

Inside The Body Politic: Examining the Birth of Gay Liberation

Honors Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation *with honors research distinction* in English Language and Literature in the undergraduate colleges of The Ohio State University

by

Justin Nicholas Hanson

The Ohio State University

June 2011

Project Adviser: Dr. Manuel Martinez, Department of English

Dedicated to Herb Spiers, a mentor, a guide, and a best-friend. Rest in Peace, Herbie.

Introduction

We gay folks know this most acutely because expressions of our very sexualities were illegal barely a generation ago (some still are). Freedom of expression is the very foundation of gay and lesbian movements. As a peaceful demonstration of civil disobedience, QAIA [Queers Against Israeli Apartheid] members and supporters should march in the parade, authors of their own messages, regardless of what Pride Toronto organizers, or their masters, have to say about it. – Matt Mills, “Let’s Get Civilly Disobedient,” *Extra*, June 3, 2010.

During the summer of 2010, Toronto’s premier gay magazine *Extra* expounded criticisms such as these attacking the Toronto Pride Committee, which oversees Toronto’s annual gay pride parade. The issues at stake: censorship and freedom of speech. During the spring of 2010, a gay political group entitled “Queers Against Israeli Apartheid” (QAIA) sought permission to march under this name in the Toronto gay pride parade, one of Toronto’s largest annual events. Sensing controversy, Pride Toronto deliberated whether to allow QAIA to march. Eventually deciding to ban QAIA from marching under their contentious sobriquet, Pride Toronto stirred up the hornet’s nest of gay activism.

Feeling their civil liberties at stage, the gay community of Toronto rallied to the cause. Citizens protested, held demonstrations, and wrote angry letters in opposition to Pride Toronto’s decision. Several members of the Pride Toronto board and community Pride affiliated organizations resigned in objection to the ruling. *Extra*, too, played its part. Publishing a slew of articles aimed at the corporate interests behind the Pride ruling, *Extra* stoked the fire of disapproval to a fever pitch. Whereas the gay community once struggled under the oppression of heterosexual society, now they found themselves pitted against their own leadership in a battle over censorship and political correctness. To many veterans of the Gay Liberation movement it seemed like the old days returned to life.

The offices of *Extra* reside in a slender building in downtown Toronto’s gay district on Church St. Though one wouldn’t think it from the weathered exterior, the offices display all the modern accoutrements of an up and coming organization: the foyer includes cushy leather couches, modern artwork adorns the offices, and the walls hold several plasma T.V.s, displaying *Extra*’s television affiliate Out T.V.

Ken Popert's office lies in the back of Extra's offices behind a maze of cubicles populated by hurrying writers and internet technicians. A modest affair, Popert's office contains only a computer, printer, desk, several books, and a rather banal office fern tucked in the corner - - pretty unassuming décor for the CEO of Pink Triangle Press Inc., the non-profit corporation which owns and jointly operates Out T.V., *Extra* magazine, Bumper2Bumper Media Inc, and HardTV.¹

Average in height with snow-like hair and fuzzy white beard, Ken Popert, 63, is the executive officer of Pink Triangle Press and administrator of *Extra* magazine. Popert's interest in the summer 2010 QAIA controversy runs deeper than most. Indeed, in his editorial, Matt Mills may have indirectly alluded to his boss when he wrote, "We gay folks know this most acutely because expressions of our very sexualities were illegal barely a generation ago (some still are)." Popert was one of those who witnessed firsthand the extent to which censorship gave cause for a community to fight and unite.

In the spring of 1973, Popert returned to his hometown of Toronto from Cornell University where he was studying linguistics. When he arrived, Popert discovered a thriving scene of gay activists. At the center of this scene was an underground newspaper entitled *The Body Politic*. Intrigued, Popert went to work for the magazine and soon became a regular contributor and, later, a member of its editorial collective. He has worked in gay publishing ever since.

Founded in 1971, *The Body Politic* developed in conjunction with the birth and growth of the North American Gay Liberation movement. Addressing practically every issue imaginable from a gay perspective including politics, legal reform, gay culture, reviews of books, movies, and theatre performances, and cultural critique, *The Body Politic* served as both a shaping force of the nascent gay culture and a tool of social action, dissent, and community development. The social and political seeds sown by *The Body Politic* seemed to resonate in the chaotic summer of 2010 for the Toronto gay community. Discussing the political activism taking place in Toronto that summer, Popert said: "I think that it all comes from some extent from the spin that the late 1970s and early 1980s put on the community here of the city and its understanding of gay people, and *The Body Politic* was a big part of that and the way we understand ourselves."²

Paul MacDonald is retired now but still lives in his favorite city in Canada: Toronto. Somewhat of a globetrotter, MacDonald, 64, has traveled the world many times throughout his life. Indeed, Macdonald's knowledge of the streets, chateaus, and architecture of the villages of France is just as astounding as his seemingly endless knowledge of the transit systems of major American cities. But now he has settled into a peaceful routine. Well, not too peaceful – an old radical must have his hobbies. As a founding member of *The Body Politic*, MacDonald also keeps a close eye on contemporary gay politics. Repulsed by the actions of the Pride Toronto committee, MacDonald also saw parallels with the old days, "It's sort of reminiscent of when we started the movement except it's a different crowd; they're multi-cultural; they're multi-colored."³ During the 1970s, MacDonald would have utilized *The Body Politic* to voice his opinion on matters such as these; now, however, other means are available. This time, MacDonald used his Facebook account to make his voice heard writing:

Pride Toronto's ban on 'Queers against Israeli Apartheid' became the catalyst to galvanize and politicize a wide segment of the queer community, which is now challenging the recent trends of the corporate & tourist oriented Pride Festival. Toronto's annual pride week may never be the same.⁴

Just another reminder of the age of the social media; "Times have changed," remarked MacDonald.

Ed Jackson resides in a picturesque country house on Palmerston Avenue near the University of Toronto. A plush garden surrounds the townhouse in the summer and various gardening tools align the brick facade as a cobblestone walkway leading to Jackson's green front door invokes images of a Tolkien-esque shire. It is a home befitting a man of literary tastes. Jackson's resume, however, includes more than his obsession with the printed word. Jackson was also a writer in his own respect, penning many political articles that appeared in *The Body Politic*. Jackson served not only as a writer for the magazine during his fourteen years of membership, but also as an activist, organizer, collective member, and secretary not to mention defendant before Canada's Crown attorneys to boot.

Now, however, Jackson's life has slowed down. Though he is no longer an activist or agitator, Jackson still participates in the Toronto gay community and monitors gay politics. When the QAIA controversy struck, the old activist within him stirred and Jackson took to the offensive. "The Pride Committee can't be censoring who marches in the parade and especially

can't be censoring words and names that can be used in the parade," said Jackson, 65.⁵ To protest Pride Toronto's decision, Jackson resigned from his post on the bath-raids panel while others on the same panel and every parade marshal followed suit. For Jackson, such moves don't mark the first instances of political activism; these actions were a regular affair while working for *The Body Politic*. Jackson credits his involvement with the magazine as instrumental not only in his own political activism, but also as a shaping force on the politics of the modern movement: "freedom of press is a potent issue, the right to be able to speak to ourselves and use the words we need to speak about issues that matter to us. I think we helped to turn that tide."

The reaction of Toronto's gay community during the summer of 2010 indicates all the signs of a strong community apparatus: political agitation, leadership roles, defined goals, and, most importantly, unity in the face of a threat. Forty years prior, this was decidedly not the case in Toronto or North America at large. At this time, laws prohibiting consensual, private gay sexual activity were only just being examined and stricken down,ⁱ gays still faced discrimination in the workplace and in public, gays were often the subject of police harassment, and the movement was confined to closed door meetings in the shadows of society, lumped in with other radical counterculture endeavors. The most glaring deficiency in the gay movement, however, was a unified community replete with structure, organization, and a rallying cry. As of 1971 in Toronto and much of North America, the Gay Liberation movement was undefined, unstructured, and lacked a means of communication; the movement's members were scattered and voiceless, its numbers small, and its ethos undefined. What the Gay Liberation movement needed was a voice, a call to arms, a means of forming the community it needed to challenge its enemies. The Gay Liberation movement needed *The Body Politic*.

Beginning with the Civil Rights movement in North America, an abundance of group movements spawned in an effort to agitate for rights, equality, and reform. Though such movements operated under the ostensible goal of gaining political rights through agitation and disobedience, oftentimes surreptitious motives underlay the rhetorical strategies behind these political designs. While need based reform was certainly sought and strived for, such groups also attempted to enact another, perhaps larger, motive of facilitating group cohesion, solidarity, and unity. For many rights groups, the primary goal was not only the acquisition of such rights, but

ⁱ Toronto struck down its ban on such relations in 1969 under the leadership of Mayor Pierre Trudeau.

the means to create and expand a cultural space that was separate, removed, and alienated from the dominant cultural superstructure.

To accomplish this, rights groups oftentimes utilized a twofold system of communication: 1) rhetoric of inclusion and solidarity aimed at the “in” or oppressed group; and, 2) rhetoric of separatism and alienation directed at the “out” or dominant group viewed as the oppressor. Perhaps nowhere is this seen more readily than in the Gay Liberation movement, the origination of which was based largely on the binary principles of appealing to the “in” group (other homosexuals) while alienating the “out” group (the dominant, heterosexual society). In this respect, the use of dissent, agitation, and cultural critique indicate a further purpose than striving for political and legal reform. The use of dissent through literature, media, and discourse to undermine power structures has been well documented; however, the examination of the use of radical dissent as a tool of cultural unity and solidarity has been neglected.

Unlike such the assimilationist messages that accompanied the pacifist driven portions of the Civil Rights movement under Martin Luther King Jr. and the women’s movement fighting for the Equal Rights Amendment, the tenor of the early Gay Liberation movement resounded to predominantly radical tunes. The Gay Liberation movement’s early use of radical rhetoric in its campaign for rights served not only to advance equality for homosexuals, but also to engender heated opposition from the straight society to strengthen gay solidarity and individuality. In this respect, the use of radical dissent contributed to the forging of a visible gay culture at odds with the dominant society as a means of unifying the new gay movement.

Within the pages of *The Body Politic*, one finds this strategy at play. In this project, I examine *The Body Politic*, a Gay Liberation periodical which developed in conjunction with the early Gay Liberation movement. *The Body Politic* was based in Toronto, Canada and enjoyed a worldwide following and fifteen-year lifespan. I analyze the magazine’s content, relevant historical occurrences in the movement and legal cases, and the collected oral histories of the founding members, contributors, and staff. I assert that the majority of *The Body Politics’* articles can be classified as two forms of rhetoric: gay inclusive and straight exclusive. Using both forms of rhetoric and operating under the pretenses of political agitation, the underlying goal of such rhetoric was the creation of a separatist gay culture: ulterior, distinct, and in opposition with the heterosexual or “dominant culture.” Using acerbic critique and incendiary discourse, several authors of *The Body Politic* fostered a hostile scenario to rally the solidarity of the nascent gay

culture. In so doing, the magazine, acting as a conduit of communication for the emerging movement, had a profound impact of the social exchange between the gay and straight cultures on a variety of social levels. Additionally, *The Body Politics*' attention to gay history and its popularization demonstrates the movement's desire to create a sense of gay nationalism and a movement narrative.

Chapter I Organizing a Community: The Founding of TBP describes the founding of the magazine, the organization of the editorial collective, and the early structure of the contents of the paper, and examines some vituperative critiques directed at heterosexual culture. Chapter II Uncovering a History: The Gay Movement in Germany discusses the impact of gay historian Jim Steakley's article series on the forgotten gay rights movement in Germany and the importance of history to the gay group identity in the midst of political action. Chapter III Igniting the Dialogue: The Year of the Children and MLBLM examines the impact of Gerald Hannon's article "Men Loving Boys Loving Men" which concerned youth sexuality, pedophilia, and the community backlash that resulted in charges leveled against *The Body Politic*. Utilizing *The Body Politic* as a case study of early Gay Liberation movement, I chart the development of a gay community rising from an amorphous collection of ideas into a structured and unique force of politics and society.

By analyzing *The Body Politic* as one of the premier communicative conduits of the Gay Liberation movement, I hope to enlighten the understanding of the interactions between the cultural spheres of North America – namely, those of the gay and straight cultures and communities. By viewing the Gay Liberation movement as a culturally shaping force rather than a series of political occurrences, one appreciates the tense oppositions that often hindered the understanding of the two cultures and kept them alienated from one another. Some have attributed this division to the presence of homophobia alone, but this is hasty generalization. Though homophobia has and certainly still does exist throughout society, to attribute the bisection of sexual cultures in North American on homophobia alone would be a serious misstep. This division, as this project will demonstrate, was utilized by the gay community themselves for a variety of purposes and enacted through a variety of means.

Today, the issues facing the gay community have changed in the wake of the growing assimilation of the gay community, globalization, and enhanced communication. Still, a divide exists between the sexual cultures in North America. Though strong gains have been made, the

gay community still struggles to assimilate fully into larger North American culture and society. By understanding how the communal divisions of this separation first came to be, one hopes to add another plank on the bridge that may not unite, but at least will no longer segregate these cultures who have so misunderstood one another.

Chapter I: Organizing a Community: The Founding of *The Body Politic*

- “Gay Liberation is the work of homosexuals themselves.” *The Body Politic* byline.
- “The master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.” Audre Lorde.

Herbert Roth Spiers had fallen in love. On his first trip to Toronto, Ontario, in the summer of 1970, Herb visited a gay bar called “The August Club” and met Grant Peterson, a native of Toronto and openly gay man. Herb was smitten and wanted to become involved with Grant, but one critical element divided them – geography. Herb lived in Columbus, Ohio, and Grant was a native of Toronto with no intentions of moving. Something had to give.⁶

This divide, however, was not much of an obstacle. A lifelong Columbus native, Spiers had grown weary of the small outpost of the Midwest and its closeted gay scene. “The Columbus scene revolved around a few bars and a little bit of a dance club,” Spiers, 65, said. “The bars usually had a front door and a back door, but nobody used the front door because nobody wanted to be seen.” Police harassment, social prejudice, and discrimination in the workplace were all staples of being gay in North America in 1970. Though having just received a fellowship to pursue his PhD in political theory at The Ohio State University, Spiers decided to forgo his fellowship, break free from Columbus, and follow his heart to Toronto. “It wasn’t a fun and happy scene,” Spiers concluded of Columbus.

Slim, intellectual, 25, and sporting a radical’s long hair and beard, Spiers arrived in Toronto in the summer of 1970 with dreams of the sort of open gay world that existed in his dream home, New York City. What he found, however, was a similar system of social oppression as existed in the small, sleepy town of Columbus: police oppression, open discrimination, and a closeted gay community. Gay bars were still straight-owned and exploitative; the police operated under systemic profiling in order to entrap gay men, and it was still an annual tradition for straights to pelt drag queens with eggs as they went into the St. Charles Bar on Halloween.

Spiers was incensed. Instead of a gay Shangri-La, he found more of the same: oppression, coercion, and fear. Spiers decided to act. In fact, he was no stranger to political action. During the 1960s, Spiers had participated in civil disobedience at The Ohio State University in protest of the Vietnam War and in support of the Civil Rights movement. At Ohio State, Spiers and his friend Bruce Gillespie spoke publicly to other undergraduates denouncing the Vietnam War and advocated student involvement in civil disobedience. Spiers had also witnessed the National Guard close down Ohio State's campus in response to protests. During his brief stint as a high school social studies teacher, Spiers taught a course entitled "Problems in Democracy" in which civil rights was a primary topic.

This time, however, it was personal. The homophobic social climate exasperated Spiers, and he wanted change. To accomplish this, Spiers looked towards the Toronto community to become involved in local politics. "I think I read it somewhere or heard it someplace that there was a gay organization," recalled Spiers, "the Community Homophile Association of Toronto (CHAT), and that it was holding meetings." CHAT was founded in December of 1970 and incorporated in 1973.⁷ When Spiers arrived at his first meeting in the autumn of 1971, George Hislop, Canada's celebrated gay icon and CHAT's founder, chaired the society. Among the organizations many services was a private phone line to assist closeted gays, the organization of dances and social events, and a communal gay forum.⁸ The initial meetings were held in Holy Trinity Church, and Spiers recalled there were 150-200 people in attendance. "Their mission was, in a very conservative way, to advance the cause of homosexual or homophile equality," said Spiers. Some, however, considered CHAT to be too conservative to enact any real change. As more radicals joined CHAT in search of a means of meaningful actions, whispers of a new, more direct group began to coalesce.

In May of 1971, Paul Macdonald stepped off a plane as he returned, finally, to his home country of Canada. The past two years of Macdonald's life had been something of an adventure. After completing his undergraduate degree in 1969, Macdonald left his native Canada on a one-way ticket to London, doubtful if he would ever return. He hitchhiked his way around all of Europe, Northern Africa, and much of the Middle East, arriving back in London on August 1st of 1970 with two dollars to his name. After finding work as a supply (substitute) teacher in London, Paul began to settle in to life as a Londoner.⁹

A fateful journey to the cinema changed all that: “I remember seeing a movie called *Boys in the Band* in December of 1970,” recalled Macdonald. “I was quite despondent when I heard the phrase ‘show me a happy homosexual and I’ll show you a gay corpse.’” Paul Macdonald is gay. Though active in radical student politics during his university years, Macdonald never managed to come out of the closet. London provided him with that opportunity. “The next day I was walking past the London School of Economics and I ran into somebody, a hippie type person – I considered myself a hippie back then – and he was standing in front of the place with a white button on his windbreaker that said ‘Gay Liberation Front.’ I put my hand on the button and said, ‘I was gay too.’ It was the first time I ever admitted that to myself.”

From this auspicious occasion, Macdonald became deeply involved in the London Gay Liberation movement. Macdonald, then 24, helped to organize demonstrations, got involved in the gay publication *Come Together*, and began seeing his first boyfriend, the gentlemen whose button he noticed, no less. Eventually Macdonald longed for home. Finding life in London “unsustainable,” Macdonald returned to Canada and settled in Toronto. There, he discovered and became involved with CHAT, but Macdonald found the group much too conservative for his radical inclinations. “They were sort of a mainstream, middle of the road, don’t rock the boat, type of gay group,” said Macdonald. Irritated with CHAT’s conventional approach, Macdonald stood up during a meeting and asked anyone interested in direct or militant action to meet him in a corner. “About two dozen of us got together. We decided we would create a new group. It was then that I met people like Herb Spiers and Jearld Moldenhauer...”

Growing up as a homosexual child in blue collar Niagara Falls, New York was a painful affair for Jearld F. Moldenhauer, 64, during the 1950s and 1960s.¹⁰ From an early age, Moldenhauer knew he was different. His lack of interest in sports and girls stigmatized his interactions with other schoolchildren; even his older brother harassed him. To remedy this, Moldenhauer withdrew to a private world of study and inquiry. He discovered Emerson and Thoreau at age 14, became interested in arts history and opera at the same age (Wagner’s Ring Cycle being his favorite), and through his passion for nature, filled his room with caterpillars, amphibians, and dozens of dried plants.

