing toilet paper roles at him to wake up. After splashing some water on his face, he woke up and we took him back to his bunk to sleep. This situation stuck with me, it made me think about the degree of alcohol abuse this man had endured that night, and how sexually charged and alone he must have felt; even being in an environment with other sexually charged men we see how compulsory heterosexuality was the only thing that informally regulated and restricted this service member from being sexually intimate with another male. Other times a male heterosexually identified service member gives in and practice situational homosexuality.

The Bunk

At nighttime, when the lights go off and the first snorers begin their nightly symphony, we can sometimes see a pitch tent going up and down. Indeed, heterosexually identified military men are thrust into homoerotic spaces whether they enjoy it or not. When 23:00 hours comes around and forced sleep is enforced in the barracks, it is commonplace to notice at times young men masturbating before sleep. You can see grey woollen sheets peaking bopping up and down. Masturbation in the bunk is a typical and commonly known occurrence in shared accommodations, such as the barracks, in modular tents and even while in sleeping bag in the field.

What we can gather by reviewing these homoerotic spaces is that military heterosexuals are undoubtedly exposed to homoerotic situations. Despite the professional and personal trust, support, and closeness those heterosexual service members enjoy, the
exposure of their sexual vulnerabilities to others, or having those needs fulfilled by other men is culturally forbidden. To dismiss this as them simply being heterosexual is not sufficient, the homoeroticism is inescapable and well known by male service members. We need to probe into why that despite the homoerotic nature of the military, the emotional, social and professional cohesiveness and ‘brotherly love’ that heterosexual service members have for their peers, why is the expression erotic agape love restricted between men, but encouraged and practiced with military (and civilian) women. This could be understood as simply another manner in which informal military culture has the power to regulate even the most emotionally bonded, sexually charged of men, in an all-male environments. It shows that legislation and policy are not the only way that sexuality can be regulated, that there is a heterosexual view of what is considered to be homoerotic, how it is to be interpreted, and what to do about it - a form of heteronormative military oppression of bisexual and homosexual identity.

**Heterosexism: as a Political Project of Power**

Understanding how sexuality intersects militarism requires an understanding of the key epistemological origins of the praxis of contemporary heteronormativity. Compulsory heterosexuality or ‘heterosexism’ as some call it, is a vital component of the sustenance of military culture and structure. Heterosexism is the idea that “leads people to assume that everyone around them is heterosexual until proven otherwise.”12 This assumption is extremely problematic and continues to be a common variable in homophobia studies. For heteronormative people, the assumption that everyone is heterosexual and that it is natural to assume as such sabotages the visibility and recognition of gender and sexual
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minorities. To make matters worse, when sexual and gender minorities grieve their mistreatment within legislative, policy or social structures they are demonised as trying to sell ‘gay propaganda’ (such as the case in Russia with their anti-gay propaganda law of 2013), and are seen as an administrative or social burden.

Heterosexism is awarded hegemony in that it is a “multilayered system by which dominant groups achieves power not through coercion but through the production of an interlocking systems of ideas which persuades people of the rightness of any given set of often contradictory ideas”\(^{13}\). As such, we can see heterosexuality as a political project by which this paradigm is deeply rooted; in a complex series of interconnecting and self replicating premises and reinforcements which inarguably maintains a certain level of censorship and control over sexual and gender identities.

**Homophobia**

Understanding perspectives on homophobia are impetrateive in order to understand military culture. Homophobia can be understood as the irrational (or rational) fear of men who are attracted to the same-sex. Therefore, in order for someone to be considered homophobic they must have a disdain for something involving a homosexual act. What appears to be occurring in society is that men, who are seen, identified or self-identified as being homosexual, might happen to have an effeminate demeanour. It is at this point where homophobia and effemiphobia are blurred and misunderstandings can occur. It leads to heteronormative men understanding most (if not all) homosexuals as effeminate bodies, which leads to them being fearful, suspicious and anxious.

Another misconception about homophobia is found in the deployment of heteronormative language. When we look at the intersection of homophobia and language we encounter an interesting phenomenon where expression and perception become dyslectic in the understanding and use of the same word (or behaviour). “Homophobic insults should be conceptualized, at least implicitly, ‘in terms of gender as opposed to sexuality’ (P.149, my italics), and that they therefore imply being “nonmasculine” and “effeminate” rather than homosexual”\(^{14}\). This hegemonic masculine usage of homophobic language is a form of expression (though there are more articulate and politically correct ways of expressing that difference) and is meant to singularly belittle effeminacy in men as opposed to the act of homosexuality. “In fact, the word gay is probably the most common word of abuse and is used to describe anything from not very good to absolute rubbish”\(^{15}\). Therefore we need to understand the ontology of the word in its deployment by heterosexuals and why they may have a misconception of homosexual men.

Correlating homophobic language (centred on the failure of men to uphold masculine traits) as hatred of effeminacy and by extension women is an inaccurate interpretation by many radical feminist and Queer Theorists. The ‘hatred’ is not meant to dislike women, but specifically men who exhibit, celebrate or radically perform effeminate behaviour. This seems to also be convoluted with the historical oppression and victimization of Queer bodies and is only further reinforced by feminists who share a similar history of oppression and mistreatment. We must not conflate the two (being a woman and being an
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effeminate homosexual) as the same experience, as the two are quite separate and distinct from each other and are different facets of the human condition. Though there are superficial and psychological similarities between men and women, the sex of the subject (male/female) becomes crucial in their gender performance and by extension its interplay with hegemonic masculinity. It is these interplays that require more analysis.

Instead of taking homophobia for at value, a more in-depth and more inclusive approach at deconstructing its origins would provide us further insight as to why some homosexuals and heterosexuals have such paranoid perspectives toward many effeminate homo/bisexuals. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick looked at other ways of touching, feeling, and knowing and points to ‘paranoid theories’ as an alternative tool for understanding subjectivity in the social sciences. She states, “it seems to me a great loss when paranoid inquiry comes to seem entirely coextensive with critical theoretical inquiry rather than being viewed as one kind of cognitive/affective theoretical practice among other, alternative kinds.” Feminist and Queer Theorists often critically attempt to explain the origins and ramifications of masculinity instead of probing into the perspective of the masculine for analysis.

**Effemiphobia**

To be male and to conduct and deport oneself as the polaric opposite of that hegemonic masculine identity can be troublesome for men ‘gay’ and ‘straight’ alike. Taking into consideration the socio-political progress over the past decades in approaching the matter of sexuality, we see that there has been a positive shift in attitudes and perspectives in hegemonic Western male society. We now see that men do not

---

necessarily feel that to be masculine one must be heterosexual, but the Queer subject can
embody other aspects of masculine capital in order to be considered ‘masculine’. It is
when men, regardless of sexual orientation, embody female behaviour and characteristics
that can become troublesome for many men. “Hirschfield argued that renouncing
masculinity did not necessarily involve homosexuality: one has to extend the sentence
‘not all homosexuals are effeminate’ to include ‘and not all effeminate men are
homosexual””17. Hirschfield provides a clear perspective on the intersection of
effeminacy and masculinity. It is the level of collective masculine capital that assigns a
particular masculine status. This status is not only privileged to men, but also any person
who dawns on, or deploys masculine attributes. By ‘masculine capital’ I mean the
successful acquisition of values and demeanour that within a Western context have been
traditionally understood as masculine. Effemiphobia can often be interpreted as
homophobia (as many people do not draw a distinction between the two) and whether or
not it is homophobia versus that of effemiphobia can have starkly negative consequences.

Alpha-males are understood to be the epitome and focal point from which
hegemonic masculinity radiates from. It would be logical to reopen discourse with these
men (such as construction workers, military personnel, frat boys, athletes, etc.) to ask,
“what’s the beef” (to use a colloquial term) with ‘gay’ people. What we see is that “the
beef” is not in fact against homosexual/bisexuals so to speak, it is against those men who
viciously and vicariously indulge in the paradoxal gender performance that goes contrary
to dominant notions of mainstream masculinity. The current trend in homophobia is not
necessarily found in homosexual acts per se, but the flaunting of perceived unauthentic

effeminacy in men that hegemonic masculinity inherently rejects. To masculine men, behaving effeminately is understood as a ‘flaunting’. Academic Brian Pronger interviewed a man who saw “[effeminacy as] the negative image in terms of something not to be - if you’ve got to be gay, then don’t be like that.” It is this type of performance that upsets many men ‘gay’ and ‘straight’ alike.

We can see that homonormativity plays into this effeminate gender performance by reinforcing and celebrating these oppositional forms of masculinity by utilizing female behaviour and language.

“Flagrant effeminate behaviour by men is commonly taken as a sign of homosexuality. Frequently, when men want to call attention to the gayness of a situation they will use effeminate signs, such as a lisp, swish, limp wrist, reference to “ladies” clothes or jewellery – “darling, where are my pearls?” – or the use of feminine names, pronouns, and habits in reference to gay men: “Oh Eunice! Who does her hair?” It used to be common that when a young man came out, he would be given a feminine pseudonym”.

It is this extreme female performance that too many men (both gay and straight) find embarrassing, ridiculous and even offensive, not necessarily because it is a stereotype of the true Queer self necessarily, but the degree and to the extent it has been taken as an affront to hegemonic masculinity. Too many masculine ‘gay’ and bisexual men find this effeminate performance to be troublesome. Queer masculine men find it quite challenging to find a place within society to fit in when caught in-between these
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two worlds of the traditional and the Queer. In his study Brian Pronger’s participant stated:

“The only thing I still don’t like about [being gay] is the public attitude toward it. And think a lot of gays bring it on themselves; the so-called obvious gays give the rest of us a bad name, if you want to put it that way. It’s how I look at it and it’s not fair. If I were straight I would look at a stereotype and say, yes, that’s gay because they are the ones that are visible, that walk around not being masculine, really being feminine, as far as I’m concerned…. The stereotypes are exactly what I see in the bars. I don’t want to be associated with it.”

This man clearly articulated that his identity as a Queer male is separate from that of the effeminate Queer. He feels that this form of Queer gender performance has become cultural, not truly representative of Queer men overall and only propagating negative stereotypes. As a result of the gender performance of effeminate queer men, and perhaps their successful visibility in mainstream gay culture and overall society, they have appeared to have monopolized what ‘gay’ identity is, and entrenched itself as counter-normative. When Queer subjects whom self-identify as masculine enter into a place of limbo where they feel ‘too gay to be straight’ and ‘too straight to be gay’. Another cissgender male Queer Pronger interviewed said:

“My image of gay people were the stereotype, the gay person who is very effeminate and very obvious. I remember sometimes riding on the bus and watching men who lisped when they talked or were very flamboyant and I thought, ‘That’s not me. That’s not the image I have of myself.…’ So I rejected the images that I
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saw, [that] offended and threatened [me]. Effeminate men threatened me, not to point where I would be abusive to them, but where I would ignore them. There was part of me too that was angry at them because this is where people are getting the image of what we’re like and we’re not”21.

Though perhaps there is a sliver of difference between anger and hate, these men’s feelings need to be recognized as being authentic, personally legitimate and an expression of their narrative experiences which deserve to be equally heard and not simply dismissed as being ‘homophobic’ or as ‘self-hating Queers’. Though his sexual attraction to men is a part of who he is, he feels that there is no need for such a radical display of perceived inauthentic effeminate performance that so many gay men indulge in. This form of extreme effeminate performance is equally as damaging as the usage of ‘bad male masculinities’ (abusive aggression, hostility, bullying, swearing, spitting in public, etc.).

In José Esteban Muñoz ‘Cursing Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity’

“Bollen notes but does not delve into the femmephobia apparent on many queer dance floors, where those who break the gay-clone edict to act like a man are de-eroticized and demoted to second-class citizenship”22. This is because the eroticization of men by the homo/bisexual subject is an attraction to particular physiological, emotional or psychological aspects that build a type of identity that are consistent with Western hegemonic male demeanour and deportment. We can see the eroticisation of male bodies in pornography such as fetishes where the alpha male is the Sergeant disciplining the

subordinate, demonstrating his masculine power over the sexual object, or the leather
daddy who cuffs, binds and spanks the objectified subject. It is the play of power and
search for it that eroticises popular male attraction. This is not so say that there are people
who do not find hyper-effeminate males attractive; however this does not appear to be the
overwhelming case.

A factor as to why men are attributed as being more ‘homophobic’ has to do with
a juxtapositioning of male identity with effeminate Queer male identity. “Similarly,
homosexuality is feared, particularly by men, because they think that it will make them
more like women”\(^{23}\). What we can gather is that distaste for Queer men has more to do
with the embodiment of female attributes as opposed to the act of homosexuality itself as
well as illuminating the power of gender norms and the risks of transgressing them.
Furthermore, to counter argue the feminist perspective, in particular the negative
association of the effeminacy in women, does not have to do with men seeing women, or
female characteristics as a pejorative or an unwanted thing (in fact they may be attracted
to it if corresponds with the heteronormative embodiment of the female subject). It has
more to do with the confusion, or annoyance of men purposefully and radically rejecting
their own perceived understanding of authentic male identity culturally determined by
gender portrayal. A similar phenomenon occurs when women embody male
characteristics or attributes such as the ‘Tom-boy’ as a failure to adhere to feminine
capital and pursuit of male capital.

The current status of gay culture in metropolitan cities also needs to be examined.

\(^{23}\) Sterba, James P., “Does Feminism Discriminate Against Men?” in Warren Ferrell’s “Does Feminism
temperament probably plays a major role. Social settings, or course, can make an enormous difference.”

It is these spaces, which encourage particular types of performances as a means of acquiring capital either within heteronormative or homonormative environments. It is also the manner in which Queer identities are deployed and more so, the performance of hyper-effeminacy in Queer men which has resulted in the homogenization of Queer identities leaving the desired masculine man on the periphery of Queer culture as an object of desire, but at the same time as an object of a Queer failure of achieving normative masculine identity. I argue from a new masculinities perspective, the current cultural form of homonormativity seems to stimulate what we now understand to be effemiphobia. There needs to be a clear acknowledgement of this dynamic by both heteronormative and homonormative men alike; sex with men does not mean one is effeminate, nor does Queer identity mean anti-normative in its wholeness. “As Bersani makes clear, sexual acts cannot guarantee any particular political stance, progressive or conservative; it is off that we want to continue to connect gay sex, wherever we may find it, to political radicalism”.

It is when society breaks this connection between gay sex and effeminacy that stereotypes and perhaps even effemiphobia itself might be understood as an issue of a chaotic past.

Being drawn to others of similar values, perspectives, interests, demeanour and culture is not only typical of hegemonic masculinity but can be found in virtually every other area of society such as: clubs, sports teams, hobbies, community groups, education, political affiliations, family, the workplace, places of worship, or any other forum where people with similar commonalities congregate. Hegemonic masculinity works much in
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the same way as does hegemonic homonormativity. We need to turn to men to critically assess what aspects of masculinity are negative, hurtful and damaging to men as well as women and empower men to challenge previously held assumptions and behaviour consistent with *bad* masculinities.
Chapter: 2 Military Masculinities

What is masculinity?

A strong correlation exists between concepts of gender identity and sexuality: where we have one, we almost always have the other. We cannot divorce ourselves from the historical rigidity of gender roles, which have been present over the course of modern history. It is in this rigidity, this compulsive heterosexual drive towards ensuring that men and women behave according to their gender roles that continues to plague the military gender system. People’s thoughts, actions and even their own very feelings are regulated into what is socially acceptable and what is not. “The gender-role system is the root of our oppression… We are taught there are certain attributes that are ‘feminine’ and others that are masculine’. To deviate away from these embodied identities would surely be considered hearsay in that it would be a violation of the social expectation of heterosexuality. To be anti-normative in gender portrayal and contravene the expectation of ‘straightness’ could therefore be perceived as a threat to the gendered order of things. Regretfully, regressive styles of Western masculinity continue to be the epicenter, which regulate the interpersonal interactions between the sexes. In fact, “nothing is inherently masculine or feminine; rather, masculinity and femininity are dependent on cultural conventions. The masculine and feminine construction of gender varies not only from culture to culture, but also from group within a culture and from person to person within a group. The signs of gender are profoundly influenced by other cultural factors such as class and ethnicity.”

come to realize that gender norms are not a core part of the individual but rather are a
reflection of environmental, cultural and social factors and should be interpreted as such.
That is to say that if we know what perceived notions of masculinity are (at least to a
particular segment of a society) and that it differs from culture, to culture; then we can
deduce that masculinity is in fact real but they differ from person to person and culture to.
It develops depending on a wide verity of influences such as technology, politics, and
religion. However nothing more has shaped the sphere of masculine identities than that of
the soldier figure.

**Military Masculinities**

Anthropological and historical analysis has shown us that men have always been used for
the purposes of war. We can trace the roots of this back to the first hunting and gathering
people where the reason for this division of responsibilities came from the constant threat
of war. Women (being the only human bearers of children) did not only assume the
responsibility of child rearing to maintain patriarchal lineage but did so for the survival
and sustenance of the tribe. Men were seen as disposable in the obligation to provide
security and protection of their communities, which meant above all the protection of
women and children. As a result of developments in technology, culture and politics,
women are now better able and have the free choice of choosing military service, child
rearing or both. Regardless of gender, all service members subscribe to the concept of
‘unlimited reliability’ when they sign on the dotted line. This consists of the total
submission to Chain of Command even it means giving up one’s luxuries, freedom of
movement, and even one’s very own life for service. “When everyone else runs from
disaster, these women and men enter the fray. While the rest of us are grabbing the
silverware, they are heading contrary to their natural instincts, into the conflict zone. They don’t limit their exposure to risk. They face losing their lives as part of their jobs. They face unlimited liability.”

Thus we see the development of the concept of the soldier figure, noble, honourable, loyal, powerful, a figure that plays with the very notions of life and death. However in order to maintain unity and collective direction, soldiers and officers must be developed and sculpted into becoming these heroic soldier figures that we see in the news and past historical accounts.

