1

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

GAYS: MASCULINE HEGEMONY AND THE POLICE SUBCULTURE
An Ottawa Case-Study

by Edward Michael Oliver
Combined Honors B.A., Sociology and History
King's College, the University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada
1993

a thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
August 3, 1995
Copyright
1995, E.M. Oliver

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-08914-2

Canada

Name

JENNIFER ANN WELLS LIVER

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

--	--	--	--

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0502
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and	
Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family	
Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor	
Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and	
Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and	
Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and	
Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0780

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry	0425
Geochemistry	0996

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Polymology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and	
Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and	
Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and	
High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

GAYS: HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY AND THE POLICE SUBCULTURE
An Ottawa Case-Study

submitted by Edward Michael Oliver, Combined Honors B.A.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

August 11, 1995

Manhood is equated with the production and mastery of what is experienced as the body, the unconscious and the unnameable. The result is a masculinity in awe of its power to overwhelm all that is other to it (Middleton, 1992: 57).

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines police-gay interaction effects from a symbolic interactionist perspective. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, serves as the research site. It is argued a gay identity, or "gayness", is "contained" in both the police occupational subculture and the gay community/subculture. The argument is that this is the result of masculine hegemony, and the "shaming" it directs at anyone believed to be gay. Support for the argument is generated from interview data (police, n=10; gays, n=16). Responses from subjects in both groups reveal the reciprocal effects of their interactions which keep "gayness" inhibited.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisory team of Professors Dennis Forcese and Don Whyte; their continuous encouragement, support, and timeless effort was invaluable to me. Thank you Professor Nancy Adamson, from the Department of Women's Studies, for availing yourself as my external reader. I would also like to thank Professor David Flynn back at King's, a friend and mentor since 1989. Additional thanks go to Alex Bruzzzone ("a friend to the end"), Nazira Conroy (for answering all my questions!), Carol Holland, Michael Graydon, Barry Deprose, Jamie Robertson, the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service, Glenn Law, Oscar Wolfman, Jen Braley, Jim Yaraskavitch, Elisa Swern, and Heidi Rimke, to name a few, for all their help along the way. This thesis is dedicated to the most important people in my life: Anne Oliver, my mother; Veronica Oliver, my sister; and Laura Carter, my fiancée. A special dedication is reserved for my late father, Ron Oliver. Thanks.

*As we run from the sun
and we harbour the lies
and we leave things undone
as we cover our eyes
does it tear you apart my love
does it tear you apart my love
it tears me apart*

-The Tea Party, "Correspondences"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
 CHAPTER ONE: Introduction.....	 1
1.1 Masculine Hegemony.....	1
1.2 The Problem.....	4
1.3 Outline.....	6
Notes.....	8
 CHAPTER TWO: The Theoretical Context.....	 11
2.1 Symbolic Interactionism.....	12
2.1.1 Subjectivity, Structure, and Self.....	13
2.1.2 Interactions in the Police Occupational Subculture.....	18
2.1.3 Interactions in the Gay Subculture.....	23
2.1.4 Police-Gay Interactions.....	28
2.2 The Social Construction of Masculine Hegemony and Police-Gay Interactions.....	35
2.2.1 The Containment of a Gay Identity.....	35
2.2.2 A Brief History of Police-Gay Interactions in Ottawa.....	41
2.2.3 Police-Gay Liaison.....	47
2.2.3.1 Police, Gays, and Diversity Training....	49
2.2.3.2 Politically Correct Police.....	52
2.2.3.3 Additional Thoughts.....	55
Notes.....	56
 CHAPTER THREE: Methodology.....	 61
3.1 The Research Approach.....	61
3.1.1 Interactionism in the Field.....	62
3.1.2 The Internet.....	63
3.1.3 Advantages of this Field Research.....	64
3.1.4 Disadvantages of this Field Research.....	66
3.1.5 Difficulties Facing an Outsider.....	68
3.1.6 Data Collection.....	71
3.2 Gaining Access.....	73
3.2.1 The Police Subculture and the Gay Community..	73
3.3 Success in the Field.....	75
3.3.1 Gatekeepers.....	75
3.3.2 Disclosure.....	76
Notes.....	77

CHAPTER FOUR: Police-Gay Interaction Effects (The Ottawa Experience)	79
PART ONE: POLICE AND GAY SUBJECTIVE REALITY	79
4.1 Perceptual Effects.....	80
4.1.1 The Police on "Gayness".....	81
4.1.2 Gays on "Copness".....	85
4.1.3 The Symbolic Importance of Femininity in a Male Subculture.....	89
PART TWO: POLICE AND GAYS JUXTAPOSED	96
4.2 Structural Conceptions of the Police and Gays.....	96
4.2.1 Conformity in the Police Subculture.....	98
4.2.2 "Gayness" and Non-Conformity.....	105
PART THREE: SELF-INTERACTION	110
4.3 The Struggle with Self for Identity.....	111
4.3.1 The Gay Self.....	113
4.3.2 Gay Identity Politics.....	122
4.3.3 The Straight "Superior Self".....	127
Notes.....	134
CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusion	136
Bibliography	141

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

Nothing is sexual but naming makes it so. Sexuality is a social construction learnt in interaction with others (Plummer, 1975: 30).

Homosexuality, defined in a certain society as deviant, is so only because of the prevailing definition, and the reasons for an individual choosing that path rather than another are contained in a process of definition and interaction. Like all identities, this identity emerges through a continuous definition by others and the actor, and the stream of action involves a series of changes we might call a sexual "career" (Charon, 1985: 182).

This introduction consists of three sections. The first section introduces the reader to the process of masculine hegemony and the concepts which relate to its deployment in the broad sociological context of wider society. The second section presents the statement of the research problem that operationalizes masculine hegemony as it is evidenced in interactions between members of the police subculture and the gay community, and as a means of containing a gay sexual identity. Also considered here are the various strategies of containment employed by the police and gays to maintain this type of hegemony, followed by an outline of the study in the third section.

1.1 MASCULINE HEGEMONY

Social interaction is a reflection in part of how male and female gender roles are appropriated in wider society. Gender roles are, essentially, prescribed attitudes and behavioural patterns assigned to both men and women based on specific criteria: one's biological sex; one's gender

identity¹; and, most important, one's sexual identity (being "straight" or "gay"). Implicit in the proliferation of such attitudes and behaviours is the deployment of masculine hegemony, defined as a heterosexist² agenda constituting "the social subordination of 'homosexuality' [and] the making of a particular male-dominated form of heterosexuality as the social norm" (Kinsman, 1993: 5).³

What, then, determines normalcy?⁴ In its purest form the sociological concept of *hegemony* translates as power exercised by political and ideological means: political force (power exercised by the state) is coercive, while ideology wins over the subordinate classes (Gramsci, 1975; Mouffe, (ed.), 1979). Therefore, masculine hegemony, as a social practice, confirms male groups' all-encompassing dominance over women (Connell, 1987) through state-related power and control. As a discourse, and of considerable significance to an understanding of gendered power relations, ascription to the ideals of masculine hegemony by males in positions of power serves to polarize and weaken gay men, "whose social practices do not accord" (Leahy, 1992: 71) with male heterosexism.

It is the association of this discourse and the practices with social power which defines hegemonic masculinity as the dominant version of masculinity; it is not merely the most popular discourse of masculinity, though it is that as well (Ibid.).

Manifest in this construction of gendered power is a prevailing "homophobic"⁵ ideology, the "instrument for oppressing a sexual minority and a powerful tool for

regulating the entire spectrum of male relations" (Owen, 1987: 221) that dichotomizes sexual identity between the categories of *heterosexuality* and *homosexuality*.⁶

Consequently, it is easy to take for granted the social privileges afforded straight men. A heterosexual may never once be oppressed on the basis of *sexual orientation*; such are the spoils of masculine hegemony and a normative gender role where the disparities of sexuality and class are maintained (Carrigan, Connell, and Lee, 1985; Connell, 1990, 1992, 1993; Kinsman, 1987, 1993; Donaldson, 1993). But what is the cost for *meaningful social interaction*? Nardi (1992: 184) says:

concepts of masculinity are shaped by concepts of homosexuality and heterosexuality. Owen (1987: 230) quotes Foucault, who said in an interview: "*The disappearance of friendship as a social institution, and the declaration of homosexuality as a social/political/medical problem, are the same process.*" This is so, Segal (1990: 139) agrees, because masculinity has been defined by its opposition to femininity and homosexuality: "*The possible imputation of homosexual interest to any bonds between men ensured that men had constantly to be aware of and assert their distance from both women and homosexuals.*"

The practice of masculine hegemony also causes many people in the gay community and straights alike to feel "shame", the negative feeling that results from violations of an internalized moral code, for being, or perceived as being, "gay".⁷ Even Plummer (1975: 175) argues that to be labelled a *homosexual* "may well mean shame." Masculine hegemony becomes reinforced as a process by which a majority of men⁸ participate, support, and vindicate their heterosexuality,

arising from the individual's perception of one of his own attributes as being a defiling thing to possess, and one he can readily see himself as not possessing (Goffman, 1963: 7).

With the added dimension of personifying a moral force in wider society, masculine hegemony lends itself more to the containment of homosexuality, and for right or wrong reasons, restrains people from committing what are perceived as *abnormal* acts. Some believe shame should be attached to those activities which deviate from the heterosexual norm, the cultural dynamic defined by men that allows them to interpret their sexual identity. The most symbolic of these acts are of a homoerotic nature. Whyte (1993b: 31) writes:

Ultimately, homophobia is a strategy of self-policing, whereby the masculine subject, by definition, shields himself through fear, shame, denial and intolerance; he is subjugated. It is here that the cognitive and the emotional aspects of masculinity come together in homosocial practices; here is where the 'discursive fact' of masculinity coalesces.

The concern herein will be with the *symbolic* nature of masculine hegemony and the shame elicited from its deployment on gays as a combined impetus towards the containment of "gayness".

1.2 THE PROBLEM

This study presents an analysis of the reciprocal interaction effects of masculine hegemony, as deployed in the police subculture, on police officers and gays. Specifically, it examines the notion that a gay identity is "contained" in

both the police and gay subcultural settings. In this paper the many interaction effects inspired by masculine hegemony on police-gay interactive encounters are measured by examining the following strategies of containment of "gayness":

1. The social construction of the deployment of masculine hegemony, and police-gay interactions in Ottawa focusing on the police as a means of social control who took "matters into their own hands to impose the kind of control that they think is necessary and would be expected by society at large" (Sewell, 1985: 140).

2. The pre-conceived perceptions held in the police subculture and in the gay community of one another and how the articulation of these perceptions influence masculine behaviour in police-gay interactions.

3. The perception of females under masculine hegemony and the police cultural response to femininity as a negative symbol in a male subculture.

4. Containment of "gayness" from the perspective of the police subculture as conformist and the gay community as deviant.

5. The identity politics involved in the presentation of a straight self and a gay self as both pertain to internalized "homophobia" materialized in the police subculture and reflected in the gay community.

In order to examine the *interaction effects* between the police subculture and the gay community one must first understand where these groups are located, categorically, in Connell's (1987: 110) "hierarchy of masculinities."

The police subculture is one whose membership is predominantly male and *heterosexually-oriented*; in essence, a powerful group in society that extols a *hegemonic masculinity* and one cast (Kinsman, 1993: 5) among those who epitomize the "most visibly hostile" groups to gays, and one in which "a 'necessary' heterosexual masculinity is a major institutional

organizing ideology." The gay community, on the other hand, represents members of sexual minorities targetted by the ruling relations of masculine hegemony and ranks, according to Connell (1987: 110), as a "subordinated masculinity." Nevertheless, there emerged a gay liberation movement (a symbol of "gay pride"), recognized by groups like the police as a serious challenge¹⁰ to masculine hegemony whereby gay resistance is elevated to a crisis level:

So-called "crises" of masculinity occur where the conditions for maintenance of hegemony are challenged. It is in such "crises" that homophobic ideologies become pronounced as strategies of containment and hegemony (Whyte, 1994: 1).

Police-gay interactions provide an apt example.

1.3 OUTLINE

In Chapter Two, "The Theoretical Context", the theoretical orientation of this paper is presented, that of symbolic interactionism. Interactionists George Mead, Herbert Blumer, Erving Goffman, in addition to more modern theorists Dennis Altman, Michel Foucault, and Jeffrey Weeks are among those sociologists who provide this researcher with a point of reference. Literature dealing with the police subculture and the gay community as separate entities is plentiful, but not so for studies which examine the interactions between the two groups. Only just recently have some significant studies emerged, notably Leinen's (1993) Gay Cops and Burke's (1994) "Homosexuality as Deviance: The Case of the Gay Police

Officer." Using the interactionist model, this researcher explains interaction as it occurs in the police occupational subculture, in the gay community, and between them. This chapter also identifies the research site, the city of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. An historical overview informs the reader of the systemic deployment of masculine hegemony in the wider society and how a local police service adopted the same power base in its treatment of the gay community, coupled by a modern interpretation of police-gay interactions.¹¹

Chapter Three, "Methodology", outlines the methodology (field research) employed in this study to collect suitable data. Data were drawn from field interviews (face-to-face and via the Internet) with the subjects. Blumer's (1969) Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method and Vincent's (1990) Police Officer provided the motivation for field research. Also discussed are the reasons why this research design in particular was chosen, its strengths and weaknesses, its parameters, and difficulties faced.

Next, in Chapter Four, "Police-Gay Interaction Effects (The Ottawa Experience)", research findings are delivered and discussed. This chapter is organized in a fashion to discuss the interaction effects deployed masculine hegemony has on: the police subculture and the gay community's perceptual, subjective definitions of situations in police-gay interactions; the structural conception of police-gay interactions; and, the presentation of self in order to

determine the process of containment of "gayness" in policing.

Chapter Five, "Conclusion", reveals the conclusions derived from the study. Based on the research findings, and the experience as a whole, this researcher seeks to answer three specific questions for the reader: What makes this project valid? What makes this project reliable? And is there, in sociology, something to be said for studies which examine the social dynamics of "straight-gay symbolic interactions" in institutions where masculine hegemony is proliferated?

Notes

¹This researcher discovered varied interpretations of "gender identity" when conversing with both respondents and lay people. It really depends on how one defines "gender". Some think of gender as defined by genitalia (one's biological sex); sociology majors tended toward gender as defined by sex roles in wider society; and, more radical thinkers went so far as to define gender by way of chromosomes.

²Heterosexism is: "the assumption that heterosexuality is the norm, that it is (or should be) the universal sexual/intimate experience. This leads to attitudinal, institutional, religious, legislative and policy discrimination against lesbians and gay men" (Anonymous, 1994: 1).

³This type of "hegemony" is administered by way of an array of societal elements, as note 2 (above) implies: "the police, criminal law, social and family policies, definitions of the 'proper' family as solely heterosexual, the continuing denial of human rights protection in many jurisdictions, the violence of queerbashers, anti-gay jokes, and through the 'homosexualization' of AIDS [Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome]" (Kinsman, 1993: 5).

⁴The argument of masculine hegemony maintaining heterosexual practices (gendered and sexual identities) as "natural", or "normal", is explored well in Boswell (1980) and Weeks (1986).

⁵A relatively "young" empirical term, the etymology of "homophobia", coupled with "homophobic" actions, has not been featured and/or discussed to any great length in scholarly works. Whyte's (1993a) "Homophobia" provides the reader with a tangible reference point.

⁶Thus far the words "homophobia" and "heterosexist" have been introduced and given a general definition. There is a need in the gay community to change in focus, linguistically, from homophobia to heterosexism. Conceptually the word heterosexism can provide a focal point as gays set their political agendas in the future. Homophobia places the attention and/or blame on gays themselves: it incorrectly perpetuates the belief that there may be something intrinsically wrong with their sexuality. Heterosexism symbolizes the true origin of anti-gay prejudice, forcing heterosexuals to confront their own bigotry. The main point, and often overlooked, is that homophobia is hegemony used against gays and straights (to keep the latter "in check") but one that affects the gay community more with internalized homophobia because many here believe gays who fall prey to "self-hatred" (acquired), which is innate, blame this preventable result on their homosexuality. Heterosexism identifies the aggressors of masculine hegemony (straights), and also the victims (gays).

⁷As noted in the gay publication Out/Look (Neisen, 1990: 37), masculine hegemony cloaks the gay community: it "helps us [gays] recognize more clearly that [what] we struggle with is in fact shame; shame due to cultural heterosexism."

⁸This is a variable expression in some of the dominant male occupational subcultures, the most recognized being the police, the military, and all other para-military institutions symbolic of power and traditional authority over its members.