Despite these distractions, Moldenhauer retains gloomy reminiscences of his childhood: “Unfortunately this belief in nature did not extend to my own emerging sexual nature, and I

suffered tremendous social pressure to conform to heterosexual life. This denial of my homosexual emotional and physical longing would remain a tortured part of my psychological life.”¹¹ Eventually, Moldenhauer escaped. By saving money through his jobs as a factory worker and paper boy and by virtue of an academic scholarship, Moldenhauer left home in 1964 to study at Cornell University.

Still, Moldenhauer had difficulty adjusting. While remaining closeted, Moldenhauer now sensed his class background as an element of further difference amongst the established, old-money students of Cornell. He threw himself once again into art and literature as a means of catharsis. The works of Andre Gide, Norman O. Brown, Herbert Marcuse, and William Blake filled Moldenhauer with a new sense of identity and confidence with his sexuality. Similarly, Moldenhauer regularly attended Cornell’s visiting lecture series which included such notables as Elliot Carter, Alan Hovhaness, John Cage, and gay icon and poet Allen Ginsberg.

Educated, confident, and determined, Moldenhauer came out in 1966. In just a few short months, Moldenhauer went from being a newly out gay man to being passionate about gay organizing. In 1967, Moldenhauer began frequenting Manhattan and attending meetings of the Eastern Regional Conference of Homophile Organizations (ERCHO), a conservative gay organization with an older demographic, which, to Moldenhauer, seemed more concerned with Robert’s Rules of Order than any kind of gay movement.

It was during one of these trips that Moldenhauer met Robert Martin, founder of the Columbia University Homophile League in May of 1967. Together the pair discussed gay politics and organizations and Martin gave Moldenhauer copies of the Columbia chapter’s founding statement of purpose and by-laws. With this precedent, Moldenhauer returned to Cornell to start his own homophile student chapter.

After an initially lackluster response by the underground Cornell gay society, Moldenhauer succeeded in founding the Cornell University Student Homophile League. During Moldenhauer’s tenure with the group there was little response. “The greatest obstacles were gays themselves,” said Moldenhauer, citing other gays’ reluctance to be openly political. However, through leafleting, Moldenhauer was able to attract a handful of gay students to the new group. Following Moldenhauer’s departure from Cornell, the group underwent changes and staged more public demonstrations as the Gay Liberation movement itself became more visible.¹²

Moldenhauer arrived in Toronto in 1970 and had no difficulty finding sexual encounters in Toronto's gay underground on the Yonge St. strip and around the University of Toronto. Despite the presence of this sexual world, Moldenhauer noticed a considerable lack of political organization and decided to act. "The gay political organization of Toronto began when I founded the University of Toronto Homophile Association in the fall of 1969," said Moldenhauer. Indeed, the UTHA was the first visible political organization in Toronto up until that time, predating CHAT, which was founded in 1970. After its inception, the UTHA was the sole community homophile group for nearly a year until George Hislop formed CHAT, which operated as a general community organization as opposed to the university specific UTHA. Sensing that the movement was growing, Moldenhauer joined CHAT as well to see what new blood the movement was attracting.

At CHAT, however, Moldenhauer found another conservative, passive organization more interested in biweekly gatherings than forceful political action. "It might be fair to say that the majority of CHAT members were simply still too closeted to get involved in public protest," he said. Moldenhauer had other ideas. A practiced organizer, Moldenhauer saw yet another opportunity to forge a new group to make political demands and agitate for legal reform. After one CHAT meeting, Moldenhauer answered Paul Macdonald's call for other radicals interested in organizing a new gay group. With this meeting, a new chapter in Toronto gay politics began.

As the radicals assembled, they began discussing the formation of a new gay group that would be more direct in its approach to political agitation. What became of this meeting was the group Toronto Gay Action (TGA). TGA consisted of Spiers, Macdonald, Moldenhauer, along with David Newcome, Peter Zorzi, Tony Metie, and others. Populating the group were "very progressive thinkers, very left wing if not Marxists or Trotskyites...it was much more radical and grass roots," according to Spiers. Unlike those in CHAT, the members of TGA preferred a more direct, inflammatory approach to political action. "It was a younger demographic with more militancy and direct action," said Macdonald.

Aside from a more incendiary form of rhetoric and critique drawing from various strands of Marxism and Trotskyism, the members of TGA also organized and participated in social action. "Zaps," as they were commonly known, were a regular method of protest. The practice, utilized throughout the Gay Liberation movement in North America, involved several gays entering a straight bar and dancing with each other in full view of the bar's patrons; the goal was

to demand equality by “flaunting” their sexuality in a social zone not designed for homosexuals. The old hands at CHAT, however, were not amused or inspired by the upstart rogues of TGA.

“There was a dynamic tension between CHAT and TGA because CHAT saw the activities of TGA as too far out, and they reflected poorly on what most gay people were like which was normal, run of the mill citizens like everybody else,” said Spiers. “There would be fierce debates on the floor of CHAT meetings.” By serving on the directing boards of both groups, Spiers acted as conduit between CHAT and TGA. Though the groups often found themselves at odds, they still mingled and tolerated each other. The gay world was too small to afford a civil war.¹³

The first official event that TGA organized was a march on the Ottawa government, which occurred in the summer of 1971. TGA spent months preparing the logistics of the march by organizing transportation, supporters, and a list of demands to present at the march. Deemed the most capable writer by the members of TGA, Herb Spiers was commissioned to write the document which would come to be called as “We Demand.”ⁱⁱ The document included ten points, which read as follows:

1. The removal of the nebulous terms “gross indecency” and “indecent act” from the Criminal Code and their replacement by a specific listing of offences, and the equalization of penalties for all remaining homosexual and heterosexual acts and defining “in private” in the Criminal Code to mean “a condition of privacy.”
2. Removal of “gross indecency” and “buggery” as ground for indictment as a ‘dangerous sexual offender’ and for vagrancy.
3. A uniform age of consent for all female and male homosexual and heterosexual acts.
4. The Immigration Act be amended so as to omit all references to homosexual and “homosexualism.”
5. The right of equal employment and promotion at all government levels for homosexuals.

ⁱⁱ There has been some confusion as to the true authorship of the “We Demand” article. In the CLG archives website EBSCO, an online source which has digitized versions of *The Body Politic*, the site lists several *Body Politic* affiliates as authors of the document. This is in error. Because “We Demand” appeared, like so many *Body Politic* articles, without an authorial byline and with only the names of the collective editors, the authorship has been inaccurately attributed to Brian Waite and Cheri Denovo. In reality, it was Herb Spiers who wrote the document assisted by David Newcome. “I wrote it,” Spiers stated plainly.

6. The Divorce Act be amended so as to omit sodomy and homosexual acts as grounds for divorce; moreover in divorce cases homosexuality, per se, should not preclude the equal right of child custody.
7. The right of homosexuals to serve in the Armed Forces, and therefore the removal of provisions for convicting service personnel of conduct and/or acts legal under the Criminal Code; further the rescinding of policy statements reflecting on the homosexual.
8. To know if it is a policy of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to identify homosexuals within any area of government service and then question them concerning their sexuality and the sexuality of others and if this is the policy we demand its immediate cessation and destruction of all records obtained.
9. All legal rights for homosexuals which currently exist for heterosexuals.
10. All public officials and law enforcement agents to employ the full force of their office to bring about changes in the negative attitudes and de facto expressions of discrimination and prejudice against homosexuals.¹⁴ⁱⁱⁱ

Some were ambitious demands (8,9,10), others fairly intuitive with regards to the legal issues at play (1-7). On August 28th, 1971, the document was read at a gay pride march in Ottawa after being approved by CHAT and TGA. The modern, gay Jefferson, Spiers, was not able to read the demands himself; a car accident en route to the march kept him from performing the task. Still, the points were read to great acclaim, and the march was deemed an overwhelming success.

Though Canada specific, the document mirrored statements of demands made by other counterculture movements and gay rights documents preceding it; though ambitious, it was hardly as radical as Carl Whitman's gay rights manifesto of 1970, which utilized a heavily Marxist tone. Indeed, the document reads so much like a legal brief that the first lawyer to see it inquired as to which firm had drafted it.¹⁵ Though certainly a checklist of needs for political change, the document also gave structure to the early movement by giving it goals of which to aspire and work towards. "Traditionally," said Spiers, "when you have an organization and the organization is grass roots, they're lobbying with a set of demands. So it was decided we needed demands too."

ⁱⁱⁱ To date, all of these demands have been accepted into the Canadian Bill of Rights or are now a part of Canadian law.

The tactic of writing a list of demands was no anomaly of the Gay Liberation movement. In 1962, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) authored the “Port Huron Statement” condemning American Imperialism, conformity, and racism, while giving rise to the Student movement. Similarly, The Black Panther Party outlined a “Ten Point Program” calling for racial equality, which mirrored many of the demands of the “Port Huron Statement” with racial overtones. In 1963, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s “Letter from a Birmingham Jail” appeared on the forefront of the Civil Rights movement. During the movement to repeal the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” Act, Lt. Dan Choi wrote an open letter to President Obama demanding the repeal of the litigious policy. Such documents, as did Carl Whittman’s “A Gay Manifesto,” allowed movement members to recognize social or legal injustices, rally against them, and fight for their repeal. In many cases, the prodigious skill of movement leaders in writing these documents inspired movement followers with their stirring prose (“Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere” etc.), which added an almost biblical legitimacy to the movement.

A list of demands, however, seemed too trivial to Moldenhauer and other radicals of TGA. Under Moldenhauer’s guidance, TGA began to discuss the possibility of forming a Gay Liberation journal. The idea appealed to all members of TGA. Though their march on Ottawa had been successful, the members of TGA wanted to reach a wider audience with their message of Gay Liberation. The members had a wealth of precedents available to them. The first Gay Liberation periodical in the United States, VICE VERSA, was founded in 1947 by lesbian Lisa Ben (an anagram / pseudonym of “lesbian”). Following the Stonewall riots in New York in June of 1969, a plethora of new gay periodicals emerged while established periodicals became more vocal.¹⁶ Among *The Body Politic*’s influences and contemporaries were *The Advocate* of Los Angeles, *Come Out!* in New York, *Gay Liberator* in Detroit, *Fag Rag* in Boston, and *Gay Sunshine* in San Francisco.¹⁷ Additionally, Paul Macdonald had worked for the London Gay Liberation Front’s *Come Together* during his time in England and brought his valuable experience with him.

After making connections with friends at another radical underground paper entitled *Guerilla*, the members of TGA had a press. Next, they set to work writing the articles, designing the layout of the magazine, and evaluating costs. It was decided that Spiers’s “We Demand” document would headline the premier issue as would coverage of the recent march on Ottawa’s Parliament. The only thing left was to settle on a name. A devotee of William Blake, Jearld

Moldenhauer wanted to name the magazine “Glad Day” after a Blake poem. Others found this name wanting in terms of flavor and appeal. While discussing the matter at a CHAT dance, Spiers, a political science enthusiast, offered “The Body Politic” as a possible title. The other members agreed. Thus, the newly christened *The Body Politic* printed its first issue on November 1st, 1971 and begun a new era of gay publication and Gay Liberation.

The orientation of the magazine is not what one would expect from a modern publishing structure. Unlike most magazines, journals, and newspapers, *The Body Politic* had no chief editor, no positions of leadership, and no single authority. Instead of an editor, *The Body Politic* utilized an editorial collective in which all contributors held an equal voice and vote. This structure undoubtedly had its roots in the Marxist influence that guided the politics of many of the founders. “We didn’t want it to be like a traditional paper,” explained Spiers, “there was going to be no editorial structure: no editor in chief, editors, publishers, and things like that which would approve things in the paper. It was decided that everything in the paper would be read, everything.”

And indeed it was. In an attempt to give *The Body Politic* the trappings of a true *vox populi*, every article written for the magazine was read aloud by the author at collective meetings, discussed, and voted on for inclusion. “In the beginning,” Spiers said, “it required a unanimous vote for each article to be placed in the newspaper.” Following the release of each new magazine, a *post partum* meeting would be held to discuss the success of the most recent paper and the manner in which it could have been improved.¹⁸

“The liberation of homosexuals is the work of homosexuals themselves,” read the byline under the cover of the first *Body Politic*. The bold statement, coined by Moldenhauer, gave the journal a sense of purpose and signified a specific form of struggle. After years of oppression, the gay community was emerging from the closet to challenge authority. Led by the already out and radicalized gay youth of the day, the movement needed to utilize mass media to reach those still in the closet and to give the strength of numbers to their burgeoning cause. In the first issue, Moldenhauer listed the purpose of *The Body Politic* writing:

Our purpose is three-fold:

1. To inform the gay community about NEWS events involving the gay liberation movement.
2. To provide a forum for individuals to express their views on sexual politics.

3. To publish prose, poetry, book and film reviews relevant to gay liberation.¹⁹

“We wanted to let people know that there was a gay liberation organization, that there was a gay organization in Canada. We also wanted to bind the country together,” said Macdonald. The needs to communicate, organize, and agitate acted as primary concerns of the founders and early writers of *The Body Politic*. As such, the orientation of the magazine reflected these goals.

To address the needs of the gay community, Macdonald organized a section of the paper aptly titled the “Community Page”; said Macdonald: “by having a community page, I thought we could have some form of coherence across the country even though we were Toronto based. We could at least let other people know that we existed, that they existed and that possibly and become a catalyst for other groups to get started.”

A mainstay of *The Body Politic*, the “Community Page” comprised a multifarious portion of the paper. Most articles were inclusive in their message and focused on the need for closeted gays to come out; moreover, such articles revealed that a homosexual cultural space existed that was safe and secure. As the distribution of *The Body Politic* grew, this purpose had far reaching effects. “People needed something like that [*TBP*]. It was a lifeline to people like people in Saskatoon, which is a pretty isolated place,” said one *Body Politic* affiliate.²⁰ In one article from 1974, Spiers related an account of receiving a letter from a youth in Saskatchewan who described his fears of being discovered as a homosexual and his despair with living in the closet. The article describes how the youth made a visit to Toronto to visit *The Body Politic*’s headquarters and met the staff; it concludes how the visit allowed the young man to realize his sexual identity in the midst of a positive and supportive gay community.²¹

Within the community page, gay group activities were a source of constant writing. Throughout its lifetime, *The Body Politic* published articles regarding new and emerging gay groups all over Canada. In the advertising section of the journal, a notice asking for announcements of group formations and their locations was always present.

Another function of the community page was to exert warnings to the gay community about possible dangers. These warnings usually pertained to police activity and directed gays to avoid certain areas where police activity was high or where police were known to be targeting homosexuals. As collective member Ed Jackson recalled:

There needed to be a vehicle to communicate, to exert warnings, to tell people the news that was happening, to provide a vehicle to protest what was going on.

There needed to be a means of communication with a community that felt very...that didn't feel together, that didn't feel like a unified group at all. And I think there was always a sense that a newspaper would be an extremely potent vehicle for making some of that happen.²²

Though homosexual acts were no longer illegal, gays still encountered police and social harassment. Along with identifying dangerous areas for gays to venture to, the paper also listed gay-friendly areas that were safe for gays to patronize and provided locations for gays to meet.^{iv} Other articles contained practical legal advice for those caught engaging in public homosexual acts. In his "Don't Grope Strangers (Introduce yourself first)," CHAT president George Hislop gave specific advice for approaching men in public in a sexual advance. Alternatively, Hislop also gave advice of what to do if arrested by the police for gay "cruising" and gave a summary of the prime areas of arrests.²³

The Body Politic also included an "Our Image" page. The most diverse section of the paper, the "Our Image" section covered all matters relevant to the emerging gay culture. The section included reviews of books, films, and theatre, presented original gay poetry, listed relevant gay events in Toronto, and presented a wide array of cultural articles. The goal of the "Our Image" section, consequently, was to establish and expand the gay cultural identity.

The initial distribution of the magazine was anything but conventional: the very first issues of *The Body Politic* were sold out of Moldenhauer's backpack at CHAT and TGA meetings. Other venues were also pursued: namely, pornographic bookstores and liberal newsstands. The members also favored the direct approach of taking their magazine to the street and bars to sell them to passerby and patrons. "I would go to the bars, sell the paper in the bars and sometimes got kicked out or harassed by the cops threatened with arrest for obstructing the sidewalk," said Macdonald.

Thanks to Macdonald, *The Body Politic* also made its way across the seas. On a trip to London, Macdonald smuggled along a bundle of *Body Politics* to give to the members of the gay movement at this old haunt of Compendium Books and other gay friendly bookstores. While in Havana, Macdonald went to the Shakespeare library in Havana University and hid a few dozen *Body Politics* amongst the library's periodical section. "I did subversive things like that," said

^{iv} In his "Toronto's Gay Spots," Toronto guru John Scythes provided a detailed map and commentary for those looking for gay friendly establishments. "Toronto's Gay Spots" By: Scythes, John. *Body Politic*, Winter73, Issue 7, p6, 1p

Macdonald.²⁴ Similarly, on his yearly trips to Europe, Moldenhauer shared the magazine with friendly gay groups in England, France, and Germany.²⁵

Stylistically, the magazine was, initially, a bit dry. Oftentimes, *The Body Politic* resembled an academic journal rather than a grass-roots magazine. Indeed, many articles contained much more academic Latin terminology than one would expect to find in any popular magazine today. As Spiers was pursuing a PhD in philosophy at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Moldenhauer had studied literature at Cornell, and various other *Body Politic* writers had backgrounds in the Fine Arts, a certain soporific quality permeated the paper. A common joke amongst the early members was that readers required at least a year of college education to understand the material. This is all changed with the arrival of Ed Jackson and Gerald Hannon.

Born in Fredrickton, New Brunswick, Ed Jackson spent most of his young life in the closet. It wasn't until he came to the University of New Brunswick that he finally came to terms with his sexuality.²⁶ An aspiring academic in literature, Jackson came to University of Toronto in 1966. Finding academic life too dull, Jackson stalled work on his doctorate degree and took up teaching English as a second language to support himself. Though Jackson was aware of an early movement stirring, his courses kept him from participating: "There was a movement kind of happening," Jackson said, "but because I was teaching in the evenings, I never got to any of those early meetings." While teaching, Jackson befriended a fellow teacher who would become one of his closest friends and the most famous writer *The Body Politic* ever had: Gerald Hannon.

Enter the iconoclast. If one were to say that *The Body Politic* had its Jacobins, then Gerald Hannon was certainly its Marat. During his fourteen-year tenure with *The Body Politic*, Hannon penned the most controversial articles the magazine ever printed.^v Raised in the sleepy town in Northern Ontario called Marathon, Hannon led an awkward childhood, secluded and sexually repressed. Hannon graduated with a degree in philosophy and a minor in English in 1966 and went to teach English as a second language while still living in Toronto. There Hannon befriended Jackson, who in turn finally brought him out of the closet. After a few years of scrupulous saving, they decided to head to Europe on a grand adventure in the summer of 1970.²⁷

^v Hannon's background and role with *The Body Politic* will be examined extensively in Chapter III.