Over the centuries, militaries have used the cultural values of communities to rally men together to subscribe to a particular type of identity; one that clarified what they were, and what they were not. The establishment of a military ethos and application within the training system has become the very core of the identity development processes. What we see is that “most militaries promote a particular kind of masculinity, one premised on violence and aggression, institutional unity and hierarchy, ‘aggressive heterosexism and homophobia,’ as well as misogyny and racism.” In other words, what we see is the promotion of what soldiers are: tough, aggressive and united and what they were not: women, unpatriotic, or homosexual. Despite of the growing political and cultural recognition of equality for women and LGBT people in Western counties, the sheer power and dominance of a masculine culture has camouflaged its hateful façade by using formal and informal means to ensure that a particular type of discipline is maintained; one that by nature demands likeness and destroys difference. The manner in which this kind of masculine discipline is manifested is found in the trajectory of a state’s cultural, political and historical origins.

Canadian Military Masculinities (The Concept of the Soldier)

Living in metropolitan urban areas whether they are cities such as Vancouver, Calgary, Toronto, Montreal, or Halifax, we can see the abundance of diversity amongst the people that we encounter from coast, to coast, to coast. The perception of Canadian society as being diverse and multiculturalism has become mainstream and has garnered international recognition; however what we do not notice is the visibility of the invisible: those who belong to LGBT people. Therefore, since the Canadian Forces is undoubtedly a reflection of Canadian society, which includes invisible minorities, the matter of LGBT service members continues to be equally as invisibilised. The danger lays when the cultural and structural nature of an institution (such as the military) is defined by what is and what it is not: another nationality or weak (in other words female or homosexual) because it would disrupt the self-perceived notions of soldierhood. Therefore, going back to the roots of such compulsory concepts of identity would provide some insight of Canadian military masculinities.

Militarism in the Canadian Colonial Period

Since the arrival of the very first French and British settlers to Canada and encounters with its First Nations People, a new epoch began towards the construction of a new Canadian identity; an epoch culminating on multiculturalism and diversity. Confederation brought new opportunities in state building deeply rooted in the notions of freedom, equality and democracy. Canada’s vast terrain and extreme cold provided challenges for the First Nations People and first European settlers who boldly ventured into the exotic lands of the New World. Living in this new world was a challenge, a place where strange new wild animals never before seen reigned in an immense expanse
ranging from brush forest, rocky shores, mountains and artic tundra. *Les Voyagers* would be some of the first European setters who would portage from river to river trading exotic furs, tobacco and other staples to export to the new world. During this time we conger up images of a ruthless land, where lawlessness, wild animals, disease, and the constant threat of attack were the norm. The idea of ‘home’ was based on the self-determination of constructing houses, roads, farms, and other means for survival. From the cowboy of the Prairies, to the bearded and plaid shirt wearing lumberjacks of Quebec, to the fisherman of the Maritime provinces developed its own version of masculinity: one premised on strength, endurance but also ability to work with others.

The expansion of European settlers and ever increasing trade markets meant a demand for regulation and control of these new lucrative resources, economies and territories. It required the formulation of rule of law by government. The alliances of regional players resulted in the conscription of these frontiersmen into militias: usually consisting of a collection of poorly trained, unequipped men with little to no discipline. A frontier meant a new way of doing things including warfare. First Nations war strategies such as ambushes were used as opposed to traditional out in the open European styles of battle. British forces on the other had, received formal training, were paid, clothed fed and abided by a strict code of conduct vis-à-vis Chain of Command. Soldiers had to comply by rigid and mortal forms of punishment in order to maintain service discipline within at times dangerous and hostile environments.

The expectation of the soldier figure continued to cultivate into the New World in the same manner as in the Old World developing into the homogenization of a national soldier identity. The obligation of military service became the social expectation and
responsibility of men. Their primary objective was their duty to serve, which meant to do as their superiors told them to do. Men did not have the freedom to chose to serve by their military and political rulers but rather was a given based on their gender. Fathers, brothers, uncles, cousins and even grandfathers were also called to pay the ultimate price in service of their communities. Therefore there was nothing nobler than being a soldier. This articulation of what a soldier’s identity was continued to develop. With the expansion of territories, wars of independence, and subsequent Confederation of the British colonies in 1867 leading to an integrated national military: a hybrid of the cunning and fluid strategies of the First Nations People with the regimented systems of service discipline and order from the French and English. Linguistic, cultural and religious diversity expanded, which paved the way for newcomers to participate in the great Canadian project of nationalism.

**Contemporary Military Identity**

The military became a reflection of this brave and new Canadian society and all the while continuing to live up to the legacy of its past forefathers. Canada’s primary military objective continued to be that of national defence but also the steadfast in the ever-real possibility of the use of force. This is why the identity of the soldier figure continued to be associated with violence: the violence that they are capable of committing, and the violence to which they can be victim. The duality of this play between life and death persisted and is why militaries continue to be seen as analogous to violence. It is this duality, which allow soldiers to relate to one another across state boundaries around the world. That is to say, that there exists a kind of universality in the reality of *being* a soldier and therefore a shared sense of identity. Being pushed to the limits, suffering, self-
control, endurance, discipline, and mortal surrender to authority are all traits that all soldiers have in common. What do differ are the structural and cultural mechanisms used to indoctrinate their service members.

**Military Structures**

Undoubtedly the most impressionable and the important experience in the formation of a soldier is that of the indoctrinating processes. Dating back to before the Greco-Roman periods, we can see the construction and development of soldiers in military facilities found throughout antiquities, which illustrate how military identity was constructed. These facilities were the technical and moral birthplaces of their soldiers; a reflection of socio-cultural perceived notions of warrior identity. Contemporary military structures continue to be inherently built upon Greco-Roman versions of: discipline, cohesion, and aggression as per the moral and ethical perspectives of those who held power. Military structures regulate the physical embodiment of military doctrine and as such must somehow seduce young men into wanting to be a ‘soldier’. “All militaries have… regularly been rooted in the psychological coercion of young men through appeals to their (uncertain) manliness” and rerouted towards concepts of masculinity, power and nationalism particular to those who are in power.

Inevitably, the formation of a particular soldier culture emerges during the indoctrination processes ensuring that service members adhere to and replicate the same type of ethic as instructed at the birth of their military careers. “The recipe for creating soldiers thus involves not only selecting for and reinforcing aggressive behaviour, it
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usually entails also an explosive mix of misogyny, racism and homophobia.”  
As such, the manner in which indoctrination is conducted regulates and establishes the accepted ways of thinking and the manner in which the military subject embodies those values. The interpersonal dynamics that unfold in contemporary times continue to be regulated by this ‘black’ or ‘white’ military duality of reasoning: security, threat, life, death, friendly, enemy, soldier, terrorist, female, male, ‘gay’, ‘straight’, to attack or not to attack: military duality is inescapable. Something is always perceived as always either a positive, or negative. When something deemed bad occurs, or a ‘deficiency’ is noticed (a breach in policy or procedure), it is seen as a bad thing and immediately corrected. Over the course of time a particular military culture develops as a result of the structures within its organization and clearly illustrates a military rational worldview woven into the very fibres of military structures to the point that behaviour and relations between bodies result in a collective identity perpetuated onward by the repetitive actions and thus ways of thinking of its service members. This type of discipline enables a soldier to enforce the bureaucratic needs and wants of the sovereign regardless of their ethical perspective. R.W. Connell’s theoretical perspective of masculinity as means for the embodiment of social power becomes a reality. Therefore, the soldier becomes a tool for power, a type of politics, ‘politics by other means’ and thus, those who are at the top regulate how this lethal state apparatus is to developed and deployed. There is no doubt that masculinity as an institutionalised military identity has shaped the manner in which social relations occur amongst men and women. Now that we have seen how the soldier identity has
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emerged, we now shall see how gender and sexuality are at play within the rigid structures of masculine militarism.

**Masculine Capital**

The masculine male subject’s never-ending pursuit of possessing the alpha-male status is an idealisation that men of all sexualities have had to reflect on, or action on at one point in time or another in their lives. Masculine capital is that which people (men and women) can acquire by demonstrating a competence or capacity in acquiring and performing attributes considered masculine in their particular culture, community or region. There is a cornucopia of masculine capital available for people to access, mostly having to do with mental, physical, and emotional endurance and strength. Performance is secondary to these traits, for example wearing a hockey jersey, drinking, and behaving in an aggressive demeanour at a bar might be considered a type of male gender performance; however excelling as a hockey player and earning respect from his/her teammates is not a performance but an actual demonstration of something real (their strength) as a hockey player. To deny the existence of masculinity as a result of the female ability to embody masculinity does not mean that these sociological masculine/feminine identities should be blurred or completely removed. In practice, they are optional to both genders to access freely (depending where of course). Depending on its application, the power of masculine capital is another aspect from which either good or bad could arise. It is this perspective that I argue: that masculine capital, like feminine capital, can be used by either gender without a need to delegitimize the other. Both can be useful or damaging depending on intent, application and context. For instance, a wealthy businessperson making aggressive large-scale decision while maintaining stoic pose and
control can also be understood as a form of masculine capital. The manner in which one handles and tolerates pain in adversity in sport can also be form of masculine capital. The ability to use force in defence of one’s family, friends, and community, one’s nation could also be interpreted as a form of good masculine capital. All three examples could be seen as *good* masculine capital in the West and are equally accessible to both men and women alike.

**Queerness and Masculine Capital**

When it comes to Queer men and their pursuit of hegemonic masculinity (the homogenisation of Judeo-Christian gender roles), they must not only meet the minimum required levels of masculinity within a particular domain but must excel in them in order to reap the benefits and indulge in the perks of discipline and hard work. Athletes in particular seem to know that in order to make their homosexuality less affronting to their teammates, they need to adhere to as many of the other mandates of orthodox masculinity as possible. “In other words, the stigma of being gay would be reduced if the athlete subscribed to all other traits of orthodox masculinity, with the sole exception of his homosexuality”\(^\text{32}\). It then becomes a battle of identities; to demonstrate not only the masculine Queer subject’s success in securing masculine capital, but also redefining the stereotype, and public perception of homosexual identity, usually seen by masculine men as effeminate, annoying, strange and/or unwanted. Regardless of whether or not masculine men agree with the embodiment of hyper-effeminacy in male bodies, inappropriate behaviour such as name calling, exclusion, harassment or discrimination
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exclusively on the bases of sexual orientation are inappropriate and is a form of *bad* masculinity.

**Feminist Perspectives**

Understanding feminist perspectives on masculinity is a key point of departure when looking towards tools of analysis on socio-political phenomena such as gender in militarism. Egalitarian feminist initiatives, theories and praxis have been of great use, not only to women but also to men. Women have entered into the work force en masse. Amendments to laws to include and protect women have and continue to be passed in economically developed, emerging and underdeveloped economies. Women’s institutions, advocacy organizations, support groups, ministries and even the development of Women’s Studies programs at universities have erupted over the last quarter century. Though there has been great success on women’s social justice, there continues to be racism, misogyny and homophobia within our societies of which we must remember women too, have been a part of as well. Our history has shown us that the xenophobia we have seen by groups who claim to hold *truth*, have shown us the dangers of adhering to positivist theoretical ontologies. We now understand that events and situations that have occurred in the world are interpretive; and therefore multifaceted approaches are needed to address issues of norms and differences. Unilateral approaches (such as ideological feminism and Queer Theory) can only offer us pieces to a much larger and quite multidimensional puzzle. Though one might have a picture in one’s mind of what an image is supposed to be, one does not hold all the pieces to that puzzle, and therefore the imagined picture might in fact be a different, more skewed version of what the picture was thought to be.
Feminism works much like a puzzle, where the existence of one’s pieces might be inarguable. One might be certain that the shades and lines clearly depict a piece of a car, though in fact it might be part of another larger structure. No one will argue that the crevasse, shape and contour of the puzzle piece might be consistent of a puzzle piece of a car. Though, when one takes a step back, and other people add their pieces to the puzzle, we find that the crevasses, shapes and contours are more clearly seen, though the total image is of something else, something similar but different. Only by collaborating with those who hold other pieces to the puzzle, can we truly understand what the greater picture is. “Feminists can no more reach their goal of equality by ignoring relevant alternative perspectives provided by women than they can by ignoring relevant alternative perspectives provided by men”\(^3\). As such, we need to reconsider the framework utilized in investigating, studying and analyzing masculinities especially when addressing men’s issues. From a new male and masculinities perspective we see that, “feminism is complicit in the project of constructing the subaltern subject it wants to represent and then heroically casting itself as the subaltern’s salvation…”\(^4\) One cannot construct theories based on a positivist framework on the totality of a reality from a single scope as that that scope is too small, too focused on a particular target. If that scope trumps and excludes what other scopes are privy to, the target might be missed or even moved, the target being of course equality. Much like a gun range, the collective bullets unleashed by several scopes shooting at a single target from several vantage points does increase the likelihood of hitting the target. Male perspectives, like feminism and Queer Theory could be used as simply another form of ammunition against


misogyny, racism, and homophobia. A new male and masculinities approach is required to slay the dragon of hate and oppression of which feminist, Queer Theorists and poststructuralists in gender and sexuality studies have already been actively engaged in.

**Women and Military Masculinities**

The abundance of ideological feminist literature that discusses the intersection of women and militarism has typically been a one-sided discourse. This has resulted in radical ideological feminist rhetoric annexing gender and sexual diversity studies as well as male and masculinities studies writing books, developing curriculum, and instituting policies that completely shut men out from presenting alternative perspectives out of conversations. It attempts to look at the masculine world of man, through the eyes of women, and as such, providing an inaccurate analysis of the true dynamics of militarism and gender. After all, so far it takes two sexes to make a baby, likewise it takes two sexes to shape the world that children are brought into. What is more, very few of these female (and some male) academics have actually undergone a military experience of *being* military, which is imperative in understanding military culture and identity. Since militarism has historically been a male affair, this institution must be understood internally before it can be understood externally from other theoretical approaches (feminist theories) and not the reverse. Men and women must look at masculinities, particularly military masculinities, from the perspective of being a soldier. That means from the predisposed perspective that men have always been and continue to be those who lead and are sacrificed in wars; therefore men’s input on militarism and masculinities would surely be reasonable to give ear to.
In fact, I argue that women are able to secure masculine capital for themselves and succeed and being alpha’s in the most rigid and masculine institutions. Thanks to developments in politics, health, education, science and technology women are now able to be soldiers and officers, to be tools of war, to kill, secure or occupy. Women, have to a degree chosen to share the burden of warfare, to venture out from the safe confines of the home to the front-line and honourably die in service of Queen and Country.

**Canadian Forces Women in Afghanistan**

Women have successfully been able to not only serve as tools war and peace, but also serve as leaders of men and women into battle. No longer are women subject to the nurturing and supportive roles of military life (as nurses or clerks) but now are able to serve as Artillery, Combat Engineers, Armour and even infantry officers. Nothing more clearly exemplifies the visibility and participation of women in the theatre of war than the career of Captain Nicola Goddard. Captain Goddard a twenty-seven year older Armour Officer was a Forward Observer Officer (FOO) in charge of leading operations within her Area of Observation (AOR). She was the first female killed in the theatre of war since the Second World War. Not only was she the first Combat Arms person to be killed in battle but also the first female Combat Arms Officer. This served is a social milestone for the recognition of women in the combat arms in that not only are women just as able as men to fight wars and lead them but also to die for them. Now women too were dabbling between the realities of taking and loosing life. They are now soldiers through and through.
Captain Goddard was not the only female combat arms member to die in the theatre of battle. Master Corporal Kristal Giesebrecht, thirty-four of Wallaceburg, Ontario, is also testament to how members in the support trades are just as exposed to danger as those in the Combat Arms. At times these sacrifices have meant the loss of young women who many might still be seen in the eyes of many parents as the loss of their ‘little girl’, a perception that still values the lives of young girls over that of our young boys. For instance, losses such as Trooper Karine Blais, twenty-one of Les Mechins, Quebec rocked the minds and minds of many. Trooper Blais serves as another example of how a young, fit, attractive female from a small town in Quebec can embody the soldier warrior identity. Women in the Combat Arms can be just as aggressive, violent, and value the same interests and goals as men, but also can embody heteronormative female attributes. Women can hump weight, fire rounds down range, and lead troops into battle, but also can on a Friday night trade in Cad-pat for high heels, a mini-skirt and dawn cosmetic make-up rather than camouflage paint, for a night out at bar with the boys. Women can still be feminine and embody masculine capital.

Therefore we need to understand this change towards military identity as a gender-neutral production of values and behaviour that use masculine and feminine attributes when needed, as opposed to being static to cisgender heteronormative perspectives. When entering into contemporary analysis of gender politics and militarism, we need to look at the masculine and feminine as means of capital that can be harnessed in the regulation and deployment of military assists and interests. What we need to understand is what see as in the West as masculine and feminine can be used as capital in the construction of a new modern soldier figure, which we have started to see in missions
such as in Afghanistan. In a Post-911 world we have seen how Canadian women have become proactive in military participation and operational readiness to be deployed to war. We now live in a culture where we have received the images of young women and mothers returning to Canada in coffins, PTSD and physical (burns, missing limbs, ext.). Indeed, women have stepped up to the plate and have placed their ‘money were there mouth is’ undoubtedly proving that women in the Canadian Forces can be as able as any man to fight, lead and die in service of their country. We will now expand on tools of analysis by seeing exactly how soldiers can embody good and bad masculinities.

**Good and Bad Masculinities**

For decades social scientists have illustrated the negative aspects of stereotyped male behaviour in the form of power, dominance, and violence. “Anthropological accounts suggest that toughness, the ability to endure pain and drink to excess, willingness to take risks, and sexual performances are all central to achieving masculinity”\footnote{Thomas J. Gershick, “Degrees of Bodily Normatively in Western Culture, Masculinities in Education” in Connell, R.W., Hearn, Jeff, Kimmel, Michael, S., Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities, Sage Publications, London, 2005, Page 373.}. However very few arguments have been brought forth that highlight the positive contributions masculinity has had over centuries. Therefore we must attempt to understand what aspects of masculinity hurt or help both men and women of all sexualities. A more balanced approach towards masculine analysis would allow for alternative understandings as to how and why men and women use masculinity as a means of identity and labour. I argue that Western male masculinity can be split into two opposite poles: good masculinities and bad masculinities. There is an abundance of positive aspects of hegemonic masculinity, “these include willpower, honour, courage,
discipline, competitiveness, quiet strength, stoicism, sangfroid, persistence, adventurousness, independence, sexual virility tempered with restraint, and dignity, and they reflect masculine ideals such as liberty, equality, and fraternity. Depending on their deployment, all of these traits can be seen as good masculine attributes which both men and women can utilise regardless of gender. Therefore it would not be far fetched to assume that hegemonic masculinity does indeed have several positive qualities and attributes and should not be automatically seen in a negative practice homogenously speaking.