⁹Regarding the comment on p. 3, "shame" is not experienced by all gays and extremely "homophobic" straights. While shame is evoked by a negative feeling toward homosexuality, "gay pride" is characterized by a positive feeling toward homosexuality, even though "gayness" is held as abnormal in the wider society. It is a case of a triumph of the will.

¹⁰Citizens are capable of bringing about change, states Gramsci (1975). This is possible only when the ruling hegemony is challenged by a given faction's revolutionary consciousness. The gay liberation movement qualifies as a "politicized deviant group" pitted against a hegemonic (heterosexual) state that politically and ideologically empowers the gay community. A police service is but one of several "relatively autonomous structures whose interaction

produces the continuities and stabilities of everyday gender" (Middleton, 1992: 153) responsible for why "homosexuality began to speak in its own behalf," Foucault (1980: 101) explains; "to demand that its legitimacy or 'naturalness' be acknowledged, often in the same vocabulary, using the same categories by which it was medically disqualified."

¹¹There are instances in this thesis where the term "policeman" and the pronoun "he" are used in place of the politically correct, gender-neutral title "police officer". Nevertheless, this style is conditional. Masculine hegemony is under the microscope here, specifically the two sexual "extremities" which persist symbolically in the battleground of gendered power relations: (male-dominated) heterosexuality, and homosexuality (tolerated less among men than among women). Also, studies focusing on "masculinity" have made a resurgence and the topic of a number of recent sociological works (see Connell, 1992: 735-51) and a subject that catches the interest of this researcher. "More seriously, relationships between men are an understudied and uncritically unfocused subject" (Edwards, 1994: 115), and despite the open recruitment of women and people of colour to police services across Canada, people generally typify the police subculture as symbolic of a white, straight, male-minded regulatory system that is resistant to change.

CHAPTER TWO: The Theoretical Context

Interactionists don't believe in asking "why" questions. They ask, instead, "how" questions. How, for example, is a given strip of experience structured, lived, and given meaning? (Denzin, 1992: 24).

In the face of widespread hostility, fear, and denunciation, most homosexuals still keep their sexual preferences hidden from heterosexuals, thus involving themselves in deception, play-acting, and an elaborate presentation of self to the outside world (Ramcharan, 1989: 173).

To recapitulate, the aim of this study is to examine how a gay identity is contained by policemen and gays, intensified by the practice of hegemonic masculinity and evidenced by police-gay interaction effects. This chapter establishes the theoretical foundation of the thesis.

The effects of masculine hegemony on members of the police subculture and the gay community are profound, and addressed within the framework of symbolic interactionist theory. "In the dynamics of hegemony in contemporary Western masculinity," writes Connell (1992: 736),

the relation between heterosexual and homosexual men is central, carrying a heavy 'symbolic' freight...The resulting oppression of gay men --that is, to be hostile toward homosexual persons in general and gay men in particular--provides a symbol for all cases of hierarchy among men.

Connell implies that in the course of symbolic interaction the boundaries of gendered behaviour in the wider society are stringent, and transcend to, and affect fervently, institutions like the police subculture and the gay community. To explain this, the early sections of this chapter are

devoted to interactions which take place in an occupational setting (the police subculture); in a sexual minority (the gay subculture); and, where these groups confront one another (interaction effects). Interactions between police officers and gays involve a basic exchange of symbols; therefore, the reader is acquainted first with the precepts of symbolic interactionist theory.

2.1 SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM

Symbolic interactionist theory, as the first word in its name implies, emphasizes the importance of symbols as means of expressing and communicating values and beliefs within a group. A symbol is any word, action, gesture, or thing to which meaning is attached, and is "used to represent whatever people agree it shall represent because symbols constitute "our reality" (Charon, 1985: 39, 54). Caution should be heeded, however. Consider this statement from Glassner (1980: 16):

Interactions consist of at least the following: events, states, phenomena, and processes. None of these can be reduced completely to analysis of symbols. Processes consist of phenomena within various events, which at each point make up an existing state amid other states.

It is central to the arguments of Mead (1934) and Blumer (1969) that when people respond to or define a situation they take into account one another's ideas and collectively define the meaning. Blumer (Ibid.: 50) offers the fundamental postulates of interactionist thinking:

(1) people, individually or collectively, are prepared to act on the basis of the meanings of the objects that comprise their world; (2) the association of people is necessarily in the form of a process in which they are making indications to one another and interpreting each other's indications; and (3) social acts, whether individual or collective, are constructed through a process in which the actors note, interpret, and access the situations confronting them.

Within this context specific foci of symbolic interactionist theory have been located, and are integrated into the discussion that follows: subjective reality; the structural conception of human society; and, the presentation of self.

2.1.1 Subjectivity, Structure, and Self

Subjective reality is what allows people to create perceptions of each other and also to act on these perceptions. A symbolic interactionist offers an explanation of a society through the subjective awareness of its social actors (Rock, 1979), which is to say a society emerges from the continuous transactions of social actors and not from the objective restraints often placed on social action. One's sense of personal cognizance and the convention that person holds as a member of his or her society are of extreme importance.

Thus, humans endeavor to 'make sense' of their social and physical environments. This 'making sense' process is internalized in the form of thought: for thinking is the intra-individual problem-solving process that is also characteristic of inter-individual interaction. In thinking, then, there occurs an interaction with oneself...Any complete understanding of human behavior must include an awareness of this covert dimension of activity, not simply the observation

of overt behavior (Meltzer, Petras, and Reynolds, 1975: vii).

In addition, social objects (symbols) are assigned different contextual meanings in different social worlds. To test this assumption take something as mundane as a man's lisp, a physical trait. This condition is subject to varied symbolic interpretation: there are individuals who will interpret the lisp as a speech impediment, a side-effect of a dental examination, or a result of physical harm. Likewise, others may view the lisp as evidence that the man is effeminate, or homosexual, all due to the way he talks. The first three interpretations are trivial; the last, however, can affect the man immensely. His voice becomes an object of shame (just the mere inclination that someone considers him to be "gay") and the man would likely be compelled to take steps to correct the speech disorder in order to feel safe among his contemporaries, if that option exists. Such is the influence social stimuli have on subjective definitions of human behaviour.

Blumer (1969: 74) also provides a theoretical focus for the structural conception of a human society when he examines social interaction and its effects on the individuals who make this process happen. In short:

Social action falls into two general categories: conformity, marked by adherence to the structure, and deviance, marked by departure from it. Because of the central and determinative position into which it is elevated, structure becomes necessarily the encompassing object of sociological study and analysis

--epitomized by the well-nigh universal assertion that a human group or society is a "social system."

A conformist is one who signifies an individual willingness to comply, to yield to the status quo. A deviant, or "outsider" (Becker, 1963), symbolizes an alternative to conformity and as a result places himself or herself at risk to be a recipient of shaming as an example of punishment.¹

Moreover, it is the intention of this researcher to reject the accustomed view of structuralists

which looks to such positional elements in a social system as "status" or "organization" for structure, finding [instead] structure in the code of rules which illuminates every social system and structures every institution. A social system or an institution is, in one sense, a code of behavior, a structured set of rules of the game which regularize all social action in terms of probabilities inherent in particular social relationships (Reuss-Ianni, 1983: 127).

Think of religion, whose earthly representation is a person of the cloth supplemented by parishoners gathered in a house of worship. By the powers vested in the man or woman of cloth as a person of God, for example, he or she can have the parishoners call to mind their sins while at the same time espouse shame on sinners (condemnation of "deviants" who depart from the structure, and the reasoning behind the United Church split over the ordination of gay ministers). This establishes the structural polarity between conformity and deviance. One has no choice but to account for certain structural concepts to determine why a social actor behaves the way he or she does: what are the role requirements of the person of cloth? What demands of status are put on this

individual? What differentiates the person of cloth from others in the social stratum of this specific micro-environment? And, what values and norms (the code of rules) does the person of cloth usher into the world of his or her audience and colleagues? These concepts are essential and influential in any of the social world's most powerful institutions.

On that note, it is Goffman (1959) who claims that social actors perform roles so that they might present a desired impression of themselves and also act in such a way as to sustain that impression, amounting to the third focus of interactionism, the presentation of one's self. The self is, in itself, a process of social interaction, but is more accurately defined as a process of "self-interaction" (Blumer, 1969: 62). What ensues is a social actor who exudes, on his or her own behalf, a moral characterization.

In consequence, when an individual projects a definition of the situation and thereby makes an implicit or explicit claim to be a person of a particular kind, he automatically exerts a moral demand upon the others, obliging them to value and treat him in the manner that persons of his kind have a right to expect. He also implicitly forgoes all claims to be things he does not appear to be and hence forgoes the treatment that would be appropriate for such individuals. The others find, then, that the individual has informed them as to what is and what they ought to see as the "is" (Goffman, 1959: 13).

Thus, people act upon themselves. In this situation of interaction those in roles of importance test their perceptions of individuals in other roles on a continual basis, and vice-versa. A "ladies' man" fits such a

description. When this man's sexual exploits become public knowledge, his coexistents will see him as the "is" Goffman describes (above): the 'straight as an arrow' heterosexual male, and a far cry from (Adam, 1987: 100) a player in the "commercial gay world" wherein "'fast food' sex," as it is sometimes regarded, takes precedence over the alleged "lasting relationships among men" which being a straight male extends to a man besides heterosexual sex. Women are affected vehemently, and are referenced, symbolically, in the conversations of these men so that the latter may protect themselves against accusations of "gayness" (Hart, 1990). The response from other people to the type of male in question will make the "ladies' man" reinforce and/or question their perceptions of him.

The preceding manner of maintaining or changing one's role behaviour is called role-making, interactive processes which "emerge and shift as persons establish and negotiate the task at hand" (Denzin, 1992: 26). The individual learns to adapt to the shame, as in this example, applied to a gay identity, and "contain" the source of this shame from one situation to the next. Blumer (1969: 63-4) expands:

the process of self-interaction puts the human being over against his world instead of merely in it, requires him to meet and handle his world through a defining process instead of merely responding to it, and forces him to construct his action instead of merely releasing it.

2.1.2 Interactions in the Police Occupational Subculture

Goldman (1950) and Westley (1952) were the first social scientists to confirm, empirically, that police officers interact and operate within a distinct occupational subculture. The chief characteristics of this subculture (Westley, 1956; Wexler, 1974; Vincent, 1990; Forcese, 1992) are identified as: intense peer-group feelings of solidarity²; cynicism toward many laws which members of the police subculture are required to uphold and toward many people they are obliged to protect; and, a feeling of alienation from civilians.

A police service is nearly ninety-percent male, and a traditionally working-class culture outfitted with "role-appropriate personal qualities" (Goffman, 1961: 87). An officer of the law is presumed to be stoic, strong, determined, and honourable.

These personal qualities...provide a basis of *self-image* for the incumbent and a basis for the image that his role others will have of him. A self, then, virtually awaits the individual entering a position; he need only conform to the pressures on him and he will find a *me* ready-made for him (Ibid.).

The police subculture is a unique group. It is said police officers acquire from their equals a "masculinity complex" that holds the "conceptual key which unlocks the door to their personality dynamics" (Adlam, 1981: 163) and affirms how police will interact with one another. The occupational subculture is a police officer's placement in a "world of experience" that is "organized into a body of localized,

interactional practices which reify these relational-structural forms" (Denzin, 1992: 28) and require a great deal of routine bonding, most noteworthy for the male element.

Every day officers must interact with same-sex colleagues on the force. Gradually, the affinity between police grows into genuine amity until it finally becomes a fixture in their personal lives fostered by the ongoing "friendship, the solidarity of men [and] membership in a virile men's organization" (Vincent, 1990: 52) in which police officers take much pride.³ The police occupational subculture comes to symbolize a surrogate family for its collective, yet personal intimacy is not a requisite or even a desirable feature of this comradeship or, in policing, partnership. Thus male bonding, when homosocial, provides sustenance for male privilege and hegemony (Hart, 1990) set with firm boundaries.

The police service has come to represent a highly regulated order of stability and conformity with a myriad of relations and restrictions. Homosexuals, it seems, have no place in that order (Burke, 1994: 193).

As a result masculine hegemony detains men and women within the limits of traditionally-defined gender roles, a very material component of what may be labelled "copness"⁴: the screening of a masculine orientation from, and its disassociation with, "gayness". While any number of factors merit analysis as to reasons why, here this researcher has elected to mark out for investigation two of what Whyte (1993a: 14) identifies as "constant risks of being masculine."

These risks (Ibid.) are heterosexual fears, both the product of a man's self-policing and the constitution of the other as a means thereto in interaction: of the male body being even remotely attractive to other men; and, the fear of homosocial bonding becoming homoerotic. The presentation of this (heterosexual) interactional self is therefore two-fold in the police setting, demanding the containment of homoerotic sensations and actions to protract *straight monotony*, and secondly, appeasement of an insistent wider society (which police must serve and protect) that does not accept homosexuality as normal. By this token for the average officer, be that person straight or gay, masculine hegemony becomes (Ibid.)

inherently blackmailable and homophobia becomes a strategy of containment of, masculinity...the power which men employ towards one another is affective, it goes to the core of their being, to their subjectivity, to their masculinity.

Vincent's (1990: 139-40) conclusions corroborate the idea Whyte posits, for in the police subculture an officer is expected to

be very appreciative of female flesh and figure. The slightest overt sign of bisexuality, homosexuality, or effeminacy would mean derision and ostracism.

The determination of an individual not to give play to the imagination of being a "fag" or a "dyke" brings forth in him or her a turgid level of homophobia that he or she uses among fellows to ward off such stigmas. This encourages the containment of homosexuality by those confederated in the

police subculture, and consigns hegemonic masculinity as an apparatus⁵ that proves one's masculinity. For example, a man, in an emblematic gesture, "overcompensates by acting macho, or worse, he feels he has to prove his masculinity by asserting power over weaker girls, women, and gays" (Bruzzone, in Vogels, 1994: 12), laden with heterosexist meanings.

When individual action turns into collective action the police subculture tenders a safe haven for members in need of "social support and reduced anxiety about their own manliness" and, inordinate circumstances notwithstanding, concedes "hatred for, and fear of, gay men" (Donaldson, 1993: 648). Masculine hegemony, thus, unfolds the line of demarcation of police behaviour collated in the subcultural environment and safeguards "professional neutrality" and/or self-possession in a male-dominated ambience. A police officer's badge of office is a symbol of public trust not to be disgraced by reproachable conduct, like "gayness":

the discrepant status of homosexuality in law, the machismo sub-culture of the police and the role of the police as regulators of deviance all make it difficult for the police to adopt or accept a non-conformist orientation (Burke, 1994: 193).

This poses a serious problem for those officers unaffected by shame and undeterred by the conformist influences of heterosexual hegemony.

In the trappings of the police subculture, peer-group hegemony, or how a group defines its material identity, "commodified in the exchange relations that the person enters

into" (Denzin, 1992: 26), is stern. Newly sworn-in officers are at first unaware of the extent to which police solidarity shapes this subculture but soon come to live "within the confines of a total institutional structure" (Vincent, 1990: 109-10). A police officer bestows upon himself or herself, metaphorically speaking, "armour"⁶: not a uniform, but instead a model of the way he or she *should be* as a constituent of this occupational subculture. And, when an officer's true ideological self, cultivated amid interaction where "imaginary relations of individuals to the real relations in which they 'live' and which govern their existence" (Althusser, 1971: 165) take place, it is either threatened or provoked by others (indicative of "closeted" gay and lesbian officers). The way to evade this conflict of identity is to "with poise suppress all signs of shame and embarrassment" (Goffman, 1967: 110).

With such complacent homosocial interactions in the police subculture, the all-inclusive afteraffects of its class-like (rank) stratification show how dutiful members simplify the ordering of hegemonic masculinities to how "particular groups of men inhabit positions of power and wealth and how they legitimate and reproduce the social relationships that generate their dominance" (Carrigan, Connell, and Lee, 1985: 179). This leaves gay men, as Messerschmidt (1993: 184) expounds, to categorically

represent subordinated masculinities. In this way, then, the police construct a...heterosexual form of hegemonic masculinity through the authorized practice of controlling "deviant" behavior of "inferior" men.

The natural order of masculine hegemony is therefore maintained, both in interactions outside of the police subculture and internally among the individual officers, for in wider society's "all-male groups" it is held, figuratively, that "an adult man who is penetrated...symbolically betrays his sex's right to power" (Gough and Macnair, 1985: 34), conduct considered a "glory hole" on policing's "blue wall".

2.1.3 Interactions in the Gay Subculture

Nowhere has the influence of symbolic interactionism been more strongly felt than in the analysis of "deviants". If deviance consists in breaking rules, then it is a social group that creates this deviance by making the rules.