Together they traveled the Old World in grand fashion, stopping in Spain, Italy, and Greece. Following these excursions, the pair went to London to contemplate resettling in the United Kingdom. On one cool London day, they happened to pass by St. Paul's Cathedral and noticed a gay rights demonstration. The demonstration was aimed at the Fleet St. and the treatment of gays in the media. Though out to close friends, Hannon and Jackson were not political, and they preferred to remain inconspicuous in public with regards to their sexuality. The Fleet St. demonstration changed all that. "It's amazing how your whole life pivots on one small moment," said Hannon. Hannon and Jackson returned to Toronto craving involvement in the new movement. They began participating in CHAT and TGA dances. At one dance, they noticed a hefty man sitting in a corner selling magazine and bought the first of issue of *The Body Politic* from Paul Macdonald and "devoured it."²⁸ Hannon and Jackson proceeded to a *Body Politic* meeting and asked to help out. They were each assigned an article that appeared in the second issue. Upon reading the pair's work, the collective saw that *The Body Politic* had some new clothes.

As a writer, Hannon appeared in many guises: one part acerbic critic, one part philosopher, and another part naughty schoolboy. Hannon's debut article, "Porn at the Clarke," describes, in lively detail, Hannon's experience volunteering for a sex study measuring sexual arousal to various erotic images at the Clarke Institute. Hannon explains how his "cock" was placed in a plastic sheath ("generously dusted with Johnson's Baby Powder") to measure his arousal. "Feeling a bit like Frankenstein before the switch was thrown," Hannon observed nude images ("dull ones") of women and children. The study was meant to ascertain whether or not gay men adhered to the Freudian principal of showing physical repulsion to the nude female body. Hannon concluded that the Freudian concept of homosexual neurosis was inherently false as he and other members did not react with disgust at the female images.²⁹ The spirited account, both entertaining and informative, ushered in a new flavor to the writing of *The Body Politic*.

With the arrival of Ken Popert in early 1973, the young *Body Politic* added yet another layer to its repertoire. As he reached an impasse on his PhD thesis at Cornell while studying linguistics, Popert decided to return home to Toronto. After having already been involved with publishing in Moldenhauer's student homophile league at Cornell, Popert once again set his sights on gay publishing and came knocking on the door of *The Body Politic*. Under Popert, *The*

Body Politic transformed from an amorphous collection of ideas into a structured tool of social organization and gay communal cohesion.

Popert was responsible for introducing the news department to *The Body Politic*. Suddenly, *The Body Politic* transformed from an intellectual paper to a professional news journal. As Popert recalls:

One of the things I set out to accomplish was I wanted the paper to adopt a more journalistic approach, and I think I was responsible for introducing the news department into the publication. Although it had had news before, it wasn't arranged in a conscious effort in any kind.³⁰

Under Popert, the "News of the Gay" became a staple edition to *The Body Politic*. More than simply focusing on local Toronto gay news, Popert insisted on delivering news about gay liberation throughout the world; as Popert stated: "It [Gay Liberation] was clearly conceived of being a thing of the world, not in just Canada or Toronto." True to this principle, the news department brought the news of the gay world, not solely of Toronto, into *The Body Politic*. Popert's methods, however, were often motivated by his belief in the political power of media.

In this respect, a revealing edition of "News of the Gay" is worth mentioning. In the 1974 July/August edition of *The Body Politic*, one discovers a keenly placed political message embedded within the "News of the Gay" section. On page 7 on this particular edition, six brief articles embody the international portion of gay news. What is interesting about these international articles is that all of them focus on the international abuse of gays; their titles speak for themselves: "Chilean fascists terrorize gays," "U.K. bans [gay] poetry," "Portugal's gays join revolution," "CHE conference plans strategy," "Activists beaten," and "Unitarians balk at rights move." All articles describe the lamentable treatment of gays in some respect, while others emphasize the need for action and organization as well. What is doubly striking about this section is the banner underlying the stories in question. Beneath these headlines, a standard advertising the "Nation Gay Pride March" is prominently displayed. With this page, a dual political purpose is at play: alert the gay community to the worldwide threat of oppression and ask them to unite in the face of this danger.³¹

Stories such as these not only served the purpose of being informative, but also spoke of the worldwide uniformity of the Gay Liberation struggle. In such articles, the stories usually focused on the pejorative treatment of gays the world over. The purpose of such a tactic was to

invoke a sense of community amongst the gays in the English-speaking world by showing that homosexuals the world over were in a state of constant defense against their oppressor. Such rhetoric underlined the notion of a universal gay movement rather than a local one; nonetheless, the appeal to a worldwide movement also acted as a unifying element on a local level. By identifying a local movement as part of a larger phenomenon, North American Gay Liberation assumed the form of a global, gay proletariat. One can almost hear the whispers of Marx's renowned "workers of the world unite" resonate in such early messages.

To Popert, this message was rather intuitive. The press, after all, had long been the apparatus of the 1st and 2nd estates, the money barons, and the revolutionaries as a tool of social change. As Popert stated, "I became more aware of how it needed to be used as a tool of politics as opposed to an explosion of ideas, so I think I was responsible for moving it more in that direction and that culminated in the renaming of it to a news magazine from a liberation journal."³² Along with Popert, other members of *The Body Politic* began to realize the journal's potential as a shaping cultural force. Soon, the ideas and theories espoused within *The Body Politic* discussed not only sexual politics, but the creation of a unique culture in relation to that of its counterpart: the straight culture.

"We have to remember," recalled one *Body Politic* affiliate, "global communication was not what we have now. That's how people would communicate: you published to communicate."³³ In the era of instant communication almost the entire developed world over, it is easy to forget that the rotary telephone, primitive fax machines, and national postal services were the apex of communication just a few decades ago. During the early Gay Liberation movement, the movement's success depended on the ability to communicate and unite over a wide geographic distance. Lacking the ability to communicate with other branches of the movement was a foremost concern of early activists. Although *The Body Politic* enjoyed ample local distribution in Toronto, the collective sought a method to communicate to the worldwide movement.

To address this, the collective took direct action. Paul Macdonald smuggled copies to Havana and London. Jearld Moldenhauer distributed copies to his Gay Liberation allies in England, Germany, and Italy on his yearly travels to Europe. The editorial collective was also deeply interested in the American liberation movement, corresponding with Gay Liberation

circles in Boston, New York, Detroit, and San Francisco and almost always exchanging liberation journals and gay periodicals in the process.³⁴ Indeed, *The Body Politic* reached as far as celebrated American gay activist Harvey Milk's circle in San Francisco, where it was greeted with much enthusiasm.³⁵

In contact with the Gay Liberation outlets throughout the English-speaking world, *The Body Politic* began to refine its message. Other founders also realized that certain themes needed to accompany the journal's message in order to work effectively as a tool of political agitation. To address this, early *Body Politic* articles pertaining to cultural and political action took the form of three categories: 1) the need for unity, 2) identification of the straight superstructure, and 3) a message of separatism and alienation from heterosexual domination.

"The question was where we could find our army," recalled Popert. The need for a unified movement during the early years of Gay Liberation was of paramount importance. Just years before, gays still met and organized behind closed doors in meetings numbering no more than 200 people. Now, with the Gay Liberation movement in full swing the English speaking world over, necessity called for a unified show of force to the dominant society in order to bring about effective change – a message *The Body Politic* did everything to advance.

In "Gay Caucus: Unitarian Universalist Gays," *Body Politic* author Elgin Blair concentrated on the importance of unity to the gay movement. As Blair wrote:

We are creating our own institutions of many kinds to carve out our own 'Free living spaces' where we can define ourselves, strengthen our personalities, and search out new ways of relating to one another and to the society we live in.³⁶

In such rhetoric, one finds the belief of gay culture separating itself in order to give meaning to its ethos. Specifically, the desire to "carve out our own 'Free Living Spaces' where we can define ourselves" focuses on the goal of developing a unified, independent movement to grow into as a communal entity.

A similar theme permeates other early *Body Politic* articles. In his "Strategy for Gay Liberation," Brian Waite offers an outline for political and social movement. Within the piece, Waite speaks of the need for political action in the forms of demonstrations and legal reform, but he concludes that only through the actions of the gay community can such meaningful change take place. As Waite explains:

We have to organize this strength in public actions, relying on the abilities of ourselves and our organizations; not on the good auspices of any individual, be he or she government official, party leader, or movement hero.³⁷

Here, Waite describes the need for communal acts through gay organizations as the ideal manner of enacting change. Furthermore, Waite endorses such actions over those of a single person, even movement's heroes, in his support of communal rather than individual action in the quest for change. Articles such as these, along with the activities of the "Community Page," demonstrate *The Body Politic's* desire to enact a unified community of Gay Liberation agitating for change under the direction of gay organizations.

In order to unify, the Gay Liberation movement needed an enemy or counterbalance to join together against. In this respect, *The Body Politic* took a definitive step in identifying the enemy of Gay Liberation – the heterosexual community. In a variety of cultural pieces and editorials, several articles in *The Body Politic* took aim at the nuclear family as the building block of society. This was a widely held Gay Liberationist belief to be sure, not one relegated to those at *The Body Politic*; as Spiers recalled, "I think the official ideology that permeated the collective of *The Body Politic* was a belief in the necessity to overthrow the nuclear family."

The emphasis on the negative aspects of the family was a popular notion during the 1970s. During the 1970s, the practice of American psychiatry suffered a tremendous backlash from various sources. Psychiatry's main detractor, R.D. Laing, lambasted his profession in a series of books and speeches while becoming a prominent figure of the New Left. One of Laing's most notable works *Sanity, Madness, and the Family*, analyzed what Laing referred to as the "family nexus." In the text, Laing examines several families of schizophrenic patients to determine the effect of a patient's family on his illness.³⁸ A revelatory work in terms of individual identity within group dynamics (along with healthy dose of Existentialism), Laing's text offered a nuanced view on the causes of the tenuously defined illness of schizophrenia by observing that family members often had a tremendous impact on a patient's psyche. Although the text concerned the family's impact on schizophrenia, Laing's ideas and language concerning families appealed to critics of the family at large. As Laing wrote:

Not the individual but the family is the unit of illness: not the individual but the family, therefore, needs the clinician's services to 'cure' it: the family (or even

society at large) is now a sort of hyperorganism, with a physiology and pathology, that can be well or ill.³⁹

This notion of the family found zealous disciplines within the Gay Liberation community who associated Laing's assessment of family life with personal stories of family rejection. Likewise, the historical psychiatric treatment of homosexuality as an illness shifted in light of Laing's assessment. As a result, the dismissal of the family as the building block of society led to the rise of gay communal living in an attempt to strengthen solidarity and organize the gay community.^{vi} Within articles in *The Body Politic*, critique of heterosexuals and the nuclear family served as a unifying political tool and a means of cultural division between the "gay" and "straight" cultures.

The earliest traces of such distinctions began simply with trite labels of heterosexuals. Among these epitaphs were, "the straights who dominate this society," "the straight monolith," "the straight syndrome,"⁴⁰ and the "hetero-freak culture."⁴¹ Though conventional, the act of labeling had a potent effect on cultural articles within *The Body Politic*, and such terms soon became commonplace. Other aspects of labeling, however, were much more generalized and striking in their approach. For example, in "Gay Caucus: Unitarian Universalist Gays," Elgin Blair made a sweeping statement regarding the dominant culture in 1972:

Most parents, doctors, ministers, social workers, school counselors, psychologists and psychiatrists have such negative attitudes to homosexuality that the emerging person is overwhelmed by a cacophony of voices trying to 'save' him. Most of us know of at least one suicide resulting from these violent efforts to force a person into the straight and narrow path of heterosexuality.⁴²

Here Blair paints rather broad strokes as he groups a variety of social professions together as antagonists to gays. Blair commits a hasty generalization in that he implies a direct relationship between the professions he lists and the gay suicide rate. Though gay youth often retain higher rates of suicide than their heterosexual counterparts, the article attributes this unhappy truth solely to heterosexual oppression without considering a myriad of other possibilities. As the critique of heterosexual society intensified, *Body Politic* authors refined their targets and their methods, most often settling upon the family as the main source of attack.

^{vi} David Cooper was another anti-psychiatry figure (he coined the phrase) to whom *The Body Politic* writers paid much attention. A colleague of R.D. Laing, Cooper applied many of Laing's principles in his work *The Death of the Family*, which commented extensively on the family's role in repressing sexual identity. In a preface to an article containing excerpts from *The Death of the Family*, Jearld Moldenhauer gave the text a glowing review.

As early as the sixth issue of *The Body Politic*, this theme resonated in the journal's pages. In his article "Oppression Begins at Home," Brian Waite discussed the family as a tool of gay oppression and *The Body Politic's* role in revealing it as such:

A look through back issues of the paper will reveal that the institution of the family as we know it in this society is a key factor in the oppression of not only gays, but women and straight men as well.⁴³

In this article, Waite employs the standard Marxist critique of the time, which emphasized the family as systemic organization of oppression in the capitalist society. In this regard, Engels's renowned text *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* was of a particular importance to the Gay Liberation movement. Engels's critique of the family employs a historical materialist study of the evolution of the modern familial structure and its use as a capitalist means of structured control. Waite, like many feminists and lesbian activists of the time, utilizes this critique saying, "The very term family, which came into existence along with the system of private property, originally signified the domestic slavery of women."⁴⁴

Additionally, the writers of *The Body Politic* were keen readers of the popular Post-Structuralist thinkers of the day who wrote on sexuality: principally, Herbert Marcuse and Norman O. Brown. A luminous member of the Frankfurt School of sociology, Herbert Marcuse's most enduring work is undoubtedly his 1955 *Eros and Civilization*.^{45vii} Often described as a synthesis of the key tenets of Marx and Freud, *Eros and Civilization* examines the dual manifestations of Freudian repression and Marxist exploitation in society. The origin of both societal ills, according to Marcuse, was the ubiquitous presence of sexual repression in society, which exhibited itself in violent outbursts or was channeled into the desexualized activity of labor. Marcuse's answer for alleviating the oppression of society was to liberate the ability for the actualization of the life instinct (Eros) over that of the death instinct (Thanatos) by allowing technological advances to replace the need for labor, thus ending exploitation and oppression.

Similar to Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization* was Norman O. Brown's 1959 *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History*.⁴⁶ Unlike Marcuse, Brown did not directly incorporate the Marxist critique into his approach to sexuality and repression, but focused mainly on an in-depth analysis of Freud. Specifically, Brown focused on the development of sexual

^{vii} For a highly accessible commentary on Marcuse, see Paul Robinson, *The Freudian Left* (Harper Colophon Books; New York, 1969) Chapter 4.

repression within children and a reinterpretation of Freud's tenuous notion of the death instinct, which Brown suggests is a unity between the life and death instincts instead of an antithesis. Like Marcuse, Brown contends that the best hope for ending repression is a type of "resurrection of the body" in which people enjoy their sensuality rather than repress it through the radical notion of "polymorphous perversity."

Such texts aligned themselves with the popular intellectual climate of the day in styling of the 1960s-1970s of Michel Foucault (*Madness and Civilization*, *The Birth of the Clinic*), R.D Laing (*Sanity, Madness and the Family*, "The Politics of the Family"), the poetry of Allen Ginsberg ("Howl"), classical Marxism and Trotskyism, and various other authors. In this regard, most of the editorial staff of *The Body Politic* were avid disciples of such authors and utilized their works as fuel for their cultural critique. These critiques were not merely aimed at the heterosexual society in general, but at the various apparatuses that perpetuated its existence.

In his article "Heteroburbia," Amerigo Marras examined the relatively recent development of the suburb as a tool of conformity and gay oppression. Claiming that suburbia is "supposed to fulfill the myth of living in contact with nature and it is also used for social control," Marras criticizes the manner in which conformity, in this case the suburbs, restricts the plurality of sexual expression, particularly homosexual expression. Additionally, Marras states that:

This pseudo-urban setting carefully avoids any uncontrollable socio-sexual outlets. To enforce the situation we are taught (school; church; home; work) to control our senses and to avoid personal contacts....It is part of the game to believe in a static society and so, for the slave to remain a slave in this case of suburban living, it is part of the game to train people to maintain the state of things, denying both personal individuality and need for socio-sexual interactions among human beings.⁴⁷

In these passages, Marras identifies the suburbs as a force of social control that inhibit the sexual expression of those who are different from the norm. Furthermore, he describes those trapped in suburban living as "slaves" who are forced into a type of suburban conformity that denies them individuality and sexual expression. In the piece, Marras concludes that "the segregating uniformity can only be the beginning of a more robotized way of life." Marras thus implies the stratification of society in which some spheres repress certain behavior (i.e., homosexuality)

while other areas allow it. The area Marras focuses on, suburbs, is of the former group and, therefore, must be avoided and, if possible, dismantled. This kind of message contributed to the ideal of creating a separatist gay culture with the gay community distancing itself from the social monoliths that suppress sexual individualism.

Within the realm of cultural critique, *The Body Politic's* most polemical author was easily Gerald Hannon. Regarded by the founders and other writers as the most adept author *The Body Politic* ever employed, Hannon approached his material in a unique and unorthodox manner. Though he wrote reviews and on politics, Hannon made his most indelible mark on the magazine in the realm of cultural critique. This is particularly seen in Hannon's distinctive method of analysis.

In his article "Throat Ramming," Hannon describes walking down Yonge St. holding hands with his partner and receiving shouts of "faggot" and other derogatory remarks from the citizenry. In the article, Hannon's partner is reluctant to show public affection for fear of abuse, but Hannon deliberately seeks confrontation. As Hannon writes: "The facts of the matter: what frequently constitutes my courage is a mixture of obliviousness and a desire to shock." Hannon claims that to be gay is to be invisible, to lead a life of solitude in the shadows of society. According to Hannon, one begins becoming visible when one comes out to his family, but this marks a negligible affair in the grand scheme of things. In order to become fully visible, Hannon believes that gays must pose uncomfortable questions and conversations to heterosexuals lest they "drift back into invisibility." Hannon names his technique "throat ramming." About as subtle as a cannon blast, Hannon describes this method as:

Throat-ramming. It must become the social extension of our public struggle for civil rights. 'Having it rammed down my throat' is a fairly common straight reaction to one's insistence on one's visibility as a gay person. They find it difficult to admit that every aspect of culture today is one violent heterosexual thrust down everyone's throat.⁴⁸

Here, Hannon diagrams a plan of antagonism against the heterosexual community through the act of "throat ramming." Hannon contends that all of culture constitutes a heterosexual version of "throat ramming" and must be responded to in kind. Such militant idiom was not designed to encourage a friendly exchange of ideas. As Hannon recalled, "I suppose partly I wanted to be

provocative; it was part of the ethos at the time. We were the radicals.”⁴⁹ Hannon’s radical message on the subject took a more dire tone as well.

In his article “Learning to Kill,” Hannon presents a similar story as was found in “Throat Ramming.” Again, the article describes Hannon and his partner walking down Yonge St. when, this time, a heterosexual couple verbally and physically assaults them. Hannon describes how the couple accosted them with derogatory slurs, how he responded with slurs of his own, and how Hannon and his partner fled the scene when the straight man threatened them with violence.

Hannon describes the aftermath:

The incident haunted us for days. We kept reliving the experience but imagining *our* fists crashing into *their* faces, *our* feet crashing into *their* rib cages, the four of us reducing them to a bloody smear...⁵⁰

Following the incident, Hannon describes enrolling in a self-defense class in which he was “learning to kill.” Hannon tempers this account while constantly invoking a sense of imminent danger and violence from the heterosexual community, which he calls “homophobia’s secret police,” saying:

I am in danger. The reality that statement represents will very likely never be clear to any gay man who has not actively tried to live his life so that he will never be mistaken for a heterosexual.