**Bad Masculinities**

Queer Theorists and feminists have only targeted and engaged forms of masculine capital, which marginalize, exclude, abuse, harass, or use acts of violence usually associated with men. From a masculinities perspective such behaviour could not only ignorant and abusive, but it discredits men, perpetuates stigmas as well as replicates ‘bad masculinities’ that hold men victim to their own self-destructive tendencies. Homophobia, misogyny, racism are only a few types of ‘bad masculinities’ that men and women have historically deployed. Bad masculinities would be aspects of masculinity, which are damaging to men and/or women. This can result in stoicism and the internalization of repressed feelings that can lead not only to long-term mental health issues such as suicidal ideation, anger management issues, depression, sociopathic tendencies, anxiety, but also physical illness such as ulcers, insomnia, drug abuse symptoms, etc. Going beyond one’s own personal abilities can also be damaging. Men also suffer from body image issues and at times men take steroids to build self-
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confident, popularity and attention instead of gaining such prestige through their intellectual, social and interpersonal abilities. Young boys are at times pushed into playing contact sports that they may have no interest in playing such as football, hockey, and boxing which glorify violence, blood and unwilling submission of other men which in time becomes a form of relating to other men. Bad masculinities are the concepts that sexually and graphically belittle and demean women as objects of men’s sexual use and abuse developing the erotic ‘slut’ or ‘bitch’ figure. Young men using the term “that’s so gay” or “don’t be such a fag”, is an inappropriate means for expressing distaste for something is a bad of gaining masculine status as a heterosexual. There is no denying that much harm has occurred to societies in the pursuit of masculinity, however there must be a separation between the corresponding gender and stereotyped act as that both genders are capable of embodying such actions. It is the responsibility of all men and women to assess, critique and approach these issues in the hopes of achieving productive dialogue and develop new strategies in removing ‘bad masculinities’ from our society.

**Good Masculinity**

Regretfully, since there are not many former service members who are current academics, who write on the intersection of gender and militarism within a contemporary Canadian military perspective, we do not hear much on minority perspectives on the embodiment of masculinity within a Canadian military context. Women who work in militaries around the world understand that they must embody particular ‘masculine’ attributes in order to be soldiers. Women’s lives have always and still continue to be more valued and more protected than men’s lives. However, now women in the CF understand that they are expected to protect, endure bodily harm and even die in the process of saving civilian
lives including those of healthy fit civilian men. Imagine, we now live in a world where a beautiful young, fit women like Trooper Blais, sacrifice their lives, in the process of protecting a male or other female. This serves as overwhelming proof that women are able to embody good masculinity and for honourable and righteous reasons. Clearly there are positive aspects of masculinity, which women can subscribe to, and master.

**Women and the Embodiment of Masculinity**

In order to study masculinity we need to approach the field from an objective manner, without pre-conceived notions or personal bias. As much in life, there are both good and bad attributes to things. There are aspects of masculinity, which both men and women have benefited from, as well can be channelled for the personal development and formation of the individual, as well as their communities. Women too, have historically embodied masculine roles of power and dominance for over a millennia; from Queen Nefertiti and Queen Cleopatra of Egypt, the Ethiopian Queen of Sheba, military leaders and spiritual leaders such as Joan of Arch of France and Saint Teresa of Avila, major economic and political superpower leaders such as Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of the U.K. and the German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Women, have always had a subversive means of power, whether it be by using the art of seduction, or their intellectual and physical capabilities as we have seen in 20th century. Women have been able to exercise power and influence through their husbands to form superhero powerhouse duos such as Hillary and Bill Clinton or even Barak and Michelle Obama. Whether it is formal power, or informal power, women have always contributed and reproduced modes of masculinity and even indulged in the embodiment of its practices. It is here, perhaps where we find a point of departure in the embodiment of good
masculinities. Whether we look at the great female leaders of the past, or women in contemporary times, we can see how women have picked certain aspects of traditional masculine behaviour to rule whole empires and lead troops into the fields of bloody or spiritual battle. By looking at good and bad masculinities we can degenderize and decategorise women in society looking at their performance rather than their identity. Likewise, in the case of masculinity, we can also see why certain forms of what we understand as Western femininity are perceived to be bad within a military context.

**Bad Femininity**

Western hegemonic ‘femininity’ has aspects too that do not mesh well for the purposes of military service. Women in the Canadian Forces understand that the identity of a soldier is incompatible with certain aspects of popular hegemonic female identity. By this I mean that women in uniform do not wear noticeable make up, do not have time to do their hair (hair is pulled back in a bun), wear manicured nails, lip stick, eye-shadow, ext. Women in the military also understand that when they are on training or operation, there is decreased physical privacy. At times there is so little space inside a tent, that soldiers must sleep on the leg, thigh, ankle, posterior, pretty much any position that helps fit everyone into the same tent and that is remotely comfortable. Women (and men) in the military understand that breaking down and crying in the middle of training or operations is unacceptable. When bullets start firing, and blood is spilt, there is no time to take a moment and cry. It is not as a result of patriarchal masculine oppressive culture, but the result of a direct operational need. There is no time for cosmetics, privacy or crying in the theatre of war. However there is a time and place for all. Since NATO missions and deployments to Desert Storm, Rwanda and Somalia in the early 1990’s we have seen the
importance of communication skills (negotiation, conflict resolution, cultural education) and mental health. The American operation “Enduring Freedom” in Iraq, and N.A.T.O. operations in Afghanistan have only furthered our understanding of the importance of looking at warfare from an alternative perspective, and consider traditional ‘feminine’ approaches to warfare.

**Good femininity**

By looking at the good aspects of femininity, or adopting productive feminist perspectives that offer answers (as opposed to closed stereotyped judgments) provide not only a tool for analysis but also prescription for positive transformative change. International Relations feminists argue that the male dominated political arena allows for the usage of politics by violent means. Many IR feminists promote using ‘female’ strategies in politics and militarism by promoting mediation, conflict resolution, diplomacy, communication skills, multilateralism, and alternative means of aggression and force such as recalling ambassadors, economic sanctions, and political isolation. IR feminist theory could also be applied to military management of operations such as the push for mental health funding, awareness, programs and services for military personal. Good ‘femininity’ means talking about one’s feelings, opening up to one’s platoon mates, being sensitive to the needs and wants of colleagues, and offer emotional support when needed. It means working collectively (not under rigid hierarchy) and thinking before acting (instead of reacting). Women have led these internal defence battles fighting traditional hegemonic masculine attitudes of “suck it up buttercup” or “write it on a CF-98 (‘Hurt Feelings’ report)” are now on the decline. Western militaries have adopted what could be understood as traditional ‘feminine’ approaches in defence, providing a
more holistic and balanced approach to defence. All these good ‘feminine’ approaches have only vastly improved operational readiness and the long-term sustainability and improvement in Defence.

**Queering Military Masculinities**

By Queering masculinities I do not mean that we should bring down masculinity or absolutely advocate against its very existence, but instead enhance it to ensure that it is more inclusive and productive in practice. I propose that the induction of a third Queer perspective, one that continues to remain excluded from military discourse, that of the Queer soldier. In chapter three (Canadian Forces Legislation and Policies), I will further explain how Queering the CF would only solidify and enhance military culture and operational effectiveness, however for this moment we will see how Queering military masculinities can also help bridge the gender gap between heterosexual males and heterosexual females. The introduction of lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, Two-Spirited, Queer, Questioning and Trans service members relieve bipolaric gender identities and gender roles within a military culture. Queering military culture includes educating and visibilising gender and sexual minorities. It means the destabilization of the traditional view and practice of hegemonic heteronormative masculinity, in the sense that gender identity and sexuality are not restricted to gender but performance. Gender identity and sexuality can appear to be one thing, but really be another, a disembodiment of self-identified gender appropriate for a required act. A member might be assumed to be gay, but might be heterosexual and vice versa. Queering military masculinities means a removal of assumptions based on gender identity. A member might believe that their fireteam partner is male, but several years later might be female. Regretfully, the opposite
is the case now in that all of these perceptions continue to be ongoing as we speak, still remaining slow to change, with little visibility, representation, or LGBT based military resources. Queering military masculinities means promoting social justice, political correctness, and the removal of assumptions or barriers to military service all-the-while promoting equal opportunity and support services. It challenges ‘bad masculinities’ (homophobia, misogyny, racism, bullying) without removing the ‘good masculinities’ (discipline, endurance, persistence, confidence) a type of military masculinity accessible and open to men, women, queers, and visible and invisible minorities alike. What this would eventually result in is the transformation of the traditional ‘concept of the soldier’, to what popular Western culture have fanaticized about in movies and shows like Starship Troopers or Star Trek: the futuristic embodiment of the duality of gender.

**Military Masculinities and New Directions**

The best example of an idealized cohesion between the sexes within a futuristic military would be in the Hollywood hit “Starship Troops”. In this movie both men and women are depicted as full equals within their military environment. Both men and women adopted a hyper-masculinized military identity by training in hand-to-hand combat, showered, ate, slept, fought and died together indiscriminate of gender identity. Heterosexual courting rituals between women and men would still be indulged in when appropriate, in other words during their personal time. Another example of how good masculinities could be practiced would be to look at how gender, culture and races interact with a futuristic military setting would be Star Trek. Though the concept of a functional United Nations, much less a United Federation of Planets can still be a fictional and idealistic idea, women and (queer) alien characters have been depicted
embodying male, female and even gender-neutral attributes. Both men and women alike practice *good* masculinities and *good* femininity. Both genders endure mental, physical and emotional challenges as Cadets in preparation for a potential danger while in service. Both genders rigidly follow orders without question from their Chain of Command. Men and women use good masculinity by using aggression and violence when called to do so. However, traditional female aspects have also been incorporated into the development and behaviour of these officers and crewwomen/men. Training also includes the incorporation of what we already discussed in feminist theorists of international relations consisting of emotional wellbeing (a happy worker is a productive worker), interpersonal skills, force by other non-violent means, consensus building, diplomacy, mediation, conflict resolution, ext. Indeed, much like the Star Trek tricorder becoming the eventual smartphone, and the reality of the present such as other planets having H2o, and the existence of black holes, similarly we will see the advancement towards gender parity as seen on Star Trek as it becomes more and more the reality of the future. Both men and women need to learn what types of "masculine" behaviour are acceptable even within a military context. Bad masculinities can damage team cohesion, comradery and *Esprit de corps*. Service members must be also educated and encouraged to take up ‘feminine’ strategies in military structures. Another means in order to break the rigid barriers of the traditional gender normative bipolar narrative that we see in society is by Queering our military spaces allowing for the fluidity of the masculine and feminine when needed.
The Irony of the Walking, Talking, Shooting, Queer Soldier

In understanding that military masculine culture is omnipresent within the formal and informal structures in the CF, we can see how countercultural social anomalies are sought out for assimilation (vis-à-vis the indoctrination processes) or be destroyed (harassed, marginalized, released, ext.). As such, discussions on why and how military Queer identities navigate hyper-masculine, heterosexual culture are imperative in understanding their invisibility and mistreatment. Queer military identities differ from mainstream Queer and military cultures alike, in that they are a hybrid of both Queer and military experiences that produce a particular and paradoxal identity, a contradiction: a walking, talking, shooting Queer Soldier. The irony of being a walking, talking, shooting, Queer-soldier can be quite contradictory given its masculine and queer nature. There are three different types of cisgender Queer military identities, those who are openly homosexual/bisexual, those who are closeted, and those who choose to be openly homosexual/bisexual and assimilate into heteronormative military culture. To choose whether to be open with one’s sexuality or hide it is consistent to the degree of one’s own self-acceptance and self-determination as a Queer individual. Being open with one’s Queer sexuality exposes a vulnerability that could be used against them during the progression of their career. Remaining closeted at work would at times consist of living a lie and hiding something important about one’s identity. Other times it becomes easier to simply assimilate to heteronormative military culture and be ‘one of the boy’s. Celebrating traditional hegemonic masculinity even if they are known to be homosexual or bisexual. Regardless of the reason, all are submissive and subservient to the particular heteronormative culture of their trade, rank, posting and element in the CF.
The Out of the Closet Homosexual Service Member

How out a service member is depends on what role one has in that CF. As we will see in the last chapter of this thesis, the degree of homophobia and transphobia varies depending on one’s trade, rank, posting and element. Regardless of one’s position in the military, the opportunity for homophobia and transphobia and its ability to hide within the cracks and failures of CF policy is opportune. There is no doubt that in a military setting the presence of an openly gay service member still manages to make too many people uncomfortable. Earlier in this chapter we looked at the importance of maintaining a masculine military identity for the purposes of military service, the possibility of violence and how the Queer subject can destabilize the gender order system to reap the benefits of good masculinity and good femininity in defence. Furthermore, we saw how both feminine and masculine attributes can be troublesome or of great use for the purpose of military training and operations.

To be ‘openly gay’ means opening the possibility for mistreatment, marginalization, harassment and discrimination that can impact the Queer member’s mental health as well as professional endeavours. To claim (or be bestowed) an identity of ‘homosexual’ is to embody all of its perceived stereotypical attributes such as being weak, womanly, strange, a sexual predator, a seducer of ‘straight’ men, fundamentally untrustworthy. As such, to self identify as ‘gay’ is to individualize oneself from one’s assumed predominantly heterosexual peers in a very personal and meaningful way to them. It is this assumption of heterosexuality that maintains the gender order and as such what a ‘real man’, or in this case a ‘real soldier’ is suppose to be. The idea of an openly gay service member is seen as an ideological fallacy, a breakdown in the social order of
things, or as someone who might potentially be an administrative burden. However there are some benefits. The openly gay homosexual in the CF is more socially accepted in the support trades such as Health Services, and Logistics. The reason for this stems from the higher gender rates of women that reduces the amount of oppressive and offensive language used in the workplace. To have an openly gay soldier in the ranks allows for the possibility of handling awkward complaints and the discussion of topics that an OC would rather not have to deal with. The Officer field in the support trades also tend to be a more positive space environment for LGBT service members. This can be attributed to the fact that most officers require a university degree to commission usually resulting in them living in larger and more metropolitan cities, exposing them to a wide range of diversity. A third area where openly gay services members are more accepted is in the Air Force, as well as the Navy. Similar correlations can be made to other Navy and Air Force branches in countries around the world. By far, the Combat Arms is the epicenter from which male military masculinity radiates. The performance and replication of hegemonic heteronormative language, behaviour and reasoning continues to fight the incorporation of queered masculinity. But what of those ‘fence sitters’ that have one foot in the heterosexual world, and the other in a homosexual one.

**The Bisexual**

The bisexual subject is truly a paradoxal personality not only in the military, but also to heterosexuals and homosexuals alike. Bisexual CF service members are typically and publically heterosexual, and take advantage of same-sex opportunities when available and usually using smart phone apps such as Grindr, Growlr and Scruff and patron known cursing sites close to base. They tend to stay away from openly gay service members in
order to not risk being perceived as being homosexual. Many CF cisgender male bisexual members are either married, have girlfriends or engage in frequent sexual encounters with women. Therefore the appearance of heterosexuality is a clear given to their heterosexual peers in that, at least from their position, the fact that a service member is married to a woman, if they are in a relationship with a woman, or are known to have sex with women is would indicate heterosexual identity.

Women, who are openly bisexual, of course are accepted without challenge by heterosexual male service members in that bisexual women are always presumed as being heterosexual, but indulge in same-sex relations as a means of satisfying the selfish ironic fantasies of the heterosexual men. This can be attributed to anti-women pornography that depicts women to be sexually objectified, belittled, used and abused by heterosexual men. Many men who openly disclose their bisexuality are paradoxal in that they are seen as really being homosexual or that they use bisexuality in order to mask their true homosexual tendencies. Therefore, bisexual men are still Queered and seen as a social threat to institutional heteronormativity unless they openly and publically show a distaste for heterosexual transgressions.

The Closeted Gay Member

The last and one of the most popular military LGBT categories consists of the closeted homosexual service member. These members comprise gay, bisexual and service members who question their sexuality and made the choice of making a clear separation between work and their sexuality. This in itself would not seem problematic superficially; however in the military privacy is a luxury that service members lack. Members shower, eat, sleep, excrete, urinate, work and share a large amount of their free time together, first
exposed to during indoctrination. During this time homosexual and bisexual service members change themselves in order to conform to the outward expectations of their instructors, peers and Chain of Command, which at times means to living ‘in the closet’. “Most homosexuals find themselves compelled to conform outwardly to societal demands. They are conscious of their societal position within-society and seek such satisfactions as occupational mobility and prestige.”37 Much like the assimilationist, the closeted service member understands the compulsive heterosexual nature of military culture, and out of concern and fear of mistreatment chooses to remain closeted. Closeted members differ to that of Queer military Assimilationists in that they might not ideologically agree on the clear-cut separation between their sexuality and work, but do so out of practical need. Many closeted CF members hide their sexuality in order to allow for their peers and Chain of Command not to be distracted by their sexuality, and only judge their professional work. The closeted member would of course be open with their sexuality if it were not for the underlying homophobic culture, still present in the CF.

The Assimilationist Queer Subject

Perhaps one of the most concerning Queer military types consists of the military Queer assimilationist. Assimilation consists of the wilful surrender to a superior force. These men have made the choice (whether it be by ignorance or not) to subscribe to heteronormative military culture, while restraining or excluding Queered experiences from friends, colleagues, subordinates and superiors. At best, the Queer military Assimilationist does not necessarily hide their sexuality, however many chose to remain completely closeted at work regardless of how ‘out’ they might be otherwise.