From this point of view, deviance is not the quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender' (Waters, 1994: 30).

In wider society the gay community is deviant and carries with it a stigma.⁷ The symbolic interactions of this group are "constantly constructed within the history of an evolving social structure...of sexual power relations" (Carrigan, Connell, and Lee, 1985: 176) where a stark heterosexual-homosexual dichotomy is routine and the threshold of tolerable homoeroticism in homosocial interactions is miniscule. Suffice to say homosexual relations, not unlike heterosexual relations, are seemingly sanctioned by the structural make-up (hegemonic and subordinated masculinities) of masculine hegemony.

When the very word "homosexuality" was invented as a social category to both symbolize and pathologize contraventions of male and female gender roles (susceptible to shaming), homoerotic pleasure was from that point on "expelled from the masculine and located in a deviant group" (Connell, 1993: 611). Moreover, "there was no mirror-type of 'the heterosexual'; rather, heterosexuality became a required connotation of manliness" (Ibid.) and allowed for the containment of gay interactions and gay sex. However, the word homosexuality also gives to the gay community a self-identity from which its members can organize themselves against the political, ideological, psychological, and above all shameful restraints of masculine hegemony on "gayness" deployed in the wider society, and in the police subculture.

Homosexuality is no longer a criminal behaviour, albeit conditionally: sexual relations are to involve adults of or above the age of eighteen and must take place in private settings. Contained by a straightworld criminal code, homoerotic interaction is by law defined as the actions of subordinated masculinities, and demands of gays two modes of impression management, what Goffman (1963) terms *in-group alignment* and *out-group alignment*.

Two homosexual roles are learned: the role as perceived by the conventional society, and the role as conceived by members of the homosexual community...Although a uniform perception of the homosexual role does not exist among homosexuals as a group, gay men learn through experience that heterosexual society's portrait of homosexual roles is largely inaccurate (Troiden, 1988: 72).

For gays, in-group interaction occurs within the gay community, or subculture. Its members are likely to bear continuously--and mutually--wider society's shaming and stigmatizing over being "the exception to" (Bawer, 1993: 165), in a heterosexist dominant culture. In a gay's own process of "coming out", the given individual fends off many social barriers to affirm himself or herself as normal (not just "that gay" or "that lesbian"); overall, an enduring struggle with the "inner stream of consciousness" (Denzin, 1992: 26) of that person, known as the phenomenological self. This path becomes easier when more people in the gay community admit they are gay and help to define a positive symbol of a gay identity for others, and most importantly themselves because a natural function of symbols is to enhance social cohesiveness and a commitment, through socialization, to the norms and values of a unified community.

Homoerotic bonding in the gay subculture offers gays "a willingness to assert one's homosexuality as an important part of one's whole life" and the chance for gays to collectively "represent a sense of shared values" (Altman, 1982: 8). It is a place where gays and the social interactions produced in their subcultural environment are not looked upon, respectively, as failures of and failed attempts at masculine hegemony as constructed in wider society, but as a group of people whose commitment to each other is the fulfillment of a "resolute and affirmative sense of self and of belonging"

(Weeks, in Altman, 1993: 7) whilst they call themselves a member of the gay community. The gay community, by virtue of the perceived nature of its homoeroticism (including the "leather culture" and sado-masochism), becomes the essence, or ultimate symbol, of "sexual orientation" and in effect carries a certain burden of both gender and sexual identities presumed to be abnormal, while straights remain exempt from this labelling process: does a "heterosexual orientation" exist?

Sociologists (Pleck, 1980; Humphries, 1985; Herek, 1986) have for years now observed symbols of hegemonic masculinity reproduced in the gay subculture through the choice of, as examples, language (use of the word "queer" by gays), dress (leather, denim), and sexual objectification (gay sexist colloquialisms). Together these symbols are revoking a gay's designation as a masculine subordinate and presenting a gay man as aggressive and strong (sexually)--traits akin to a heterosexual presentation of self--while meaning to shatter the myth of the gay subculture as a conflux intrinsically deviant and/or effeminate.

Out-group interaction for gays in straight society is an exacerbated task. For the majority of gays, here lies the test of having to present their self to others from "the point of view of a second grouping: the normals and the wider society that they constitute" (Goffman, 1963: 114-5). And, while some members of the gay community are successful in escaping the constraints of masculine hegemony, the silent,

closeted gays keep their true self-identity privatized and enter a state of denial, an unconditional surrendering to masculine hegemony "self-created and self-controlled" (Plummer, 1981: 56). Aware of the inevitable social and economic consequences which follow being openly gay, a dualism emerges in the process of a gay man's self-policing: he interacts as "a gay" among his equals but also interacts as "a straight" among heterosexual colleagues, acquaintances, and family.

If one does not have an overt sexual identity in a society where heterosexuality is omnipresent, one essentially passes as heterosexual with all the political implications that implies for males and females (Edwards, 1994: 54).

In sum, this interactive role-making with out-group significant others leaves the in-group ghettoized.

Nevertheless, heterosexual men are to some extent envious of those in the gay subculture in that the latter group (mostly the men) is not counteracted by the almost ceremonial, obligatory rites of homosocial bonding (marriage, or the endless playing out of a straight gender role) where these interactive rituals are observed to be "superficial" (Nuttin and Crano, 1989), in that the above examples serve to reaffirm a person's "straightness". Straight men especially are more uncomfortable with public displays of affection (like hugging another man) because of how male others may define the situation, while gay men are more at ease (see Edwards, 1994). A heterosexual man does not want to be shamed sexually, or

judged to be effeminate, let alone gay. Donaldson (1993: 648) pursues this theme and writes that masculine hegemony is also

threatened by the assertion of a homosexual identity conflict that homosexuals are able to give each other sexual pleasure...the inherent egalitarianism in gay relationships that exists because of this transitive structure (my lover's lover can also be my lover), challenges the hierarchial and oppressive nature of male heterosexuality.

Overall, the psychic forces of social interaction (one's feelings, needs, and overt behaviour) and signifiers of a gay identity (reduced to sexual indicators) control the exposure of the self to others, an austere meaning of deviance those in the gay subculture absorb. The

sense of otherness, outsider identity, or simply difference, is partly the outcome of the definition of gay sexuality itself as other and different and partly the result of the practical and social parameters put around potential same-sex relationships (Edwards, 1994: 112-3).

Only the non-acceptance of gays in wider society stands in the way of their lifestyle being accepted. Masculine hegemony implies that individuals must be homogeneous, which for a gay person means ultimately choosing between two cultural affinities: assimilation into a heterosexist society, or individuality offered in the gay subculture.

2.1.4 Police-Gay Interactions

Interactive encounters between police and gays have taken place discriminately in observed covert meetings with hidden homosexuals in public washrooms; police supervision of private gay clubs through license checks, surveillance operations, or

raids; and, confrontations at gay liberation rallies between police and "politicized" gays. These eventualities, including harassment and entrapment methods by police, isolate the gay community from the latter. Masculine hegemony is accentuated, and is an extremely important variable in the maintenance of the police self-image, as police are not expected to succumb to shaming publicly.' Gayness is a symbol of being shamed; therefore, homoeroticism must be repressed, hence a motive behind its containment and the conservation of masculine hegemony.

What symbolic processes are at work here? Interactionism contributes this account of a dominant group's behaviour in relation to a lesser, "deviant" group:

some people become deviant...because their location in society means that they were less exposed to its dominant norms and values and were thus free to constitute norms and values of their own...The underlying notion within such a view is that deviants are different sorts of people from 'normals', they are disadvantaged¹⁰ (Waters, 1994: 30).

The legacy of police-gay encounters precipitates a militant conceptualization of the police subculture as but one group of many who must be won over to adjust the thinking of the larger society, and a group to ignore and struggle against as representatives of a value system (masculine hegemony) inequitable to gays.

Pressure on the gay self is enormous: "will we be unsettled in the presence of police officers? Will we be able to come out to them?" (gay male 9). These questions are

typical of circumstantial self-meanings gays deal with in "situations of interaction [which] may be routinized, ritualized, or highly problematic. In them consequential experience occurs" (Denzin, 1992: 26); homosexual witch-hunting was once routine duty, and arrests for lewd (gay) behaviour were of high priority to police chiefs. These choice interactions allowed police "to foster rather than to prevent crime" (Gallo, et. al., in Humphreys, 1970/1975: 88) in communities where inequality (gay areas suffice) was a symbol (Forcese, 1992: 5) of "numerous police and police interventions", called "overpolicing".

How is containment of "gayness" catalyzed in situations where police and gays confront one another directly? The police and gay subcultures are both tightly-knit networks, though a gay's ability to be part of an invisible minority makes "gayness" harder to contain. The self, the matter braving shame,

is powerfully sensitive to the social and cultural environment. But because the self is structured by responding to external influences through internalization, what was once external becomes internal, and the demarcation between external and internal is no longer sharp (Menaker, 1992: 127).

The policing of gays, consequently, gives the impression of heterosexuals being ashamed of experiencing shame relating to their sexuality.¹¹

It is no wonder police are cited as using their wide powers of discretion under the law in ways that are anti-gay. A retired (lesbian) officer reveals that for men in the police

subculture it means "power-tripping" (lesbian officer 2). Society grants police a monopoly on the use of violence; "the borders of action are laced with stretchable legal concepts like 'reasonable suspicion', 'probable cause', 'questionable circumstances', and 'articulable grounds'" (Bouza, 1990: 6). Gays argue ambivalence toward policemen stems from these powers exercised in the private realm of the gay subculture. The failure of police to discern public and private (gay) sexual and socially interactive conduct invites speculation: how does one's role and perspective in a reference group undergo change during exceptional situations in interaction with others?

Answers unfold when situations in which masculine hegemony is rather extreme in its administration are explored. First, there is the worst possible case-scenario, hypothesized by Messerschmidt (1993: 184), of a policeman as *gay-basher* and a gay man as *victim*.

Gay-bashing by police officers serves as a resource for constructing a specific form of masculinity: physical violence against gay men witnessed by other heterosexual street cops reaffirms one's commitment to what is "for them" natural and masculine sex--heterosexuality. Thus, the victim of police gay-bashing serves symbolically as an instrument for confirming one's heterosexual status among street cops (Messerschmidt, 1993: 184).

The second, more realistically, explains those instances where the police, as a group, cannot identify with routine calls involving gays. During interaction of any kind, "human beings create the worlds of experience they live in" (Denzin,

1992: 25). However, when police officers act upon the meanings a gay identity has for them, the cardinal stereotype of gays as "sex-crazed maniacs functions socially to keep individuals' sexuality contained" (Mohr, 1988: 25) and clouds the officers' perceptions. The police service, for example, does not have the power to interpret domestic incidents between a gay or lesbian couple. How do police officer's self-reflections fare when faced with a person who admits to being a victim of violence in a same-sex situation? Heterosexist ideology is attuned to the concept of the "straight", nuclear family; it is important for police to understand the symbolic diversity of family dynamics when they go to someone's house, for instance to understand that a home with four men can mean two partners and their children.

Most recently, the public's fear of AIDS and the moral panics generated by it have given being gay meaning in policing as a "vector of transmission for disease and death" (Kinsman, 1993: 4), an operational discourse maintaining the adages of heterosexuality as the "only 'normal', properly gendered, 'healthy' and 'safe' way of life" (Ibid.)--masculine hegemony as determinant of a homeostasis, "whence its privileged link with the law" (Foucault, 1980: 107), in the police system.

Our survival depends on the family. Gays are frequently perceived as subverters of the family or, at best, as indifferent to the institution. As alarms over societal survival escalate, those seen as threats are responded to more harshly (Bouza, 1990: 221),

and become principal targets for lawful and societal shaming, a symbol of the police subculture limiting "gay public visibility" and keeping a gay identity "contained" (Kinsman, 1987: 208).

Police-gay encounters are also a vehicle for the police subculture's resistance to change. Here administrative powers reside in the hands of few, while rank-and-file officers, "followers" as Leinen (1993: 199) describes them, make up the balance. (Masculine) hegemony--when used as a "political utility of rejection as a way to control discreditable groups so as to maintain the status quo" (Ibid.) and ensure advancement in policing--stands as the unwritten code of conduct for a police service. If a gay identity in a person is not honourable, and if at an officer's discretion being seen with a gay person could make the officer lose face or cause embarrassment later in the accompaniment of peers or civilians, measures will be taken accordingly.¹² As regularly noted in the police subcultural setting (Reuss-Ianni, 1983: 119), "the headquarters managers can mandate...any planning model but they cannot make street cops/workers treat the new program seriously or honestly." In retrospect, Shearing's (1981: 286) model of a police target as "scum" and the public as "victim" is effective in this context of police-gay interactions, when the gay community is the former and wider society is the latter:

the scum are..."in essence" troublemakers, while
the public are "in essence" their victims. In

distinguishing between the scum and the public as two classes who oppose each other as enemies, the police subculture makes available to the police a social theory that they can use in the context of their work to define situations and to construct a course of action in response to them. This theory enables the police to transcend the situated features of encounters by relating them to a broader social context which identifies the "real trouble-makers" and "real victims."

So long as the law regulating and "containing" sexuality is biased more against gays than heterosexuals, police-gay interactions will always produce subjective, "textually-mediated social relations" (Smith, 1988: 178), originating from the categories in Canada's Criminal Code, in the police subculture. And,

although law enforcement practices appear objective, they are in fact gendered...regardless of how individual police officers view homosexuality.¹² [This] enforces normative heterosexuality by ensuring that human sexual activity takes place in private-home settings (Messerschmidt, 1993: 184).

The fallacy is that cultural prescriptions (overt or covert) in the police subculture, among them the labelling of gays as "deviant" (given a police officer's authority as an enforcer of laws which prohibit deviant sexual behaviour), rather than actual interactive experiences with gay people, form the basis for most heterosexist attitudes and behaviours toward the gay community as a whole.

2.2 THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF MASCULINE HEGEMONY AND POLICE-GAY INTERACTIONS

Sexuality...is the name that can be given to a historical construct: not a furtive reality that is difficult to grasp, but a great surface network in which the stimulation of bodies, the intensification of pleasures, the incitement to discourse, the formation of special knowledges, the strengthening of controls and resistances, are linked to one another, in accordance with a few major strategies of knowledge and power (Foucault, 1980: 105-6).

In the subsequent sections an historical approach is taken to illustrate the various contextual artifacts of masculine hegemony, and the containment of "gayness", as they have evolved over time through the deployment of masculine hegemony by church and state. Gay stereotyping is explained first; then, how the latter process becomes nurtured in the police (causal and affected) and gay subcultures (affected), as a point of focus for police-gay interactions both in the past and at present, are explored. This is to ensure that the reader understands the frequency of the interactions.

2.2.1 The Containment of a Gay Identity

Police have a hard time ascertaining how the gay community has the propensity to proclaim a gay identity. Another issue that gives members of the police subculture trouble when interacting with gays is the distinction the police make between being straight or gay, evident when officers ask gays: "why can't you be like everyone else?" (gay male 1). To quote the president of Ottawa's Pink Triangle Services (PTS), and a male officer on the Ottawa-Carleton

Police Service (OCPS), "unless you can understand gay shame, you cannot understand gay pride." Symbolically, gays stand as an "invisible" minority group: the gay community does not have reflected for it images of a "visible" minority group and lack totally the social and cultural support of one because not everyone in the gay community is known publicly ("closeted" gays). In their place a series of stereotypes has been presented and taken as truth to "contain" a gay identity.

Religion

First, gays are sinners. Despite selected and literal usage of Biblical passages to purport abhorrence of homosexuality by clerics and scholars, the word "homosexual" (or an equivalent "translated" term) is absent in the Bible (Boswell, 1980). Catholicism and Protestantism made firm their bearing on sexual regulation, asserting sexual intercourse as a procreative function, and not as a vice. Masculine hegemony was paramount: female sexuality was contained by the sanctity of marriage, and non-procreative sexualities, including prostitution and sex outside wedlock, were also controlled.

Male homosexuality received the harshest sentence, and the Church targetted what it termed a craft: sodomy.

Leviticus 18[:23]: "You shall not lie with a male as with a female, for it is an abomination," ignominious and unspeakable. Intercourse with a male incurs the same penalty--death--as intercourse with an animal. Whence Leviticus 20[:13]: "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put

to death; their blood shall be upon them" (Ibid.: 376-7).

Homosexuality, more so than any of the other "sins of the flesh" (Weeks, 1986: 32), could lead to damnation, a paranoiac ideology that in earlier times spread the fear that if left unabated by moral authoritarians, homosexuality would snare the entire laity into its "practice".