You are in danger.

Unless you never leave the safety of your room, you are in danger.

Throughout the piece, Hannon suggests an overwhelming sense of peril facing the gay community; moreover, this danger comes in the form not merely of oppression, but of violence. Hannon is clear that his message does not apply to him alone, but to homosexuals everywhere. Similarly, Hannon casts the entire heterosexual community in the role of an iniquitous and violent institution while cultivating a sense of paranoia. As such, the pronoun use in Hannon’s description of the attack (*his*) develops an entirely different connotation in which the two heterosexuals who assault Hannon become representatives of the entire heterosexual population against whom Hannon advocates aggressive self defense. This aggressive language mirrored other American Gay Liberation periodicals that called for violence. One of *The Body Politic*’s crucial influences, *Gay Sunshine*, made similar editorial calls for violence against the straight society.⁵¹

This kind of violent *casus belli* was not isolated to the Gay Liberation movement alone, having antecedents in many other counter-culture movements. Most notably, The Black Panther Party developed a reputation for violent action during the 1960s by carrying weapons in public and threatening police officers. The Weathermen, a radical offshoot of the Students for a Democratic Society, orchestrated a string of bombings throughout the United States in acts of calculated destruction; furthermore, the Weathermen executed the escape and exile of jailed New Left figure Timothy Leary. The most direct precedent for such rhetoric, however, would undoubtedly be Malcom X's famous "By Any Means Necessary Speech." In this speech, Malcom X notably stated:

I don't believe in violence – that's why I want to stop it. And you can't stop it with love, not love of those things down there, no. So, we only mean vigorous action in self-defense, and that vigorous action we feel we're justified in initiating by any means necessary.⁵²

The notion of aggressive self-defense weighs heavily in Hannon's call for the use of defensive violence.^{viii}

Though *The Body Politic* collective and readers appreciated Hannon's unique style, many often took offense to his controversial positions. In an editorial, one reader made his opinion of "Learning to Kill" known:

No, I am not going to learn to kill. Your article may have been intended to raise a few eyebrows. It turned a few stomachs too. The writer is very skilled at serving up a 'heart-touching, true story' much that stirs up the homosexual herd into passively mooing in agreement. Added to this sop is enough 'strength and solidarity' rhetoric to work the herd into a mild stampede and ignore the inherent stupidity of the idea.

It is time you directed your learned paranoiac attention toward what really causes straights to beat up on gays, and consider that maybe it is not primarily because they are straight and you are gay. Homophobia is a good-sounding word; it sells a lot of theses. But it is used so often today that people who didn't know

^{viii} Additionally in his speech, Malcom X defends the charge of doing "violence in reverse" saying: "Now, the press, behind something like that, they call us racist and people who are 'violent in reverse.' This is how they psycho you. They make you think that if you try to stop the Klan from lynching you, you're practicing 'violence in reverse.' Pick up on this, I hear a lot of you all parrot what the [white] man says."

they were victims of so-called homophobia now have a phobia of straights who are all supposedly obsessed like Hitler with a single destructive urge – homophobia! Quit inventing diseases! You’re no better than the psychiatrists.⁵³

The editorial’s author is quite revelatory. In particular, the author recognizes the “strength and solidarity rhetoric” Hannon employs in the article and within many of his articles, which often went to extraordinary lengths to appear contentious.^{ix} The author’s claim of the reversal effect of the movement’s “phobia of straights” underlies much of the Separatist rhetoric found within the cultural critiques of *The Body Politic*. Such rhetoric, however, was not merely an appendage to the early *Body Politic*, but a veritable *raison d’être*.

Within the early editions of *The Body Politic*, one finds a budding culture searching, struggling, and experimenting with its own ethos and its place within society. As an ideal method of communication with the emerging gay community, *The Body Politic* played a variety of roles. Some roles were rather customary with providing reviews of the arts in the form of book, film, and theatre, casting a scrupulous eye on the representation of gays in the media. Other roles were much more politically and socially motivated.

The establishment of the “Community Page,” existing throughout *The Body Politic*’s lifespan, served the purpose of uniting wayward gay groups across North America. Particularly, this page served as a way to reach out to closeted gay youth in need of assistance. In this regard, *The Body Politic* was eminently successful; as one contributor recalled, “It was a lifeline to people like people in Saskatoon, which is a pretty isolated place, and we were hearing from people in Saskatoon.”⁵⁴

Though *The Body Politic* certainly reached out locally to a great extent, its influence stretched south of the Canadian border and across the Atlantic in an effort to help coordinate the worldwide Gay Liberation movement.^x The establishment of the news department under Ken Popert helped to legitimize the magazine as a tool of politics. Within the realm of cultural critique, however, is where *The Body Politic* made its deepest mark.

^{ix} In particular was one article “Was Christ a Cocksucker?” By: Hannon, Gerald. *Body Politic*, Nov/Dec74, Issue 16, p14, 3p. The article discusses the link between religion and neurosis and the anti-sexuality policies of Christian faiths. One need hardly point out the title; according to Hannon: “It was a combination of wanting attention because every writer wants attention and being a bit childish, embarrassingly sometimes. It seems a bit puerile to me now.”

^x “Over its life *TBP* would have more than 80 regular correspondents in 21 Canadian cities, occasional ones in Europe, Australia, New Zealand, the UK and the USA -- all of them activists in their own locales and, of course, working for free.” Rick Bebout, <http://www.rbebout.com/oldbeep/beyond.htm>.

Influenced by the prominent radical theorists of the day, several authors of *The Body Politic* utilized the journal as a potent means of social critique. Articles pertaining to cultural and social critique can be categorized in two groups: gay inclusive and straight exclusive. Most articles within *The Body Politic* fall under the former category; however, a wealth of articles denouncing the straight community embodies the latter. In keeping with the intellectual currents of the time, many of these critiques were directed at the nuclear family in a conscious effort by *The Body Politic* editorial collective to portray heterosexual society as alienating and oppressive. As Popert recollected, “In our newsletters, there were little columns devoted to writing nasty stuff about families: stories drawn from the *Toronto Sun* about children killing their parents, parents killing their children and so forth. That was mainly my doing I have to say.” Spiers, too, recalls this sentiment: “I think that the official ideology that permeated the collective of *The Body Politic* that there was a belief in the necessity to overthrow the nuclear family. It took an anti-marriage position because it took an anti-family position.” Despite these attitudes, an inconsistency existed between such theories and their application.

“I don’t think everybody in the collective was anti-heterosexual,” said Spiers. Examining the contents of *The Body Politic*, one might beg to differ. Articles describing heterosexuals and heterosexual society invariably painted the straight community in a disparaging light, yet many on the collective were not as hostile towards the straight community as such articles might suggest. “All the times I ever brought anybody home [to his family], either a gay boyfriend or friends, they were just treated so well,” recalled Spiers. Spiers also remembered visiting Paul Macdonald’s and Gerald Hannon’s family and becoming close. Similarly, Gerald Hannon reported a positive relationship after coming out to his mother, who later came out herself. Other members of the magazine, too, recalled fond memories and constructive relationships with their family. “I had the most wonderful family!” said another *Body Politic* contributor.⁵⁵ As such, though the pages of *The Body Politic* tell a different tale, many amongst the collective did not entertain a vehement opposition against all heterosexuals and the family institution. Such beliefs were often held for more political purposes; as Spiers said, “The underlying assumption was there were certain things that held together the gay liberation ideology: critique of the nuclear family, things like that.”

This critique of the family was undoubtedly a cornerstone of *The Body Politic*’s early ethos; moreover, the critique was a centerpiece of *The Body Politic*’s political aims of the day. In

accordance with the intellectual gay rights zeitgeist of the time, *The Body Politic* lambasted the heterosexual community with much vigor. Some of these critiques were logical, academic, and thorough, while others like Hannon's were controversial, sardonic, and provocative. Although many writers and staff of *The Body Politic* genuinely believed in the substance of these attacks, examined holistically one notices a deeper motive at play: the marshaling of gay solidarity in the face of an enemy. A derivative tactic to be sure, such maneuvers were highly effective in rallying the gay cause together into a political demographic. "A house united cannot fall," as they say. Studying group resiliency in various subcultures, psychoanalyst Fritz Redl noticed a similar occurrence in group movements faced by threats:

One curious but not uncommon accompaniment of this process is what Fritz Redl has called 'protective provocation.' Certain kinds of behavior to which we are strongly inclined may encounter strong resistance because this behavior would do injury to the interests or feelings of people we care about. The same kinds of behavior would, however, be unequivocally motivated without the complicating guilt feelings if those people stood to us in the relation of enemies rather than friends. In such a situation we may be unconsciously motivated to act precisely in those ways calculated to stimulate others to expressions of anger and hostility, which we may then seize upon as evidences of their essential enmity and ill will....The hostility of the 'out-group,' thus engendered or aggravated, may serve to protect the 'in-group' from mixed feelings about its way of life.⁵⁶

Similarly, a pair of sociologists studying the Gay Rights movement in Columbus, Ohio, from the years of 1970 to 2000 concluded:

This research supports research suggesting that a loss of political opportunities may have a differential effect on mobilization than the emergence of new threats. We demonstrate that countermovements may inadvertently trigger a movement's mobilization by promoting stigma against the movement's constituency. Thus, we contribute to studies of stigma and mobilization by showing that movement opponents may influence the timing of mobilization to resist stigma. The generation of stigma by countermovements may increase the salience of an identity, facilitating mobilization and the formation of a collective identity around

that identity. A loss of allies and opportunities, on the other hand, can discourage group members from mobilizing around that identity.⁵⁷

Within the critiques found in *The Body Politic* directed against the heterosexual community, one finds the principle of “protective provocation” at play: the new Gay Liberation movement as the “in group” and heterosexuals as the “out group.” In an effort to marshal gay solidarity, the authors of *The Body Politic* attacked not only unjust laws and discriminatory policies, but the entire heterosexual community itself, most readily seen in the scathing critique of the nuclear family. Being that several *Body Politic* members testified to the nature of this tactic compounded with the fact that many members reported positive relationships with their family emphasizes the political utility of such assessments. As Spiers said, “there was a bit of a contradiction between the theoretical of the nuclear family and your every day normal practice.”

The early pages of *The Body Politic* reveal an emerging and threatened community struggling to define its ethos and marshal solidarity for effective group action. In many respects, the magazine was typically counter-cultural as an underground radical publication with its Marxist rhetoric and anti-establishment attitudes. Cultural articles concerning books, films, and theater reviews sought to examine the representation of gays in the arts and the place of homosexuals in the art world. The “Community Page” attempted, rather successfully, to enlarge the gay community throughout North America. Under the guidance of Ken Popert, the “News Department” was established and brought together international news of the gay movement while harnessing such news as a political force. In the realm of cultural criticism, *The Body Politic* targeted the heterosexual world and the families that configure it for the purpose of defining an antagonistic counterpart against whom to act and rally. The use of dissent in this fashion was employed not only to foster political change, but to manifest cohesion.

In sum, *The Body Politic* wore not one mask but many in its quest for Gay Liberation. Driven by various personalities with their own agendas, the early *Body Politic* resembled a mixed bag of politics and culture. By 1974, it was not yet a professional periodical but was emerging as a developing force of culture and politics with a dedicated following. Spiers brought his philosophical predilections in his critique of psychiatry, Popert his political guile to the “New Department,” Macdonald his proletariat solidarity to the “Community Page,” Moldenhauer his ingenuity, and Hannon his risqué styling and subtle ironies. In terms of group communication,

The Body Politic's place in the gay movement, along with other forms of gay media, was essential. As the distinguished gay rights sociologist Laud Humphreys noted:

Change movement members, in general, must leap communication barriers, that the society erects in self-defense. They must find a common language, develop an ideology, counter the propaganda control exercised by the State, and communicate both warning and hope. Because the homosexual segment of society is rewarded for passing on the one hand and for sexual competitiveness on the other, its communication problems are compounded. The role of the gay press becomes a central and decisive one in the movement for gay freedom.⁵⁸

As *The Body Politic* grew in numbers, it also grew in sophistication. Attracting new members with skills in writing, graphic design, and marketing gave *The Body Politic* a modernized, professional feel. By 1973, the journal was still evolving: not yet as reputable as a mainstream newspaper, nor as jejune as a leftist rag. Likewise, the editorial collective often resembled a veritable musical chairs game with members coming and going, and the most permanent members being Ed Jackson, Ken Popert, Gerald Hannon, and Herb Spiers.

By 1974, *The Body Politic* had effectively established itself as a force of gay media in Toronto, enjoyed a worldwide following, and corresponded with noted intellectuals of the day. Though the journal became more professional, the mainstay sections therein continued to operate as the "Community Page," and the "News Department," and the variety of cultural articles often directed at the heterosexual community remained. With the paper successfully growing, the political message evolving, and its enemy clearly defined, *The Body Politic* took another step forward in defining the nature of the gay struggle: identifying a history and the formation of gay nationalism.

Chapter II Uncovering a History: The Gay Movement in Germany

-“He who controls the present, controls the past. He who controls the past, controls the future” - George Orwell

-“Remembering the past gives power to the present.” - Unknown

“Obviously,” wrote the up-and-coming gay historian Jim Steakley in an acclaimed article series in *The Body Politic*,⁵⁹ “gay people are going to have to write their own history.” This

daring aphorism underlies the tremendous impact of gay publishing to the North American Gay Liberation movement. By the mid-1970s, sources on gay history and social theory were practically unheard of, being resigned mainly to the Kinsey reports and various literary works.^{xi} Ken Popert recalled this deficiency saying, “Before the emergence of any kind of political movement, the only kind of writing there was about homosexuality was either literary or medical.”⁶⁰ During the 1970s, as the Gay Liberation movement progressed, the role of gay history, along with gay media, became a matter of utmost importance to the cause of Gay Liberation. Even during the movement’s relative infancy, movement leaders and writers felt the need to place the movement in a historical narrative was of tremendous importance. Arguably, and in the realm of gay rights chronology, the most enduring moment of modern gay history was the Stonewall riots of 1969 in New York City.

June 27th, 1969 was a scorching day in Manhattan. Despite the heat, several clients arrived at the Stonewall Inn on 8th Avenue and Christopher Street to withdraw from the swelter of the night and mingle. At the time, the Stonewall Inn was one of many popular, mafia-controlled gay bars in Manhattan. Such bars were routinely exploitative of their clientele and inherently dangerous. Although the mafia garnered considerable profits from their gay clients, they cared absolutely nothing for their safety: gay bars routinely were kept in unsanitary conditions, many had no fire escapes, and they were often the site of drug deals. At the time, however, gay bars were one of the few places where gays could congregate, mingle, and pursue sexual intercourse away from the public eye.⁶¹

The Stonewall Inn was a popular bar despite its conditions not only for its gay clientele, but also for police raids.^{xii} Various liquor laws made it illegal for bars to serve or allow homosexuals in their presence. As such, the ability to operate a gay bar was held almost exclusively by the mafia, who could afford to bribe police with regularity and deal with fines when the police decided to make a raid.⁶² June 27th, 1969 was such a night.

^{xi} A number of social scientists during the late 19th and early 20th centuries pursued questions of sexuality in great detail. Known as the “sexologists,” these early researchers included Havelock Ellis and Magnus Hirschfeld, whose works were studied by Sigmund Freud and other luminaries of the day, who are often considered sexologists themselves. Despite the early presence of such works, this early sexology was largely supplanted in the public’s mind by the Kinsey reports and given little notice. A good anthology of such works is Lucy Bland and Laura Doan, eds., *Sexology Uncensored: The Documents of Sexual Science* (The University of Chicago Press; Chicago, 1998).

^{xii} “Stonewall had no running water behind the bar; a returned glass was simply run through one of two stagnant vats of water kept underneath the bar, refilled and then served to the next customer. By the end of the evening the water was murky and multicolored” (Carter 181).

After four undercover officers infiltrated the Stonewall Inn, Deputy Inspector Seymour Pine of the NYPD initiated a raid of the Inn. Police moved through the bar and separated the staff from the clients. Many clients resisted, and the transvestite clients gave the most trouble. At the time, police had the right to “check” to see if transvestites were men or women (i.e., examine genitalia). Eventually, a crowd formed outside the inn to discern the commotion. Many in the crowd believed, wrongly, that the police were beating the customers inside; similarly, the crowd witnessed several policemen forcibly detaining and arresting several clients outside of the bar. Though the details of the event are not precise, this is generally agreed to be the turning point of the riot.

After several scuffles broke out outside the Inn, the crowd became agitated and assailed the bar with bricks and firebombs, forcing the police inside of the Inn. Though under considerable duress, Inspector Pine remained extremely calm and in control of his men while calling in the Tactical Police Force (TPF) for assistance. The tumult attracted attention from all over Greenwich Village and soon a large crowd had gathered. At one point, a group of younger, more eccentric gays formed a kick-line, rockquette style, and sang songs taunting the police. The TPF arrived at the Stonewall arrayed in riot gear and dispersed the crowd by the following morning.⁶³

The riot continued the next morning, but a strong police presence on Christopher Street kept action to a minimum. The Stonewall Inn did not survive long following the incident; furthermore, neither did its owner – “Fat” Tony Lauria was killed by his overlords for being an embarrassment and drug addict. Soon after the riots, gay movement activity began to increase in The United States: the Gay Liberation Front and its eventual splinter group the Gay Activist Alliance were formed, and they took an active, aggressive role in the movement under the leadership of a radical youth sect.⁶⁴ The next year on June 28th, 1970, over 10,000 people attended the first annual parade commemorating the riots.⁶⁵ Starting with the Stonewall riots and its commemoration, the Gay Liberation movement possessed a historical and idiosyncratic event to build and grow from. It did not take long for the Stonewall Riots to pass into the realm of movement legend.^{xiii}

^{xiii} For engaging and informative accounts of the Stonewall Riots, see Martin Duberman, *Stonewall* (Penguin Books; New York, 1993) and David Carter, *Stonewall: The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution* (St. Martin’s Press; New York, 2005).