The Queer military Assimilationist subject not only tolerates but also can use homophobic language as a means of projecting a heterosexual identity. Many of them do not see a need, understand or even care to see any sort of LGBT discourse in defence as that they choose to see sexuality as a private affair and not something to be known about or discussed. Queer military Assimilationists do not see military culture, as being exclusively heterosexual, but in fact that somehow the military is a non-sexualised professional workplace environment. They see whatever a homosexual (or anyone) does in their own time as being a private matter, and ignore how heterosexual culture is promoted by heterosexual language, values, experiences and entrenched in policy, services, training and leadership. The irony of this perspective is that heterosexuals can graphically discuss their own sexual conquests over women, use racist and homophobic language, and discuss and share their heterosexual relationships about their girlfriends and wives; however Queer men cannot.

The Queer military Assimilationist accepts and celebrates heterosexual values and culture, but refuses to infuse it with their own Queer sensibilities. It is a functional strategy that allows for Queer cisgender military men to be able to successfully continue a military career yet still have relationships and sexual experiences with other men. “What an assimilationist strategy implies is that the lesbian and gay experience embodies nothing worthwhile, innovative or liberating… There are lots of queer insights that can contribute to the enrichment of heterosexuals and the betterment of society.”38

Regretfully, many Queer military Assimilationists might understand LGBT equity based perspectives, but keep mute which leave room for further homophobia to continue
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unchallenged. Many choose not to fight mainstream compulsory heterosexuality, not be anti-normative and exclude any conversation on homosexuality in the workplace, which illustrate a clear pattern of behaviour that can be perceived as being self-destructive and dishonest to colleagues. If a homosexual is unable to be assimilated by heteronormative military culture or refuse to conform, then the subject becomes a clear threat. “This social demand for conformity to gender roles and expectations denies choice, crushes individuality, and sustains homophobia and misogyny… The military is the incarnation of the gender system and the ultimate defender of that system. Its whole ethos is based on the straight male machismo, which oppresses women and queers. This machismo is a direct result of the gender division of labour which assigns men to the social task of specializing in domination and violence.”

Being Queer, is a disruption to the ‘straight’ male identity of the soldier figure, and signifies a loss of military power over maintaining the gender system. If one conforms to the system, in other words accept and celebrate heterosexual values, experiences, ways of thinking, and other structural contributors that secure and replicate military compulsive heterosexuality, anti-normative bodies will continue to endure hardship.

Over the course of this chapter we saw how the identity of a soldier is constructed and engineered, and how female and Queer bodies navigate through the arena of military masculinity. The progression of gender and sexual parity and slow reinvention of the soldier identity as being female, Queer, or of colour in Canada is slowly become more visible in the ranks, however are still marginalized and pushed away from certain trades, ranks and elements as a result of traditional cultural military identity. Women and Queer

---

bodies can and do adapt positive aspects of masculinity for the purposes of military service, however much can be learned by the experiences and perceptions of these two military minority groups. The experience of being female, or Queer can provide positive contributions to the military by providing alternative approaches, experiences, and strategies as well as further enriching the interpersonal trust and support for service members providing a more positive space workplace environment for CFLGBT service members. In the following Chapter we will see how legislation, policies, law and services intersect LGBT rights and interests in Canada, as well as other military jurisdictions.
Chapter 3: CFLGBT Legislation, Policy and Programs

The formal inscription of rules, regulation and policies are fundamental cornerstones in the maintenance of Western militaries. Legislation is interpreted and therefore amplified by my means of policies, which provide instructions on authorised protocols to handle particular situations. Over time, legislation and policies structure social behaviour developing a culture and means of interacting reflecting institutional guidelines. The Canadian Forces (CF) still continues to construct particular patterns of behaviour, which exclude gender and sexual minorities out of discussions on their own treatment, interests and needs. Though the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, it has been unable to prevent the social or structural equity that we continue to see in for CFLGBT service members. Not much has been done on part of CF to battle homophobia and transphobia other than the repeal of CFAO 19-20 “Sexual Deviation - Investigation, Medical Investigation and Disposal” of gender and sexual minorities. The pass of the Employment Equity Act only designated four particular groups as being vulnerable groups within Canadian society, therefore allowing for the workplace protection, resources, programs, support offices and budgeting for women, aboriginals and people with disabilities and visible minorities while excluding gender and sexual minorities.

Charter Task Force Survey

After the passing of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982, discussions started over how to incorporate openly homosexual and bisexual service members into the CF. For almost half a century LGBT people have been protesting in Western democracies around the world; from the Castro in San Francisco, to the Greenwich
Village in New York, to the Toronto Bathhouse Raids in the gay Village, the homosexual question was an inevitable issue which was difficult to steer away from. The Canadian Department of National Defence (DND) chose to commission a Charter Task Force survey that would investigate the ramifications of a DND lift on the policy banning on homosexual service members. The survey consisted of a wide variety of questions about sentiments and attitudes towards homosexuals legally allowed to work in the Canadian Forces, such as shower and sleeping spaces, degrees of trust, comfort levels in taking and giving orders from homosexual/bisexual service members, ext. The analysis of 1,477,000 respondents led to the DND to conclude that “homosexuals threaten military group norms and values, and their inclusion risks disruption to group functioning and operational effectiveness.” As such, the DND did not recommend lifting the ban on people attracted to the same-sex. The persecution by the CF’s notorious NIS (National Intelligence Service) and by the Military Police (MP’s) continued through the Cold War period.

Entering into the early 1990’s, the matter of homosexuals serving in wars such as Desert Storm in 1991 generated public questions as to whether homosexuals were in fact fighting wars overseas yet still were oppressed and barred from military service. The gay liberation movement in other countries succeeded in securing the repeal of sodomy laws and employment equity legislation such as the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, and other Western states. Jurisdictions such as the United States under the Clinton Administration were unable to fight off the influences from the Christian right and social conservatives on the lift on the homosexual ban. Therefore the highly contentious compromise of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” (DATD) policy restricted any

---

military personnel from inquiring on what a member’s sexuality was, disclosing one’s homosexuality, or speaking about wanting to have sex, or pursue same-sex marriage. In this chapter we will be revisiting Canadian legislation and policies that intersect sexuality and gender identity as well as highlighting the failure of current diversity policies and the sheer refusal of the CF for developing new ones. We will also look at other jurisdictions to see how other states have reacted to and developed military LGBT based programs, initiatives, events, services and education.

**Canadian Common Law**

The recognition of common law registration for benefits was extended to CFLGBT service members as late as 1996. The recognition of non-heteronormative couples by the Government of Canada secured access for LGBT couples and families to finally receive equal benefits such as insurance, travel allowances, accidental death benefits, living accommodations, right to access a hospitalised partner and ownership of property after death. This meant that the Chain of Command (CofC) would also have to incorporate the same-sex partner of LGBT people as a next of kin, which would allow the CofC contact and assist a member’s same-sex partner and provide limited access to the Chain of Command as their heterosexual counterparts did. Though the legislative and policy benefits further pushed the yardstick towards equality in the CF, the social culture of the military would not be as easily changed.
SHARP Training

The introduction of the Sexual Harassment and Racism Prevention (SHARP) course was the DND’s reaction as to how the CF interpreted the admittance of non-heterosexual, female service members, as well as tackling matters of racism in the CF. The program was thought to ‘hit two birds with one stone’ in that it would be a visible and public attempt at educating service members on sensitivity training as well as demonstrating the visibility of LGBT people in the ranks. Regretfully, service members began to see SHARP as more of a mockery or joke, rather than an actual training program. Those who felt uncomfortable with sexual minorities looked at this professional development course as a ‘bird course’, where they were forced to talk about LGB people’s feelings and other ‘mushy’ topics of conversation which did not do too much to correct the colourful politically incorrect language and behaviour which persisted by the heterosexually identified white male majority. All of a sudden, calendars of naked women had to be taken down, women were attempting to venture into trades for which they were pre-determined to be ‘too weak’, but worst of all: homosexuals were being allowed to enter and stay in the Canadian Forces. Allowing these creepy, perverted, untrusting, moles to enter and march within the ranks in her Majesty’s Canadian Forces was a direct attack on hegemonic masculine military culture that had been enjoyed since the first armies and militias during the Canadian colonial period.

For CFLGBT people SHARP was poorly designed. It did not properly explain what sexuality was, why it was important in defence and why discrimination, harassment, marginalization of sexual minorities was wrong, unethical or hateful. It also failed at explaining the impact that homophobia and transphobia could have not only on a victim
but also the subsequent issues that could arise from such behaviour, such as the long term mental health of a lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB) member, their being distracted, scared or more preoccupied in hiding their sexuality than doing their job. The curriculum overall seemed to be too ‘patronizing’, uninteresting, and noticeably awkward in its delivery for both ‘gays’ and ‘straights’ alike. Trans talk was simply not even a part of the conversation in SHARP training. The collective heterosexual attitude when taking the course made it clear that too many heterosexuals were not listening or understanding the message and CFLGBT people were well aware of that fact.

**The Employment Equity Act of Canada**

Despite the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, it appeared that it was not enough for protecting vulnerable groups. Therefore, further legislative instruction was required to expand the equity mandate by the government of Canada. The passing of the Employment Equity Act in 1995 was seen as a further expansion of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Four particular groups were seen as especially requiring more protection, setting up the framework for programs and services in the hopes of balancing workplace equal opportunity for women, visible minorities, aboriginals and people with disabilities. Within this context, equal did not mean equality, therefore provisions and mandates in the promotion of diversity in education, visibility initiatives, conferences, services, programs, research and analysis on reporting were also outlined. The Government of Canada was clear: “employment equity means more than treating persons the same way but also requires special measures and the accommodation of differences.”

---

employment equity discussions which of course meant no services, no programs, no initiatives, or special protection of LGBT service members as the other major minority groups were able to enjoy.

**LGBT Failure in the Employment Equity Act of Canada**

Debates as to why sexual minorities were not entered into the Act ranged from LGBT people not wanting to ‘self-identify’ as non-heterosexuals in the workplace, sexual and gender minorities being too small of a minority for the passing of such an act and that political officials (and some LGBT people) believing that current legislation (the repeal of Sodomy laws, the Common Law status of same-sex relationships, workplace benefits, housing protection, ext.) was sufficient. Regardless of the reason, sexual orientation was not included as a designated group, which has resulted in a lost legislative opportunity to not only extend further protection of gender and sexual minorities but also improve services and support for them. The exclusion of sexual minorities from the Employment Equity Act and more so the CF’s refusal of establishing similar services for LGBT people, has led to the public affairs rhetoric of placing full blame on the Act as the central reason why sexual minorities do not have any services or special consideration.

*Canadian Forces Defense Advisory Board*
The DND’s reaction to the Employment Equity Act was to mirror the legislation by establishing corresponding offices to interpret the mandated requirements of the Employment Equity Act. Women, aboriginals, visible minorities and people with disabilities are able to indulge in the DND’s privileged services which provided the geographical space, funds, and authorization to research and develop new programs and initiatives that would increase diversity measures towards employment equity. Ironically enough, these four designated groups have not advocated for the inclusion of sexual and gender minorities. Personal interviews with senior officers of the Canadian Forces Directorate of Human Rights and Diversity (CFDHRD) as well as CF members who have attempted grass roots efforts at approaching this office have made it clear that there seems to be an internal attitude that does not see, or choose to see gender and sexual minorities as either having a need to have the same types of support that the other designated groups receive, or that the DND is more interested in following current mandates and policies then thinking for themselves and developing ones of their own.

**Defence Disabilities Advisory Board**

The interesting aspect of the DND in developing and supporting a Defence People with Disabilities Advisory Board is of particular interest and controversy. In order to enter and stay in the military, all service members are required to be physically, mentally and emotionally fit for service. Members must meet a universal standard of health in order to maintain the proper level of training and operational effectiveness. If a member becomes physically injured, let’s say they are missing a leg, or their vision or hearing is impaired, they could be placed on a Permanent Medical Category (PCAT) and medically released. Likewise if a member is suffering from severe mental health problems they
might also be placed on a PCAT and be medically released. Though this office does assist in the research and development of people with disabilities in Defence (more so civilians), this office is unable to ensure employment equity in that unhealthy members who no longer meet the universal medical standards for service are placed on category for release. It could be argued that this office is unable to protect CF members with disabilities, yet disabilities are privileged over sexual minorities in the CF in that they are allowed to advocate a disabilities mandate in defence, are allocated funds, resources, support and programs that perhaps are more needed by another large minority groups who are in fact healthy enough to serve full military careers.

**Defence Women Advisory Board**

Though women make more than half of the Canadian population, they constitute only about 13% of the Regular Forces military and 15% of the entire Canadian Forces. Despite the Employment Equity Act, defence offices, policies, programs, conferences and research, women continue to be underrepresented in the CF. Women however are allowed to be openly aggressive in their criticism of DND policies and routinely continue to publish statistics, figures and publications on how women continue to suffer workplace disparities. If a CFLGBT service member were to write the same types of criticisms on the status of LGBT people, it would not be published, usually referencing a lack of policy on sexuality justifying their actions (in that sexual orientation and gender identity are not included in the Employment Equity Act).

What is more, though this defence Advisory Board is for women and their allies, it seems to cater more towards a particular type of women: the cisgender heterosexual white women.
Defence Aboriginal Advisory Board

The First Nations People of Canada (referred to by some as Aboriginals) have been an internal consideration in policy development by the Government of Canada. There has always been a relationship between the First Nations People of Canada and the military dating back since before Confederation in 1867. Regretfully the face of colonial influences and the damage on Canada’s First Nation’s People continue. The military still use First Nation’s People as a means to expand Government interests and propaganda. The ‘Rangers’ were established as a paramilitary organization under the Department of National Defence. The intent was not only to further extend visibility and inclusion of First Nation’s people in DND, but more importantly to increase numbers of in Defence. It would appear that the public affairs and diversity statements disguise the face of an alternative agenda one that manipulates legislation and policies of First Nation’s People to advance political interests both within Cabinet and the Department of Defence. Therefore slapping a First Nations person with a Ranger hoody, hat and outdated weapon and having the white man in combats directing them, and taking opportune pictures to show how diverse and inclusive the CF is towards First Nations people seems to be what the CF sees as diversity.

A second troubling point of consideration consists of the strategic use of a minority group for the advancement of political interest. The matter of Canadian Artic sovereignty has especially gained popular interest in Canada since the turn of the century. The usage of the ‘Rangers’ in the most northern of communities solidifies Canada’s claim over the land used by First Nation’s People. More attention to Artic Sovereignty
also means more support for defence budgeting in order to maintain control over land and the resources that lie underneath in Canada’s Great North.

**Visible Minority Advisory Board**

Since, *visible minorities* are also a designated group under the Act, and as a designated group worthy of the military’s protection and support, they receive the same types of services as the other three groups. Though pushing the agenda; for women, aboriginals and visible minorities in the workplace is seen as an overall push toward diversity; while gender and sexual minorities are completely left out of consideration or conversation.

All these points do support the argument that DND supports minorities only when forced to by government intervention. What is more, when they are in fact forced to incorporate minority policies they are used in such a manner, which supports the Chain of Command’s interests and not those who require it the most. The Defence Advisory Groups have been and continue to be used as a public relations tool to portray a false image of its actual composition and attitudes towards minorities groups.

**Gender and Sexual Minorities**
Even when employment equity is forced, there is a clear and preferred treatment of other major minority groups over that of LGBT people. That is not to say that these Advisory Boards should not exist, or that their work does not contribute in some way towards employment equity but they are failing their mandates, continue to be used as PR tools and ignore LGBT input in defence diversity discussions. This type of deferential treatment is clear, blunt and evident when looking at policy, educational training programs, health resources and other services and structures in the CF both formal and otherwise.

To only further ensure that LGBT interests are excluded from visibility, the Chain of Command questions and challenges almost any and all grassroots efforts toward LGBT visibility. Only a handful of LGBT events have ever been authorized and when they are, they bask in the positive public attention as being seen as socially progressive and inclusive. Those CFLGBT service members who chose to show the leadership and develop new initiatives such as the Pride flag raising ceremony in Edmonton or the few Pride Parades that CFLGBT members assisted in over the years, endure an incredible amount of anxiety, nervousness and personal concern as to how taking the lead on such ‘Queer’ initiatives might negatively impact their career as someone who is trying to become “the token gay”, “the shit disturber” or in military terms being “an individual”. Diversity in the CF is only diversity by what it defines as diversity (much in the same manner that it has its own definition of harassment).

From their perspective (the CF cissgender heterosexual perspective) the current policies are inclusive enough as they are, and ignore any input or complaints made by LGBT service members (failed harassment complaint system and LGBT services),
academics, journalists and national LGBT advocacy organizations like Egale Canada. Unless the CF undertakes the formal and structural changes in order to somehow include LGBT people in defence discussions, above all have discussions on the type of resources and support they receive, there will continue to be failures and inconsistencies in policy on gender and sexual minorities which will continue to dance on the periphery of the defence stage of performance.

Same Sex Marriage

The matter of same sex legislation became the latest in Canadian public discourse in the advancement of ‘gay’ rights in Canada. Despite of enjoying the same rights and benefits as their heterosexual counterparts, the formal recognition of same-sex/gender relationships was the new project in Canadian LGBT rights. In Canada, marriage equality symbolized the intellectual and social advancement of socio-political thought. The advancement of LGBT rights was seen as a further progression toward modernity in Canada as well as other Western democracies. The Canadian Conservative party under Prime Minister Steven Harper might have supported very basic gay rights (housing, employment, anti-sodomy legislation, ext.) there was a need to appease the conservative political base that were against same-sex marriage. As such, instead of risking further debate in the House of Commons, the matter was forwarded to the Supreme Court of Canada to adjudicate. This politics of avoidance on the matter satisfied at least to some degree the Canadian conservative base as that the legislation did not pass in the House of Commons but instead by a (supposedly) unbiased legal third party: the Supreme Court of Canada. At the same time this also allowed for the conservatives to not be perceived or demonized as having an anti-gay agenda. Same-sex legislation was made legal July 20th
2005 under the Civil Marriage Act. What was interesting was that the passing of marriage equality in Canada did not greatly change or impact the types of benefits and services that CF members would receive. However, it did improve the overall public image of homosexuals being seen just as legitimate as their heterosexually identified married couples. This closed the gap a little further, allowing for LGBT people to be seen as more similar to their heterosexual peers whether they liked it, or not.