Religion, as an institution, was the forerunner of gay containment in the wider society one sees today. Oddly enough, these church actions predated "the homosexual", who had yet to reach a personage until the late nineteenth century.

The Law

Masculine hegemony has also allowed for the classification of gays as criminals. The 1553 Act of Henry VIII in Britain was the legislation responsible for condemning gays convicted of sodomy to death, sentencing not eradicated until the 1930s. The Criminal Law Amendment (Section 11) of 1885 then emerged, intertwined with "concern over national identity" (Edwards, 1994: 17), which a gay identity infringed upon, and made homoerotic relations illegal totally.¹⁴

Change began to abound in the late 1960s. Britain lifted its criminal treatment of homosexuality to tolerate (and not condone) this sexual practice (the 1967 Sexual Offences Act) amid powerful social norms which proscribed such sexual behaviour. Only if the participants "were over twenty-one at

home alone and kept the curtains closed and the noise down were [they] within the law" (Ibid.: 22). Canada followed suit in 1969 with an amendment to its criminal code that before, in legal diction, defined homosexuality as sexual psychopathic behaviour (see Kinsman, 1993). Those reforms were the result of the Report of Britain's Wolfenden Committee (1963: 52).

It is obvious that however 'mature' a boy of that age may be as regards physical development or psycho-sexual make-up, and whatever analogies may be drawn from the law relating to offences against young girls, a boy is incapable, at the age of sixteen¹⁵, of forming a mature judgement about actions of a kind which might have the affect of setting him apart from the rest of society.

A negative approach in the application of the Criminal Code to sexually related matters is taken because of the doubt that homosexuality is a choice in most cases and the belief that it is learned behaviour, just as language is learned behaviour: "because our society frowns on heterosexual relationships at the very early stages of sexual development, it is not suprising that the first sexual activity for many young people is a homosexual one" (Ramcharan, 1989: 174).

"The Homosexual"

In 1869 the homosexual person, in clinical terms and in name, was born.¹⁶ "Gayness" was diagnosed as a sickness, and medicalized as a socially and sexually psychopathic condition (with the theory: if gays are sick, they must be "cured"). In the hierarchy of masculinities, gays took their place (Foucault, 1980: 43):

Homosexuality appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed from the practice of sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphrodism of the soul. The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species.

It took until 1974 for homosexuality to be abolished from the list of diseases registered by the American Psychiatric Association, bringing to an end the reign of doctors as "the new priesthood" (Weeks, 1986: 12) in one area of so-called deviant sexual behaviour, a position supported by the Canadian Psychiatric Association.¹⁷

Paedophilia

Even today gays are often portrayed as paedophiles, which makes it imperative to distinguish homosexuality from paedophilia, two different practices. The argument from those who equate being gay with pedasty is that it is non-consensual. Children do not have the boundaries and sexual awareness that adults do, and even with teenagers there is almost certainly going to be an abuse of power from an older person. Young people rarely have the personal autonomy to avoid being taken sexually advantage of, and it is the paedophile's attraction to that powerlessness that makes it appear as a pathology rather than a healthy relationship.

"What is most interesting in the avoidance strategies used by playing the simplistic *homosexual*, therefore *paedophile* game is not only the avoidance of the question of power politics in sexual activities but also avoidance of the slightly large class of sexual abuses that occur between adult males and underage females in what might be taken as an *implementation-specific* detail of heterosexuality at large. It remains a marvel of reasoning that arguments developed

along the line of *paedophile*, therefore heterosexual and from there to the position that to protect innocent children we must clearly outlaw heterosexuality as the gateway of moral degeneracy that leads to paedophilism are never developed" (gay male 9).

There is a reason for this ideology. The feeling is that if the adults of today had been socialized and/or seduced by what one police officer calls a "skillful homosexual child-molestor", such as a member of the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA), they would probably be gay right now. Moreover, sentiments are that homosexuality is not a phase one grows out of, but a sexuality children are unable to change if left too long as such.

Gay Mythology

Altman (1982: 172-207) identifies three redundant themes in gay mythology: gay sexuality's "promiscuity", its "publicness", and its "kinkiness". Promiscuity is the most widely used stereotype. A common denominator of the negative caricatures given gays and gay sex is the perceived nature of gay sexual encounters. Because homoeroticism is made private by law it becomes, quite easily, "impersonal" sex of a kind deplorable even to some gays:

"Promiscuity is rampant in the gay community. Dysfunctional sex leads its participants to pursue stranger and stranger sex with more and more people in an attempt to reach the sexual high which is attainable only with natural heterosexual sex. Male homosexuals routinely have hundreds of sexual partners during their sexually active years and these quantities translate into dysfunctionality" (gay male 7).

The best-known locales for impersonal sex are steam baths, public washrooms, and public parks, where it is not uncommon to raise furor in straight society, although to say that the average gay male has a significantly greater number of sexual partners than the average heterosexual male does is empirically unsubstantiated.

These cumulative stereotypes demonstrate how dominant forces in the deployment of masculine hegemony, "medicine and psychology, sexology and pedagogy, took a role, alongside the Churches, [in] establishing moral and social standards" (Weeks, 1986: 12), and had (have) the capacity to associate "gayness" with abnormality. Heterosexuality is normal due to its majority in numbers and level of social acceptance. A majority is almost always seen as the norm, and homosexuality is abnormal due to it being in a minority.

2.2.2 A Brief History of Police-Gay Interactions in Ottawa

Ottawa's gay community used to be very closeted and paranoid, a throwback to one controversial police issue: national security. Gay men were deemed "security risks", the equivalent of spies, as part of a purge campaign that lasted from the 1950s through to the 1960s. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) made it their mandate to identify gays in public service and report them as security risks to federal authorities. Files were kept on these gays (some nine thousand in Ottawa alone), with some terminated from their

workplace. A blatant exercise in masculine hegemony, police assumed gay public servants could be blackmailed by straight cohorts--a fallible quality ranking gays lower on the hierarchy of masculinities where they occupied the subordinate category, a practice transported to local police.

To search out gays, the Ottawa police used the morality squad in the city's gay "ghettos". The gay community faced a two-pronged attack: the RCMP (federal), looking after national security; and, the Ottawa Police (municipal), representing the guardians of public morality. This deliverance of gay containment in Ottawa was felt into the 1980s, and the public shaming that befell many gay men left a residue of paranoia that was quite distinct from other Canadian cities (state many gay respondents).

Meanwhile, in the United States, came the year of "Stonewall". On June 28, 1969, police routinely raided New York's Stonewall Inn, a bar frequented by gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgenders (GLBTs). The police were forced to barricade themselves inside the bar when the gay community united against the police in a show of solidarity. In the words of a lesbian respondent, "it was about finally standing up against a system that allowed a person to be abused for not conforming to a standard set by those who had the power to oppress gays." Gay liberation was officially born out of an encounter between police and gays.

The same revelation was realized in Canada twelve years later, enacted, symbolically, by a 1981 series of police raids on gay bathhouses and bars in Toronto, Ontario, and the ensuing mass-arrests of gay owners and patrons of these locales.

Whatever the reasons for the raids, they have had a startling effect on the gay community. Gay people who previously led quiet discreet lives have become rebels with a cause, literally overnight (in Action!, a special publication of the Right to Privacy Committee, undated, in McMahon and Ericson, 1984: 25).

The Association of Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals of Ottawa (ALGBO; formerly the Gays of Ottawa (GO)), formed in 1971 on the heels of "Stonewall", proved that amid dominant masculine hegemony there did exist a distinct gay identity in the capital region. This sparked the establishment of a stronger, well-organized group with a well-defined system of interactions and communications, and a platform for gay economic strength and politicization.

The example of homosexuality...provided a repertoire of political strategies and organizational forms for the mobilization of other erotic populations. Transvestites, transsexuals, paedophiles, sado-masochists, fetishists, bisexuals, prostitutes and others have vocally emerged, clamouring for their right of self-expression and legitimacy (Weeks, 1986: 77).

Four highly publicized events occurred which further scarred police-gay interactions and relations in Ottawa. In 1975 a male prostitution ring involving teenage boys was broken by Ottawa police. The "leader" of the ring possessed a list of clients, names of which were released by police for public consumption (gay male 6). Police relayed to civilians

that it was not acceptable within the law to be homoerotic in one's lifestyle, publicly or privately. How were the effects of this raid taken? Of the named individuals, none were ever found guilty by law, and few cases were ever brought to court (gay male 2).

That incident nonetheless struck fear into the gay community. One year later the police raided gay establishments in Ottawa, part of the systematic gay pogroms which commenced in nearby Montreal, Quebec, prior to it hosting the Summer Olympic Games (see Kinsman, 1987). The men arrested were cited as being "found-ins" of a "bawdy house". These proceedings symbolized that in the police subculture, then, homosexuality was seen as a contagion, and dirty (the raids in Montreal were code-named "Operation Soap").

In light of the police raids in Toronto a landmark meeting was arranged (February, 1982) between the Ottawa Police and the gay community at the GO Centre. Ottawa Police representatives were in attendance "to establish an ongoing, meaningful, and constructive liaison between the police and the gay community" (LeBlanc, 1982: 2) and to generate "open dialogue with a view to avoiding conflicts in the future" (Ibid.). Initial social interactions are difficult, and police-gay interactive encounters are no exception. From a gay perspective, the police offered lip service:

[With] no concerted effort to educate members of the force about the position in society of the gay minority it was time that gay groups should come into police

training sessions and that eventually GO could have input into the ongoing training of officers (Ibid.).

At street level, the then-manager of "Club Ottawa" called the encounter a "farce" (Ibid.), adding of police management, "I just can't trust them. They don't seem to be aware about what the cop on the beat is doing" (Ibid.). Despite a by-law preventing discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, gays realized "it does not apply to the police" (Ibid.). There was a definite lack of communication between police administrators and rank-and-file officers, which meant that gay police officers could not "come out" on the police service.

In the month of May, 1984, in Ottawa, the RCMP unveiled a document targetting gay men and lesbian women in the form of then-Commissioner R.H. Simmond's standing orders: the RCMP Policy in Respect of Homosexual Conduct (RPRHC). The document's materiality was generalized to embrace the sentiments of police services nation-wide (supposedly to placate public interests) and a gratuitous anti-gay sentiment to forge a singularized model of police policy and procedure. The underlying message was that in order to contain a gay identity the police subculture had to maintain its masculine, powerful identity for its audience--the wider society. The policy stated, undeniably, that "gayness" was a "bonafide operational and occupational impediment" (Simmonds, RPRHC, in GO INFO, July/August, 1985: 3), an undisciplinatory orientation not fit for policing. Because the police "are a reflection of

the community's mores" (Ibid.), there was a reluctance to recruit and publicly accept gays in policing for fear of the police losing the "faith and trust" (Ibid.) of the civilian population and risk of "public repugnance" (Ibid.). Reference to the holistic police self-image is paramount; in fact, it is collective properties of the police subculture emphasized, not individual experiences.

The employment of homosexuals could be most disruptive and lead to incidents of violence against the homosexual. The effectiveness of police service is, more so than any other activity, predicated in strong group cohesion and morale. The employment of homosexuals would be subversive of both (Ibid.).

Moreover,

police forces of this nation have traditionally exhibited a strong abhorrence to homosexual behaviour to a far greater degree than some segments of their corresponding civilian population...police adopt a paternalistic relationship to its members and, as such, it endeavours to ensure that the majority are kept happy and that their individual rights will be respected to the greatest degree possible with the Force structure (Ibid.).

It was obvious that an "openly" gay person would not be welcomed in this occupational system.

Throughout the duration of these events there persisted in Ottawa a history of violence suffered by members of the gay community and cynicism shown towards it by police (OCPS Bias Crime Unit (BCU), 1994). Gays were severely beaten by gay-bashers over a number of decades in known "cruising" areas but few ever reported the attacks. A low percentage of anti-gay crimes which occur annually are ever reported to the police, "a legacy spawned by the fear of being gay and the fear that

the gay community will be treated even worse by the police" (gay male 10, male officer 3). In more symbolic terms, police-gay interactions are marked by five "barriers" (OCPS BCU and the Liaison Committee (LC), 1995: 16-7): (1) a mistrust of police; (2) "homophobic" attitudes of police services; (3) a history of inadequate police training on "gay issues"; (4) lack of systematic data collection for anti-gay crimes; and (5), "the stigma attached to being the victim of a hate crime." Most shocking was the death of Alain Brousseau six years ago. Beaten, robbed, and then thrown from a bridge, Brousseau was murdered not because he was gay (he was not), but perceived to be gay by his assailants. Gays remain outspoken on this incident because of the attention paid to the fact that Brousseau was heterosexual. His murder is a regional symbol of how the deployment of masculine hegemony can result in destructive behaviour.

It is in this historical context that in January, 1993, the OCPS formed a Bias Crime Unit (BCU).

2.2.3 Police-Gay Liaison

Ottawa lays claim to the first Canadian police service to establish a BCU, staffed by four officers. Their duties include handling violent crimes motivated by homophobic bias. Since that time, fifty-two reported anti-gay crimes have been investigated in Ottawa (Gannon, 1995: 11). The OCPS Liaison Committee (LC), a recognized police unit serving the GLBT communities, has as its objectives to secure provincial

and federal legislation on hate crimes in Canada and to lobby against homophobic ideology at all levels of society in co-operation with the police. In 1994 the LC implemented the Community Access Project, aimed at giving officers of the OCPS a "gay perspective" on community relations and bringing the police service and the gay community closer together. The LC is also allied with the AIDS Committee of Ottawa (ACO), the ALGBO, the Gender Mosaic (transgender support group), the Ottawa Knights (leather culture), and PTS, whose representatives (and the BCU) attend monthly LC meetings at the police station.

In an unprecedented move Chief Brian Ford hired LC co-chair David Pepper (a civilian gay activist; Carol Holland is the other co-chair) as director of community development and senior assistant to the chief of police, in 1995. Because a police officer is not the chief's "confidant", police homophobia may escalate; this researcher was told by gay professionals "you don't gain points by working with fags and dykes." Select gay community workers (from the LC, PTS, and the ACO) with officers from the OCPS Human Resources department co-ordinate and present anti-homophobia workshops two-to-three-times a year as part of the OCPS diversity training sessions (the police and gays meet in a gay setting (PTS) and socialize together after training sessions), with the vision of reaching every sworn-in officer on the OCPS.

2.2.3.1 Police, Gays, and Diversity Training

In social systems "few groups are so closely identified with shame as the male homosexual" (Nathanson, 1992: 298). The only members of the Ottawa Police in attendance at the first police-gay liaison meeting (1989) were police educators and trainers. Says one gay male: "they were older men, and a bastion of old-fashioned ideals." A distinct feeling of shame clouded the perceptions of the gays, by police, during this interactive experience:

"One trainer could not even look us in the eye and spent the whole time looking down at his table, sometimes glancing up and making comments that we [gays] were criminal in our activities. Their liaison for minority communities happened to be a minister of the United Church of Canada (UCC), so homophobic he had led his church out of the UCC over the ordination of gay ministers" (gay male 2),

but the sessions have continued.

Herek (1984a) offers two possible strategies for change from negatively reinforced symbolic attitudes to positive ones: to appeal to the values consistent with the self-concept of individuals and those supported by their most important reference groups; and, to arrange for positive interactions between the individual and gays. Interactions should occur under conditions of equal status, common goals, co-operation, what Herek terms "moderate intimacy", and entail co-opting police officials and rank-and-files to the same concept of change. The nature and context of the continuous police-gay training sessions are apposite: discussed are matters (see Pepper, 1993a: 35) like sexual orientation issues; dialogue

and information/idea sharing on dealing with washroom sex; that entrapment not be used by the OCPS with relation to public sex (a request of the Ottawa-Hull Lesbian and Gay Task Force on Violence); access to computer reports in target areas for gay-bashing; exchanges of information on possible anti-gay incidents, and Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)/AIDS-related issues and concerns. Sessions are led by a gay man and a lesbian to provide both a male and female perspective on "gay issues" for the police.

Gays often hear (from officers) that all victims of crime are treated the same, but this is not the case when "AIDS" is mentioned. It is still regarded as the *gay disease*¹⁸, as "disease sanctions still largely frame and organize many of our deepest sexual beliefs ('sick' is after all one of our favoured terms of abuse)" (Weeks, 1986: 99). Thus, police fall into the trap of *professional neutrality*.

"Compare a junkie (easy to perceive what is wrong) to a well-dressed man (what has he done?). The second person will be treated differently than the junkie. One gets the police party-line defense because they are trained to elicit the correct response and be real men. Young officers are especially indifferent, and full of self-righteousness and arrogance. It's the naive nature of being caught up in the myth of being a cop, like an officer is declaring closure on what's really going on out there" (lesbian 1).