In their succinct article “Movements and Memory: The Making of the Stonewall Myth,” Elizabeth Armstrong and Suzanna Cragge address the significance of the Stonewall riots to the collective memory of the North American gay subject. Although other Gay Rights inspired riots preceded the Stonewall Riots in historical chronology, the Stonewall Riots alone achieved a mythic status. According to Armstrong and Cragge, this occurred due to the Stonewall Riot’s *commemorability, resonance, mnemonic capacity, and commemorative form and potential for institutionalization*. The insight the article provides is rather stunning. As the authors demonstrate, the Stonewall riot was uniquely constructed by movement organizations like the Eastern Regional Conference of Homophile Organizations (ERCHO). As movement leaders recognized the need for a commemorative event, the leaders of ERCHO found the Stonewall Riots to be a salient choice for annual remembrance. Instead of keeping the event geographically specific, ERCHO resolved to, “Contact homophile associations throughout the country and suggest parallel demonstrations on that day. We propose a nationwide show of support.”⁶⁶

Interestingly, while groups in Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles supported the resolution for commemoration, the issue met with some resistance in San Francisco. Like groups in New York, San Francisco gay groups considered themselves at the forefront of the movement, and they refused to commemorate an event that occurred in another locale. By 1972, however, San Francisco abated its resistance and joined the annual celebration. In their article, the authors conclude that the meaning and commemorability of the Stonewall Riots were actively constructed by movement groups and leaders. Unlike similar riots that predated those at Stonewall – namely, the Compton Cafeteria Riot in San Francisco in 1966, the Black Cat Raid in Los Angeles in 1967, and movement activities in New York prior to Stonewall – the Stonewall Riots took on a special meaning due to its historical chronology during the later, tense years of the counterculture and due to the deliberate construction by eastern American movement leaders. So thick is the mythic palpability of the Stonewall Riots, that many scholars and authors cite the event as the beginning of the modern Gay Rights movement although the considerable activities of the Mattachine Society and Daughters of Bilitis antecede the Stonewall Riots by more than a decade. Despite this misconception, Armstrong and Cragge conclude that, “The Stonewall Story is thus an achievement of gay liberation rather than an account of its origins.”⁶⁷

Just as the historical meaning and resonance of the Stonewall Riots were consciously constructed and utilized by movement leaders, so too was the discovery and writing of a dramatic gay history and the appropriation of movement symbols by *The Body Politic* during the mid-1970s. This history centered around an article series concerning the largely forgotten gay rights movement in Germany written by the emerging gay historian Jim Steakley. The articles concisely describe Steakley's research into this era, which he would use for his doctoral thesis at Cornell University at a time when academia was largely silent on the topic of homosexuality. Underlying Steakley's groundbreaking discovery is the overarching use of his historical material in the application of gay history for movement aims and goals, which took the form of comparing the tragic past with the unjust present and through the use of symbolic representation. In this chapter, I will discuss the significance of Dr. Steakley's articles to *The Body Politic*, the sense of tragic gay history, the creation of a historical narrative story, and the appropriation of the Pink Triangle as a potent symbol of the Gay Liberation struggle.

By 1973, *The Body Politic* was still young but had made significant strides towards becoming a professional news journal: graphic design had improved, the paper was more organized, and the quality of the writing had improved drastically since the initial issues. Although the writers at *The Body Politic* were well aware of the Stonewall Riots, they, like Jim Steakley, sought deeper historical precedents than the rumble on Christopher Street.

Prior to the 1970s, the serious historical treatment on the issue of homosexuality in the Western world was relatively scant. In the first of his three-part series, Steakley comments on this deficiency:

The relative abundance of fictional treatments of homosexuality, no matter how skillfully written, by no means compensates for the paucity and inaccessibility of historical accounts. History, as Aristotle pointed out, has to relate what did happen, while fiction is allowed to relate something that might happen; fiction is universal, history is particular.⁶⁸

The lack of historical literature on homosexuality was largely due to the public's distaste of the issue and its status as a taboo subject. When Kinsey's volume on male sexuality was published in 1948, it caused a sensation and drew ire from a variety of morality groups. Films dealing with homosexuality during the era invariably painted the issue in a disapproving light. In particular was the film *The Boys in the Band* (1970), which is most remembered for the iconic line, "Show

me a happy homosexual and I'll show you a gay corpse." As Steakley rightly points out, a wide array of fictional representation of homosexuality existed, but concrete histories were scarce. Writers like Gertrude Stein, James Baldwin, Tennessee Williams, and Truman Capote all dealt with themes of homosexuality in their work prior to 1969 and achieved great literary success. Still, the lack of sources of gay history was a keenly felt absence amongst the Gay Liberation movement.

Steakley's article series on the gay movement in Germany debuted in the June, 1973 issue of *The Body Politic*. Writing with the passion of an activist and the precision of a historian, Steakley opened his series by addressing the rejection of a gay past and the need for the gay movement to find one:

Part of the oppression of gay people lies in the denial of our history. The veiled allusions, isolated anecdotes, and embarrassed admissions which occasionally crop up in standard works of history provide ample evidence of this mode of oppression, which functions by silence and distortion. We have come to accept and even to expect such treatment at the hands of straight historians; but for too long gays have simply accepted the values of straights and, with slight modifications, made them their own.⁶⁹

The first article series commented on Karl Heinrich Ulrich's studies on homosexuality in Germany during the 1860s. Interestingly, Steakley focused on the first German gay periodical *Der Eigene*, which appeared in Berlin in 1896. According to Steakley, the magazine, "was designed to encourage gay consciousness and pride; its subtitle was 'A Journal for Masculine Culture, Art, and Literature.'"⁷⁰ In the article, Steakley also describes the German women's movement and various other social reform groups. Steakley concludes that the rise of the gay movement in Germany at that time was due to German urbanization and development, stating that with the rise of big cities came the emergence of aberrant subcultures.

In the second part of his series, Steakley explains the work of Dr. Magnus Hirshfeld, a prominent 20th-century German gay scholar who wrote books, conducted studies, and participated in films regarding the study of homosexuality. Steakley also onerously describes the Nazi party's early treatment of homosexuality. In one startling letter unearthed by Steakley, one recognizes the seeds of the coming persecution:

Anyone who even thinks of homosexual love is our enemy. We reject anything which emasculates our people and makes it a play-thing for our enemies, for we know that life is a fight and it's madness to think that men will ever embrace fraternally. Natural history teaches us the opposite. Might makes right. And the stronger will always win over the weak. Let's see to it that we once again become the strong! But this we can only do in one way – the German people must once again learn how to exercise discipline [*Zucht*]. We therefore reject any form of lewdness [*Unzucht*], especially homosexuality, because it robs us of our last chance to free our people from the bondage which now enslaves it.⁷¹

At the end of the article, Steakley concludes by accounting the exile of Hirschfeld and another sexuality scholar, Dr. Kurt Hiller, by the Third Reich. Steakley writes, “On May 11, 1933, the Institute for Sexual Science was stripped bare by the Nazis, who burned everything they could find in a public ceremony; the building was handed over to the use of the Nazi Associated of German jurists and Lawyers.”⁷²

The most arresting of Steakley's articles is easily the finale, which describes the persecution of gays during the Holocaust. In this article, Steakley reveals that not only were homosexuals targeted in large numbers for extermination, but they often endured some of the most miserable conditions and treatment in concentration camps. Steakley also emphasizes the denial of such historical accounts and the need to reclaim even the darkest elements of gay history:

The fact that homosexuals were major victims of these crimes is mentioned in only a few of the standard histories of the period. And those historians who do mention the facts seem reluctant to dwell on the subject and turn quickly to the fate of other minorities in Nazi Germany. Yet tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of homosexuals were interned in Nazi concentration camps. They were consigned to the lowest position in the camp hierarchy, and, subjected to abuse by both guards and fellow prisoners, most of them perished.^{73xiv}

Along with revealing the stygian history of the German gay rights movement, Steakley also inadvertently discovered what would become a potent symbol for the contemporary gay

^{xiv} NB In his expansive book on the history of American gay periodicals, *Unspeakable*, Rodger Streitmatter attributes the discovery of the German gay rights movement to Allen Young, “Early Gay History,” *Gay Liberator*, April 1974, 6 (Streitmatter, 205). However, Jim Steakley's articles predate this article by Allen Young.

rights movement – the Pink Triangle.^{xv} In the last of his article series, Steakley described the significance of the Pink Triangle in the concentration camps:

Homosexuals were distinguished from other prisoners by a pink triangle, worn on the left side of the jacket and on the right pant leg. There was no possibility of ‘passing’ for straight, and the presence of ‘marked men’ in the all-male camp population evoked the same reaction as in contemporary prisons: gays were brutally assaulted and sexually abused.⁷⁴

Soon after Steakley’s articles appeared, the Pink Triangle was transformed from a signifier of shame and degradation to a powerful symbol of gay pride. Under the direction of those at *The Body Politic*, The Pink Triangle – now turned upright instead of the downward position on concentration camp uniforms – appeared on hats, tee shirts, and posters with uplifting movement slogans (e.g., “Silence Equals Death”). When it came time for the editorial to officially incorporate *The Body Politic* as a nonprofit organization, the name they settled upon was The Pink Triangle Press.

The symbolism of the Pink Triangle spread throughout the North American Gay Liberation movement and entered into the sinews of popular culture. In the London West-end play *Bent*^{xvi} (1979), Ian McKellen (a closeted homosexual at the time) played a gay man struggling to conceal his homosexuality in a German concentration camp by posing as a Jew. McKellen’s character falls in love with a fellow homosexual prisoner, who takes pride in wearing his Pink Triangle and is unashamed of his homosexuality. Still, McKellen’s character hesitates to openly admit his homosexuality, preferring the comparatively more lenient status of being a Jewish prisoner. Eventually, the Nazis execute McKellen’s love interest. In the dramatic dénouement, McKellen’s character dons his lover’s Pink Triangle embroidered jacket and commits suicide by grabbing an electric fence. *Bent* made its way to Broadway in 1980 and to the silver screen in 1997.⁷⁵ Similarly, in the cult-classic *The Rocky Horror Picture Show* (1975), Dr. Frank n Furter, a transvestite, wears a Pink Triangle on his dress.⁷⁶ Predating both films was *Sunday Bloody Sunday* (1971), which starred Peter Finch as homosexual doctor who battles a

^{xv} Again, Streitmatter is at fault. Here Streitmatter cites Frank Rector, “The Pink Triangle,” *Queens Quarterly*, July/August 1976, 18 and Richard Plant, “The Men with the Pink Triangles,” *Christopher Street*, February 1977, 10. Again, Jim Steakley’s articles predate those that Streitmatter cites. Although Streitmatter discusses *The Body Politic* briefly *vis-à-vis* other issues, he does not mention Steakley or his articles. One imagines that the ambitious breadth of Streitmatter’s study is responsible for these anachronisms.

^{xvi} The term “bent” is a 1930s-1960s era British epithet meaning “eccentric, perverted; *spec.* homosexual (also as n.)” (OED, “Bent”)

middle-aged woman for the affection of the same man.⁷⁷ In 1980, Heinz Heger's published his memoir on his experience in a concentration camp entitled *The Men with the Pink Triangle: The True Life-and-Death Story of Homosexuals in Nazi Death Camps*, making the Pink Triangle and the story of homosexuals in concentration camps widespread knowledge.⁷⁸

To the members of *The Body Politic*, Steakley's articles and the Pink Triangle had an indelible effect by serving as a focal point in the development of the periodical. As Herb Spiers recalled:

The publication of Jimmy's articles made people take notice that what we were doing in terms of struggling for gay rights and gay liberation was not something new and was not something unique to us and that, as a matter of fact, this had quite a long history.⁷⁹

Similarly, the palpability of the Pink Triangle as a movement symbol was of the utmost importance; as Ed Jackson said:

It was turning what had been a symbol of horror and negativity into one that was positive and a memorial, a way of remembering that this was a really active movement. It was an extraordinary movement with a very active subculture and Germany totally wiped it out. So it was a sense that it was a reminder that we need to fight for these things, and that you know that it can all be taken away again. We always need to be vigilant and need to be politically aware of things.⁸⁰

The popularity of Steakley's articles on the gay movement in Germany and the subsequent appropriation of the Pink Triangle as a movement symbol emphasize the importance of print culture to the emerging Gay Liberation struggle and community. Furthermore, the use of print culture and the attention to gay history not only advanced the cause of gay rights, but also contributed to the proliferation of gay nationalism and creation of a gay narrative. Beginning with Steakley and other contemporary researchers, a wealth of literature emerged during the 1970s detailing the untold or forgotten instances of historical homosexuality in various times, cultures, and locations.^{xvii} By uncovering such histories and their popularity amongst the gay

^{xvii} Well known recent works of this genre include John Boswell, *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe* (Vintage Books; New York, 1995) and George Chauncey, *Gay New York* (Basic Books; USA, 1994). Both works popularize previously unknown or unconsidered moments in history when homosexuality was practiced openly and without taboo.

community during the early Gay Liberation era, the use of print was undoubtedly employed to strengthen the gay community for social and political action.

In his celebrated work *Imagined Communities*, historian Benedict Anderson examines the concept of nationalism as a creation of print culture. Defining a nation as “an imagined political community,” Anderson observes that a citizen’s place in a community is quite literally imagined, and modern citizenship has little to do with traditional borders or state sovereignty.⁸¹ Although Anderson focuses his study primarily on Western European states after the Reformation and Imperialism in Southeast Asia, his concepts of imagined nations are applicable on a wide scale of sociological observation.

“The convergence of capitalism and print technology on the fatal diversity of human language created the possibility of a new form of imagined community, which in its basic morphology set the stage for the modern nation.”⁸² Here Anderson suggests that the growth and possibility of imagined communities is due directly to expansion of print capitalism. Following the standard chronology of the gay rights movement “beginning” with the Stonewall Riots of 1969, one notices that not only did the movement become more politically open and active, but that the amount of gay media rose exponentially following the riots and their ensuing symbolism. Following the Stonewall Riots, Streitmatter observes that as of 1972 in the United States, 150 publications were in print with a combined circulation surpassing 100,000.⁸³

Obviously, a correlation exists between the surge in gay activism and the increase in gay media. Quite simply, as the gay print culture grew, so did the gay community. Although no demographic figures exist for openly gay members of a gay nation, it seems pellucid that the rise of gay activism following the Stonewall riots indicates the growth and solidification of an open and active gay community, imagined and strengthened through print capitalism. Describing the rise of the French bourgeoisie, Benedict Anderson notes, “they did come to visualize in a general way the existence of thousands and thousands like themselves through print language.”

In his massive anthology on the history of homosexuality in America *Gay American History*, Jonathan Katz prefaces his work with proclamations on the necessity of history to gay people and the role of history in the gay movement. As Katz writes, “Our existence as a long-oppressed, long-resistant group was not explored. We remained an unknown people, our character defamed.”⁸⁴ Like Steakley’s metadiscourse on the need for gay history, Katz makes similar claims on the importance of his work:

My research focused on uncovering and presenting enough significant evidence to demonstrate that the heretofore suppressed, hidden history of homosexual Americans does exist, and to insure that, like Gay Americans today, its existence can no longer be denied.⁸⁵

Here Katz explicitly states the symbiotic relationship between the Gay Liberation struggle and the uncovering of a gay history. Katz further comments on the role of his historical work to individual homosexuals:

My research and selections have been particularly concerned with that material I hoped would be most useful to Gay women and men in our present struggle to create a positive, rounded sense of self, to establish unalienated ways of relating, and to abolish those social institutions that deny us.⁸⁶

Like Steakley, Katz emphatically states the importance of gay history in the role of the individual gay person's comfort with his or her identity, and the need for gay history for use on the broad level of Gay Liberation.^{xviii} For *The Body Politic*, this attention to history was vital in the furtherance of movement goals and in the construction of Gay Liberation identity. With the publication of Steakley's articles, *The Body Politic's* standing rose to new heights, garnering increased attention from readers. As Herb Spiers said, "It started giving us a great deal of credibility as a voice for gay liberation on a theoretical-historical level, cultural level, geographical level, so I think it was extremely important."⁸⁷

By delving into and popularizing gay history, *The Body Politic* gave itself and the Gay Liberation movement a sense of purpose and timelessness. Similarly, the identification of a long, perilous gay history gave the current movement a sense of identity and historical trajectory. As Ed Jackson recalled, "We thought we were the first people in this movement, and then we discovered there had been another one, and we discovered it had been totally wiped out."⁸⁸ The identification of gay history was also used for rhetorical purposes, comparing the injustices of the past to contemporary issues. Finally, gay history, popularized through print-capitalism, served to strengthen the "imagined community" of gay nationalism which transcended borders and state sovereignties, uniting the movement in a worldwide struggle against oppression.

^{xviii} As Larry Gross writes in *Up from Invisibility*, "The core narrative of lesbian and gay identity at the time [1970s] – and it hasn't entirely changed – was that of coming out, to oneself, to other gay people, to family, friends, and the world at large."

Through articles (and later books) like Steakley's on the German gay movement and the symbolism of the Pink Triangle, gay culture became more complex, layered, and detailed. No longer would the history of the movement or the people be traced back to the single event of the Stonewall Riots but through the vast halls of immemorial time. As Steakley wrote, "Examples such as these will help remind us that our history did not start with Stonewall in 1969, but that women have been loving women, and men have loved men, as long as this continent has been inhabited."⁸⁹ Soon, necessity forced *The Body Politic* to lay the past to rest and focus exclusively on present quagmires.

Chapter III Igniting the Dialogue: The Year of the Children and MLBLM

"It's amazing how sometimes your whole life pivots on one small moment..." – Gerald Hannon

Gerald Campbell Hannon was born in Bathurst, New Brunswick in 1944 and matured in a sleepy town called Marathon from the ages of three to eighteen. The tiny "pulp and paper town" wasn't the sight of much youthful excitement for Hannon. "I was pretty much a pupa, I think," said Hannon, describing his childhood. Along with Marathon's lack of excitement was an almost total lack of sexual discussion or awareness. "In Marathon, where I grew up," said Hannon, "I didn't know anything about sex, straight or gay. It was a kind of time when it wasn't much talked about."

Beyond discussion of sex itself, Hannon noted unawareness on the specifics of human reproduction until his late teen years: "I remember asking my mother where babies came from, and she got very upset and said, 'Well, daddy puts his birdie in Mommy's belly.' That didn't clarify issues." Accordingly, along with an ignorance of sexual reproduction, Hannon had no conception of sexual categories. "I didn't even know there was such a thing as gay then," said Hannon.

All this changed when Hannon absconded to Toronto for university. Hannon's first sexual experience was with a doctor. As an incoming student, Hannon was compelled to seek a medical examination per school requirements. During the examination, the doctor deliberately aroused Hannon with casual brushes of his penis, and culminated the examination by masturbating him on the examination table. The incident perplexed Hannon: "I had the feeling

that this was wrong, but I had no way to know to be sure that it was wrong...So I left very puzzled, mortified, flummoxed, and embarrassed, but not knowing exactly why.”

Aside from his unusual encounter with the doctor, while at university Hannon noticed homosexuals as a definable presence for the first time. “A number of my friends would go queer bashing; that was one of their weekend sports.” Although his friends asked him to join in such activities, Hannon refused, and he was considered an oddity. Hannon lost his virginity to a woman after he left university. He enjoyed it, and he had numerous girlfriends and heterosexual encounters following his first foray, yet something was amiss: Hannon was attracted to men.

Hannon met Ed Jackson in the spring of 1968. The pair taught ESL courses together in the evenings and became friends, spending their evenings together after their teaching. One night, Hannon stayed over and shared a bed with Jackson. Jackson and Hannon had sex, and Hannon began to entertain notions of his homosexuality. Together, Jackson and Hannon toured Europe. While in London, they witnessed a gay demonstration and resolved to become activists in Toronto. Though Hannon considered himself as bisexual, the event tipped him to considering himself as exclusively homosexual. Jackson and Hannon returned to Toronto in 1971 and began writing for *The Body Politic*. Over the course of *The Body Politic*'s lifetime, Hannon would be its most notable contributor and most vilified accomplice.⁹⁰

1977 was a hallmark year not only for *The Body Politic*, but for the Gay Liberation movement at large. During 1977, a wide and powerful opposition movement proliferated to challenge the advance of gay rights legislation. In both the United States and Canada, the movement was fueled by grass-roots conservatism and the increasing vocalization and influence of the Religious Right centering on an ethos of the preservation of traditional morals and values. In 1977, the issue on both sides was a topic of the utmost sensitivity and explosiveness – youth sexuality.