The first CF same-sex marriage occurred shortly after the passing of the new amendment to the Act at CFB Greenwood in 2005. The heteronormative military family imagery of the monogamous, young, fit, masculine, cisgender male running into the arms of his stay at home cisgender wife with children, are no longer becoming the standard norm at deployment reunions. With high divorce rates and an increase in alternative heterosexual lifestyles such as swingers, open relationships, common law status relationships, those who choose to not marry, remarry, or simply share living accommodations with a lover are quickly increasing. This gender and sexual landscape continues to change, thought its progression in the DND continues to be slow in comparison to the rest of Canadian society.

**Gender Identity in the CF**

The concept of gender identity perhaps is the most perplexing and paradoxical aspect of identity politics faced in Canada, which can scare and confuse too many. Nothing is taught in the military educational system that explains what gender identity is, why it is important to respect, and what occurs if gender minorities (MTF, FTM, gender Queer, Two-Spirited) are marginalized, excluded or harassed. I recall once in my own carer in the CF I met a trans female MCpl weapons tech instructor. Three times a day, when she
entered the eating Mess Hull, literally the whole room would stop, look over at her as she
walked by and stared at her. She would then sit down, and eat her meal ignoring the fact
that so many members were still staring at her, and whispering what she knew were
negative and offensive comments about her. I sat with her, and brought some of my
CFLGBT peers as well as some heterosexual ones from my course to sit with her. Eager
ears surrounded her as she told us of her tours and her time in the Air Bourne Regiment,
her transition, and how she was teaching a course at the Weapons tech school on base.
What I learned from this encounter was that the efforts of an individual (approaching her,
bringing friends over, and listening to her) opened up space for education and awareness
to the point that young Privates while using their heteronormative masculine
colloquialisms called her “a bad-ass tranny, which jumps out of planes with grenades and
a machine gun”. They in fact thought that she was “cool”. Not the most politically correct
language to use however a little more education on trans people in the CF could fix that
for sure. It is also important to look at how a derogatory word such as “tranny” could be
used to actually complement her soldiering capabilities, at the root not meant to be
transphobic but instead a cultural military means of expression, which could be cultivated
with the right training.

Since the passing of gender identity as a ground of discrimination in Canada after
dealing with several requests for sex changes by service members, the DND has had no
other choice other than to obey by legislation and facilitate gender transitioning from
born sex, to self-perceived gender identity. The result was the passing of a military policy
called CANFORGEN 031/12 CMO 017/12 081428Z Feb 12 CF MIL PERS INSTR
01/11- Management of CF Transsexual Members Unclassified. This is the closest piece of LGBT policy in existence in the CF.

**Canadian Forces Harassment Complaint System**

The formal inscription of rules, regulation and policies are the foundation of Western militaries. As such, the Canadian Forces socializes particular forms of behaviour, bringing certain types of identities closer than others. Excluding LGBT people out of conversations guarantees the continued failure of current programs and lack of new ones to address matters of gender and sexuality persist. From the CF’s perspective, there seems to be not much of a need in having additional policies on gender and sexual minorities since the repeal of CFAO 19-20 “*Sexual Deviation - Investigation, Medical Investigation and Disposal.*” The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom’s allowed for the prohibition against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, however prohibited grounds for discrimination do not tackle the greater social or structural inequity within military structures. The passing of the Employment Equity Act only designated four particular groups as being vulnerable minorities within Canadian society, therefore allowing for the marginalization of gender and sexual minorities in the workplace. When asked what tools and mechanisms are available in order to prevent homophobia, the CF constantly references their alleged comprehensive harassment policy. Currently, the CF’s definition of harassment (as a prohibited ground of discrimination) in the Canadian Forces must meet five particular points in order for it to be considered harassment. If all five points were not met, then it would not be considered harassment pursuant to DOAD 5012-0 Harassment Prevention and Resolution:
“Harassment is any improper conduct by an individual that is directed at and offensive to another person or persons in the workplace, and that the individual knew or ought reasonably to have known would cause offence or harm. It comprises any objectionable act, comment or display that demeans, belittles or causes personal humiliation or embarrassment, and any act of intimidation or threat”\(^{42}\).

To place this military harassment policy into context, if an instructor lines up his/her platoon and then calls them “a bunch of faggots” it would not considered harassment because he/she might not have known that there was a homosexual present, and the instructor did not directly call them a “faggot”, but the whole platoon, therefore two of the five criteria were not met and this incident would not be considered harassment. If anything the LGBT member might endure even more harassment for being an administrative burden. What is more, if a work colleague is heard by a third person sharing hateful sentiments and homophobic language at work, and the homosexual member reports it because he/she is offended or worried of future mistreatment by the offending member, it would not be considered harassment because the LGBT member was not present. The drafting and application of this regulation therefore allows the possibility for systematic harassment and deployment of homophonic language, behaviour and deportment that reinforces a model of militant compulsory heterosexuality, where homosexuality can be publically ridiculed in government employment. The only viable mechanism to report harassment or discrimination is vis-à-vis this harassment complaint system; a system, which is referenced when asked how homophobic/transphobic behaviour is dealt with in the CF. In other words accepts the

\(^{42}\) DOAD 5012-0 “Harassment Prevention and Resolution”, Canadian Forces, Department of National Defence, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, December 29\(^{\text{th}}\), 2000.
current policy is used as a scapegoat tactic in response to civilian or internal questioning on harassment. Even if a harassment complaint is successful, then mediation is encouraged and rarely are administrative procedures such as, a verbal warning, written warning, or counselling and probation or disciplinary charges; such as Summary Trials and Court Marshall enforced as a result of a homophobic incident.

Sometimes a homophobic infraction might escalate to a disciplinary level depending on the recommendation of the RSM (Regimental Sergeant Major) or the Commanding Officer (CO). Military charges (either Summary Trial or election for a Standing Court Marshall are possible, however unlikely, as that all other mechanisms for conflict resolution and discipline must be considered prior to the laying of such a charge. In other words, what results is if a member is confirmed to have committed harassment or a non-criminal code service offence, it will almost always be handled at the lowest level possible. The severity of the matter is almost always underplayed and almost always individualized and dealt with as a particular incident as opposed to considering it as potentially larger and more systematic issue. Since there is no policy or mandate on the investigation or study of gender or sexuality, there is no data on the matter. This is why it is extremely difficult to investigate or study issues around gender identity or sexuality in the Canadian Forces. What is more, homophobic/transphobic offences in protocol would fall under the name of another charge “Conduct Prejudicial to the Good Order and Discipline”, or “Insubordination”, “Abuse of Rank and Authority”, ext. The context on the incident would only be found in the particulars of the charge reducing the ability to access any charges having anything to do with sexuality. The burden of proof lies strictly
on the victim (or investigating authority with terms of reference set forth by a CO for an investigation) to substantiate the laying of the charge.

**Canadian Forces Director of Military Careers Administration (CFDMCA)**

The DMCA is a DND office which regulates and directs any matters relating to administration reviews on medical and/or conduct related matters that no longer meet the universal standard of employment. This office coordinates the “CF Drug Control Program, and more importantly, they have the power to adjudicate on release issues including audits and administrative reviews for both reserve and regular forces service members. In reality, this office removes individuals from service that they deem ‘unfit for service’, which is open to interpretation by the adjudicating Officer. This office has been used as a tool for subversive budget cutting by removing ‘unfit’ or unwanted service members including administrative burdens from service instead of investigating what could be done in order to avoid release proceeding.

As we will see in this chapter, the CF has not only used this office as a means to rid themselves of LGBT service members, but service members that they feel do not fit into military culture. This can be done by searching out a member’s ‘dirty laundry’ interviewing peers, any military lovers that an LGBT person might have had, going on their Facebook, work e-mail, or even simply charging them for being two minutes late or even forgetting a Dr.’s note at home which builds a paper trail. These relatively small issues are then overinflated and dramatized in order to justify release. The processes of administrative and disciplinary proceedings can seriously impact a member’s mental health undergoing these intimidating and stressful procedures.
Since the gradual withdraw of the CF in Afghanistan, multilateral initiatives were developed in order to cut down on the number of service members employed by the DND. This resulted in instructors on courses rigidly critiquing and failing members labeling them ‘unfit’ for the specific trade they were admitted for. Alternative options offered to officers who failed a course even if it was the first time, consisted of either switching to an unwanted trade, giving up their Commission as an Officer in the CF, be demoted to a Corporal or release. Instructors at bases such as CFB Gagetown have proactively chosen to go after people to fail them because regiments were too full, operational need low, and therefore they did not want to take on any new officers. This unethical and unfair practice is secluded under a veil of backdoor agreements between the regiments and training schools to reduce the number of service members. These dynamics are too complex to understand and challenge by NCM’s and Jr. Officers. Once out of the military, these broken service members choose not to go public on the matter because they fear that the publicity might be a barrier to future employment in the civilian sector.

Another area of concern has to do with what Adjudicating Officers (AO’s) are brought into these offices and what their professional and personal expertise is on incoming files other than just being an officer in good standing. CF officers are posted to this office as a result of rank, seniority and approved posting choice by their career manager. It is expected that the officer have the professional and educational experience to adjudicate on file reviews and audits. However, like much in life, at times rank is not sufficient to handle all intersectional matters centred on release. Complex files are not something that these officers are unaccustomed to; however, when sexuality and gender
identity becomes related to conduct or medical release, they do not have sufficient knowledge or experience in handling these taboo issues. These administrative officers at times lack the education or personal experience in empathizing on LGBT based issues. They cannot see the greater picture of things on how sexual minorities navigate their careers in the CF, what their needs and wants consist of and above all how they are victim of inefficient and lacking LGBT based military policies. Instead, these officers strictly adhere to policy and regulations, at times ignoring personal sentiment on what should be done.

As a result of not having any specific policy on sexuality, or education as to how sexuality and military culture intersect, CFLGBT service members end up falling through the cracks of policy. Sexuality (more than gender identity) is seen as an irrelevant factor to service, an early 1990’s DND attitude and strategy in handling the homosexual issue.

**Canadian Forces Ombudsman**

The role of the CF Ombudsman is to serve as a neutral third party to investigate matters relating to DND. It operates independently from the Chain of Command who reports directly to the Minister of National Defence. “This office serves as a direct source of information, referral, and education for the men and women of the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces. Its role is to help individuals access existing channels of assistance or redress when they have a complaint or concern. In addition, the Ombudsman may investigate and report publicly on matters affecting the welfare of members and employees of the Department or the Canadian Forces and others who fall
within its jurisdiction. The ultimate goal is to contribute to substantial and long-lasting improvements to the Defence community.\textsuperscript{43}

The Ombudsman shall, on the Minister’s behalf,

a. act as a neutral and objective sounding board, mediator, investigator and reporter on matters related to the DND and CF;\textsuperscript{□}

b. act as a direct source of information, referral and education to assist individuals in accessing existing channels of assistance and redress within the DND and CF; and

c. serve to contribute to substantial and long-lasting improvements in the welfare of employees and members of the DND and CF community.\textsuperscript{44}

The problem with the CF Ombudsman has to do with the fact that they only have the authority to force the Chain of Command to follow already established rules, regulations and protocols. They will not intervene on a matter until there is a filed breach in protocol (in which case they reference the appropriate authority in the matter) or if they see systematic failures on the same issue. For example, if a harassment complaint is submitted and finalized and the complaint is considered ‘not harassed’ as a result of five criteria not met; then the Ombudsman cannot do anything about it because policy procedures were followed. If a complainant disagrees with the result of the harassment complaint, there are no available options other than to submit a grievance to the Canadian Forces Military Grievances External Committee (CFMGERC), which once more will review policies, and might still find the harassment complaint to be unfounded based on

\textsuperscript{43}“Our Mandate”, National Defence and the Canadian Forces Ombudsman, Department of National Defence, Ottawa, Canada, January 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2013.  

\textsuperscript{44}“Ombudsman Mandate General Duties and Functions”, Ministerial Directives, 3. i. 13, Department of National Defence Ombudsman, August 2006.
established criteria pursuant to DAOD 5012-0. If you happen to release from the CF (as many LGBT people do rather then deal with any further mistreatment) then the members are not allowed to redress the matter at all.

**Military Grievances External Committee (MGERC)**

As of June 19th 2013 what was formally known as the Director General of the Canadian Forces Grievance Authority (DGCFGA), changed its name to the MGERC. The MGERC is a federal military tribunal who is mandated to review *certain* grievances. The ambiguity of the word certainly allows for ample interpretation for a deciding authority to accept or reject a grievance. This can be problematic since the initial decision as to whether to take or reject a grievance depends on the interpretation of the grievance by the intake analyst.

The Queen’s Regulations and Orders (QR&O) volume one, chapter seven further explains the stages of the grievance process; in which particular instructions on time frames are established elaborating on the stages of the grievance process. It details the duties and responsibilities of the Commanding Officers, Initial Authorities (IA) and Final Authorities (FA). It identifies who can act as an IA and what grievances must be referred to the grievance board. It also identifies those categories of grievance that must be referred to the Grievance Board.

The National Defence Act: Section 29 (NDA: Section 29) provides the legal framework for the grievance process establishing the parameters on the right to grieve. It also ensures that the IA and the FI to consider and determine grievances. This section also authorizes the grievance board to provide findings and recommendations to the CDS to prescribe grievance categories. Furthermore, DAOD 2017-0, *Military Grievances*, is
the DND policy that entrenches law and policy into a type of Standing Operating Procedure (SOP) during a grievance.

When we examine what the MGERC’s mandate is, we superficially see an inclusive policy, which states:

“Any officer or non-commissioned member who has been aggravated by any decision, act or omission in the administration of the affairs of the Canadian Forces for which no other process for redress is provided under the National Defence Act is entitled to submit a grievance”. 45

Regretfully, the realities of who can grieve, how and under what conditions are established in such a manner that forces members to use all available resources prior to submission of a grievance. What is more, NCM’s and Jr. Officers are not fluent in the bureaucratic and procedural processes of a grievance. Grievances, like harassment complaints are culturally seen as an, ‘administrative burden’ though members have the freedom to exercise that right. Therefore members instead choose to ignore or not grieve an issue. When we examine the intersectionality of the grievance processes with gender and sexual identity we find that this office has little to no power to intervene, because members who grieve are redirected to submit a harassment complaint instead of grieving. As we saw earlier, if only four out of five points are met, then the incident would not be considered harassment, and the MGERC would agree that only four points were met, even if there was what one consider blatant hate language, it is not considered harassment. The LGBT service member has the option to either suck it up, or release from the CF.

---

Canadian Forces Directorate of Human Rights and Diversity (CFDHRD)

The DHRD was established as the incarnation of the Employment Equity Act in the Department of National Defence. Though the term “diversity” has been a word more synonymous in referencing gender and sexual diversity in rights based discourse in the West or at the very least to include it, it is used only to reference the diversity of the four designated groups pursuant to the Employment Equity Act of Canada. Therefore, for whoever looks into the administrative structures of the CF it would give the allusion that there are structural services for diversity but neglects to explain that sexual orientation is not included.

To make matters even more interesting the DND has separated the Diversity offices into two, consisting of the Director of Diversity and Well Being (DDWB) for civilian personnel and the DHRD of which CF service members fall under. This separation of Diversity jurisdiction is concerning as that there appears to be different standards and liberties as to how diversity in incorporated in DND. In other words diversity differs if you are a civilian verses that of military personnel, though on paper both branches are supposed to reflect the same degree of diversity.

Instead of the CFDHRD being an approachable office that reinforces current diversity policy and programs, conducts research on minorities and improves or creates new policies, it would appear that it is more interested in defending current policies and procedures and only advancing the interests of the four designated groups. The hope is that in having established these offices, the CF believed that it would have reached its diversity mandates set forth in the Employment Equity Act and that they would no longer have to worry about the ‘diversity’ question.
Since this push towards “diversity”, the CF has traditionally used particular individuals as their ‘token’ female Commanding Officer, “token Jewish Chaplain”, “token Sikh” or even ‘token’ senior ranking female infantry soldier (currently a lesbian Sargent (Sgt.), not a very high rank at all). Whenever possible photo opportunities, speeches and military publications are delivered with the explicit attempt to paint to the picture of the CF as being a reflection of Canadian society and an ‘employer of choice of all Canadians’. This idealistic and romanticised approach from an institution with the force and arsenal to level whole cities surely cannot be this utopian in the treatment of its Queer personnel.

However, the moment that sexuality is introduced into diversity discussion and how it could be brought into policies and programs, DHRC states that there is neither mandate nor visible need to do so. DHRD routinely reassigns responsibility of the exclusion of sexual orientation to the Employment Equity Act, back to the government, at which point in time the same public affairs is statements: that the CF has zero tolerance towards harassment or discrimination of any kind, that members undergo sensitivity training (only on the four designated groups) and has a comprehensive harassment program to deal with homophobia. What this results in is continued invisibility, harassment, and censorship of LGBT issues in the CF.

What they do not disclose is the fact that Commanding Officers do have the authority and the discretion to authorise ‘personal development’ initiatives of which could be covered under the unit’s budget. The problem seems that Commanding Officers either do not understand the importance of forcing sexual diversity into military education, feel awkward or nervous about bringing themselves into the spotlight on what
is still a controversial and taboo topic, or they feel that they do not have the mandate or responsibility to promote gender and sexual diversity. Many Commanding Officers feel that any programs or initiatives that are of a sexual or gender nature should be channelled through DHRD at which point DHRD would either say there is no mandate for sexual orientation as a result of the Employment Equity Act and over and over we go through this ‘chicken and the egg’ dynamic which quite successfully deflects the true underlying issues and remain hidden. Though there have been many requests and inquiries on the status of CFLGBT service members by journalists, academics and Egale Canada as well as internal CF grass roots initiatives towards visibility, protection and support for CFLGBT service members, the CFDHRD still turns a blind eye to gender and sexual minorities hiding behind policies and mandates that that are either incomplete, inadequate or marginalize CFLGBT service members. What we can see is that despite the name DHRD it does not protect, research, or advocate for gender and sexual diversity.
Comparisons with other Jurisdictions (Five Eyes)

**British Armed Forces**

Sexuality as a designated group vulnerable to discrimination was introduced into the U.K.’s Employment Act of 2003. Unlike Canada’s Employment Equity Act, which only designates four protected groups, sexual orientation is in fact included in the U.K.’s version. Furthermore the EU’s Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999 and subsequently the Employment Equality Framework Directive 2000/78/EC September of 2000 also set forth a clear policy that removed workplace barriers against sexual and gender diversity.