Encouragement of lines of communication and interactions are the prime objectives of police-gay liaison; however, will the diversity trainings govern how police officers create and manifest their conceptions of gays at a subjective level?

"I believe the trainings are extremely valuable, as they allow the chance for straights to talk to gays around other officers. Officers genuinely begin their process of understanding a segment of the community of which many had no prior contact. Participating with the established police system, with no desire to become an officer, I run the risk of merely offering band-aid solutions, like reform, rather than looking at underlying inequalities and ideologies, that perpetuate a basically closed and oppressive system" (gay male 6).

In any para-military system, including the police occupational subculture,

"The masculine model most certainly overrides all others. Ultimately this model oppresses all women, gays, bisexuals, transgendered people, people of colour, and straight males themselves by forcing them to adhere rigidly to current constructs of gender roles" (Ibid.).

The police subculture and the gay community/subculture, symbolically two inclusive reference groups, do become demystified as attitudes toward male hegemonic power and sexuality (in policing, heterosexist; with gays, gender-neutral) are challenged and confronted. The President of PTS explains:

"In one strategy we ask officers: do you know any gays or lesbians? One hears the two guys down the street from me are gay and they're just great, or my niece is a lesbian and she and her partner have been integrated into the family successfully. This brings out peer support regarding gay issues and concerns among officers. Instead of some gay guy telling the police this, it is fellow officers saying whatever you're saying about lesbians you're saying about my niece. Police begin to realize that adding to the effects of shaming gays and the shame that plagues gay-positive officers is unacceptable. While initiated by gays, these conversations are sustained by the police!"

In the end, the police subculture (the "brotherhood"; see Skolnick and Fyfe, 1993) is impenetrable, symbolically: "we [gays] can't change the values, attitudes, and behaviours of

cops; we merely plant the seeds of police-gay liaison. What we say is that no one should be made to feel ashamed to be gay or talk to someone who is gay" (gay male 3). Police officers are fragile people and feel they should be protected from out-groups (gay trainers are told "you may have offended some of the officers by what you said today"). Masculine hegemony, echoed by "copness", offers the police that luxury.

2.2.3.2 Politically Correct Police

Community-oriented policing is held largely "accountable" (male officers 2, 6) for "political" change in the police system--a return to the days of "beat cops" (they knew who was beating their wives and children, who was doing drugs, who was gay, and so on; and, they were called in to intervene and negotiate their respective community's crises). Policing is really going back to a long and proud history but a number of officers prefer the defensive, isolated shell of the police subculture.

The police subculture imposes a distinct code of behaviour, and the shame associated with "gayness" is focal when an officer thinks like an officer. Arguably, if a gay person can communicate with police officers and succeed in breaking down the veneer of "copness" on an individual basis, a gay self-identity ceases to be a shameful difference from the standpoint of a heterosexual self-identity. In general terms, one under the guise of "copness" neglects to recognize that

even where an individual [a gay man] has quite abnormal [effemine, homoerotic] feelings and beliefs, he is likely to have quite normal concerns and employ quite normal strategies in attempting to conceal these abnormalities from others (Goffman, 1963: 131).

Shaming is a peculiar, yet symbolic, device in the process of social interaction (a product of masculine hegemony), for "there may be as much shaming directed at gays who refuse to come out of the closet, and at those who oppress homosexuals, as there is shaming directed at the offending itself" (Braithwaite, 1989: 14).

To explain, the police say they have never defined "sexual orientation" as an issue while performing their duties. A citizen was a citizen, and a crime was a crime. "We may all have our own biases, individually, but as an organization I think we treat a complaint as a complaint" (male officer 3).

"It's to the point where no one is going to know what to say to one another anymore. There is no longer a common sense approach to responding to calls. By making police politically correct and watching everything they say and do, they are not doing their job effectively" (female officer 1)..."The LC, the BCU, storefront police volunteers, they're not real! Instead they're a facade, a front!" (male officer 4).

Not wanting to be told how to do *their job*, or dubbed "social workers", the police clash with gays, *politically*, and vice-versa.

"Being politically correct is making people wait ten seconds before they open their fucking mouths! Thinking before you talk, how I will label myself. As for the new community relations officer being gay, he's seen as a public relations ploy, the chief's political statement. Police see him as eliminating a police position at a

senior level. It's the feeling of being upstaged by a fag" (gay male 3).

Canadian human rights and employment equity legislation creates a "level playing field" for target groups: visible minorities, First Nations people, the physically challenged, and women. Sexual orientation is not included in the itinerary. Some police interviewed feel being gay creates advantages now. This brings one to the LC itself: was it established to hire "token gays" to symbolize a positive police-gay liaison...or political correctness? The factors this researcher would try to judge to predict a successful outcome (*long term effects*) for police-gay interactions in lieu of this committee are as follows: (1) who does and does not support the LC? Because David Pepper works alongside the Chief of Police, the latter is well informed on police-gay issues. Many rank-and-file officers fear a gay "hidden agenda" (male officers 1, 3, 4); (2) with regard to resources, will the responsibilities of committee members reflect what is best for both the police and gays, or just the *policing of* gays?; (3) when reports are made, who receives them? Are recommendations expected to be followed through?; and, (4) will the LC give way to hiring practices to hire "openly gay" police to help police their own community, arguably the biggest predictor in success and/or failure of this committee.

For police officers, it is not so much that one is gay; direct interaction with gays, or gay "outings", symbolize change in the police system and are not welcome in its

subculture. For example, the radical gay organization "Queernation", upon the establishment of a branch in Ottawa three years ago, called for the "outing" of gay and lesbian minorities city-wide. Police were non-supportive, "feeling both threatened and under the impression that all gays would support Queernation" (gay male 1). Outing is a difficult philosophical question for many gays, and the

immediate difficulty is the prehistory of 'queer' as a discriminatory term and consequently the confrontation lies in the dissolution of differences into an alternative, unificatory 'nation' (Edwards, 1994: 150).

Changes in police procedure represent external pressures, and while one can influence some of the new officers, once sworn-in the internal pressures from other officers compromise positive symbols of gay issues, political correctness, community-oriented policing, and bias crime, with enormous influence from peers:

"police who deal with gay and lesbian issues (the BCU) are not thought of as real cops anymore" (male officers 1, 3; gay males 2, 3).

As the gay community becomes more influential, and as its consciousness "grows increasingly explosive so does the police force, making the problem worse because now the issues appear focal (the result of special, local conditions) rather than diffuse and culture-wide" (Nathanson, 1992: 471).

2.2.3.3 Additional Thoughts

Pierre Trudeau, while serving as Canada's Minister of Justice in 1967, remarked "the state has no place in the

bedrooms of the nation" (in Kinsman, 1987: 163). How have police officers digressed? How do they distinguish between public and private behaviour? How have organizations like the police responded to gay liberation since "Stonewall"? Connell (1993: 617) offers a general synopsis.

Gay liberation, from very early on, was a much more radical, indeed revolutionary, challenge to hegemonic masculinity. The slogan "Every straight man is a target for gay liberation!" jokingly catches both an open-ended libertarianism and the point that gays cannot be free from oppression while heterosexual masculinity remains as it is. Drawing on Freudian ideals, some gay theorists argued that the repression of homosexual affect among straight men was a key source of their authoritarianism and violence. These ideas have never been turned into an effective practical politics; but they remain an important moment of critique.

The gay community lobbies for the decriminalization of homosexuality, equalization of ages of consent, anti-discrimination legislation, and partnership and parenthood legislation. State-mandated masculine hegemony prevents such changes, and a researcher must be aware of this. Queries directed at the methodological issues related to this study are answered in Chapter Three.

Notes

¹Masculine hegemony appropriates shaming in this manner, as it "ensures that the self and the object remain in vital connection, and...that the self does not have to give up too much of its integrity in favour of the object" (Hultberg, 1988: 117). Those unable to resist the offerings of the object are labelled deviants. Braithwaite's (1989) Crime, Shame and Reintegration is recommended for further reading.

²This amounts to a police brotherhood. See Skolnick and Fyfe's (1993: 89-112) Above the Law: Police and the Excessive

Use of Force, Chapter Five, "The Culture of the Police."

³"Most people feel comfortable, and socialize mainly, with other cops, a feature of the police culture noted by observers from the 1960s to the 1990s," write Skolnick and Fyfe, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

⁴This researcher wishes to thank Professor John Shearer for the use of this term.

⁵Shaming gays is "an effect that generates defense" (Menaker, 1992: 127; see also Morrison, 1989).

⁶see note 4.

⁷The pinnacle of successful shaming and stigmatization of an individual or group is the assignment of a deviant characteristic, known sociologically as a master status. "Homosexual" is a master status trait, and "this label will dominate all other 'characteristics' of the individual; 'good athlete', 'good conversationalist', 'good dancer', and the like are subordinated to or negated by this trait which is immediately felt to be more central to the 'actual' identity of the individual" (Page, 1984: 10). The label of homosexual is repeatedly one of containment.

⁸For a much more extensive discussion of this social phenomenon, and its significance alongside contemporaries like the Women's Movement and civil rights movements, see Rock's (1973: 100-10) Deviant Behaviour.

⁹This brings to attention the "machismo qualities of the police culture" (Skolnick and Fyfe, 1993: 95), including keeping up an impressionable appearance, or self-image, to civilians and to each other.

¹⁰From Vincent (1990: 139), a Canadian officer picks up on the stereotypes of gays as disadvantaged and abnormal (taking into consideration this officer's police service had just succeeded in arresting a "ring" of gay men sexually involved with underage boys). "Maybe those bastards are sick or were deprived when they were young. I don't know all about that psychological crap that makes saints out of those queers. On the whole, they don't bother anyone, and we leave them alone as long as they behave and mind their own business...As a matter of fact, I kind of feel sorry for them. They're not a happy bunch. They seem to have that hunted look on their face. But those guys that were going after those underage kids, I don't have too much respect for them. It's funny; they are not all exactly from skid row either."

To place this masculine ideology into a proper historical context, one need only reflect on the rhetoric of former chief

constable John Chisholm of the Toronto Police (1958: 27), which speaks volumes for generations of officers who were (and are) coerced into contempt of, and villification of, the practice of homosexuality in this country. Chisholm issued the following statement: "Homosexuality is a constant problem for police in cities, and if the police adopt a laissez-faire attitude...city parks intended for the relaxation of women and children and youth recreation purposes, will become rendezvous for homosexuals...The saddest feature of all, however, is that homosexuals corrupt others and are constantly recruiting youths into their fraternity."

¹¹In "tearoom" reports police always denigrated (and seemed shocked by) gay male interactions, noting "persistent staring, unaccountable friendliness, boyish smiles, even groaning, rubbing of crotches, and open displaying of cocks at urinals" (Bartley, 1983: 9). These role-making encounters led the police to reduce homosexuality to depravity and made them also contain gay signifiers more to avoid the stigma of attraction to a member of the same sex. For many police officers being a "decoy" (see Humphreys, 1970/1975) for a gay man in a public washroom is a form of shame, or humiliation, and tests the boundaries of masculine hegemony. Compare this to a type of homosocial bonding that has been receiving a lot of attention in the media lately--*hazing*. "They enact a ritual of humiliation, in which one reverts to a kind of fetal status, and these are all forms of being born again. The first form of humiliation is making a male into a female...All of his maleness is stripped from him, and it has to be given back to him...Homosexual or homoerotic acts--usually simulated--are also not unusual in the rituals...What you're meant to do is re-bond with an all-male group. The risk of that is that it might work too well...The dose of humiliation is to demonstrate that the participants aren't really homosexual...It's encouraging closeness in men, and at the same time punishing that closeness" theorizes Carol Burke, an associate dean at John Hopkins University in Baltimore (in Bobak, 1995: 24).

¹²There is a definite lack of trust toward police actions in the gay community. How is it gays feel they cannot rely on police services for protection? Police homophobia is held (Smith, 1988: 165-6) to be engineered "internally by local staff sergeants" responsible for reinforcing police action on patrol within the boundaries of masculine hegemony, behaviour inclusive to the police subculture. For instance, some police officers consider anti-gay crimes (gay-bashing, blackmail, and so on) harmless pranks or appropriate forms of behaviour (Finn and MacNeil, 1987). Police officers are even prone to committing acts of anti-gay harassment and violence (the gay community's major concern); it has been discovered already here that regulating the sexual lives of gays functions to

maintain the "masculine cult" (McConville and Shepherd, 1992: 194-5) and to avoid overt shaming for officers. Documentation is bountiful. National studies conducted in the United States have annually documented numerous cases of police verbal and physical abuse, entrapment, blackmail, unequal enforcement of the law, and deliberate mishandling of anti-gay violence cases (National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 1986-1991). Another study on police abuse of gays (Comstock, 1988) reveals that sixty-seven percent of respondents cite previous abusive experiences or perceived threats from police officers. In 1993 police in Montreal and St. John's gained public attention when they used "outdated and heavy handed surveillance and entrapment methods to harass and arrest gay and bisexual men" (Pepper, 1993b: 2). It could come down to mistrust based on fear of pending shameful police-gay encounters.

¹³Skolnick (1966/1975: 103-4) provides two case scenarios. One, about an officer who once allowed a gay male (in a public washroom) to initiate oral copulation (to press for a stronger felony charge) before he made the arrest. The response: the arresting officer might have been "enjoying his work too much." Two, what is to be said of a police officer in conflict with the heterosexual code of his or her occupational subculture who sides with peers at the expense of personal conviction to avoid denouncement? Is masculine hegemony really "blackmailable", as Whyte (1993a) suggests?

¹⁴The Oscar Wilde trials in Britain (late nineteenth century) are the historical milestones of governmental legal authority over homosexuality. One should consult Cohen's (1993) Talk on the Wilde Side: Toward a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities.

¹⁵The former age of consent for heterosexuals of both sexes. At present the age of consent is fourteen years of age; to engage in anal intercourse (same-sex sex), partners must be of eighteen years.

¹⁶For further information on the evolution of this term, see Altman (1982), Weeks (1986), and Kinsman (1987).

¹⁷A genetic link to homosexuality was a major headliner in the spring of 1994 in scientific journals. See Byne (1994), Holmes (1994), Mestel (1994), and Nimmons (1994).

¹⁸"I don't believe that the taxpayers should pay a program to teach you effective methods of sadomasochistic interaction," said Republican Newt Gingrich (January 14, 1995) on how AIDS education programs promote homosexuality. This quote was selected to exemplify further the "moral panics" spawned by the AIDS epidemic. Michael Graydon (a respondent) of the ACO is a featured speaker at the OCPS anti-homophobia

diversity training sessions and is, in the words of one closeted lesbian officer, "accepted by the guys even though he is gay. He's one of the very few gay men to negate some of the many misconceptions of AIDS, gays in general, the gay lifestyle, and most of all break the silences that occur when gays address police officers."

CHAPTER THREE: Methodology

How does one go about measuring the effects of masculine hegemony and the "shaming" it engenders on the containment of "gayness" in police-gay interactions? This chapter addresses the various methodological issues involved in the completion of this project. When a social researcher decides to study members of a local police force and a stigmatized minority group, the gay community, he or she is sure to encounter some problems. The immediate problem, upon commencing with the study, is settling on an efficient research approach. The next is gaining access to the group(s) one chooses to examine. Lastly, and most crucial to the researcher, is the task of locating potential subjects for inclusion in the study: meaning securing trust and maintaining good rapport with them, thus ensuring a co-operative researcher-subject relationship.

3.1 THE RESEARCH APPROACH

This researcher chose field research that consisted of field interviews conducted with respondents personally or electronically through the Internet. This section deals with specific tenets of the research approach: linking field research and symbolic interactionist theory; the advantages of both corresponding with and interviewing police officers and people who make up the gay community; the disadvantages of the latter; difficulties faced by the researcher; and, the means of collecting appropriate data from subjects.

3.1.1 Interactionism in the Field

The premise behind symbolic interactionism in field research is the direct observation and study of human events as they are occurring or have occurred over time, in stark contrast to an analysis of statistical social data. The researcher has an obligation to uphold the objectives of the interactionist model (adapted from Neuman, 1991: 63):

1. To investigate meaningful social action produced by individuals (sexuality is considered by some a learned behaviour).

2. To explain how human interaction fosters a definition of the situation.

3. To describe how a group's meaning system is manifested and preserved over a period of time.

4. To realize that empirical evidence is entrenched in the context of "fluid social interactions of social actors" under study.

5. To remember that for social actors, interaction constitutes the creation of meaning by individuals who repeatedly try to interpret their respective social worlds.