By 1977, *The Body Politic* had grown even more sophisticated in its presentation and presence in the Gay Liberation movement. Given considerable credibility by Jim Steakley's article series on the gay rights movement in Germany, *The Body Politic* enjoyed its status as something of an intellectual authority on contemporary gay rights issues. As the writers at *The Body Politic* began to delve deeper into the effects of heterosexual culture on homosexual people, childhood and youth sexuality became a topic of investigation and exploration. For the

philosophically and intellectually inclined writers at the paper, the need to confront and explain their own instances of sexual ostracism and alienation led them to reconsider their own adolescences and how straight society still perpetuated a system of repression on gay youths.

In March of 1977, *The Body Politic* can be seen addressing this very issue. In an article describing a gay youth group, Jeremy Bass reported on a group which included members who welcomed, “any gay people under 21.” Bass also cites Barbara Gittings’s talk “Gay Liberation is for Children Too” at the University of Manitoba.⁹¹ Prior to this, Gerald Hannon had already tackled the issue of youth sexuality head on in one of his earliest articles. In his “Of Men and Little Boys,” Hannon confronted the assumption that homosexual men are inclined to seduce children.⁹² In “Children and Sex,” Hannon described the difference in sexual experience and orgasm in youth boys and the healthiness of sexual expression.⁹³

During the early months of 1977, Hannon and *The Body Politic* challenged another perfidious issue – censorship. In his article “Censored,” Hannon discussed the decision of a censorship committee to halt the distribution of a dozen sexual tabloids published in Toronto.⁹⁴ Throughout the year, *The Body Politic* published numerous articles regarding the pervasive censorship of gay media and literature, particularly media of a sexual nature.^{xix}

Compounding the dystopian reports of wide media censorship was consistent reporting on police interference. Much like New York City, the Toronto police force had a long history of both tacit and overt hostility towards to gay community, which *The Body Politic* made substantial reference to. In many instances, articles reported the abuse of police force against homosexuals the world over to remind homosexuals of the perils of state tyranny. In one article, Stuart Russell described a raid of a gay bar in Montreal and the needlessly aggressive tactics of the local police:

On July 4th, more than 10 cops – *one with a machinegun* – raided the Studio One, a popular gay men’s disco. Under the phony pretext that ‘We’re looking for someone’ and ‘the boss was impolite to us,’ they held patrons for over one hour,

^{xix} A sampling includes: “The Gay Sex Manual Scandal” *Body Politic*, Apr77, Issue 32, p1, 1/4p; “The U.S. Report on Pornography” *Body Politic*, Apr77, Issue 32, p17, 1/8p; “The Police” By: Stirling, Robert. *Body Politic*, Apr77, Issue 32, p18, 1/3p; “So What?” *Body Politic*, Apr77, Issue 32, p18, 1/5p

and handcuffed 15 who were taken to the station and later released without charges.⁹⁵

Throughout the tumultuous year, the issues of youth sexuality, censorship, and police brutality would coalesce into the most perilous period *The Body Politic* had thus far experienced.

Just as the Gay Liberation movement was making strides towards reform, a powerful antigay movement developed in the United States. This movement centered around the “Save our Children” campaign which attempted to block gay rights legislation while supporting antigay legislation. The movement’s unlikely leader was Anita Bryant, a former beauty queen, Christianity spokeswoman, and actress for the Florida Citrus Commission. Bryant is primarily remembered for her campaigns in Dade County, Florida and her unsuccessful legislative campaign in California that also featured renowned activist Harvey Milk.

Though Bryant’s activities took place in the United States, her resistance to Gay Liberation caught the notice of the writers at *The Body Politic* in Toronto. In an article detailing Bryant’s activities in the United States, Harvey Hamburg called upon his readers to boycott Bryant’s patron, writing, “A word to the interested: your local grocer can easily differentiate between Florida citrus products and, for example, California produce. Maybe you should too.”⁹⁶

Incensed, the writers of *The Body Politic* went beyond standard political criticism of Bryant in favor of theatrical satire. In his mocking “The Ballad of Anita Bryant,” Eric Gordon set some collective thoughts about Bryant and the “Save our Children” campaign to verse:

Now Bryant read the Bible, and the Good Book says it’s bad
For you and me to go to bed, it makes God God-damned mad.
But David was a hero and Jonathan his mate,
Are not the Fundamentalists a little out of date?

They say we kidnap children and recruit them to our side,
We’re sick, abnormal perverts, godless communists besides,
But look at us and you will see a mirror of yourselves,
So put those ancient myths and lies back up there on the shelves.

Of people of this country who value liberty,
Will you sit back and watch the voters vote for tyranny?

Or will you join our struggle, and marching hand in hand,
Together with all people fight for justice in our land?⁹⁷ (9-20)

Gordon mixes his satire with concise references to the religious rhetoric fueling Bryant's campaign, and he touches upon the issue of youth sexuality that will dominate the discourse on both sides.

Amidst this turbulent debate, tragedy struck Toronto and inflamed the populace. In August of 1977, four criminals abducted 12 year old Emmanuel Jacques, a local shoeshine boy on Yonge Street. Jacques was kidnapped under the pretense of giving him some work to do; but, once they had gained the boy's trust, they led him to an apartment room where they raped and drowned him. A few days later, one of the murderers, Saul Betesh, contacted the famous Toronto gay rights activist George Hislop to confess his crime. Hislop advised Betesh on how to find an attorney, contacted the local police, and convinced Betesh to turn himself in to the authorities. Betesh turned himself in, and provided information that led to the arrest of three accomplices.⁹⁸

The murder enraged the citizens of Toronto, particularly the Portuguese community. In light of the tragedy, many of Toronto's infuriated citizens directed their ire at what they believed was the crumbling innocence and propriety of Toronto, perpetuated by the vice on Yonge Street. Pornography stores, bars, and other sexually explicit venues came under heavy scrutiny during a wide public opprobrium which specifically targeted one group as responsible – homosexuals.⁹⁹

In the public's mind, the ongoing age of consent debate surrounding youth sexuality comingled with Jacques's rape and murder in an alarming way. The writers at *The Body Politic* realized that the political climate for debate of the issue was extremely volatile, but they felt the need to defend their community against what they believed was unjust censure. "Certainly the Emmanuel Jacques case again didn't make any sense to pin it to age of consent," said Hannon. "It was a trio of lunatics who decided to sexually abuse and murder a kid."¹⁰⁰ Gerry Oxford, a *Body Politic* contributor who joined the magazine just prior to the turbulent year of 1977, also recalled the caustic climate during the summer of 1977. As Oxford said, "People were tying us [homosexuals] to the whole Emmanuel Jacques thing, which was horrifying that people would associate every homosexual in the street with what happened to Emmanuel Jacques. You had to fight that."¹⁰¹ Ken Popert, too, felt the need to confront the issues in the open, despite the truculent political climate, "We also believed that when these issues are in the air is when you voice your point of view, not when nothing is happening and it is not interesting."¹⁰² And voice

an opinion *The Body Politic* did. It was during this summer that Gerald Hannon sat down and composed his article “Men Loving Boys Loving Men.”

Hannon’s indelible article describes the activities of three pedophiles – referred to as “boy-lovers” – and it ruminates on the philosophical and legal issues surrounding the controversy of youth sexuality and the age of consent. Due to its considerable length, I find it inconvenient to reprint the article in its entirety. Likewise, due to “Men Loving Boys Loving Men’s” centrality to this chapter, I find summarizing or paraphrasing the article myopic and inadequate. As such, I believe that outlining the particulars of the article is the best way to allow the reader to gain a concise yet edifying appreciation of its contents. I have attempted to be thorough and succinct with my descriptions without sacrificing content. I have also been selective with my textual quotations by choosing what I considered to be the most illuminating and crucial material of Hannon’s central thesis. The outline reads as follows:

I. Introduction

- A. Hannon begins with a reflection on a painting of C.J. Atkinson, the founder of the YMCA. Hannon comments on Atkinson’s desire to help underprivileged boys by giving them a “sanctuary.”
- B. Hannon offers that Atkinson was a pedophile, a “lover of boys” in the most direct sense of the phrase (i.e., a wholesome relationship, possibly but not necessarily sexual). Hannon maligns the use of the word “pedophile” as a clinician’s word that has become a pejorative for homosexuals.
- C. Hannon tells us that we will become acquainted with three “pedophiles”:
Simon, Barry, and Peter. Again, the author impugns the deprecating portrayal of pedophiles and their common associations as depicted in the mainstream media:
 - 1. “A psychopath draws a circle of hapless boys to him and after months of wild, degrading sex he murders them – the Houston story.”
 - 2. “A pathetic man incapable of forming meaningful relationships with adults finally turns to children for his social/sexual outlet.”
 - 3. “A group of well-placed and usually wealthy citizens make clandestine use of a well-organized ‘boy bordello,’ one that recruits runaways and

waifs and makes big money by selling their sexual favors to the well-to-do.”

- D. These, according to Hannon, are the generalizations of pedophiles and homosexuals. Furthermore, Hannon describes what he believes is true molestation, which he contends is actually perpetuated by heterosexuals: “The media equate boy-love and child molestation. And they use that equation as a weapon against all gay people. Children are molested when they are physically or psychologically coerced into a sexual act, and that sort of thing is almost exclusively a heterosexual occupation.”

II. Simon

- A. Hannon reports on a thirty-three year old man whom he has interviewed for the article. Simon is a primary school teacher and a member of several social services that cater to young boys, including Big Brothers. Simon’s current lover is one of his students, a twelve-year-old boy named David.
- B. Simon describes his early sexual activities with David as being initiated by the boy through throat licking and sucking of fingers and toes. Simon also references that David had performed oral sex on him. Simon describes a brief lull in the relationship that had since been repaired. Simon says that he and David, “both undress, and bring the mattress out here in front of the TV, and we eat and wrestle and giggle and blow into each other’s bellies and generally laugh and have lots of fun. And that’s really more pleasurable to me than having sex...because there’s so much affection.”
- C. Hannon comments that Simon believes his activities with David and boys like him “form a kind of sex education” in which Simon “liberates him from the idea that sex was a no-no.” Simon has standards for an affair that transcend the base need for sex: “I just can’t go out and seduce a kid. There has to be affection.”
- D. Simon concludes by saying, “I just want to liberate my kids a little bit and help them find their own sexual direction. Help them realize their sexuality is nothing to be ashamed of.” Hannon finishes Simon’s piece by calling him a “romantic.”

III. Peter

- A. Next, Hannon reveals Peter, a forty-eight year old entrepreneur who is independently wealthy and “cool.” Hannon asks Peter if he believes a pedophile movement would be effective in changing the public’s mind on the issue; Peter responds that it would not.
- B. Hannon wonders how Peter courts his boys without a job that places him in regular contact with them. Peter explains his method: “With boys you have to impress them at first, you have to call attention to yourself. I do it with a big car, or a deep tan, or ability...I’ve picked up boys in theatres. You sit down beside them and start making comments about the movie, and then you might say ‘here’s a quarter – now it would have to be a dollar – ‘why don’t you get us both a coke.’ Then there’s a long, long period of courtship, talking, driving around town, having a hamburger. And it might never happen. There were lots of boys that I would have loved to make advances to and never did.”
- C. Hannon comments on Peter’s approach, “For Peter, as for Simon, it is the relationship that matters. So much so, that he is still in contact with many of the boys he began having sex with ten years ago and more.”
- D. Hannon emphasizes Peter as a positive influence on his boys as they matured throughout their lives, assisting and guiding them in their studies and careers. Peter tells how some grow up, get married and have children, and still keep in touch with him.
- E. Peter explains his philosophy on his sexual relationships with boys in their sexual development, “I think my relationships give *all* the kids a real appreciation for a perfectly valid form of sexual activity. It takes a threat away from it and gives some kind of balance, more sense of objectivity than they would have otherwise.”
- F. Peter tells Hannon that his sex with boys mostly consists of mutual masturbation, some oral sex, and rare occasions of anal sex. Peter says that the twelve to fourteen age brackets constitutes his main area of interest, but the youngest boy he has engaged sexually was seven years old.

IV. Barry

- A. Hannon's last subject is the least described in terms of age, career, and income. Barry has a twelve-year-old lover, Billy. Hannon accompanies Barry to the country where Billy resides.
- B. Once in the country, Barry and Hannon are joined by Billy and his two older brothers, whom Barry has also previously engaged in sexual intercourse. The group has an enjoyable evening around a campfire with wine and spends the night in tents.
- C. The next day, Hannon speaks privately with Billy at a restaurant and describes the meeting: "What did I discover? No startling truths, no insight into the human condition, not even any insights in this particular relationship – though I think it became clear to me that it *was* a relationship, and a significant one. Billy didn't talk like that. He said Barry was his best friend."

V. Conclusion

- A. Hannon concludes the article with a long metadiscourse concerning Bryant's "Save our Children" campaign. While doing so, Hannon also makes several stabs at heterosexual culture as per his custom. Writing about people whom Anita Bryant has converted, Hannon states: "If they grow up straight, they'll grow up proud to be Americans, secretly proud to be white, a majority that's 'quiet' because its soul is empty, in marriages that last and last because nothing is quite so binding as mutual distaste and suspicion."
- B. Hannon continues his harangue by placing Bryant's campaign as the latest in a long line of reactionary historical movements including McCarthyism, witch hunts, and the Inquisition.
- C. Hannon admonishes Bryant by stating that gay people do indeed have their own recruits – people, gay or straight, who have learned that homosexuality is not immoral and that gay people are not monsters. Hannon cites the activities of his eponymous interviewees as not acts of deviance but healthy acts of sexual edification: "Simon's students are recruits. If they grow up gay, they grow up remembering a loved role model, they grow up knowing sexual acts are not disgusting, they grow up with the possibility of coming out long before

the early-to-mid twenties, the age when so many of us finally caved in, or came out.”

- D. Hannon ends with a contemplation of a picture of the Bryant family praying together before bedtime, positing that one of Bryant’s own children may very well be gay. The core of Hannon’s article peaks in the final two paragraphs, “And he or she [Bryant’s possibly gay children] would be the truly molested child. Every homosexual has suffered that molestation. Every homosexual’s sexuality has been interfered with – impeded, strangled, diverted, denounced, ‘cured,’ pitied, punished. That is molestation. And it has nothing to do with what Simon, Barry and Peter are doing. *They* are the heirs of Mr. Atkinson, ‘Leader in Boy’s Work,’ community workers who deserve our praise, our admiration and our support.”¹⁰³

Hannon himself, by his own and all other accounts, has no sexual interest in boys. His motivations lay in his own history of sexual philistinism brought upon him by a society’s silence on all things pertaining to sex. Likewise, Hannon felt his youth experience mirrored that of other homosexuals who spent their childhood mired in a state of psychological torment over their sexuality. Ken Popert, a fellow member on the editorial collective, supported Hannon’s willingness for exploration:

Our interest was always sovereignty of young people over their sexual lives; it was never about adults being able to eroticize children. If you look at that article, it was part of a series about young people and their sexual rights and that was our concern because we had all grown up as young people who lived in extremely repressive circumstances, and we knew what it meant to be young and know yourself to be gay and what a soul-destroying thing that could be...¹⁰⁴

Hannon’s childhood had been totally devoid of sexual discussion, let alone homosexual discussion. For Hannon, this unifying lack of exposure was something common to practically all homosexuals during their maturation. Not only did Hannon feel he was tapping into the homosexual collective unconscious, but he was also voicing a broad perspective by challenging Canada’s unreasonable laws on youth consent. Hannon and others believed such laws embodied

the apparatus of a biased legal system which served to hinder and repress homosexual exposure. As Hannon said:

Well, it was partly close to my heart because I was such an ignorant, confused, sexually ignorant kid myself. You don't want to see that kind of thing replicated for any young person again. Not knowing where babies came from, not knowing even what the concept of homosexuality was, it seemed like a medieval mindset almost. You don't want people to have to go through that; there was so much agony that went along with it.¹⁰⁵

Despite being written over the summer of 1977, *The Body Politic's* editorial collective abstained from printing the article until December of that year. "Yes," said Hannon, "it was scheduled for a summer issue and that's the summer Emmanuel Jacques was killed. I guess we were smart enough to realize this was a dicey time."

Although the collective's qualms over the political climate were one reason for the article's period of desuetude, dissension over the article's content was another. Not everyone at *The Body Politic* felt that it comprised a dispassionate examination of an issue or that it was *eo ipso* appropriate. "Frankly," said Gerry Oxford, a *Body Politic* volunteer working in 1977 and close friend of Hannon, "I've always thought he was being disingenuous on that topic." Oxford recalled engaging in arguments with others at *The Body Politic* over the ethics of "Men Loving Boys Loving Men." Oxford recalled one such argument saying, "He [another *Body Politic* member] was toeing the line, which was that this article was not supporting pedophilia. I said, 'that's nonsense.'"¹⁰⁶

In contrast to Oxford opposition to the article, others felt it should be run immediately and in full exploitation of the irascible political climate. "In my own case," said Ken Popert, "I have never been a great fan of waiting for anything."¹⁰⁷ Oxford, however, remains unconvinced.

Specifically, Oxford's main concern was that the article was not, as Hannon claimed, a disinterested look at pedophilia but that it was a *de facto* statement of support and justification. In Oxford's viewpoint, Hannon's article was less a cogent examination than veiled proselytizing: "He doesn't try to convince. He thinks he does, but he doesn't. He sings to the choir... His approach in this article, to me, was to suggest that there wasn't any other point of view."¹⁰⁸

Though well-written and engaging, the article is not without its deficiencies. The largest of these, by Hannon's own admission, was the omission of any of the children's direct quotations

and explanations. “The difficult thing,” said Hannon, “and I didn’t think I did it in the piece, was trying to get the kids alone and speak to them for their impression. I couldn’t seem to make it happen, and it was a real weakness in the piece.”¹⁰⁹ Likewise, Barry’s lack of biography and quotations stand in stark contrast to the detailed accounts of Simon and Peter, making for a curiously bland finale in terms of choice of subject. Additionally, Hannon did not consider the rational viewpoints of the opposition, which might have included the coercive influence of those in a position of authority (i.e., teachers, counselors) over the choices of children. After much waiting, debate, and planning, the collective released the article in the final issue of the fevered 1977.