**The MOD and LGBT Policies and Programs**

The Ministry of Defence (MOD) Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Forum is a Departmental workplace diversity forum developed by the MOD, composed of volunteer staff who represent the LGBT staff working throughout the Department and who wish to be referred to as LGBT staff. Therefore we see the freedom of self-identification can be of great help, and contrary to Canadian LGBT public opinion on self-identification it has not negatively impacted people in the MOD. The aim of this forum is to:

- Represent the interests of LGBT staff throughout the MOD;
- Ensure that the Department fully meets its obligations and commitments under the Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations of 2003 and the Sex Discrimination (Gender Reassignment) Regulations 1999;
- Raise awareness and publicity of LGBT issues throughout the Department;
• Provide a channel of communication between LGBT staff and can meet in a private and safe environment to discuss LGBT issues and that facilitates for interaction and communication between LGBT staff are provided;
• Form a confidential support network of LGBT staff working within the Department;
• Oppose discrimination and inequality, particularly on the grounds of sexual orientation or gender identity; and
• Promote the welfare of LGBT staff

We also have local networks at:
• MDPGA also have a staff support group LGB Unite;
• Northern Ireland.46

The MOD’s impact assessment procedure requires them to find possible grounds that marginalize, persecute or mistreat sexual and gender minorities in their practices and SOP’s in order to ensure that any discriminatory aspects are completely removed from the workplace and its extensions. This Diversity Policy Statement is displayed at defence installations across MOD facilities that explicitly refer to sexual orientation as a form of discrimination providing visibility of LGBT people in the MOD as well as reinforcing a clear policy directive against mistreatment of their gender and sexual minority status.

In the MOD’s “Our Dignity At Work Policy” we find restrictions that further amplify their ‘zero tolerance stance’ on bullying and harassment, which is included in their diversity training provided to all of its service members. The CF does have a similar policy however as looked at before in this chapter however only center on four particular

designated minority groups. Sexual orientation in the Canadian DND is not clearly outlined nor explained as it is in the MOD’s diversity training program.

Even before potential candidates choose to apply to join the military the Recruitment Centers clearly emphasis that the “MOD is committed to diversity in all walks of life, irrespective of race, ethnic origin, gender, religion and without reference to social background or sexual orientation”\(^47\). They do not reinforce diversity because of legislation or political correctness but because they believe that, as their recruitment website states, it is the “morally right” thing to do so. This is an outstanding and proactive stance to take of which Canada might consider developing too.

**MOD and LGBT Advocacy NGOs**

The MOD has also chosen to be proactive in ensuring that LGBT interests, needs and wants are met by working in partnership with external institutions, in particular British LGBT advocacy organizations. As such, they are members of the Stonewall Diversity Champions Program and take part in routine Workplace Equality Index benchmarking exercises. These benchmarking activities help identify improper workplace practices, which allow participants the opportunity to grow their sexual orientation action plan. Furthermore, much like the Canadian (LGBT) Public Service Network, U.K. LGBT staff also has a support group called LGB Unite. This group is another mechanism within the public service that provide support services and positive space environments to express themselves and enter into conversation with other LGBT people and their allies within the public service.

The United Kingdom, like the other members of the Five Eyes is an outstanding example of how governments look at and enable legislation, policies, and initiatives that address matters of workplace inequality. It also highlights the very public and proactive efforts made by a military ministry in ensuring that the MOD is truly a positive space environment for their LGBT personnel. Canada’s close cultural, linguistic, political commonalities and historical roots to the United Kingdom seems to not be taken into consideration in regards to LGBT issues. What is more, DND’s failure in acknowledging gender and sexual minority issues and sheer lack of interest of developing new policies and resources is indicative of a hegemonic masculine military culture of silencing LGBT visibility and voices.

**Australian Defence Force (ADF)**

The social dimension of Australian male culture is deeply rooted in the colonial period where mass amounts of British prisoners were brought to penal colonies to this exotic terrain. Over time, this contributed to a macho, ‘bad-boy’, Australian outback, Indiana-Jones male figure type. The dangers and ruggedness of the Australian terrain was synonymous with their version of the Aussie cowboy type. As such, a heteronormative culture continued developing where sexuality developed, maintaining a traditional British polite disregard.

As Canada did in 1992, so did Australia lift it’s ban on LGBTI (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Intersexed) members to serve openly in the ranks. However, unlike Canada, senior officials in the Australian Defence Force (ADF) advocated for a lift on the band on gender and sexual minorities as that it positively contributed to their personal morale and ability to operate effectively in the workplace.
The progression towards workplace equity for LGBTI people developed differently and at an earlier period in Australia than Western Democracies. In 1986 the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOTC) Act authorised the investigation of any kind of workplace discrimination including that of sexual orientation. Their approach was more consistent with a social conservative approach to privacy. A ‘What happens behinds closed doors, stays behind closed doors’ perspective, looking at sexuality as irrelevant, personal and not work related.

A second strange political phenomenon occurred in Australia on the debate of LGBT workplace equity; there was none. The national conservative and left wing liberals both visibly supported LGBT employment equity, a rare occurrence in political legislature anywhere.

The Australian Parliament voted for the passing of a Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Bill), which was vigorously supported by both the government and opposition coming into law August 1st, 2013. It was the first Bill of its kind to introduce intersex people into consideration and protection. Here we find once more this kind of dualism in Australian politics where same-sex marriage is not supported; however protection, benefits and services for them are encouraged. Regardless, the ADF force has benefited greatly from the introduction of sexual orientation in HREOTC, removal of the policy that banned LGBTI service members to serve openly in the ADF, as well as its active collaboration with Australian LGBT advocacy organizations.
The ADF and LGBT Policies

The ADF has chosen to be proactive in ensuring that visibility and diversity are promoted and enforced within its ranks. It has developed and deployed a well-oiled multi-vector approach at tacking the issues that gender and sexual minorities face in defence. The Australian example highlights the cooperation between both LGBTI NGOs and the ADF, where a policy of diversity is truly exemplified. Unlike in the DND, the ADF has played an active role in opening conversations and taking input from those who know LGBT issues the best, LGBT people themselves. Despite the fact that Australia still has not passed equal marriage, yet the ADF has taken the initiative to do what it can to ensure that equity is pushed to the fullest extent within the ADF without being forced by the government to do so.

The Directorate of Diversity (the ADF’s counterpart to the CFDHRD) houses the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex forum. A collective that probes into the current status of LGBTI Australian services members, conducts qualitative research, and provides strategies for the improvement and development of LGBT protection and support in defence.

The “People Strategy and Culture Branch leads cultural reform initiatives; champions diversity, disability, indigenous and women's leadership in Defence; and is the central point of contact for Defence and APS engagement on these key initiatives” in the ADF. By March 2012, The ADF formally gained membership into the Diversity Council of Australia, a leading diversity advisor to the Australian business community. As such they have access to up to date diversity facts, figures, statistics and analysis on

matters of sociological analysis on gender and sexual diversity. Furthermore, the publication of “Understanding Transitioning Gender in the Workplace” was developed in conjunction with the MOD’s Gender Centre in order to assist military leadership in understanding the different parts of a member’s professional life that are challenging during the transition processes. The publication serves more as a point of reference than a tool; however it does provide perspective in knowing what actions to take and how to coordinate with other Defence offices on Trans issues. The ADF is also a member of “Pride in Diversity”, another LGBT NGO that advocates for LGBTI rights in Australia.

Since 2012, the Defence Force Gay and Lesbian Information Service (DFGLID) has been operating as a support network that serves current LGBTI serving members, Veterans and civilian personnel. Their objects consist of supporting, strengthening and educating defence personnel on LGBTI matters. DEFGLIS has a larger mandate as well; which provides peer-support to LGBTI service members, provide referrals to wellness and mental health services, promotes diversity principles with managers and leadership as well as represent the interests of LGBTI service members on policy related matters. The composition of this LGBTI military NGO is extremely inclusive, meaning that anyone who might have any relationship to sexuality and the military is welcome to the group. This includes current serving members, reservists, public servants, veterans, family, friends, reporters, and supporters. DEFLIS has contributed to the following projects:

- The development of information and access to tools and resources;
- Equal benefits for same-sex partners;
- DEFGLIS/Defence Participation in Martis Gras Parade in 2008;
• Contribution to the international Out Serve’s Leadership Summit as well as the New Zealand Pride in Defence conference;
• Training and development for personnel, and;
• Bilateral participation with the ADF in the 2013 Mardi Gras Parade.

What we can gather from the Australian example is that despite the great socially conservative undertones of Australian culture, they have demonstrated a certain level of consideration towards gender and sexual minorities. They have done this by setting out a clear mandate that explicitly addresses sexual orientation and gender identity affording them, both in the public in the private sector, the protection and support needed to have a safe, friendly and productive workplace environment. Furthermore, the ADF has sought out guidance and information from non-governmental organisations, which have been instrumental in education, advising and participating in ADF LGBTI initiatives and programs. The DND has nothing even close to these types of resources, support, research, networking out of lack of interest and LGBT mandate.

New Zealand

When looking to other jurisdictions like New Zealand and see how they have tackled the issues of sexual and gender minorities within a defence context we see that their approach has naturally developed in the similar manner as other Departments of defence. The Homosexual Law Reform of 1986 decriminalized homosexual acts over the age of 16. Later, the New Zealand Human Rights Act of 1993 prohibited discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation except in the public service (in other words the military). By 1999, the Labour party amended the Human Rights Act to remove the restriction on sexual orientation in the public service that it was an deemed a clear and unfair form of
workplace discrimination by the Australian Government. Unlike Canada’s DND, the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) was not opposed to removing the barrier against LGBT service members. The Civil Union Act of 2004 recognised same-sex and opposite sex unions, that resulted in the 2005 Statutory References Act which extended equal benefits and services to same-sex unions.

The contributions of New Zealand military NGOs have been vigorous despite its small size. Cooperation between DIFGLIS Australia has let to the formation of DIFGLIS New Zealand in 2010. Part of DIFLIS New Zealand’s role was to provide sensitivity education such as what type of language and behaviour is inclusive and exclusive, such us using gender neutral adverbs, not to assume everyone is heterosexual, not use homophobic terms, and use terms such as ‘significant other’ or ‘partner’, as opposed to always assuming heterosexuality. They have also participated in the 2013 ‘Pride in New Zealand’ Conference. This type of dialogue has not only strengthened acknowledgement and support for NZDF LGBTI service members but as probe into concurrent LGBTI defence issues such as policy, programs and services. Opening this means of conversation between the NZDF and LGBTI service members, veterans, academics and members of the civilian population only further patches up the bureaucratic and social cracks in which sexual and gender minority fall through as they do in Canada.

**United States Armed Forces**

We have now entered into a new epoch in the United States, a now post-“Don’t Ask Don’t Tell” era, where there is now a wide understanding that being a member of a sexual minority no longer compromises operational effectiveness, and no longer could be a barrier to military service. The only barrier that still remains consists of the matter of
benefits centered on same-sex marriage. The reason as to why same-sex relationships in the U.S. military are not recognised nor receive equal benefits as their heterosexually identified peers is most definitely not the fault of the U.S. Department of Defence (DOD) but that of both state and federal political governments. “Since the Federal Government does not recognise same-sex marriages, a Marine cannot claim dependency for a same-sex partner, for BAH purposes.”49 The moment that same-sex marriage becomes legal within federal and state jurisdiction the DOD will comply and follow through with legislation and policy. Therefore the matter of equality in terms of benefits in the DOD is still a forced issue both by pro-gay rights supporters from within the DOD but more importantly in political offices in both Republican and Democrat circles as well as the Obama Administration itself.

In the meantime, there are some policies and educational training programs, which have been introduced in and around the time of the repeal of DADT. In the U.S. Marines, an educational training lesson was given to let both heterosexually identified service members and LGB service members. Upon review of U.S. Marine’s PowerPoint presentation on the repeal of DADT their Chain of Command has made it quite clear, that any violation of new policies post-DADT would be unacceptable by stating that: “the DOD and the Marine Corps maintains: zero tolerance for harassment, violence or discrimination”50. Furthermore, this is reinforced by the usage of military law by explaining that “violations may be punished as: violation of lawful regulation, disobeying

49 “Repeal of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell (DADT)”, US Marine Corps Briefing notes on Repeal of Don’t Ask Don’t Tell, Department of Defence, United States of America, 2013.
50 “Repeal of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell (DADT)”, US Marine Corps notes on Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”, Department of Defence, United States of America, 2013.
an order, or dereliction of duty”\textsuperscript{51}. Though the lecture is paradoxical in that it also explains that all members are equal to each other and should be treated as such, however equal benefits are not authorised nor are Chaplain’s prohibited from anti-gay language because it would be a violation of their 5\textsuperscript{th} Amendment rights the lecture was successful in warning the subsequent ramifications of discriminating or mistreating a Marine or sailor on the bases of sexual orientation.

However, despite the U.S. Defensive of Marriage Act (DOMA) the Marines have made it clear in their educational and training programs that “gay, lesbian, and bisexual Marines and Sailors are treated in the same general principals of military equal opportunity or MEO, policy to promote an environment free from personal, social, or institutional barriers that prevent Marines or Sailors form resting to the highest level of responsibility possible and they are evaluated only on the individual merit, fitness, and capability”. The DND could have made a similar policy, however the elevation of gender and sexual minorities to the same level as Canadian Employment Equity Act standards much in the same way that the U.S. elevated sexual orientation as an equivalent to Military Equal Opportunity (MEO) criteria. Though the U.S. DOD did take over a decade longer to repeal their anti-gay law than Canada, the acceleration of equality has been substantially quicker than Canada. Over a dozen military LGBT NGOs currently operate in the U.S. offering medical, financial, social and spiritual support as well as advise and practice advocacy work which has resulted in the push for several lawsuits against the DOD.

\textsuperscript{51} “Repeal of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell (DADT)” Tier 3 Brief, US Marine Corps Power Point Presentation, Department of Defence, United States, 2013.
Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)

Service members Legal Defence Network were instrumental in the protection of active duty LGBT service members from harassment, discrimination and release proceedings. Service Members Unite was inaugurated in 2005 was geared towards the progression of LGBT rights in the U.S. branches of the military. The “Knights Out” was another U.S. military LGBT NGOs catering to the particular needs of West Point associates, likewise the U.S. Navy had its own version: USNA Out. The transgender community created the Transgender American Veterans’ Association with the objective of providing visibility and support for former transgender service members and the authorization to admit and allow trans members into the ranks. This LGBT NGO also advocates for a military trans positive space for former and current service members to not only interact, but provide peer based support, and celebrate gender diversity in all its various forms other than the traditional bipolar gender order which still continues to dominate American military culture. This NGO is simply another service that is centered and catered around these vulnerable LGBT groups within the U.S. military.

In the same manner that we have seen male soldiers running into the arms of their girlfriends and wives, there are also male and female service members who run into the arms of their gay or lesbian partners. Therefore there was a demand for support for spouses and partners of LGBT service members, which resulted in the creation of the American Military Partner Association created in 2009. Its objective was to provide services to spouses of military personal that would otherwise not be provided by the DOD as a result of queered gender and sexual identity.
With the spread of same-sex marriage in U.S. states and its federal recognition just around the corner, the abundance of U.S. military LGBT NGOs, conferences, studies, centres, services and programs we can see that the United States who lagged way behind in the LGBT rights spectrum is starting to surpass even Canada. Canada needs to relook at the situation of its LGBT service members and see what struggles they continue to face, if the current services and policies sufficiently assist and protect members from homophobia and transphobia, as well as consider new directions; to improve and develop a diversity model that actually invites LGBT input and be active participants in decision making. Much like in the DOD, DND should consider working in partnership with local LGBT NGOs to identify areas where gender and sexual minorities might be marginalized or excluded, and develop new inclusive and supportive approaches to considering where LGBT people are left on defence discourse. Regrettfully, unlike the U.S., Canada has not had, and continues to lack formal Defence LGBT input and military LGBT NGOs to assist in filling in the gaps in services.

The removal of sodomy laws, access to same sex-benefits, being protected as a ground of discrimination and same-sex marriage have all been milestone achievements in Canada, however it would appear that within some of its domains there are still disparities in equality that continue to remain unresolved. Canada; unlike most of its NATO allies have not included sexual orientation as designated group under its Employment Equity Act, an act used by the DND as a federal mandate which has resulted in the creation of the CFDHRD which excludes LGBTI needs, complaints and interests. Financial funding, services, policies, offices, education and visibility programs for the major minority groups and not any for our most currently vulnerable minority group
(LGBT people) does leave much room for marginalisation, invisibilising and discrimination of an essential aspect of human nature.

When comparing Canada to that of other culturally and politically related jurisdiction we find that despite Canada’s reputation of its inclusive attitude toward LGBT people it is in fact lagging behind all “Five Eyes” member states. The DND has not upgraded their policies to address sexual orientation but continues to occupy a space of limbo, out of sync with not only the rest of Canadian society, but allied militaries as well. The “Five Eyes” are not the only secular countries that have been not only legally open to LGBT people but also have been proactive in ensuring that legislation is amplified vis-à-vis policy in order for the proper programs, support and initiatives to be in place to ensure actual Employment Equity. More importantly, that a means of communication initiated between the Department of Defence and LGBT communities that they are sworn to protect and serve.

It is clear that Canada’s Department of Defence continues to use a politics of turning a blind eye to something that is still considered an uncomfortable and unwanted topic of conversation. To discuss matters of sexuality is to recognise the existence of the only other alternative to their sexuality: the act of homosexuality. To acknowledge that which is most dreaded, most paradoxal is to welcome it into the spotlight for all others to see. Validation of its existence would only acknowledge alternative possibilities of being which deviate from orthodox heterosexual patterns of behaviour: it would be a paradigm shift in the way military nuclear families develop.

Regretfully, “winning law reform and equality with straights has its limitations. Usually it means little more that homoconformity within hetero society. We comply with
their system. It is parity on heterosexual terms - equal rights within a framework determined and dominated by straights.”