The union of field research and interactionism illuminates also what is synonymous with masculine hegemony in the police and gay subcultures, conflict, when one group gains power at the expense of another. "The sphere of sexuality is one area where domination of one group by another has been very pronounced" (Plummer, 1975: 118). This state

arises from breakdown in communication, a misinterpretation of symbols, inaccurate role taking, poor communication with the other, misinterpretation of situations, or failure to align acts appropriately and/or cooperatively (Charon, 1985: 189).

The postulates of symbolic interactionist theory (Chapter Two) allow one to extrapolate meanings of, and come to conclusions about, the above problematics of choice encounters in which hetero- and homo- sexualities clash.

Conversational Analysis: otherwise referred to as argot¹, it is a branch of field research derived from ethnomethodology, and stakes a claim that

the use of natural language in conversations provides order and management of the social settings in which the conversations take place. Conversational analysis provides descriptions of the way in which conversations achieve this order (Abercrombie, Hill, and Turner, 1988: 52).

The language² of police officers and gays is of much importance in the interviewing process, as the choice of dialogue by a straight or gay person, complemented by body language (in response to the words "gay" and "lesbian", for example) can send signals to the listener about how comfortable that person is with the topic.

3.1.2 The Internet

The proliferation of the Internet computer system is a researcher's dream come true. Hundreds of thousands from the gay community are connected to the Internet. The National Capital Freenet (Ottawa) also brings the researcher in touch with prominent figures in the local gay community through a computer. Numerous discussion "newsgroups" have been established: soc.motss (members of the same sex); can.motss; alt.politics.homosexuality; and soc.support.youth.gay-lesbian-

bi are popular. By posting messages to these newsgroups (and the Freenet), monitoring them, and corresponding with people electronically (e-mail), intelligible and reliable respondents are obtained. Overall, an invaluable tool for the field researcher.

Regardless, prevalent in this communicative medium are "flamers", people who login to the Internet intent to defame someone by way of posting profanity directed at another or committing character assassination of another in a post. Homophobes on the Internet were observed as the primary source of this discriminatory activity during the course of this study. The following response was received through e-mail from a "military man" in response to this researcher's post on the newsgroup alt.law-enforcement. Please note the text is in its original and has not been modified, demonstrating the frustration it incurs on a researcher:

"I have a sister that is a cop and I am in the military and so me and her deal with this all the time of fags and my opinion is that if they keep to themselves and not try anything to other personnel then hey let them in but if they try anything I will kill them and that is the truth...I hope that has been of some help...oh yeah here [Canada] the fags want special rights and as far as I am concerned they can take that one for a long walk off a very short pier!"

Researchers should expect their fair share of similar experiences.

3.1.3 Advantages of this Field Research

Sociological research aims to infiltrate and report on human interaction in the real world. Field research offers

one such a method.

Plasek and Allard (1985: 30-1) discuss the major criticism of the use of survey instruments and quantitative methods over that of the field survey approach.

The absence of research on the behavioral aspects of responses toward homosexuality is partly due to the fact that behavioral studies are far more difficult than cognitive studies to design and implement... This obstacle insures that the simplest type of research, the written questionnaire which taps cognitive and, less frequently, affective dimensions, will be the prevailing method of inquiry. In future research on public responses toward homosexuality, the major focus should be on what people do in relation to homosexuality rather than on what people say. It is ultimately in action, not in words, that a society is libertarian or repressive.

Since the theoretical foundation of this study is symbolic interactionism, direct contact with the subjects adds context to established ideas of the self and one's relationship to reference group signifiers, societal elements which mark the attitudes and behavioural patterns of a group. Mead (1934) revealed years ago that symbolic attitudes are rooted in past and present experiences of a person's pattern of socialization.³ By attempting to explore similar experiences of respondents, which express symbolically one's own concept of self, the interviewer has the ability to bring out personal traits in the interviewee which may establish what the origins of the latter's reaction to shaming (toward a gay sexual identity) are, the affect on self-identity, attitudes toward one's own sexuality, and interpretations of the type of person one perceives oneself to be (as an

individual, and in relation to others).

Another advantage of this method is the way in which the data are generated. In many respects, the interviews belonged to those people being interviewed. A high degree of objectivity on the researcher's behalf was ensured by requesting from subjects only their points of view on questions put before them and promising never to take the respondents' opinions (subjective) out of context or truthfulness. For police officers and gays this is a recurring problem following conversations with journalists, a point mentioned adamantly to this researcher by subjects.

3.1.4 Disadvantages of this Field Research

To begin, ten (n=10) police officers (OCPS, active and retired) and sixteen (n=16) members of the Ottawa gay community were selected for inclusion in this study (from a pool of thirty-three (n=33) respondents). These individuals were not taken from a random sample; they were determined on a voluntary basis (OCPS: Human Resources, the Ottawa Police Association, the LC, the BCU, and rank-and file; the gay community: past and present administrators from PTS, the ACO, and others involved in police-gay liaison). This researcher is not in a position to argue that the opinions and experiences of the sample gathered necessarily represent those of the larger population of police officers and gays in the entire study region, and beyond. However, the results yielded from interview data and published resources has allowed for

tangible generalizations and conclusions about police-gay interaction effects, which are collared as of deployed masculine hegemony.

Interviewing respondents also presents obstacles. When compared to survey and experimental methods, field research measurements yield more validity than reliability, and the field researcher is unable, therefore, to generalize results the same as those culled from "rigorous sampling and standardized questionnaires" (Babbie, 1994: 217).

When a sociologist approaches individuals in their respective environments and asks questions pertaining to gendered power and containment of gay sexuality, he or she must assume that subjects will at times choose discretion as the better part of valour and hold back integral information. On more than one occasion this researcher nearly resorted to an interview with a police officer or gay civilian conducted vicariously through an acquaintance; some appeared nervous over meeting at their workplace or a neutral site of their choice. For members of the gay community the mention of police-gay interactive encounters may stir up memories they would just as soon forget.

Also, there is the absence of direct participant observation, a powerful method of field research.

For those who regard human association as an ongoing process of interpretation of and definition by acts which have a subjective meaning, this method has great advantages in that it allows a more sensitive, subtle and complete interpretation of the causes and meaning of interaction (Vincent, 1990: 10).

A Humphreys (1970/1975) Tearoom Trade-like study was not this researcher's intent, and because one is unlikely to be at an officer's side at reported incidents of gay-bashing, gay public sex, or domestic violence involving gay partners such a method is out of the question. The presence of a researcher in these situations would surely affect an officer's behaviour toward a gay victim. The officer might also think the method of intervention he or she used would be closely observed, noted, and analyzed by the researcher. If one were to maintain a visible presence at a police station, one would obstruct the regular duties of the police. And, to masquerade as a gay person would raise the ire of subjects from the gay community, not to mention cause serious debate over the real motives of this research agenda.

The anti-homophobia diversity training sessions held for OCPS officers were closed to civilians, and this researcher was robbed of a golden opportunity to observe direct interaction between police officers and gays in a gay setting (PTS). Attendance at the monthly meetings of the LC helped compensate for the loss.

3.1.5 Difficulties Facing an Outsider

Conducting face-to face interviews (unlike communicating electronically) requires the obvious presence of a researcher with subjects. Two decisions have to be made. What is the proper orientation for a researcher to take as to provide a setting where respondents will engage in conversation openly

and freely? And, how does the researcher present his or her self to the interviewee?

Blumer (1969: 73-4) suggests that for the purpose of social research the most appropriate methodological position to take is "from the position of the actor," as opposed to that of an "outside, detached observer." The purpose of that role is

to see the operating situation as the actor sees it, perceive objects as the actor perceives them, ascertain their meaning in terms of the meaning they have for the actor, and follow the actor's line of conduct as the actor organizes it--in short, one should have to take the role of the actor and see his world from his standpoint (Ibid.: 74).

Consequently, great care is taken not to interpose a researcher effect. This occurs when a social scientist with personal biases toward a given view or explanation of the world engages in research that will maximize the probability of evidence in support of his or her preferred view. Care was taken to transpose the meanings of police-gay interactions and the attitudes and behaviours derived from them from the standpoint of a police officer and of a gay person.

As a researcher it is difficult not to fall into the trappings of popular misrepresentations of "gayness", straight mythology, and dubious research findings whose focus is the cause/treatment of homosexuality, and not appear supportive of masculine hegemony. Real information from real people eliminates much of the heterosexist biases in research topics of this kind. Also, the personal contact with police officers

shed light on what it really means to be a law enforcement officer, given the behavioural codes of conduct expected of one.

Sociologists inject as little subjectivity into their research as particular topics will allow. This is the essence of value-free sociology, of more importance here to the researcher because police officers (see Vincent, 1990) and gays (see Kinsman, 1993; Leinen, 1993) are often misrepresented when profiled or studied by a sensationalist press and armchair social critics, and social scientists.

Unsuspecting skepticism that surfaces when a heterosexual social researcher covers the topics of masculine hegemony and homosexuality, and finds out the more a topic is associated with shame the more difficult it becomes to study that topic, also try one's patience. When this researcher investigated the interaction effects between police and gays, he was very vulnerable to shaming. At the library, checking out books about homosexuality made people frown. Some police and gay respondents asked "are you gay"? At the police station when this researcher had to ask where the LC meeting was being held, the response would be "you mean those gays and lesbians...follow those people over there." While at PTS, a gay setting, heterosexist fears come to mind. Did someone see me go in? Will I be followed after my departure? This is, surely, experiential evidence. It reflects, through the researcher's experience, what Goffman (1963) refers to as

"stigmatization".

There exists a warning for prospective social scientists concerned with addressing issues which touch on homosexuality in the slightest. It is, basically,

the professional stigma associated with sustained research interest in the topic of homosexuality: "if you're that interested in them, you must be one!" That stigma keeps many researchers away (Plasek and Allard, 1985: 33).

As these situations are encountered one learns how to deal with them.

3.1.6 Data Collection

A field researcher must decipher what information translates into viable or appropriate data for the project. Personal interviews were recorded via a micro-cassette recorder then transcribed onto hardcopy format. Although the potential for reaching a wider pool of respondents and acquiring general information on the topic under study from the Internet and the National Capital Freenet (combined with face-to-face interviews) is increased dramatically, distinguishing acceptable data from undesirable data is less tedious (people write or verbally relay only required information). The interviews, which ranged from fifteen minutes to two hours, can yield not only desirable results, but leave the researcher with off-topic anecdotes also. How is the empirical line drawn?

One must stay on focus and abide by the golden rule of interviewing:

the interview is an instrument of data collection --but also a sharing of ideas and philosophy and experience and symbolic expressions...a sharing of self (Kirby and McKenna, 1989: 68).

Concepts are a hallmark in scientific inquiry and help to explain relations among variables. They are "significant elements" (Blumer, 1969) in an understanding of social worlds and are subject to intense "methodological scrutiny" (Ibid.) due to their influence on data generated.

A formal questionnaire was never devised. Questions posed to a specific individual were unique to that person. Rarely did this researcher talk during an interview, so important were the responses of subjects. Transcripts of the interviews were coded and organized according to: gay or heterosexual "shame"; perceptions of police officers and the gay community of each other; police and gay behaviour; and, variations of self-identity (police and gays).

A police officer would be asked questions along the line of: How is the gay community perceived by police? How would an officer handle being perceived as gay? Are the police a hegemonic, macho, or male-oriented group? How are gays received when they visit the station? A person from the gay community, inversely, could expect these questions: Could you discuss the effects of labels placed on homosexuality? How do gays perceive the police? How are gays considered abnormal and deviant in wider society? How is the self affected by internalized homophobia? Given this rationale data was collected in an empirically-based manner.

3.2 GAINING ACCESS

Gaining entrance into the social worlds of subjects is all-important. Currently the OCPS employs over eight hundred personnel, while the number of people in Ottawa's gay community can only be estimated as numbering in the tens of thousands. This section offers information to future researchers who will at some time be consulting police officers or gays on delicate matters of sociological significance.

3.2.1 The Police Subculture and the Gay Community

The police subculture is unquestionably a unique group of people, and entry into their world is difficult. The police subculture functions as a defense against public censure and a vanguard for police authoritarianism (Stoddard, 1968; Vincent, 1990). This is attributed to the "we-they view" (Shearing, 1981: 285) the police have of its public and high levels of stress and danger police endure in the line of duty. In response to the mass media and abundant studies on policing,

many people have become instant experts; a certain mythology about the urban police officer has developed, reinforced by movies and by several popular television series (Vincent, 1990: xvii).

Similarly, one is reminded constantly that most gays are still coming to terms with their sexuality, which differs from the heterosexual norm. These people are assumed by gay respondents (and a number of gays who share their experiences

through posts to the Internet newsgroups, like public forums) to suffer from unimaginable shame and guilt because they feel attracted to members of the same sex, or to both. Should these feelings become publicly known, these people may become outcasts in their communities. As a result, they feel that they must hide their true feelings from the rest of the world, even their own families and friends, and sometimes feel isolated and unloved.

Research on attitudes and behaviour toward gays (see Ellis, 1993) suggests that prior exposure reduces the negativity of attitudes toward the gay community. In support of that research, and research looking at the use of confirmatory questioning strategies, it is expected that individuals with prior exposure to the gay community and positive attitudes toward gays will choose fewer negative information-seeking questions for a proposed interview.

In both cases gaining access to subjects implies a suitable presentation of self.

People explicitly and implicitly present their "selves" to others. We display who we are--the type of person we are or would like to be--through our physical appearance, what we say, and how we act. The presentation of self sends a symbolic message (Neuman, 1991: 347).

Babbie (1994: 43) simplifies this process one step further. One remarks on the assumptions he or she makes "about the other person just based on appearance, language, and under what circumstances the people have met" and watches "how knowledge of [the] other unfolds through the process of

interaction."

3.3 SUCCESS IN THE FIELD

To a great degree this thesis deals with reactions to homosexuality and the effects of masculine hegemony on them. With this in mind, a researcher risks low response rates from the targetted populations. Is a police officer going to accuse the researcher of labelling him or her a homophobe? Is a gay person going to object to the researcher's ideas? These queries seal the need for assistance from people on the inside, and full disclosure of the researcher's goals and objectives.

3.3.1 Gatekeepers

The role of gatekeepers (Neuman, 1991: 345), those with the "formal authority to control access to a site" is imperative in securing the trust of police and gays. It is (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983: 73) "ethically and politically astute" to enlist the aid of gatekeepers, as they help "shape the conduct and development of research" and allowed this researcher to be "channelled in line with existing networks of friendship and enmity, territory and equivalent boundaries."

It was visits to and attendance at meetings of the LC, this researcher's advisory team, a fellow graduate student, the "super information highway", and respondents that made it possible to reach police officers and members of the gay community for this study. There occurred a snowball effect:

where there was one willing interviewee, there was a suggestion for another. This procedure was repeated on the Internet and Freenet through posts and e-mail which allowed this researcher to inform members of the gay community of relevant facts of the project at hand and to answer any questions they may have had.

Police officers were apprehensive as a whole. In the gay community of Ottawa research sites proved to be welcome settings for anyone (sexual orientation aside) seeking a better understanding of its concerns. Positive rapport prevailed throughout.

3.3.2 Disclosure

Full disclosure of the research goals and objectives to potential subjects is vital. It is the duty of a researcher to abide by ethical guidelines: to show respect for subjects, display tact, and remain honest as to avoid deceiving the sample. It is also necessary to provide one's subjects with an executive summary (upon request) of the study and sample questions that may be asked of them. This is a way to avert any confrontations that could arise between the researcher and subjects.

In conclusion, when interviewing the police, a formal albeit "masculinized" institution in any given society, one is dealing with those whose job is to uphold and enforce laws, whereas with members of the gay community (which has aligned its own formal institutions and identity) one meets people who

have a maligned view of laws regulating same-sex sex and equality, and who are more outspoken and liberal on such issues than police. Optimal results from interviews are attained not by deceiving subjects or "playing one side off the other". The goal of this exercise, in this sense, is for the people involved and readers to learn something about themselves, if not for the police-gay interactive experiences shared with this researcher by people in the study sample. Analyses of these encounters are the cornerstones of Chapter Four, and the Ottawa experience.

Notes

¹Bogdan and Taylor (1975: 53) note: "researchers must start with the premise that words and symbols used in their world may have different meaning in the world of their subjects." A field researcher discovers how argot affects social relations and meanings (mainstays in interactionism), and forces him or her to become educated in different contextual meanings of words. When among gays, the word "partner" (lesbians) and "lover" (gay men) should be used in place of spouse. One should refrain from blatant use of the term "homosexual". How police officers and gays interpret the meaning of "public" and "private" behaviour can determine opinions and descriptions of gay culture and lifestyle, and the repercussions on relations between the two groups. For further information, see the soc.motss FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) file available on this Internet newsgroup.