Attending the article was a long, detailed *apologia*, anticipating a thunderous reception. “1977 has been the year of the children,” opened the introduction. The introduction commented on the growing relevancy of children amidst the struggle for gay rights and the perception of gay men as child molesters: “We have begun to realize, for one thing, that many gay men and women are parents themselves ... Regardless of the nature of our real everyday contacts – or lack of them – with children, all of us have been branded as every child’s potential ‘molester.’” It also comments on the tense political climate with the Jacque’s murder trial still looming, but the introduction also comments that “the ‘climate’ will never be ‘right.’”¹¹⁰ Most presciently, the introduction foresaw the media barrage *The Body Politic* would soon encounter:

We also know that the media are likely to react as though they had just found a delectably rotten plum in a Christmas cake from a bakery they’ve never much liked. The issue might well be splashed sensationally across the tabloids (especially on days when there isn’t much real news), lines may be quoted out of context and juicy bits read over the air to satisfy prurient interest. Columnists like the Toronto *Sun*’s Claire Hoy will be delirious.¹¹¹

Indeed, the result of the publication was bedlam. Public reaction to “Men Loving Boys Loving Men” ranged from support to monstrous indignation from fellow Gay Liberation organizations, gay readers, straight readers, and other contemporary publications. In the area of support, *The Body Politic* received letters applauding the article. As one reader wrote:

Articles like ‘Men Loving Boys Loving Men’ are important ways to get the rest of us to understand our biases, so that we may better defend each other. The

publication of the essay was another example of the courage and politic acuity of *The Body Politic*.¹¹²

Aside from broad praise applauding *The Body Politic's* willingness to confront testy issues, the magazine also received letters from those who had a personal stake in the article's contents:

Your recent article made me proud to be what I am. Yes, I am a pedophile (odious term): I love boys... It is regrettable that society is yet unable to strip pedophilia of its mystery. Pedophiles are not witches to be hunted down and burned at the stake. They do very ordinary things with very ordinary boys who typically welcome not only the physical exploration but also the entire relationship, of which sex is only a part.¹¹³

Despite the various letters of support, *The Body Politic* received condemnation from its regular readers and from other activist groups. One reader commented on damage done to the gay cause by aligning pedophilia with gay rights writing, "The legitimization of same-sex love among adults is far more important and accessible aim than the legitimization of adult-child eroticism. If the two are linked, the latter can only hinder the former."¹¹⁴ Similarly, Marlowe Amber of Toronto lambasted *The Body Politic* for its disregard for the political climate:

Your reckless self-indulgence has done irreparable harm to the gay community throughout a North America already nauseated by the Gacy horror in Chicago and similar mass murders of boys and young men in California and Texas.^{xx} Extolling pedophilia, at best, could only harm and alienate otherwise tolerant heterosexuals, while at worst it plays straight into the hands of the Anita Bryants and official rednecks who are only too eager to grasp at any excuse for harassment.¹¹⁵

Fulfilling the prophesy in the introduction, Toronto *Sun* columnist Claire Hoy embarked on a campaign of public invective against *The Body Politic* with apparent personal venom. Writing with a palpable rage, Hoy attacked not only *The Body Politic* but also The Ontario Arts Council for funding the magazine with an annual \$1500 grant. After denouncing the contents of the article, Hoy asks, "How sick can these people be, these homosexual activists who whine that society picks on them, and all they want is equality?"¹¹⁶ Hoy continues his attack in a veritable shower of criticism:

^{xx} This is in reference to the John Wayne Gacy mass murders and rapes of young men and boys during the 1970s. Gacy was caught by police in the spring of 1978.

It would be inappropriate here, in a family newspaper, to repeat the words of these child rapers, to tell you what they do, boastfully, to these little kids, all in the name of some sort of loving, honest relationship. Loving and honest, hell. They're bloody criminals, these people.¹¹⁷

Hoy's anathema was not confined to a single article. Using his column with the *Toronto Sun* as a bully pulpit, Hoy continued to excoriate everything from "Men Loving Boys Loving Men," to *The Body Politic*, liberals, and the homosexual population at large. Describing the introduction to the article in which the collective writes, "Children are to be the last frontier of heterosexist bias," Hoy responds that "What that is, in effect, is a declaration of war by these homosexual radicals, a clear, published statement that what they really want is free access to our children, yours and mine."¹¹⁸ Aside from identifying a new homosexual *casus belli* with regards to children, Hoy also calls homosexuals "creatures" and "sick." Hoy also pleads with his readers to act against this new threat, "I can tell you that unless the legendary silent majority out there complains about it, we'll all wake up one day to discover that society has quietly condoned this disgusting madness."¹¹⁹ Hoy concludes his article, entitled "Kids, not rights is their craving," by making a plea reminiscent of Anita Bryant: "They want to spread the word, to convert the kids to homosexuality. And if we let them, they'll get away with it. We owe it to our kids to make sure it doesn't happen."¹²⁰

A number of Toronto's readers heard Hoy's conservative call and decided to write in. In one editorial, a citizen uses Hannon's article to attack further Civil Rights legislation:

The Ontario Human Rights Commission wants to protect homosexuals in jobs – to make it like race, religion, nation origin, etc. This is wrong, for it would give homosexuals even more access to schools. To pander to them is simply decadence.¹²¹

The editorial ends with the writer supporting Anita Bryant writing, "Maybe, indeed, Toronto needs an Anita Bryant to put priorities right and to rout the moral plague."¹²² Similarly, just as *The Body Politic* encountered internal division over the article, several members of other gay rights groups protested the collective's willingness to print the piece. As one group leader protested:

On behalf of the board and members of Ha Mishpacha, I cannot begin to express our shock and indignation at the article 'Men Loving Boys Loving Men.' It failed

on almost every level to be the serious discussion it was supposed to be. Child sex is not a gay issue. It is something society as a whole must deal with.¹²³

Despite the public outcry, *The Body Politic* reveled in the exposure. “You couldn’t pay for that kind of publicity,” said Herb Spiers.¹²⁴ Hannon, too, admitted to personal motivations for writing the article, “It was inflammatory and likely to get me read.”¹²⁵ Not only did the hoopla get Hannon read, the mystique surrounding his authorship of “Men Loving Boys Loving Men” would follow him for the rest of his journalistic career. “It made a huge media flap,” said Hannon.

Many homosexuals in Toronto applauded *The Body Politic*’s decision to run the article despite the tense political climate. As one reader comments, “As to the timing [of the article] I cannot think that you could have done better, whether it was accidental or intentional.”¹²⁶ Soon, the writers of *The Body Politic* began to notice not only the jeopardy of their decision but also its possibility for increased solidarity. As one writer warned, “The Real [sic] danger is that we’ll do what our opponents want us to do. Become confused. Attach [sic] each other. Be Divided.”¹²⁷ As the author insists, the internal division posed a grave threat to the gay rights movement; if the issue became too divisive, it threatened to undermine the unity that groups, organizations, and media outlets like *The Body Politic* had worked so hard to build. In the same article, the author lists a clarion call of warning:

Danger. The forces arrayed against us are gaining strength. The want to turn the clock back, to put gay people back in the closet, women back in their ‘place’ and youth even more firmly under the ‘protection’ of adults. An opportunity. Lesbians and gay men, feminists and the young themselves, united and strong in the face of this threat. We’ve shown we can come together in a time of crisis. The crisis is far from over.¹²⁸

Soon, the specters of such warnings took a very real form. In less than six weeks after *The Body Politic* printed “Men Loving Boys Loving Men,” the Crown laid charges against the magazine under sections 159 and 164 of the Criminal Code.¹²⁹ The charge – “transmission of immoral, indecent, or scurrilous literature” – was an antiquated piece of legislation that had never been utilized before.^{xxi} On January 5, 1978, police raided *The Body Politic*’s headquarters.

^{xxi} This is commonly confused with the charge of obscenity, yet, however negligible the difference may be, it constitutes an alternate offence.

Edward Jackson, present at the raid, recalled the incident, “They were really out of central casting in a way, these cops who came in and put things into boxes and taking them off. It was pretty scary.”¹³⁰

After the shock of the raid wore off and the reality of the charges sunk in, the editorial collective that had been charged – consisting of Gerald Hannon, Ken Popert, and Ed Jackson – sought legal advice. “I called Clayton Ruby,” Ed Jackson said. Clayton Ruby was a Toronto attorney, specializing in civil rights litigation. Aside from his prowess, Ruby possessed the theatricality of a lawyer who knew how to orchestrate a public trial of such fanfare.

The trial was a protracted affair, lasting over a year and covering all manner of topics including psychology, ethics, and ancient Greek philosophy. Despite the gravity of the proceedings, Ed Jackson remarked that “it was very entertaining.” In particular, Jackson spoke with relish of the examination of Claire Hoy, the indignant writer for the *Toronto Sun*, by Clayton Ruby when Hoy was put on the stand. “Clayton Ruby got him on the stands and tore him to shreds,” said Jackson.¹³¹

One article appearing in a January, 1979 edition of the *Toronto Sun* commented on the trial’s farcical qualities. Describing the testimony of Reverend Ken Campbell, an evangelical Christian and Anita Bryant supporter, one notices the presence of the ridiculous:

Under cross-examination, Campbell told defense lawyer Clayton Ruby he would like to see a return to the Socratic question-and-answer method of teaching in public schools. ‘So we owe a great debt to Socrates,’ Ruby said, asking whether Campbell knew Socrates was a homosexual and ‘slept with little boys on a regular basis?’

The article also remarks on, “frequent bursts of laughter from the public gallery,” and it references Judge Sydney Harris’s, the presiding judge of the case, humorous observation that “there have been no allegations made about Plato.”¹³² As Ken Popert remembered, “Sometimes it felt like a well-organized circus rather than a juridical proceeding.”¹³³

For those under the microscope, the trial was no laughing matter. While Clayton Ruby did an admirable job defending *The Body Politic*, his services were not *pro bono*. For months, *The Body Politic* ran ads asking for donations to its defense fund, and they were rewarded with an outpouring of support from the Toronto gay community. To many homosexuals living in Toronto, it was, indeed, the community that was placed on trial – if it was not a trial about the

nature of homosexuality per se, the trial did concern homosexual's ability to question and print as they saw fit. Even those who took issue with the particulars of "Men Loving Boys Loving Men" took the matter personally. As Gerry Oxford said, "Was it the wisest of articles? [Indication that it was not] I mean once it was done, you had to fight for it, the same as gay marriage...once it's out there you have to fight for it because, otherwise, it would be a step back."¹³⁴ Judge Harris, on the other hand, was quick to acknowledge the opposite viewpoint: that the trial comprised an idiosyncratic issue over content, and it had nothing to do with homosexuality. As Harris said, "This trial, contrary to what a lot of people seem to think, has nothing to do with homosexuality. It has to do with the publication and circulation of an article on pedophilia."¹³⁵

After months of litigious squabbling, philosophical tedium, and startling courtroom *ad hominem*s, the show closed the curtain. Called to the courtroom on Valentine's Day 1979, Ed Jackson, Ken Popert, and Gerald Hannon came to hear Judge Sydney Harris render his ruling. Harris's decision contained over 12,000 words – the decision was so long that the defendants were allowed to sit while listening. One of Harris's many preambles to his thoughts on the case concerned the hysteria surrounding the trial and its misconceptions:

I particularize these issues, because in the light of events, to which I shall refer, occurring during but extraneous to the trial as well as after the hearing of evidence and argument but before judgment, it is necessary to say that this is not and was not a trial concerned with many of the attitudes, events, offences, sexual orientations, moralities and decencies which many members of the public and many of those professionally using these organs of public information generally known as the media have considered it to be.¹³⁶

Here, as before, Harris felt the need to distinguish the trial as purely concerning Hannon's article and not an indictment of homosexuality, despite those perceptions. Throughout reading his decision, Harris oscillated between admonishment and praise, seeming on the verge of declaring guilt and innocence with each subsequent remark. "It seemed to waver back and forth," Hannon said. "There was that kind of tension going on between the whole thing."¹³⁷

Consequently, Harris felt a great need to also distinguish the particulars of the law that the trial was not addressing, speaking at some length to the codes of the law not under

examination. After a long preface, Harris addressed what the trial was about, specifically citing criminal code 164:

Every one commits an offence who makes use of the mails for the purpose of transmitting or delivering anything that is obscene, indecent, immoral or scurrilous, but this section does not apply to a person who makes use of the mails for the purpose of transmitting or delivering anything mentioned in subsection 162.¹³⁸

Eventually, Harris turned his attention to the specifics of Hannon's article and his legal opinion regarding its contents:

The specific article 'Men Loving Boys Loving Men' discusses pedophilia and pedophilic acts and persons; it is not written in a prurient style nor does it have the typical hallmarks of hard-core pornography -- it is not lascivious, sexually stimulating nor titillating. It does not use gross explicit language calculated to cause sexual arousal or stimulation. It forcefully argues in favour [sic] of a particular attitude of non-condemnation of pedophiles. The article was, as appears from the preface on p. 29 (reproduced later in these reasons), deliberately published and circulated following a specific and considered decision of the 'Collective', and was 'the latest in a series on youth and sexuality' by the same author -- the others of the series were not put before me.¹³⁹

Next Harris read "Men Loving Boys Loving Men" in its entirety and with its preface, with brief asides. In the interest of absolute diligence, Harris then summarized each witness brought before him in the case. At the end of these summaries, Harris concluded this of his witnesses:

Professors, journalists, a police officer, psychiatrists, psychologists and ministers of some religions are not representative of the community as a whole, and even so, they all differed in varying degrees and ways. Despite the most profound and impressive qualifications and experience of those who had counseled homosexuals and pedophiles, there was no general agreement as to the morality or the immorality, the decency or the indecency, the scurrility or otherwise of the article as a whole, including its preface, nor of ex. 1 as a whole.¹⁴⁰

In keeping with the eclectic nature of the trial and its resources, Harris slipped into long periods of metadiscourse concerning the case and the article: Harris asked several rhetorical questions

including whether or not coverage of an indecent and immoral event like the Holocaust was itself indecent or mere reporting, asked the same questions of everyday newspaper coverage of murder, noted that Robin Hood had moral motivations but committed crimes nonetheless, and made inferences into the ethics of New Journalism, “The Hannon article is as much reportage as was the coverage of the Jacques trial --albeit Hannon may be writing history in the fictional form --as was Capote in *In Cold Blood* for example ‘a well-known and popular writing device.’”¹⁴¹

After airing his thoughts on what must have been a considerable chore of research, investigation, and absorption into the semantics of three ambiguous words, Harris finally concluded with his decision:

As a person, I am appalled and disgusted by the acts of Simon, Peter and the others -- but my felings [sic] are subjective -- and as a Judge, I must judge with objectivity and with concern for the right of free discussion and dissemination of ideas unless there be a clear incitement to unlawful action... it follows that each of the accused is not guilty of this charge and I so find. It is unnecessary to deal with the question of vicarious criminal liability of the officer directors for the acts of the corporation.¹⁴²

The Body Politic was vindicated. But the editorial collective could not celebrate for long – The Crown repeatedly charged the magazine for “Men Loving Boys Loving Men” and other sexually explicit articles and brought the collective to court.^{xxii} The years of legal fees would eventually bankrupt *The Body Politic* into surrender, but they were never found guilty of any offense.

1977 was a watershed year not only for *The Body Politic* but for the Gay Liberation movement at large. During 1977, the long stewing debate over youth sexuality and age of consent laws finally reached explosive levels, while writers consistently challenged and explored such concepts. In the United States, a conservative movement marching to a religious drumbeat strongly denounced the gay movement and homosexuals themselves, while attempting to enact restrictive legislation against them. Finally, the rape and murder of Emmanuel Jacques in the summer of 1977 inflamed Toronto into an anti-gay frenzy.

Into the midst of this tumult strode Gerald Hannon, whom controversy followed like an ominous cloud. Motivated by a childhood fraught with sexual confusion and the disparate

^{xxii} There is no double-jeopardy in the Canadian legal system.

inclinations of genuine interest and a quest for notoriety, Hannon made youth sexuality his issue. Hannon's cause de célèbre, "Men Loving Boys Loving Men," caused a whirlwind of action in the movement, igniting protests, displays of support, and landing *The Body Politic* before Judge Sydney Harris.

The article's reception among general society was predictable: outrage, disgust, and confusion. The editorial collective anticipated as much in their introduction to the article in which they discerningly predicted many of their upcoming travails. The reception of the article amongst the gay community was much more intricate as the issue carried a particular resonance amongst the community. After decades of stereotypes of homosexuals as child-hungry molesters, Hannon attempted to confront the issue outright with an examination of the very people whom society so regularly demonized – pedophiles or "boy lovers."

With "Men Loving Boys Loving Men," Hannon opened Pandora's Box, and the gay community was forced to face one of its most divisive issues. Some supported Hannon's implicit claim that boy lovers could act responsibly in the role of executing a nurturing sexual relationship with young boys. Others, while not directly supporting this claim, maintained Hannon's right to examine and discuss such issues despite the risk involved. And many decried the article and its writer singlehandedly regressing the movement at an impossibly delicate time. This multifarious reception by the gay community demonstrated the wide variety of opinion that existed amongst a community that could, at times, achieve great uniformity. Despite the varied opinions, the fact that the gay community of Toronto rallied around Hannon and *The Body Politic's* right to freedom of the press during the trial demonstrates that the attempt at solidarity that *The Body Politic* had worked so hard to construct had indeed been successful. Even with intensely controversial issues in which there was no clear bottom line, the gay community rallied around the right to discuss those issues in all forums. In the years to come when the gay community would face the most dire of circumstances and threats from manifold sources, the need to hold together would be paramount to the Gay Liberation struggle and the gay community at large. It was a solidarity the people at *The Body Politic* would need when the Crown continued to charge them with obscenity, a solidarity the homosexual community of Toronto would need when the Toronto Police raided the bathhouses in the early 1980s, and a solidarity the entire North American gay community would need when it faced one of the most destructive and challenging issues of its history – the AIDS crisis.

Mild-mannered and soft-spoken, Gerald Hannon seems an unassuming iconoclast. His manner is inviting, his disposition mellow, and his features (a bulbous nose and a mustache that seems to have taken permanent residence on his lip in the 1970s) denote a kind of ordinary temperament that belies Hannon's printed word. Gerald Hannon still writes. Following *The Body Politic's* decline, Hannon worked as an independent writer, and he continues his work as a freelance journalist. Today, Hannon is known as Canada's premier profile writer and has garnered numerous awards and honorable mentions for his craft. Regardless of leaving *The Body Politic*, Hannon seemed to be followed by a cloud of controversy wherever he went. While teaching a course on magazine journalism at Ryerson University, Hannon came under criticism for admitting that he worked part-time as a prostitute and for his views on the efficacy of boy-love. Hannon's opponents attacked him for his views on pedophilia and insisted that he was using his post as an instructor to taut his feelings on the issue, using "Men Loving Boys Loving Men" as evidence.¹⁴³ As with before, Hannon beat the charges. Still, for better or worse "Men Loving Boys Loving Men" will likely forever highlight Hannon's oeuvre. However, the controversial author probably doesn't mind; he has kept his court summons for his famous article for over thirty years – it's framed and proudly displayed on the wall of his apartment.

Conclusion

- "It [*The Body Politic*] was wildly successful," Gerry Oxford and Herb Spiers, separately.

During the past forty years in North American political and sexual discussion, the issues facing the Gay Liberation movement have evolved dramatically. When the Gay Liberation movement "began" in earnest following the Stonewall riots in 1969, the movement immediately adopted a militant, confrontational position that reflected the radical counter-culturalism of the day. Driven by a radical youth sect, the movement adopted a bold tone and attacked the various institutions of society as oppressive and coercive. Marriage, the nuclear family, and the state came under heavy scrutiny. In such critiques, one perceives persistent themes of alienation and Separatism as the gay rights movement attempted not only to change society, but break away from it.