Using heteronormative rules, regulations and policies without formal LGBT input allows for inequality, marginalization, discrimination and/or inadequate treatment for its non-heterosexual service members. We can therefore deduce that CFLGBT issues stem not only from current policy failures such as the harassment complaint system, the lack of a policy on LGBT people, but also refusing to open a Defence CFLGBT office under the CFDHRD.

---

Chapter 4: Case Studies

Now that we have reviewed how sexuality, masculinity and policy regulate military environments we shall now see how it has impacted CFLGBT service members professionally and personally. We will be reviewing examples of real life cases, which highlight the systematic marginalization, discrimination, harassment, and at times persecution of CFLGBT service members. In fact, so common is homophobia and transphobia in the CF that it has been challenging to choose which incidents to review. Therefore I have chosen the incidents that reflect the most common as well as the most complex cases of both, formal informal discrimination. I also chose these incidents because they occurred at the most critical times in a CF member’s career: during training and when deployed. What better than the home of CF’s basic and Combat Arms training bases, to see how sexuality and gender identity is perceived and developed? This is why Canadian Forces Base (CFB) Gagetown and Base des Force canadiennes (BFC) St. Jean were of particular interest as that they are responsible for the professional education and development of future CF soldiers and officers. We will see how homophobia can destabilize trust, and the wellbeing of service members while on dangerous and hostile taskings (military errands) such as deployment. It is during these critical stages in a service member’s career where they are the most vulnerable, the most broken and suscette to pivotal identity changes.
Case Study 1: CFLRS LGBT Admin Reviews

The first case study that we will review is on workplace homophobia endured by a young Combat Arms Officer at B.F.C. St. Jean at the Canadian Forces Leadership and Recruit School (CFLRS). CFLRS is where Regular Forces (Full-Time) Non-Commissioned Member’s (NCM’s) are sent for their basic training. The reason as to why this administrative review is of particular interest is because it was conducted by an impartial third party CF officer on not only the discrimination of a homosexual member in particular, but also the overall homophobic and by default transphobic issues endured by CFLGBT service members at CFLRS. Earlier in chapter one I discussed the military culture and indoctrination processes where new recruits are broken and rebuilt into a new and particular type of identity. We shall now see exactly how the Chain of Command at CFLRS manipulated, solicited, and created malicious information to damage a CFLGBT person who was openly gay, and administratively fought the homophobia of peers and superiors. The following are excerpts of the administrative investigator’s analysis (the names have been changed in order to protect the member’s privacy):

“15. ...Indeed, there is no observation, warning or indication stating that platoon personnel were concerned about OCdt [April’s] behaviour and attitude. In comparing OCdt [April’s] evaluations with those of other members of the Platoon, it can be seen that the evaluation of “performance” is very arbitrary and inconsistent and leaves room for discrimination.

17. Overall, OCdt [April’s] file appears to reveal omissions and shortcomings in administrative and disciplinary procedures. All of OCdt [April’s] requests were ignored by CFLRS personnel, yet the complaints, statements, and comments of
others against OCdt [April] were all taken at face value and seem to have been 
exploited to the fullest in order to initiate administrative and disciplinary 
procedures against OCdt [April], and this was done without regard to deadlines. 
All of this does indeed seem to indicate discrimination/harassment.

18. The fact that investigations were conducted by several people at CFLRS concerning 
OCdt [April’s] case, with no mandate and no coordination, etc., is also 
questionable.

19. Lastly, the fact that CFLRS instructors and personnel make primarily negative 
associations with the name “[April]”, together with the fact that the file contains a 
number of complaints and statements concerning the treatment of GLBT people 
from other GLBT people as well, tends to indicate that some of OCdt’s allegations 
are surely will founded.

20. Based on the statements of GBLT people, it is obvious that the work climate for 
GBLT people - in any Division - is not what these people would like, since most of 
them are hesitant and even fearful about revealing their sexual orientation. “

The first excerpt from the Administrative review on OCdt found that a
recommendation for release was initiated with reference towards deficiencies in attitude 
and behaviour despite there being no record of any misbehaviour. Furthermore, when 
comparing this member’s file to that of other members of his platoon it was found that 
“performance” seemed arbitrary and subjective as opposed to it being a breach in 
protocol, which in the case of this member indicates discrimination.

In the second paragraph we see that there were omissions and shortcoming on 
behalf of the Chain of Command at CFLRS, which were typical in reference to OCdt

April. What was more; statements requests and comments by OCdt April were blatantly ignored by the Chain of Command. What the third paragraph indicated was that the Chain of Command also went out of its way to solicit this member’s course peers into writing any kind of antagonistic documentation in order to initiate release proceedings. This was done with no mandate, no terms of reference and solicited to the platoon when the member was not in the room.

The fact that CFLRS instructors and personnel systematically made negative associations with a member’s name, did nothing professionally to warrant such mistreatment and the fact that other LGBT service members were complaining of similar issues meant that OCdt April’s claims were seen as “well founded”. This would indicate that OCdt April was more or less ‘voted off the island’ so to speak, as a result of peers and instructors not being comfortable with this service member being open with his sexuality, and challenging moments of homophobic language and behaviour.

Finally, in the last excerpt, we find that it was “obvious that the workplace climate” was not what CFLGBT members wanted as that they were hesitant and fearful of other’s knowing their sexual orientation. This administrative review clearly indicated the fact OCdt April’s instructors, staff and even peers were able to collectively push him out of the CF using by searching out justifications, and creating a paper trail in order to build a case for his release. If it were not for the multitude of reports by other CFLGBT service members at CFLRS reporting systematic homophobia and mistreatment, then OCdt April would have simply and efficiently been kick-out of the CF. His career would have been destroyed, systematic homophobia would have continued and the visibility of another proud, open LGBT service member defeated.
What we can draw from the administrative report submitted by Captain Victor is that he exposed the structural inequalities of sexual minorities at this military installation. The Chain of Command had not only failed in maintaining a positive space environment for its LGBT service members, but most disturbingly enough, has broken a basic military value taught at the very infancy of a soldier’s training… taking responsibility for one’s actions. The Chain of Command at CFLRS did what militaries do: react to a threat. In this case, the threat case from the potential realization and exposure of its homophobic, misogynistic and at times even racist culture. To accept this fault, would mean that there has been a systematic failure to enforce current policies and unveils the lack of available policies and procedures that might be required for sexual and gender minorities.

**Case Study 2: Harassment at CFB Gagetown**

The following case studies will look into the workplace and social environment of the Combat Arms at CFB Gagetown. CFB Gagetown is home to several units and regiments including the Combat Training Centre (CTC) composing of the Armour School, Artillery School, Infantry School, Tactics School, and School of Military Engineering. CFB Gagetown also has many other operational and support regiments on its grounds. In this study, we will be looking at three documents of particular interest, a witness statement report, the completed harassment complaint of the same member, as well as the routine death threats towards CFLGBT service members.

I chose to follow OCdt April’s journey from CFLRS to CFB Gagetown in order to see how the administrative and systematic forms of homophobia followed him when he was sent for his Combat Arms Training courses. The following was a formal witness
statement report given to the Chain of Command by 2Lt Bond in regards to the way in which the then 2Lt April was being treated at work.

“When 2Lt [April] walks by, there are individuals that give him dirty looks, who exclude him, and quite clearly ostracise him. I do feel that the origin of this does lay in homophobia, as that 2Lt April is quite proud and non-submissive to homophobic language and non-inclusive terminology. People seem to feel threatened by his strength and comfort with his orientation… I strongly believe that he is stable, experienced, and smart enough to be a leader if we can ensure that others do not discriminate his fundamental and human difference”.

This heterosexually identified Armour Officer has illustrated the cultural environment that that an openly gay, lesbian, bisexual or trans member must endure if they are to be ‘open’ with their sexuality and who utterly refused to be oppressed by homophobia language, attitude or behaviour. As this Armour 2Lt stated, he believed that the “origins of this lay in homophobia” which is of course a troubling and challenging military cultural attitude to face. As we have seen in chapter three, if a service member were to report LGBT harassment, it would only exacerbate mistreatment and result in their becoming an administrative burden, a troublemaker, and individual: which is the worst thing a service member could possibly be.

The hate towards LGBT people in the CF is not only occurs at home in Canada but also occurs on operations overseas. The irony is that in the early 1990’s homosexuals were still thought to be an operational risk, arguing that it would be people who had sex

with people of the same gender that were a security threat and not heterosexual service members. What we see is the opposite. Not only did we not see this speculation occur, but also in fact it is the heterosexual member who has become a threat to homosexual service members and those who count on their service. Violent threats and death threats is a concurrent reality in the CF. Earlier in this chapter we saw how CFLGBT service members live in fear of being known as counter normative (trans or non-heterosexual). Now we will see what happens when these fears are finally brought to life to psychologically target gender and sexual minorities by uttering violent as well as death threats. Part of have experienced being non-heterosexual in the CF allowed me the opportunity to listen to the personal narrative experiences of other CFLGBT service members and how they lived in a culture where not being heterosexual meant fear of repercussions.

**Case Study 3: Homophobic Death Threats**

During my time at CFB Gagetown I became acquainted with a closeted gay male Sapper (Artillery Private) who shared his fear of being ‘outed’ and what happened when his sexuality was exposed. He reported that one day he drove his vehicle to the base at CFB Gagetown and left it parked in front of the base gym. When he finished his workout and returned to his vehicle he noticed that all four windows were bashed it with a note left under his windshield wiper that stated: “Your kind are not wanted here”. Though the Sapper did report the hate crime to the base Military Police (MP’s), no follow-up was ever reported.

The same type of incident occurred with a MCpl Combat Engineer from CFB Gagetown where he had received a “death threat note”, only this time it was left under his
windshield wiper in front of his regimental Headquarters at C.F.B. Gagetown. The MCpl explained that he brought the matter to his Chain of Command and his platoon was told that if they (his superiors) were to find out who left that note on the dashboard of this MCpl’s vehicle, that there would be serious consequences. The investigation into the hate crime was inconclusive and they were unable to find out who left the “death note” under the windshield wiper. The member also shared that this was not surprising since he had always been concerned about how his peers and superiors would treat him as a result of being usually the only openly known homosexual male in his platoon. What is more, with his promotion to MCpl he was undergoing issues maintaining discipline and respect from his new subordinates because of his sexual orientation.

A similar incident took place but this time to an infantry officer at CFB Gagetown. While on a holding platoon waiting for his next course, this 2Lt reported that after returning from an excursion from Fredericton that day, he and a former female infantry officer (who also reported having endured hardships as a result of her gender in the infantry officer trade), came across a carved inscription on the door to his room. It read: “NO FAGGOTS IN THE INFANTRY” in bold letters. The matter was brought to the Infantry School Chain of Command and MP’s, which resulted in a scolding of this member’s fellow infantry officers awaiting training. Reporting the incident only intensified the amount of marginalisation and isolation. This 2Lt reported: “they starting saying that I carved the message into my own door... I don’t know why anyone would do that. It’s not like I benefit in any way from doing that”. Instead of his peers supporting him during this difficult time, many blamed him for the carving the homophobic threat himself. The reason for this mostly had to do with the pack-like mentality that military
members have when confronted with a collective threat. In this case, it would have been
easier to blame the individual for his hardships, then actually blame another infantry
officer of being capable of such an act and if they did, then they are bound by
brotherhood to keep it to themselves. In the end, like the other examples of threats
aforementioned, the MP’s were unable to find out who had committed any of these
offences.

To further illustrate the degree of homophobia and how some service members who
not only completely disregard the health and safety of CFLGBT service members but
also that of their subordinates, we can look at an incident that was made public by the
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). In September of 2011, at the Kandahar Air
Field (KAF), after serving two months in Afghanistan Warrant Officer (Wo) Andrew
McLean received a death threat what read:

“You’re gay. Because of this, -2’… that’s metric [for] six feet, 61/2 feet under?” 56

Wo McLean reported to a CBC reporter:

“I went through a lot of emotions. I went through anger, embarrassment,

humiliation… fear for my safety.”

Not only had Wo McLean’s sexuality been involuntarily exposed in the workplace
but it had negatively impacted his workplace environment including his personal safety.
To make matters worse, the emotions that McLean went through as a result of being
victim to such a homophobic threat is a serious distraction from his primary job as a
deployed service member. Service members must feel that they have the support and trust
from their subordinates, peers and superiors in order to not only accomplish mission

56 “Gay Soldier Says he Received Threat in Afghanistan” Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, January 30th, 2012.
objectives but also for them and their peers to return home safely free from distractions, especially personal threats. Having to worry about being around a fellow service member who might potentially point their rifle at him, or have a sabotaged tool or equipment while on operations such as a weapon, or vehicle, is a terrifying situation to have to work in especially when one has to deal with the regular stresses of deployment. In order to avoid the terrifying reality of being exposed as a homosexual, CFLGBT service members at times go through great lengths to rid themselves of their homosexuality.

“The Warrant Officer explained, “I tried every trick in the book to be heterosexual”.

When he was asked why, he stated, “Because that’s the conflict. That’s what society expects you to be.” The expectation of heterosexuality in the ranks is not only regulated by the subversive manipulation of administrative procedures but more importantly the hegemonic heteronormative military culture as discussed in the previous chapter. In this case, this Wo felt that so strong is the push for military heterosexuality that he “tried every trick in the book to be heterosexual”, no doubt being psychologically damaging to him. Indeed, compulsory heterosexuality is always assumed to be the standard in the CF. If one does not meet this identity criteria then there is not only the possibility of harassment or mistreatment but in fact one’s very own life could be at risk.

As Wo McLean put it: “You see the negativity all around you, and why would anybody choose to confront that?” This type of hyper-vigilance towards exposure and formal/informal discrimination is analogous to what 2Lt Bond witnessed in his observation of the marginalization and harassment endured by 2Lt April. It is at this point that we must understand something of which I have illustrated in other examples of
homophobia in the Canadian Forces. It would appear that a main reason as to why harassment, discrimination and marginalisation are not reported is out of fear: fear of the hidden ramifications of reporting by peers and superiors. The psychosocial consequences of living in such an environment not only impact this member’s mental health but can also exacerbate other mental health illnesses typically associated with military service such as addictions issues, anger management, anxiety and depression. Furthermore, that with PTSD only further worsens acute to long-term mental illness. The extra load of having to deal with homophobic threats only further adds to the weight of an already heavy ‘rucksack’. Not only do CFLGBT service members have to perform as well as their fellow peers, but also not let things such as homophobic death threats get in the way.

As Wo McLain explained, "These types of notes are what pushed people over the edge", it is these types of messages, whether subliminal or blatant that discourage LGBT people from service. What is concerning though is the low rate of reporting that occurs on homophobia in the CF. Reporting the Chain of Command to the media can be considered by peers as a total betrayal to the CF. However as Wo McClain made clear "If I don’t stand up, who’s going to stand up?” and "If I don’t identify something, then who’s going to identify it?” The answer to that question is nobody. Publicly sharing endured homophobia to the media would not only informally jeopardise one’s own military career but also hurt the chances of entering into another workplace environment in the civilian world. Since Wo McClain was near retirement, he chose to step up to the plate and take on Canada’s military by sharing his experiences for others to know how LGBT people are treated even while on dangerous operations such as being deployed overseas.
**Case Study 4: CFLGBT Members and Isolated Postings**

At times being posted to isolated postings can be as challenging as being deployed overseas. With few people, usually in socially conservative communities, and an increased risk for gay-bashing, CFLGBT service members give above and beyond more than that of their heterosexually identified colleagues to do the same job. There has been no published study to this date that looks into the situation of CFLGBT service members tasked to isolated postings. Therefore, the personal narrative experiences of the challenges endured by CFLGBT service members remain invisibilised. The following interview was conducted in order understand what the current situation of CFLGBT members tasked to isolated postings was. The member was a logistics Cpl posted to A.S.U. Yellowknife of francophone decent. On the question of: “*Do you feel that there are sufficient resources for LGBT service members at your current posting?*” The member stated that he did believe so, however he could not really say as a result of not having a need to seek out related resources and therefore was unable to know to what extent LGBT resources consisted of in the CF. When asked if he felt that the CF had the responsibility of accommodating sexual orientation and gender identity when considering postings for non-heterosexually identified service members, the member felt that the CF did to a certain extent have the responsibility of accommodation when dealing with LGBT people being tasked out for long term isolated postings. He believed that the CF did not have the right to be “*digging into it [sexuality] unless the member brings it up*”. Therefore an important equilibrium between privacy and the acknowledgement for a need to accommodate would be required when addressing these issues. This would mean that
the member should have discrete access to resources, all-the-while leaving self-disclosure up to the member to share.

Cpl Blais was asked: “Do you feel that CFLGBT service members have fewer difficulties in isolated postings then heterosexually identified service members?” The member replied by stating that he did feel that CFLGBT service members had greater difficulty at isolated postings in comparison to heterosexually identified members. He felt that his sexuality in relation to his isolated posting “doesn’t make it easier for a gay member to be um, comfortable in the workplace…” What this would indicate is that the current workplace environment provided by the CF is not providing sufficient LGBT based resources in the form of support, guidance, advocacy, or intervention when handling matters of sexuality and gender identity.

When asked if there was an operational need for him to be posted to an isolated posting for over three years there seemed to have been some confusion as to what the definition of operational need really meant. When I asked the member to define the term ‘operational’ he responded that in retrospect, he perhaps would not have made the same decision to take the posting. The member was quite redundant in pointing that aspect out which had resulted in his “certainly not getting the social life, a love life, a sexual life that [he] would like to have”. In comparing his current situation to other heterosexually identified service members he stated, “I believe that it would be easier for a straight service member to enjoy an isolated posting…” in that they would have more freedom of self-determination to search out opposite sex people for friendship, sexual encounters and long-term relationships. These are important aspects of a member’s social and love life.

---

57 Interview with Cpl Blais, “The Current Situation of Canadian Forces LGBT Service Members Posted to Isolated Locations”, Protected B, University of Toronto, Department of Political Studies, April 2nd, 2012.
that are vital in supporting a member in their career. Having a bad social or sex life (especially where there are none) can negatively impact a member’s overall health and wellbeing and by extension work.