²Language is the most recognizable symbol (universally) in communication and/or interactions. An ethnomethodological term comes into play: *indexicality*. This refers to the process of explaining a person's words and utterances by their contextual significance so they make sense to the researcher.

³Remember, however, that gender and/or sexual identity is not the result of socialization. The issue is not whether gender springs from nature or nurture. Rather, the issue is whether a child should have a gender identity thrust upon him or her. For example, if a young girl chooses to play with Barbie dolls and the like, the point is that she made the

choice, and not her parents. What would be wrong would be for other parents to say to their daughters, "You must play with Barbies like John Doe's girl does!" Even if most other girls did play with Barbie dolls, these hypothetical people should not expect their daughters to do the same thing automatically. The closest analogy is handedness. For years it was held that the right hand was the natural one to use. Left-handed kids were not allowed to write with their left hands. Speech difficulties later in life were traced to this. Even though most people were right-handed, it did not follow that all should be, just as it did not follow that people were right-handed due to social expectations.

CHAPTER FOUR: Police-Gay Interaction Effects **(The Ottawa Experience)**

This chapter represents the union of the results of field research conducted in Ottawa, pertaining to police-gay interaction effects, and the three foci of symbolic interaction, introduced in Chapter Two: (1) subjective reality; (2) structural conception; and, (3) the presentation of self. With this the nature of the interactions is made clear to the reader. Moreover, it is important to understand that masculine hegemony is not endemic in the police subculture, nor is it only the gay community that is victim to this heterosexist practice. The police are vulnerable too, as masculine hegemony, and the resulting containment of a gay identity, is a "given" in dominant institutions throughout society. Therefore, to conclude that a group either opposes or accepts gays is irrelevant. Of prime concern are the effects of police-gay interactions. The spectrums of interactionist thought listed above are partitioned in the chapter to highlight the individual significance of each, beginning with police and gay subjective perceptions of one another. How do these symbols affect their actions?

PART ONE: POLICE AND GAY SUBJECTIVE REALITY

We become human by learning a set of values, feelings, perspectives and assumptions when we are young, helpless and uncritical. When that set of values and feelings is no longer adaptive to the world we later inherit, we experience a crisis, which commands on one hand that we interpret the world as we originally learned to do, and on the other that we

realise that the world which gave birth to our philosophy is no longer what it was (Gioscia, in Scheflen, 1974: viii).

"Morality" means sexual conduct to many respondents...among some segments of the population, sex is not directly referred to but obliquely euphemized. One common "euphemism" for sexual conduct is "morality" (Plasek and Allard, 1985: 27, 35).

5.1 PERCEPTUAL EFFECTS

People who go into law enforcement often do so because they want to have an active part in the bettering of life in their community. Enforcing the law and helping the citizen in need is very fulfilling to these people, given their genuine "working-class" ideals. As officers testify,

"because we all have heard so many religious types say that homosexuality is evil, that thought gets wormed into our subconscious and is hard to remove. So here the police officer is trying to eliminate evil and we stand there, righteous paragons of what makes a good community and it causes turmoil in the subconscious."

Now, note that in the above the concept of perception is paramount. How one is perceived is all important in every form of social interaction. For the gay man or woman it is a doubly rough situation because if members of the gay community (including police officers) make any effort to hide their "gayness", then they have lied to their fellow officers and that is worse than anything. If new officers especially make no effort to hide their sexual orientation then they have put up that extra (and thick) barrier that must be penetrated before they can be seen as an individual to be trusted with one's life.

What does this mean? It means just as the first female officers had to prove themselves (and new ones still do) before full acceptance, gays will have to prove themselves as worthy of being officers of the law, let alone moral citizens. In most police services, gays will have an extra hurdle. One is reminded that a person's meaning systems, in reference to sexuality, are quite simply an

organized set of perceptions and attached feelings that an individual holds about himself or herself with regard to some social category...[and] divide[s] identity into one's presented identity, which is the individual's picture of self presented to others with regard to a specific defined category; and the individual's perceived identity, which is the image held by another about self with regard to a specific identity (Coleman, 1988: 17).

This examination of perceptual meanings seeks to discover the extent to which the shame of being perceived as gay affects officers in the police subculture, how the gay community perceives the police, and also how femininity is symbolized in a male subculture, namely the result of interaction. Cultural meanings, or symbols of a particular type of group are usually self-defined. The subjective reality of people from the outside (with their own perspectives) looking in on another group, however, is characteristic of police-gay interactions.

5.1.1 The Police on "Gayness"

Police officers are placed in a precarious position, having been witness to the worst possible side of gays: gay hustlers, transsexuals, drag queens, and gays under the

influence in bars. Thus, police are subject to a distorted view of gay sexual identity. There are many preconceptions and misconceptions of gays by straights all through wider society, naturally, although "police tend to see things in extreme ways" (gay male 9). This mind set persists because, as officers noted, "we don't get to see gays in whatever might be called their natural environment." Gays often have to confront a police officer in shameful predicaments. How, a gay person wonders, does law enforcement look upon a gay man assaulted or raped in a "cruising" area, victims of same-sex abuse cases, and the aforementioned gay criminal (solicitation by a male prostitute, or a man cited for public sex)?

Still dominant are the values of the "old-boy school". When gender and/or sexuality is a factor in the police subculture, police officers prefer to see "boys" and "girls". Restraint and a marked fear of homosexuality are placed on one's homoerotic impulses around other officers and "open" ways, as AIDS and gays remain closely correlated in the perceptions of straight society. Police tend to conceptualize gayness with dirty¹, unprotected (and unnatural) sex, and sex alone. This ostentatious feeling of shame is derived from "the fear that if you get into a shower with a gay man he will rape you and give you AIDS" (gay male 4). In all, this fear is a pervasive symbol of the perpetration of masculine hegemony as it exists in the police subculture. The "gay cops" of Leinen's (1993: 118) pioneering study make the points raised

thus far clear:

When they [police] think of gays, it's a blow job, a dick in someone's ass. This is the image they see--they don't see warmth, love, affection. And if this image is conjured up, it's always of one of the guys in a dress.

Such perceptions are by nature intrapersonal, and occur when one transgresses a personal moral code. Of interest is how personal moral codes are created. Individuals generally create their personal morality by internalizing values and norms found in their social system. Certain institutions, including (though not only) the police, play a role in creating that social system, including values and norms. So when one speaks about the deterrent effects of shaming gays in the context of masculine hegemony, one is talking about what sorts of values and norms these institutions ought to cultivate:

"There's a side of me that sneers at them, but there's a side of me that is accepting of them. I have relatives who are gay, so I'd hate for them to see the bad side of me. Knowing gays puts me in a unique position. Even though I talked a lot with an effeminate gay speaker one time at the station, it went well and he seemed like a decent guy. But for so many here, it is hard to get past the gay caricatures, like what is construed as a gay personality" (male officer 4).

Police officers will state without hesitation that there is "a major misconception of the police by gays" (male officer 2, female officer 2) when the two interact while an officer is on duty. A marked social distance between gays and straights remains intact, and takes on many dimensions. One such dimension involves an interactive encounter between a police

officer and a (straight) male cross-dresser in Ottawa. Before the latter fact was known to the officer, the two would converse regularly at the cross-dresser's place of business as the officer ran his beat. One day the policeman entered the store when the man was dressed as a woman. Since that time the officer (male, middle-aged) has not looked the man in question directly in the eyes. This is also indicative of how police deal with prostitution;

"men will pose as johns to catch female hookers, and women will likewise pose as hookers to snare johns, yet no man will ever dress up as a male prostitute to lure gay johns" (male officer 4).

These perceptions of "gayness" are also symbolic of the macho image of the policeman. "Policing is perceived as some macho thing" was a phrase repeated by the officers questioned. One officer's testimony tells of the masculine paradox at the station:

"The guys, they are drawn into it. Cops supposedly hate bikers, yet it's cool to be a biker cop, the most popular, and they have to have a Harley Davidson, too" (Ibid.).

Is police subjective reality toward a gay identity as part of its working personality (see Skolnick, 1966/1975) so suprising? Officers know full well gay people often experience traits found in other minority groups, among them an almost obsessive concern with society's perceptions of homosexuality and their own state of mind, the denial of entry within a hated group (no "open" gays officers in Ottawa), withdrawal, passivity, and even frustration against their own

group (the gay subculture). Being a good officer, much like a good soldier, shields straight men from the interactive pitfalls and thought processes gays face repeatedly.

5.1.2 Gays on "Copness"

Police are a symbol of mistrust in the gay community to this day. A law enforcement officer can be perceived also as a representative of all that is not gay with gay persons who are content to define (male) police as "macho, homophobic, racist, and sexist pigs" (female officers 1, 2; lesbian 3). On the surface there is the embarrassment factor for gays over being the victim of an anti-gay crime and the fear of being perceived as vulnerable in the presence of a police officer. Underneath the surface, an innate inclination for someone in the gay community, and one that is often overlooked by an officer, is that when a gay person is arrested he or she is also "outed"!

The police are perceived as the primary force behind this public shaming of gays, yet much of it is self-induced by gays. Police service extends to taking a report and investigating crimes and incidents motivated by an anti-gay bias. Officers exert no power over the courts, which are open to the public, along with one's gay identity. In these cases, "the victims have not come out in the gay community itself, so the fear of shame is overwhelming" (female officer 2). In confronting officers, an outed man or woman battles several possible internal scenarios.

"Who will be present when it's divulged that I'm gay? Or, in cases of denial and failure to report crimes to the police, it becomes a case of no one gets hurt but myself and if I let it go it will probably stop (female officer 1)...Some gays are more comfortable with being the victim, but because shame is more or less what you feel or fear what will be the consequences of a certain identity or action, gayness will always be contained because who wants to explain why he was in Remic Rapids (a cruising area by night) park on a hot summer night anyway?" (male officer 1).

And, as acknowledged, the social platform of police-gay interactions, and where perceptions of both groups are groomed, is a situation in which a gay is seen at his or her worst, or extremely defenseless. Gays pinpoint masculine hegemony and the shame it engenders in the police occupational subculture, where it is believed one "does not have to be gay to be bashed, but such a motivation is inherent in attacks on our community. Police officers have no concept of being singled out from other groups, as gay-bashing is exasperated for who one is, in the case of gays" (gay male 3).

How do gays measure this rationalization? "Copness", while conjuring up images of a straight, masculine model, also elicits through the perceptual lens of the gay community "very sexual beings" (Ibid.). Police, gays claim, undergo a change of experience once they are sworn-in. A member of the transgendered community drew a candid analogy: "I dress up as a woman, while cops dress up in a uniform and become police officers." With the harassment and anger an officer faces from civilians while on duty, and with no overt release mechanism (professionally) in place for him or her to vent

individual feelings, gays perceive police as being latently repressed individuals. With a history of shaming "gayness" and containing it from the collective police persona, policing can symbolize a succinct interactive experience for gay men.

"I can't imagine a gay man becoming a police officer. It's something I wouldn't do. But for those who are ashamed of their sexuality, this is a way of becoming tough. Here we are dealing with those not sure of their sexuality, and are wanting desperately to suppress it from others and themselves. Perhaps becoming a police officer will make things right" (gay male 5).

Similarly, how police are perceived as voyeurs of gays has changed. Referring mainly to the former's raids on gay bars and bathhouses (and to a certain extent straight strip clubs), a vocal member of the gay community prophesizes this form of police-gay interaction represents how societal shame placed on homosexuality brings the two groups closer together. "Police don't want to search and arrest people so much as they'd like to sit down and watch the show. It's their job to do the policing, and many of us do not think they want to do it." Here is where gay demystification takes place for police.

"With calls to gays having sex in the parks or in the stairwells of malls, many policemen naturally would not want to express an interest in them. We do have officers who will cruise certain areas (parking lots, parks) to catch people screwing. It's very voyeuristic. The officers have no intention of arresting these people. They just want to sneak a quick peek. This is only for policemen who have not yet admitted to themselves that they are, or may be gay" (male officer 3).

2 of/de 2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

Some gay respondents confided the fact that friends and acquaintances within the community find the idea of having sex with a police officer a real "turn-on". Nevertheless, these same people are skeptical of having openly gay officers on the police service. Like an average citizen, gays feel unsettled over interacting with the police. A gay officer, along with his or her peers, "is first and foremost a police officer rather than distinctly a member of the gay community. His or her first loyalty would lie with the police" (gay male 1).

The gay consensus is that police officers will always "do their job and do what they are told" (gay males 1-10; lesbians 1-6). If wider society shows disrespect toward them the police will do their best to thwart change and shackle themselves more securely into the group psychology of policing (the we-they mind set all over again). The shaming and/or "containment" of gays will co-exist with the latter because wider society continues to portray a negative image of gay identity, and by doing so keeps the shame of being gay constant as well. The statement "we are everyday people" came from many a gay subject in response to a void in the police subculture: no positive or regular caricature of a gay person outside of David Pepper and the LC (not sworn-in officers). "The symbols are there," recounts a gay male OCPS diversity trainer, stating perceptually that

"policemen are incredibly cock-proud. They think being gay is some political thing, some ulterior motive. They can't conceive of going past the fact that you like to suck dick. They think it's

all about that! Police don't understand there's a whole cultural context within this picture. Am I gay when I suck dick? Yes. Am I gay when I take out the garbage? Yes. It's not a coat I take on and off. Cops just can't understand the notion of being gay, especially in their working environment" (gay male 3).

In the event gay officers do become "open" to their peers, the effects of straight-gay interactions will not hide the shameful perceptions of "gayness" and its violation of "copness".

"In a force this size (over eight hundred officers), oddballs tend to stand out. Not saying that gays are oddballs, but they would certainly be thought of as such, almost spectacle-like. Strange people, or anybody considered deviant, would become outcasts because they symbolize an unwelcome change in policing" (female officer 2).

An important point is that moral beliefs (hence, perceptions of what is shameful) can change. Indeed, in talking about shame one is really talking about hegemonic policies that can influence people's moral beliefs, hence their actions and interactions, and the social problems (being gay is seen as one) a group like the police seek to address. Then the question becomes where one draws the line between personal and social morality, between the public and the private.

5.1.3 The Symbolic Importance of Femininity in a Male Subculture

The honour of women is seen in terms of how it reflects on the menfolk and what effects it has on the capacity of individual men to compete (Giddard, 1987: 168).

It strikes this researcher that the significant amount of work in identifying the cause of women's domination, oppression, and other shameful conditions under institutionalized masculine hegemony could be used in an analogous fashion by sexual minorities. Women can be "shamed" (while not experiencing shame personally) by men who wield power in the wider society, in defiance of a woman's gender identity. Lesbian women are shamed because of their gender affects. In a sense, the same force that teaches "real men" to put down women also has a couple of lessons on putting down lesbians. Gay men and/or transgendered men are also symbols of femininity, says one such respondent, and that makes them "third-class citizens." Transgenders, in heterosexist dominant ideology, are thought of as even less of a woman and the labels they endure in conversation in conventional society aptly demonstrate this: drag queens, stone butches, transsexuals, and passing women (see Namaste, 1993). Namaste (Ibid.: 2) elaborates:

Since gender and sexuality are not the same thing, there are a variety of sexual identities available within transgender communities. Some female-to-male transsexuals identify as gay men, while some male-to-female transsexuals describe themselves as lesbians. Many transgenders adopt a heterosexual label, while others prefer to call themselves bisexual. Some transgenders define themselves as sexual beings, without stipulating who they choose for their partners. Lesbian/gay and transgender communities are not the same, although they can overlap.

Women in policing is now commonplace, but not without conditions. They, like all heterosexual men on the police

service, find themselves thrust into a masculine identity.

"I'm sure it was hard for women to be accepted as police. I'm sure this situation is changing, and I suspect the same will be true about gays and lesbians, but only when we on this service are given the opportunity to be openly gay, let alone women. The challenge will be for those homophobes to feel a sense of camaraderie without having to accept the homosexual parts of themselves, which can cause a lot of anxiety. I suspect that gays, lesbians, and straight women will do better by playing more on their turf than on ours. Accepting the practices of the police community at large will go a long way to becoming accepted, and no longer shamed. This is not to say gays should accept police attitudes toward them, but accepting, not necessarily acting on and internalizing, most of their prevailing attitudes will help immensely" (female officer 3 [lesbian]).