Although the movement has evolved drastically, much of the character of the modern gay rights movement and LGBT community can be traced back to the early movement activities like

those at *The Body Politic*. During its early years, *The Body Politic* attempted to use sensation and extreme rhetoric to encourage closeted homosexuals to come out and for all gays to join together to enact social and legal change. As it matured, *The Body Politic* turned its attention to identifying and popularizing the history of gay oppression, constructing a narrative and origin story from which to fight and rally towards equality. Finally, once established, *The Body Politic* confronted some of the most controversial subjects facing the gay community – youth sexuality, the age of consent, and the ethics and misconceptions of pedophilia or “boy-love.”

Though highly diverse, when viewed in its entirety *The Body Politic* can be read as a succinct barometer of the gay rights movement, as much a microcosm of the movement as a lens to view it. The magazine’s story was one of unlikely leaders, unity in the face of danger, and perseverance in the midst of multiple threats. It addressed the gay community, the straight community, the media of Toronto, and the federal government. It was visited by the likes of Michel Foucault, Herbert Marcuse, and Dennis Altman. It enjoyed thousands of readers in Toronto, the United States, much of Europe, Australia, and other areas of the world. Despite its political and social motivations, *The Body Politic*’s primary goal was influencing closeted gays to come out of the closet and be comfortable with their identity. In that and other respects, both Herb Spiers and Gerry Oxford said, “It [*The Body Politic*] was wildly successful.”¹⁴⁴

The founding members and contributors of *The Body Politic* remain active. Ken Popert heads The Pink Triangle Press, an immense gay media conglomerate that includes *Extra*, *The Body Politic*’s successor. Ed Jackson still resides in Toronto. Following the decline of *The Body Politic*, Jackson remained involved in several gay activist groups and took a leading role in such groups during the AIDS crisis. Jearld Moldenhauer, who left the paper early on, spent years nurturing his gay bookstore, Glad Day, in Toronto and in Boston. In the 1990s, Moldenhauer sold the bookstore to his friend Jon Scythes, who owns and operates the Toronto branch. Now, Moldenhauer splits his time between Toronto and his alternate home in Morocco. Gerald Hannon, the magazine’s most acclaimed writer, now pens articles for various magazines in Canada and is known as Canada’s premier profiler. Gerry Oxford now lives in New York City. After working for several years at the United Nations, Oxford has turned to personal non-profit projects in Manhattan.

Following his departure from *The Body Politic* in 1977, Herb Spiers settled in his dream home of New York City. There, Herb worked in sales before becoming a partner in an art

agency, which he ran for three decades. An asymptomatic sufferer of HIV, Spiers finally succumbed to cancer in the spring of 2011 after many years of fighting. During the 1980s, Spiers was instrumental in forming ACT UP New York and other AIDS related organizations.

Paul Macdonald's life has slowed down since his retirement. After he left *The Body Politic* in 1974, Macdonald pursued a career in electronics and sales before retiring after a life of work and travel. Macdonald still travels a great deal as a spirit marked with wanderlust is want to do. During Macdonald's recent visit to Columbus, Ohio, I saw the old rebel in him still shine: "Is this about as a good an alternative paper as I can find around here?" he said, clutching *The Other Paper* as he was about to return to Toronto.

When reminiscing about the time at *The Body Politic*, the voices of the founders and contributors adopt a passionate tone of the better days gone by. Though they are all realists, one notices it is hard to keep the nostalgia at bay. "They were the most important years of my life, really," said Hannon.¹⁴⁵ Despite his successful career as a writer, Hannon pines for the glory years, "I'm not changing the world now the way I helped to earlier, and those were important things." Ed Jackson, too, cited *The Body Politic* as one of the most influential moments of his life: "It gave me a confidence about the world and my place in the world that I probably wouldn't have had if I had not been a part of it."¹⁴⁶ Herb Spiers said that his time with *The Body Politic* were "the years I was most proud of in my life."

Now, *The Body Politic* has all but faded from the collective memory of the North American gay community; it seems only the older generation can recall the glory days of fighting the powers-that-be through the words of a magazine. The founders and contributors like to joke that they have become oddities, fodder for academic speculation. But *The Body Politic's* legacy lives on: *Extra* and The Pink Triangle Press continue to thrive, the Canadian and Lesbian Gay Archives (founded by those at *The Body Politic* in the early 1970s) holds an impressive collection of materials, and the founders still serve on the boards of local gay groups.

The Gay Liberation movement has come a long way. From the early days when it was a struggle to get openly gay people to congregate, now a proliferation of LGBT community groups abound in most major cities and college campuses. In the early days of the movement, discussion of sexuality usually only included gay, straight, or the tenuously defined bisexual categories; today, a wide lexicon has emerged in an effort to incorporate the expansive fluidity of human sexuality. In the late 1960s and into the 1970s, gay sources of media were largely grassroots,

extremely leftist, and ephemeral in lifetime. Now, gay publishing and media enjoy a large and thriving demographic. From a time when marriage was vilified by radical gay media at every turn, now an almost uniform push for universal marriage rights has manifested itself.

The Gay Liberation still faces its share of struggle: debates over gay bullying, outing, and gay marriage appear poised to take center stage in the years to come. The LGBT community will undoubtedly fight for those rights against conventional society, the government, themselves, or whoever might stand in their way. It is a community that stands ready to make further leaps towards progression and equality, a community with purpose and trajectory. To better understand where the LGBT community and North American culture and society might be going, it would be well served to observe sources of history from this movement, sources like *The Body Politic* – an artifact of where contemporary culture has been, a chronicle of history not yet frozen in time.

¹ <http://www.pinktrianglepress.com/business.asp>

² Ken Popert, Interview by Justin Hanson, Private Interview, June 15, 2010.

³ Paul Macdonald, interview by Justin Hanson, Private Interview, June 17, 2010.

⁴ MacDonald Facebook Post.

⁵ Edward Jackson, interview by Justin Hanson, Private Interview, June 15, 2010.

⁶ Herbert Roth Spiers, PhD. Personal interview. 27 June 2010.

⁷ Rick Bebout, <http://www.clga.ca/Material/Records/docs/chatlga9.htm>

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Paul Macdonald. Personal interview. 17 June 2010.

¹⁰ Jearld Moldenhauer. E-mail interview. 6 August 2010.

¹¹ Jearld Moldenhauer. E-mail interview. 6 August 2010

¹² Jearld Moldenhauer. E-mail message to author. 16 October 2010.

¹³ "It was such a small gay world then." Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010.

¹⁴ Herb Spiers and David Newcome, TBP issue 1. 1971.

¹⁵ <http://www.rbebout.com/oldbeep/concep.htm>

¹⁶ Rodger Streitmatter, "Breaking the Editorial Ice with 'America's Gayest Magazine,'" "After Stonewall: Transforming a 'Moment' into a Movement," *Unspeakable: The Rise of the Gay and Lesbian Press in America* (Faber and Faber; Boston and London, 1995).

¹⁷ <http://www.rbebout.com/oldbeep/concep.htm>,

-
- ¹⁸ "It was an endlessly talked of magazine." Gerry Oxford. Personal interview. 29 June 2010.
- ¹⁹ Jearld Moldenhauer, *Body Politic*, Nov/Dec71, Issue 1, p2, 2/3
- ²⁰ Gerry Oxford. Personal Interview. 29 June 2010.
- ²¹ Herb Spiers, "On his way: Letters from a small town youth," *Body Politic*, Mar/Apr74, Issue 12, p16, 2p
- ²² Edward Jackson. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ²³ George Hislop, Don't Grope Strangers (Introduce yourself First), *Body Politic*, May/Jun72, Issue 4, p18, 2p
- ²⁴ Paul Macdonald. Personal interview. 17 June 2010.
- ²⁵ Jearld Moldenhauer. E-mail interview. 6 August 2010.
- ²⁶ Edward Jackson. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ²⁷ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010.
- ²⁸ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010.
- ²⁹ Gerald Hannon, "Porn at the Clark," *Body Politic*, Jan/Feb72, Issue 2, p9, 1/2p
- ³⁰ Ken Popert. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ³¹ *The Body Politic*, Jul/Aug74, Issue 14, p7.
- ³² Ken Popert. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ³³ Gerry Oxford. Personal interview. 29 June 2010.
- ³⁴ Jearld Moldenhauer and Paul Macdonald interviews.
- ³⁵ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010. Hannon explained meeting one of Harvey Milk's associates after the decline of TBP and the associate relating how TBP had reached Milk's circle to much fanfare.
- ³⁶ Elgin Blair, "Gay Caucus: Unitarian Universalist Gays," *Body Politic*, Jan/Feb72, Issue 2, p16, 2p
- ³⁷ Brian Waite, "Strategy for Gay Liberation," *Body Politic*, Mar/Apr 1972 Issue 3, p4, 2p.
- ³⁸ R.D. Laing and A. Esterson, *Sanity, Madness, and the Family* (Basic Books, Inc.: New York, 1964).
- ³⁹ Laing and Esterson, 9.
- ⁴⁰ Hugh Brewster, "The Myth of the New Homosexual," *Body Politic*, May/Jun72, Issue 4, p22, 1p
- ⁴¹ Jude, radical pervert, "The destruction of sexual duality," *Body Politic*, Nov/Dec71, Issue 1, p3, 1/3p
- ⁴² Blair, Elgin "Gay Caucus: Unitarian Universalist Gays," *Body Politic*, Jan/Feb72, Issue 2, p16, 2p
- ⁴³ Brian Waite, "Oppression Begins at Home," *Body Politic*, Jul/Aug72, Issue 5, p19, 3/4.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵ Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (The Beacon Press; U.S.A., 1955)
- ⁴⁶ Norman Brown, *Lie Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History* (Wesleyan University Press; Middle Town, 1959).
- ⁴⁷ Marras, Amerigo. *Body Politic*, Winter73, Issue 7, p25, 1p
- ⁴⁸ Gerald Hannon, "Throat Ramming," *Body Politic*, May/Jun75, Issue 18, p14, 2p
- ⁴⁹ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010.
- ⁵⁰ Gerald Hannon, "Learning to Kill," *Body Politic*, Feb76, Issue 22, p8, 2p
- ⁵¹ Streitmatter, 131. Here Streitmatter cites Charles Thorp, "Power/Liberate Create Theory;" and, "A Gay Liberation Manifesto," *Gay Sunshine*, December 1970. Wrote Thorp, "The enemy is straight society."
- ⁵² Malcom X, "After The Bombing Speech / By Any Means Necessary Speech," Ford Auditorium, February 14, 1965. http://www.malcolm-x.org/speeches/spc_021465.htm
- ⁵³ Editorial Response: "Learning to Kill," *Body Politic*, Apr76, Issue 23, p2, 1/4p
- ⁵⁴ Gerry Oxford. Personal interview. 29 June 2010.
- ⁵⁵ Gerry Oxford. Personal interview. 29 June 2010.
- ⁵⁶ Albert K. Glum, "A General Theory of Subcultures," in *The Subcultures Reader*, ed. Ken Gelder (New York: Routledge, 1997), 53.

-
- ⁵⁷ Nella Van Dyke and Ronda Cress, "Political Opportunities and Collective Identity in Ohio's Gay and Lesbian Movement, 1970 to 2000," *Sociological Perspectives* 49.4 (Winter 2006): 521.
- ⁵⁸ Laud Humphreys, *Out of the Closets: The Sociology of Homosexual Liberation* (Prentice Hall Inc.; New Jersey, 1972), 133.
- ⁵⁹ Jim Steakley, "Homosexuals and the Third Reich," *Body Politic*, 1974, Issue 11, p1, 3p
- ⁶⁰ Ken Popert. Personal Interview. DATE
- ⁶¹ David Carter, *Stonewall: The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution* (St. Martin's Press; New York, 2005) 79-82.
- ⁶² Ibid, 17-18.
- ⁶³ Ibid, 137-177.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid, 182-232.
- ⁶⁵ Rachel Kranz and Tim Cusick, *Gay Rights* (Facts on File Inc., New York, 2000)
- ⁶⁶ (Minutes of the Eastern Regional Conference of Homophile Organizations, November 1-2, 1969, MSNY files, quoted in Marotta 1981: 164-65; Teal {1971} 1995:300)
- ⁶⁷ Elizabeth A. Armstrong and Suzanna M. Crage, "Movements and Memory: The Making of the Stonewall Myth," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 71, No. 5 (Oct., 2006) pp. 724-751. American Sociological Association.
- ⁶⁸ Steakley, Jim "The Gay Movement in Germany: Part One 1860-1910," *Body Politic*, 1973, Issue 9, p12, 6p
- ⁶⁹ Steakley, Jim "The Gay Movement in Germany: Part One 1860-1910," *Body Politic*, 1973, Issue 9, p12, 6p
- ⁷⁰ Ibid.
- ⁷¹ Steakley, Jim "The Gay Movement in Germany Part Two 1910-1933," *Body Politic*, 1973, Issue 10, p14, 6p
- ⁷² Ibid.
- ⁷³ Steakley, Jim, "Homosexuals and the Third Reich Part Three", *Body Politic*, 1974, Issue 11, p1, 3p
- ⁷⁴ Ibid.
- ⁷⁵ <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0118698/>
- ⁷⁶ <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0073629/>
- ⁷⁷ <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0067805/>. Many claimed that Peter Finch was black-balled from receiving an Academy Award for his role due to the subject matter.
- ⁷⁸ Heinz Heger, *The Men with the Pink Triangle: The True Life-and-Death Story of Homosexuals in Nazi Death Camps* (Gay Men's Press; London, 1980)
- ⁷⁹ Herb Spiers, PhD, Personal Interview, DATE
- ⁸⁰ Ed Jackson, Personal Interview, DATE.
- ⁸¹ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (Versen; London and New York, 1983) 7.
- ⁸² Ibid, 46.
- ⁸³ Rodger Streitmatter, *Unspeakable: The Rise of Gay and Lesbian Press in America* (Faber and Faber; Boston, 1995) 117.
- ⁸⁴ Jonathan Ned Katz, *Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the United States* (Penguin Group; New York, 1976) 1.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid, 2.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid, 5.
- ⁸⁷ Herb Spiers, PhD, Personal Interview
- ⁸⁸ Ed Jackson, Personal Interview, DATE
- ⁸⁹ Steakley, Jim "The Gay Movement in Germany: Part One 1860-1910," *Body Politic*, 1973, Issue 9, p12, 6p
- ⁹⁰ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010.
- ⁹¹ Bass, Jeremy, "Gay Youth Group" *Body Politic*, Mar77, Issue 31, p7, 1/9p
- ⁹² Hannon, Gerald, "Of Men and Little Boys," *Body Politic*, Jul/Aug72, Issue 5, p3, 1p, 3
- ⁹³ Hannon, Gerald, "Children and Sex," *Body Politic*, Autumn72, Issue 6, p3, 2p
- ⁹⁴ Hannon, Gerald, "Censored," *Body Politic*, Apr77, Issue 32, p1, 2p
- ⁹⁵ "Police hit gays in city wide crackdown" By: Russell, Stuart. *Body Politic*, Sep77, Issue 36, p5, 1/2p
- ⁹⁶ Hamburg, Harvey, "Anita's Citric Acid" *Body Politic*, Mar77, Issue 31, p8, 1/4p
- ⁹⁷ Gordon, Eric, "The Ballad of Anita Bryant," *Body Politic*, Jul/Aug77, Issue 35, p12, 1/9p (9-20)
- ⁹⁸ Christian Cotroneo, "'Canada's Official Homosexual' George Hislop dies at age 78." *Toronto Star*, Pg. A04
- ⁹⁹ Dale Brazao, "'Shoeshine boy' tragedy lives on for family; Sister speaks out on eve of killer's parole hearing," *Toronto Star*, A.01, October 17th, 2002.

-
- ¹⁰⁰ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010..
- ¹⁰¹ Gerry Oxford. Personal Interview. 29 June 2010.
- ¹⁰² Ken Popert. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ¹⁰³ Gerald Hannon, "Men Loving Boys Loving Men," *Body Politic*, December77/January78, Issue 39.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ken Popert. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ¹⁰⁵ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010..
- ¹⁰⁶ Gerry Oxford. Personal Interview. 29 June 2010.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ken Popert. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ¹⁰⁸ Gerry Oxford. Personal Interview. 29 June 2010.
- ¹⁰⁹ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010..
- ¹¹⁰ Editorial Collective, Introduction to "Men Loving Boys Loving Men," *Body Politic*, December77/January78, Issue 39.
- ¹¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹¹² Gayle Rubin, "Letters to the Editor," *Body Politic*, February 1978; Issue 40.
- ¹¹³ Anonymous, "Letters to the Editor," *Body Politic*, March 1978; Issue 41
- ¹¹⁴ Michael Jonson, "Letters to the Editor," *Body Politic*, February 1978; Issue 40.
- ¹¹⁵ Marlowe Amber, "Letters to the Editor," *Body Politic*, March 1978; Issue 41.
- ¹¹⁶ Claire How, "Our taxes help homosexuals promote abuse of children," *Toronto Sun*, December 22, 1977; page 20.
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁸ Claire Hoy, "Kids, not rights is their craving," *Toronto Sun*, December 25, 1977; page 16.
- ¹¹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁰ Ibid.
- ¹²¹ "Bawdy Politic" Editorials, *Toronto Sun*, December 27, 1977; page 10.
- ¹²² Ibid.
- ¹²³ "Letters to the Editor," *Body Politic*, March 1978; Issue 41
- ¹²⁴ Herbert Roth Spiers, PhD. Personal interview. 27 June 2010.
- ¹²⁵ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010..
- ¹²⁶ Editorials *Body Politic*, Apr78, Issue 42, p2-2, 1/4p
- ¹²⁷ "Crisis: In the midst of danger a chance to unite" *Body Politic*, Feb78, Issue 40, p1, 1p
- ¹²⁸ Ibid.
- ¹²⁹ "TBP raided and charged" *Body Politic*, Feb78, Issue 40, p8, 2p
- ¹³⁰ Jackson interview.
- ¹³¹ Edward Jackson. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ¹³² "Magazine told how to molest, witness says," *Toronto Star*, January 5th, 1979; page C15.
- ¹³³ Ken Popert. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.
- ¹³⁴ Gerry Oxford. Personal Interview. 29 June 2010.
- ¹³⁵ "Trial told of Socrates' sex life," *Toronto Star*, January 4th, 1979; page B6.
- ¹³⁶ Regina v. Pink Triangle Press et al. No. 4557. Provincial Court, Judicial District of York Ontario. 14 February 1979.
- ¹³⁷ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010..
- ¹³⁸ Regina v. Pink Triangle Press et al. No. 4557. Provincial Court, Judicial District of York Ontario. 14 February 1979.
- ¹³⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁴¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁴² Ibid.
- ¹⁴³ Tracy, Nedsoly, "Hannon Fights to retain post: Union files grievance for hooker prof," *Toronto Sun*, July 6th, 1996. http://www.wordiq.com/definition/Gerald_Hannon
- ¹⁴⁴ Herbert Roth Spiers, PhD. Personal interview. 27 June 2010.
- ¹⁴⁵ Gerald Hannon. Personal Interview. 16 June 2010.
- ¹⁴⁶ Edward Jackson. Personal interview. 15 June 2010.