In the matter of whether the CF had the responsibility to accommodate CFLGBT service members in ensuring that they live and operate in non-homophobic (socially progressive) environments, there were four areas of concern presented by Cpl Blais. The first aspect consisted of the screening process where members were assessed on the potential of their being able to operate in isolated postings. The second point was “in the information that is given to the members prior to accepting the posting”. This consisted of either advising them of the circumstances they would be under if they were to be sent to an isolated posting. In particular, the interviewee was of the belief that perhaps the CF should advise members who are being considered for an isolated posting for over three years that if they were LGBT, then perhaps this posting might be especially challenging for them without needing to ask them directly what their sexual orientation was. If the member chooses to ask why or self-identify as being LGBT, then further information could be given such as what to expect; a socially conservative community, no LGBT pubs, clubs, gyms, sports teams, restaurants, community centres, places of worship, ext. The third point that Cpl Blais eluted to was that “they just want to fill in positions” in that the CF and had a disregard or disinterest in caring about what consequences there might be for a CFLGBT member sent to an isolated posting. Lastly, in relation to his posting, Cpl Blais was upset at the fact that “they are making it sound like a dream”, therefore enticing and luring the member into being convinced of doing something that might have
both short and long term consequences to the member’s professional and personal lifestyles.

The member was asked, “Do you feel that you have more, less or equal opportunity to romantic relationships as your heterosexually identified CF colleagues as a result of your posting?” He expressed that as a result of his current posting it was, “hard to find people, either to be friends or more…” Whenever he would be allowed to leave the region he would find himself exploiting the opportunity of having sexual relations with other men in larger cities, though he would rather be in a monogamous long-term relationship like many of his heterosexually identified peers. His impulse for having sexual encounters with men while in larger cities was a health concern to him as that he felt that it would increase his chances of contracting sexually transmitted infections (STI). He would rather be posted to a location where he could have the option of dating men for the purposes of a romantic relationship, rather than being forced to take advantage of potential partners when on course, a tasking or one of his yearly paid round trips back home for the holiday season. Cpl Blais found that, “to spend an extended time such as over three years is definitely, for [him] anyways proved difficult when it comes to social life and dating life”. His being posted to an isolated location robed him of the opportunity to pursue happiness in a very important and meaningful way:

“And when you add on top on that the fact that it is very hard to find a gay environment to have friends or, you know a partner and so it makes outside work and outside routine work, it makes it really hard to find a happy place. You know? The fact that I am in an isolated posting makes it hard for me to have a decent life
outside of work and outside of that... But if you’re gonna be a single gay member to an isolated posting I think that you face additional challenges potentially”.

Clearly, this member was not content at his current posting. He was also cognisant that his job requirements were negatively impacting his professional and personal life in a way that he never underwent before. Selectively caring or respecting fundamental human rights is imperative in order to live and contribute to any community. When peers, superiors, and communities have an ‘I don’t care about your sexuality’ or ‘what you do behind closed doors is your business’ attitude it can deeply damage a person’s value, Therefore, like Wo McLean, members would rather hide that enriching aspect of human life, their sexuality in exchange for along less threatening workplace environment.

When asked, “have you ever attempted to hide your sexuality in the CF?” The member replied “Yes” and when asked why he stated:

“Not comfortable with myself, not comfortable with what my coworkers would say, not feeling comfortable with what my superiors would say, fear of being treated differently by supervisors or course instructors and the fear of being treated differently or unfairly by instructors or coworkers”.

In the matter of not feeling comfortable with himself, he did not mean that he had ‘issues’ in accepting his sexuality but rather his not feeling comfortable with how to handle the situation within a work military context. This was further clarified when he stated that he did not feel comfortable with his coworkers, supervisors and instructors knowing his sexuality. What seems to be most concerning is this underlying “fear” of his superiors and peers finding out about his sexuality, and the attitude and the behaviour that
they may deploy as a result of them knowing. His perceived fear of exposing his sexuality would indicate that something in his environment triggered that fear. This was further articulated when he stated that he did not want to be treated differently or unfairly. Though, there being an emergency mental health phone number that any CF member could be used, he was not sure how useful it would have been. The only Canadian military LGBT resource appears to be a Facebook group called the Canadian Military LGBT Network of which he felt it was important to have:

“This big gay Military Network it seems to be undercover and it seems to be this big secret that no one knows about and it’s just like the backdoor of the CF that there is the a gay Facebook page. You know, where it seems like all of these gay service members rallying up to try and create some people or resource that you can turn to. But if there were something more out there, something more official, it would be definitely beneficial to give to service members and it would be an obvious place to turn and ask for help.”

The matter of a gay military group networking to become the “backdoor of the CF” for LGBT service members indicates that the CF is in some way oppressing, controlling, or restricting LGBT perspective and input. There are larger concerns that go beyond the experiences of this member. CFLGBT members appear to have a need to hide the facilitation of a resource for themselves (in this case a Facebook group) in order to not jeopardise their careers or live in fear of exposure and potential mistreatment. The lack of support for these members has led to grassroots efforts, which seem to be kept under a veil of cyber secrecy. Four things in particular have been made clear during this interview; that pre-screening is not inclusive of LGBT factors, members fear disclosing
their sexuality, there is a lack of LGBT resources, and lastly and most importantly that the CFLGBT standard of life is unequal to that of their heterosexually identified peers.

**Case Study 5: HIV/AIDS in the Canadian Forces**

HIV/AIDS in Canada used to be a matter of great panic during the HIV epidemic of the 1980’s. Many thought HIV/AIDS to be God’s punishment for homosexual acts. As such, the DND too concerned HIV/AIDS could not compromise operational effectiveness by exposing CF members to HIV infected bodily fluids. Homosexuals in the ranks therefore became a direct operational health risk. With time and medical advancement in the field of HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, infection rates have somewhat stabilised. Through safe sex education, health promotions, education, free access to condoms as well as the development of retro viral medication allowed Western gay men to not see HIV as a death sentence, but rather a condition to live with which did not necessarily incapacitate a person from working much less infect another. A person can still have HIV, and still be otherwise fully healthy by taking medication that renders the infection undetectable to the point of significantly lowering the risk of infection to others even if there is exposure. If there is a confirmation of HIV exposure, medication can be given within 24 hours to flush the virus out a person’s system, a day after pill so to speak. As we speak HIV/AIDS vaccines are currently being tested in clinics in North America and the hopes for a medical breakthrough just around the corner.

Let us tie what we know of HIV back into how it plays in operational effectiveness, including that of the Canadian Forces Land Force Doctrine and Training System (CFLFDT). There is no current policy on HIV/AIDS in the CF, which has largely been left to medical officers to research and find out what appropriate courses of
action to take depending on the infected member’s physical, emotional and intellectual status. That is to say, that if there are no signs and symptoms of HIV/AIDS as a result of a member taking his/her medication, then the infected member is as healthy as any other service member. Knowing this, it would make sense to many that CF members living with HIV (not AIDS as that it is a more incapacitating form of infection), should be allowed to participate in national defence because they are after all, able bodied people. Though granted there is space for discussion as to how such a policy could or should be developed in a manner where both the infected member’s rights are maintained, and at the same time does not compromise either mission objectives nor the safety of others. This void in policy discussion has resulted in the marginalization and invisibilization of CFLGBT service members living with HIV, who not only must live with the infection everyday, but also endure mistreatment and discrimination as a result of their HIV status.

In order to remove the veil of silence on HIV in the CF and understand how an HIV positive member navigates through the turbulent seas of bureaucracy and service, we will look at the narrative experiences of a Jr. Armour Officer posted to C.F.B. Gagetown. The reason as to why this member and base were chosen was as a result of this member’s HIV positive status; he was a homosexual male, posted to one of the most homophobic bases in the CF. We have previously discussed why this base was of particular interest to studying sexuality in the CF. It is the largest combat arms base in Canada and the home of the Combat Training Centre (CTC) which develops the next generation of Combat Arms Officers. Interviewing this Jr. officer showcased the interplay of sexuality; gender, HIV and militarism within a Canadian context.
The respondent chose to remain anonymous as he continued to serve at the time of interview, as well was going through the CF harassment complaint process. His experiences show not only how a gay member is treated in the CF, but also how he navigates through the formal and informal complexities of also being HIV positive in the CF. Overlapping themes of masculinity, homophobia and lack of support and policies illustrate how the CF continues to fail gender and sexual minorities. Luckily, the interviewed member felt that his masculine capital enabled him to better function in military culture than other gay men might have.

“I’ve had people that actually tell me ‘that you seem straight, kind of normal or whatever’ so it’s not a problem. But if you were ‘all prissy all the time and acted all effeminate then’ they alluded that they would not be treating me the same and accept me as they are because I do act a little more masculine then what the stereotypical gay would be.”

Once more we see the importance of embodying masculine behaviour and demeanour in order to be accepted by the rest of the group. If one does not meet the ideal standard of the ‘soldier’ identity complex, then they risk being an unknown and paradoxal being, a threat to cohesion and mutual trust. Homosexuality is one of these violations of hegemonic masculine culture, especially in the military. “I think there is definitely room for people to be treated differently”, he said, that the military environment continues to be a niche for homophobic and other discriminatory behaviour. On the other hand the interviewed member also directed blame to other gay men. “I think that some guys might use it as sort of a camouflage about their own homosexuality.”

---

Diversity and LGBT Studies we sometimes forget that LGBT people can at times be the most hateful towards other LGBT people for various reasons. We can even see contemporary political examples such phenomena such as gay neo-Nazi groups, gay anti-black groups, cultural groups and closeted men who have sex with men (MSM).

As we have discussed in past chapters, some trades are more, or less accepting and tolerant of LGBT people. The interviewee echoed that fact by saying “I think that the infantry would be probably the most shining example out of all those others that would have the most perception or actually situations of people being treated differently because of their sexual orientation;” furthermore “there is a perception that people are treated differently in the army and Special Forces than it is in the navy and air force.” This also further pushes the yardstick into an even more interesting point. If CFLGBT service members were being mistreated and harassed in the navy, air force, and army, then how would it be like for an LGBT Special Forces Service member? Surely the increased security conditions of a Joint Task Force II (JTF2) or CSOR (Canadian Special Operations Regiment) service member would almost completely silence any open complaints of homophobic mistreatment for the purposes of national security.

**CFLGBT/HIV Support**

As we previously discussed in Chapter three, current legislation, policies and resources still continue to allow room for marginalisation and discrimination. I have already argued how CFLGBT members require improved resources comparable to those of heterosexual service members. Equal does not always mean the same. The interviewee was lucky in that in his case, there were key LGBT people in vital positions of support and authority that assisted him through his difficult diagnoses and even fought with his Chain of
Command to ensure that he would be treated fairly. Having LGBT people that are in the appropriate places does help. “My Medical Officer, my nurse practitioner is gay as well but my social worker was too and he purposely paired my up with him [the nurse practitioner] as well. That was definitely helpful.”

One would think that the main issue here would be the lack of policy, education and resources, however what this case study found was that in fact the Chain of Command at the Armour School, CTC at CFB Gagetown in fact worsened the situation of an HIV positive gay member putting him through even more duress and cruelty, discriminating him as a result of his HIV status, restricting him from going into the field for training and refusing to provide him the urgent support he needed.

“It is important too that when I say I didn’t receive the support, I mean I didn’t receive the support from the Chain of Command, [I received] all the support in the world from Mental Health from Health Services, like they were awesome, they were really, really, good.”

When asked if he believed there should be CFLGBT services he stated: “I think that for those people who want them that they should have that resource there… I don’t know of any formal clubs or any formal recourses outside of mental health”. It would appear that the only support this member received happen to be from two gay healthcare professionals: his nurse practioner and mental health professional. Though the interviewee stated that the whole team at Health Services at CFB Gagetown was outstanding, we cannot divorce the fact that the bulk of the services, did come from two gay Health Care professionals that had the sensitivity, experience and knowledge on how to handle a CFLGBT related issues such as HIV status.
Training and Development Education

From the very beginning of the interview, the interviewee made it clear that the CF educational training system was inadequate in delivering a fair and holistic military curriculum. “The CF’s training system is really, really, lacking in a lot of places I think.”

When asked if he felt that the CF did any sort of education on gender and sexual minorities and how it related to service he stated: “No. I don’t think that the CF does really any education on that at all”. Though the interviewee welcomed any sort of initiative that would improve education on LGBT people, he felt that there was no point in developing another failed sensitivity training course that made the topic of employment equity for gender and sexual minorities a mockery.

“You have to make sure that when you do that as well, that you’re doing it properly because as you know some people who say, harass someone and then go on SHARP training or whatever it’s called now, they just kind of laugh at it and shake it off, and they don’t actually have to do this or learn anything from it. So if there was an education policy in place which I think is a good thing the more people that know about it. Obviously knowledge is power, and the more people know, the less people are likely to discriminate.”

The cisgender white male heterosexual military fear of educating service members on matters of sexuality and gender identity continues to be an awkward and unwanted topic of conversation. It is for this very reason that formal exposure to an otherwise invisible minority is needed. By giving properly constructed LGBT sensitivity education to CF members, it allows for a point of reference, a reminder and even a refresher that the violation of human dignity, not to mention that of a fellow service member, is
unacceptable. It can negatively impact the individual, their family, friends, and even operational effectiveness. That sexuality is not a choice, but can be the result of biological and/or environmental factors, which formulated a person’s gender and sexual identity. Having discussions in the CF on human rights within an LGBT context reminds service members who they really are, a reflection of societal values of democracy, justice, and diversity: in other words values that are considered intrinsically Canadian. However, what is the use of protecting those values if they are violated in the most insensitive and subversive ways.

“Because of the misconceptions that lay in the Chain of Command, how they are not educated about it and that’s the one thing that I asked in my grievance for my Chain of Command to be educated on it. I was told by the CTC [Combat Training Centre] Commander, that that would not be possible because the CF doesn’t have an official policy on it. I’m not too sure if that’s true or not, but that was what I was told: that they would not be educated because of that.”

There is no doubt that the upper echelons within the DND are aware of how current policies fail gender and sexual minorities; however they have chosen to turn a blind eye to what regretfully still remains a contentious and under investigated topic.

**HIV and Sexuality as an Administrative Burden**

Though the public assumption is that sexuality and gender identity (in theory) is not a barrier to military service in Canada, many are not fooled by this policy propaganda. The interviewee knew of other CFLGBT members including closeted ones. His very own roommate was also a closeted Armour Officer and shared concerns that the interviewee did as well as other CFLGBT service members shared.
"I think that he was concerned that especially with being in the training system that somebody might have an unspoken prejudice against it and act upon that while they were possibly were evaluating him or something like that. I don’t think that he was fearful about anyone coming up to him saying ‘you fuckin’ fag’, but I felt he was worried about those people who have internal prejudices that they might not verbally say it to anybody but might still harbour those feelings."

As if it was not difficult enough undergoing CF combat arms training, being gay, and having HIV, the interviewee had to deal with the helplessness and vulnerability of being totally and completely subjected to what his Chain of Command thought was best for him despite of guidance from Health Services.

**Administrative Challenges with HIV**

CFLGBT members who encounter administrative issues (including medical administrative issues) are the most susceptible to marginalization and mistreatment where instead of helping or making an informed decision on an LGBT related issue; brute, aggressive and uneducated choices are made solely based on privilege of rank and authority.

"I feel that many times, Health Services was actually limited in what they could do because the Chain of Command had such control over my situation that there were a few times that Health Services said ‘listen we can’t really do anything more, it’s kind of in you Chain of Command’s hands.’"
The CF publically appears to be interested and proactive in investigating CFLGBT related issue (as we saw earlier in this chapter with the Sapper, Combat Engineer MCpl, and Wo McLean) however with little or no result. In fact, in the case of this interviewee the Chain of Command worsened the situation.

“They were not supportive at first even though they claimed to be. They didn’t give me the help that I needed. In fact for the first year after my diagnoses they were the biggest reasons why I had such a difficult time with it first.”

To make matters worse, as if a lack of interest or education on CFLGBT matters is not enough, it is not atypical for the Chain of Command to manipulate and blackmail administrative procedures in order to attain their selfish interests.

“I kind of felt that they were using that as leverage for me to drop the grievance; because on one hand they had the grievance and said “listen you can sign off on this and we’ll be good to go” and then “oh and your posting message is on its way, it’s coming, its coming”. So they didn’t say drop the grievance or you’re not getting posted, but it was pretty obvious that that is what they are doing.”

Investigations on OCdt April at CFLRS also indicated the exact same type situation where in that case of an Administration Division Warrant Officer at CFLRS attempted to bribe OCdt April in a similar manner. When the decision was made that OCdt April was to return to course after Captain Bond’s administrative review, he was brought in for a meeting. 2Lt April stated: “the Warrant said, “you are returning back to course. The least you could do for the Chain of Command is to drop the harassment complaint””

at which point in time, OCdt April replied with “No.” and carried on with his complaint. In

59 April, OCdt, “Complaint Report: [Service Number, April] OCdt” to Platoon Cmdr., CFLRS, BFC St Jean, August 26th 2009.
the end the complaint resulted in a failed attempt as that it did not meet all five points for
the incident to be understood as harassment as per the policy. Ironically, the witness for
that meeting happened to be a closeted Van Doos’s (Royal 22nd Regiment) infantry
Warrant Officer (who also happen to self-identify as being bisexual despite being married
to a woman who was unaware of his sexuality).

Though this case study focused on HIV, it did touch on several aspects that we
have encountered since the beginning of this thesis: sexuality, gender identity, legislation
and policies. It showed us how sexuality is perceived in the CF, how a lack of policies
has resulted in marginalization, harassment, discrimination, as well the physiological
burdens that a CFLGBT member endures for service to Queen and Country. It also
highlights a need to improve current policies and to develop new ones in order to ensure
that gender and sexual minorities can live, work and operate within a positive space
environment inclusive to their rights, needs and dignity.
Major CFLGBT Historic Events

First Canadian Forces Contingent to March in Toronto Pride 2008

First Canadian Forces Contingent to Match in Ottawa Pride 2008

First Pride Flag Raising Ceremony C.F.B. Edmonton, 2013 (Greg Southam Edmonton Journal June 7th 2013)
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