In wider society masculine hegemony, the "sexual-political control of women by men within the institution of heterosexuality and by means of specific heterosexual practices" (Jackson, 1987: 74), is used to make women the sexual commodity and to contain their femininity. If they do not allow themselves to be available to men, then women--straight or lesbian--do become invisible, or "contained" by their own doing.

The world of female homosexuality is even more secret than that of men. We take it for granted that women (partly because our society pays them less than men) will share living quarters, but rarely do we suspect that the arrangement suggests any sexual connotation. Here, too, shame is associated with the very idea of being "different" (Nathanson, 1992: 299).

Lesbians are the safest bet for policemen taken in by the pressures to exhibit anti-female and anti-gay behaviour in the process of male bonding. Women have to fight the *you must be a lesbian* sort of thinking, and any acceptance by straights is

usually sexually connotated (lesbianism in straight porn imagery again). In the broader spectrum, if policemen accept lesbianism it amounts to a total devaluation of women, so why should women from all walks of life care too much? A gay man symbolizes, to the average straight man, a betrayal of his gender, and also of his position in most social systems. Fears are roused: men are not threatened by lesbians but they feel threatened by gay men.

"I do feel straight men fantasize a great deal about women having sex. Most lesbians are tough. They've bought into the macho image of policing. Many of them, and this goes for straight women also, were probably tomboys. Everyone has known a tomboy: she is one of the boys. A lesbian is not as taxing as a gay male for a straight man. You don't have to have to shower with lesbians at the police station. And if you accept that most human beings are somewhere on the sexuality scale from one to ten I suspect a lot of men are worried they may have homosexual feelings. A man, from that point of view, is much more threatening than a woman. The fear of shame leads many (policemen) to say *all that woman needs is a good fuck by a real man to turn her around*" (gay male 1).

The same interactive effects of deployed masculine hegemony in the police system begin to filter down to the gay community as plain sexism:

"women aren't seen for the most part. Take a look around, how many establishments do you see funded by dyke money, and how many times gay has been used to include lesbians. We're not male and gay is a male term. We are lesbians" (lesbian 5).

Yes, there is evidence of containment of femininity in the gay community, but not as symbolic as in policing and the wider society.

Men...are ashamed of their own sensitivity to suffering and love because they have been taught to regard these

as feminine. They are afraid of becoming feminine because this means that other men will despise them, and they will despise themselves. Men are as afraid of being rejected and despised as we [women] are. They have only a defensive solidarity (Tolson, 1977: 18-9).

Sociologists agree (see Whyte, 1993b) that misogyny and homophobia are both rooted in the stringent polarization of male and female gender roles and the dominance of the male in homosocial bonding is its most rigid symbol. To contain homosexual tendencies, men cannot rely on their dominance of women (and femininity) alone. Once in the police subculture, the male brethren role rewards aggressiveness, ascendancy, and the nullification of feminine characteristics.

Although it is necessary, the containment of women is not a sufficient condition to assure control over masculine subjectivity and homosocial practices...The possibility of the homosocial becoming homoerotic poses a constant risk to the masculine subject and to the homosocial pact. The mediation of the feminine must be sustained, or the pact is broken. Gender regimes and the gender order set proscriptive limits to the forms of homosocial desire, delineating a "space" rather than an agency of domination (Ibid.: 29).

Masculine hegemony is not fully at loss to these gender regimes and the gender order. An historical aspect of policing touched on was a trait akin to male power: physical strength. Although it is not as much the case as in previous years, policemen were often required to overpower lawbreakers, or at least intimidate by physical stature. The Western world views physically strong men in peculiar ways, and sets some symbolic expectations of their "straightness" (the masculine symbol of law enforcement) and their emotional fortitude

(mirroring the physical one). Rarely does one see a so-called "frail" policewoman.

"Many police agencies struggle to find valid, entry physical agility tests which do not discriminate against women by overemphasizing upper body strength but still maintain standards. There is the notion that a woman officer violates the male self-image and the organizational and social myth that law enforcement is a man's job. Implementing change that challenges deeply held beliefs about masculinity and long-standing customs about policing is difficult" (lesbian 3).

Vincent's (1990: 125) findings on women police indicated that where there was strong group resistance to women joining the force the presence of women would "inhibit the male officers in their language, in their humour, and in the easy-going camaraderie that existed among them." Nevertheless, some officers do welcome a remedy for "paunchy excuses for masculinity" (Ibid.) that inhabit the police service--on the part of both sexes!

"Cops are required daily to face life-threatening situations from a position of strength. If you aren't a bigger man than the adversary you face, then you will fail at your job. This is why, in my opinion, it took so long for women to get into law enforcement jobs. There was even a minimum height requirement, symbolically masculine of course, and unless a cop was so many feet tall he'd (meaning she'd) never survive out there all alone" (female officer 3 [lesbian]).

This brings the researcher to an observation while in attendance at a LC meeting (February 20, 1995) while sitting beside a fellow civilian who first introduced himself, then what he termed his "femme mode". The police officers assembled were silenced but managed the occasional stare and

snicker at the expense of the male cross-dresser. This is natural in a police setting, says this person.

"Because I like to dress as a woman, and assume her identity in public, I am automatically perceived as gay, an abomination to my maleness. If I was open about this as a police officer, I'd be a bigger target for homophobia than gays. Men who are forced into female roles are considered safe and interesting, while on the other hand, a man in a dress walking down the street is also something to be feared. For transgendered individuals and cross-dressers, it's an uphill battle for acceptance by society. It'll be a wonderful day when we can, without the pain of shame, be able to be the people we are without having to have it okayed by women who want to dress up just to make it acceptable."

Officers are befuddled when individuals like these ask them how they would be treated if encountered on the street after a bar closes (this respondent found out that any transgendered or cross-dressing person would be held in a male jail cell). These people, fusing together all that is symbolic of women and femininity, are also affected by hegemonic masculinity and were somewhat "contained" within the community until the LC recently made the interests of transgenders and cross-dressers a part of its official agenda. In the end, it makes one rethink the symbolism of femininity in male subcultures like the police. How is a woman's "honour-shame" complex (see Goddard, 1987) affected by masculine hegemony in the police system?

Women's honour is an element, a resource, which is controlled and manipulated by men. It remains unclear to what extent honour may be an exclusively male code or what perception women may have of this code and of their own honour (Ibid.: 168).

For the full implications, substitute identity for honour.

PART TWO: POLICE AND GAYS JUXTAPOSED

For persons with symbolic attitudes, certain reference groups appear to be particularly influential. Expressing their attitudes reinforces their self-conceptions, publicly identifies them with important reference groups, and probably elicits acceptance or avoids rejections of significant others. For example, heterosexuals who express hostile attitudes toward homosexual persons also tend to endorse traditional ideologies of family, sexuality, and sex roles (Herek, 1985: 12).

Practices and projects personalize social structure...while reflecting the micro-power relations that impinge in the specific situation at hand. These practices are often staged and executed so as to deliberately alter the specific fate of one ensemble of individuals, often at the expense (moral, symbolic, economic, legal) of another group, or interactional collectivity (Denzin, 1992: 28).

How is structure a symbol of one's sexuality? In police-gay encounters, being the former offers a distinct advantage over being the latter. This part deals with the effects of police-gay juxtaposition in their interactions.

5.2 STRUCTURAL CONCEPTIONS OF THE POLICE AND GAYS

It is widely accepted by sociologists that perceptions of homosexuality and responses to it are "determined by a society's social structure" (Greenberg, 1988: 14). The sections below examine how the influence of masculine hegemony and the shaming it attaches to "gayness" in the police subculture is symbolic of conformity, and how the same processes are used to contain gays as deviant, or a subordinate masculine identity in the aforementioned masculine typology outlined by Connell (1987).

Structure (viewed as codes of appropriate conduct) is both focal and deterministic to social actors. Sometimes the influence of reference group signifiers is never known to social actors in a respective collective. The police subculture is the dominant reference group in an officer's life, and the same can be said for the gay community (subculture) and gays individually. The structural properties of social systems provide the symbols by which people act and they are also the outcomes of those actions. Under the guise of loyalty, tradition, and custom, there is an almost unbridled belief that the way things are done is unequivocally the right and natural way (Douglas, 1983), drawing a comparison to Foucault's (1979) commentary on the art of punishing in the regime of disciplinary power. The deployment of masculine hegemony in the police subculture and in interactions between police and gays, and its position on the containment of "gayness", "refers individual actions to a whole that is at once a field of comparison, a space of differentiation and the principle of a rule to be followed" (Ibid.: 182). It separates followers from subordinates (gays) in a system. It can also be said that this mechanism, for the police and gays together,

measures in quantitative terms and hierarchies in terms of value the abilities, the level, the 'nature' of individuals. It introduces, through this 'value-giving' measure, the constraint that will define difference in relation to all other differences, the external frontier of the abnormal [the shameful]...The perceptual penalty that traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions compares, differentiates,

hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it normalizes (Ibid.: 182-3).

Other people's morality (about homosexuality) influences the behaviour of the police, and police behaviour influences their well-being. If the police are concerned about the well-being of others, and as civil human beings we should be so concerned about this, then we (and undoubtedly the gay community) may legitimately be concerned with their moral authority. The behavioural patterns of police can also influence our well-being, sometimes directly: thus, many among us in wider society hope that the police system is structured in such a way as to possess moral beliefs proscribing, along with murder and theft, homosexuality. But the effect can also be indirect; society is not atomized, like a bunch of marbles that move around and only interact when they collide. It is more like a web; the more strings one cuts, the weaker the whole structure (and hence the other strings) become.

5.2.1 Conformity in the Police Subculture

There is a substantial measure of peer pressure in so-called straight male systems that are anti-gay in their intent. Even if members act perfectly heterosexual there always lies a concern that one will be perceived as gay. "In the police subculture it's even worse," says a former PTS president, of the tendency of officers to succumb to the structure of policing. A unified system, officers in the police subculture adopt an "us versus them" approach, and by

doing so conform to popular beliefs, because they see a minority group (the gay community) that is hard to accept for risk of shame. To put it bluntly, "sucking cock is the ultimate symbol of non-conformity" (gay male 3).

Language is also a telling signifier of group homogeneity; the police still identify "shame" in the social unacceptability of gays. In many social systems, the police subculture included, it is still acceptable to converse in a politically incorrect mode against gays, unlike against other groups. Homophobia of this kind enacted in a police service is a *group effort*, yet mounted action taken by the *individual*. Officers know what to and not to conform to in their subculture.

"You cannot now say to someone *you're just a nigger*. But you can still say *you're just a fag, you're just a cock-sucking faggot* because that is still tolerated --one is not, one is. We don't, in a knee-jerk response, conclude that every woman who is raped really wanted it. People don't do that anymore; some may feel that way and believe it, but they don't express it as much. So the social discourse around what you can and cannot say is severely limited now. If a swastik is painted on a synagogue, people go berserk. If the word fag is scrawled on a wall, the level of shock is low because of the tolerance for hatred of gay people. You've got to expect this, but for Jews, blacks, and women --no! Since there is a tolerance of this toward gays, the police still do it! (gay male 3).

As compensation, the officers find shared meaning in the group consciousness to be part of his or her reference group. It is hard to bring gay-positive/supportive symbols out in the "intensely homophobic atmosphere" (Ibid.) of a police station due to the constant challenge to these attitudes. To be a

regular guy means to avoid the ramifications of non-conformity and undisciplined conduct imposed by management: "in cases where men need someone to blame a homophobic slur provides an easy outlet with which to vent frustration among other officers" (male officers 3, 4, 6).

The order of policing is a para-military organization centred on its chain of command, a talk-down, hierarchal system that is extremely conformist and resistant to diversity. At first, the police were hesitant to accept into its fold women and racial minorities. It was believed these outsiders would not command respect and disrupt the unity of the police service. Diversity of any kind is hard to deal with at first, but gays and lesbians can more than any other minority group hide their identity and make less of a problem for management and the rank-and-files. Furthermore, the police are never (at a professional level) put in the position of a sexual object, so an officer's behavioural patterns are ascertained from the standpoint of a "non-sexual self-assessment" (male officer 4; gay males 3, 4). Few doubts are ever raised about his masculinity, unless he is rumoured to be gay. With this code of conduct is a belief that police have the ability to identify someone who is gay, relying heavily on their street knowledge of the gay community.

Without the support of the chief of police, it is open season for gays.² Only since the 1990s have similar systems, the RCMP and the Canadian military, lifted their bans on gays

and lesbians from entering their ranks (the OCPS has yet to comply officially). The RCMP, policing's "big brother", regularly spawns a trickle-down effect straight from it down to national defense, and finally to local police services in Canada. If the police infrastructure reacts like its counterparts and accepts "open" gays in, symbolic messages are sent through the ranks that this will happen, harassment will not be tolerated, and that gays are in: "in policing, discipline is supreme" (gay male 2).

"on issues of cultural or sexual appropriateness, police officers lose the ability to think for themselves. They need leadership to face them head on. The simple remedy is to remove gayness from one's sexual inhibitions" (lesbian 1).

Masculine hegemony is symptomatic of the wider society police serve and protect, and the structural make-up of the police subculture is but one of several institutions to reflect this systematic order. There is evidence of generally accepted societal attitudes and norms that correlate individuals with their dominant group and are reinforced continually: "other social groups are considered 'funny', or 'peculiar', and strangeness, as always, seems to pose a threat and must be rejected or guarded against" (Douglas, 1983: 217-18). Power, a potent concept in any masculine hegemonic structure is what the police subculture (straight-imaged) believes will be severely limited by societal acceptance (hypothetical) of homosexuality and gays themselves. However, power (as institutional masculine hegemony) is as yet heavily

concentrated on a masculine model:

"That gay and lesbian group has an office at the station. As expected, they are not very popular amongst the members of the service. Some resent the fact that they are paid by the force and many police officers here feel that the money should be going to something else, like more police officers" (male officer 2).

Or, more of us.

In light of these sentiments from straight officers, gays tackle the alleged hatred and fear of them (a guise for shame) in a conformist subculture that spurs a contentious debate in interactions between police officers and gays: how are internalized shame and fear of loss of power operated in tandem by the police to "contain" a gay identity? Shame is used as a strategy to retain power; this "homophobia", therefore, must be seen as part of the operative strategy of "containment" that protects police power.

"Not all police officers are homophobes--I prefer the term heterosexist myself--nor are they the idiots we see presented in the mass media, or in government. A good many of them are neither racist nor ultranationalists. They just quietly profit from the dominance of heterosexuality. It's not all a fear issue, either--which is why I don't like *phobe*. The fear of queer is the fear of losing dominance, of the changes to the world that would take place if alternative sexualities were accepted. It is profoundly political, and just too damn complicated" (gay male 10).

Normality is, therefore, an omnipresent effect of conformity to conventional mores and values in a reference group. Adherence to normality and/or morality, masculine hegemony, creates a sociocentrism, as "'people like us' tends to define equally the excluded, the different" (Douglas, 1983:

216). When containment of homosexuality, and the lack of commitment to legitimate gay concerns of violence and civil equality (as perceived by the gay community) is marked in police behaviour the root cause lies (as mentioned) in

"a reaction to the fear of displacement of power. I'm saying that I would hate Marxists if they took over the country, and told me that my yearly salary would be distributed for the good of all. I'm saying that I would hate to be made uncomfortable, to have my power taken away. I think the straight culture reacts the same way. Now, if there's some way to share the wealth, so to speak, without hurting them, okay, let's do it. But I don't see how it's possible. I may be subscribing too closely to some physics-based model of sociology, wherein there is a conservation of power. Anyway, that's where I think some of the hate comes from. The totemic' idea takes away from it, in the sense that there's a lot of place for straights to be displaced from--not just symbolically, but materially and intellectually and romantically" (gay male 9).

Are the police then themselves empowered by masculine hegemony in their chosen profession, and in interactive encounters with gays?

"Heterosexuality has invested a lot of time and effort in itself, and the police culture is an interesting example of this. Acceptance of homosexuality, as opposed to the containment and shaming of it, does a lot. It invalidates the family structure. It encourages exploration into other sexualities, such as polyamory or pederasty. It makes us think uncomfortable questions about what we know, who we are. That's why I never liked the place at the table' line of thought. I don't want to be accepted by the police subculture if it means giving up my differences, because my differences from straight people are quite drastic. I think homosexuality has in it a great deal of revolutionary power. Enough so that it scares me, and at times scares me straight into the closet, where I'm supposedly safe. So, I think of homophobia and the suppression of a gay identity as more of a power issue than one of ignorance" (gay male 10).

The strong bond to cultural heritage in policing is evident through its methodical idiosyncrasies: language, training colleges (old-school, fraternal), police gathering places, and rituals. How are these social factors (symbols) made meaningful? How do power relations in the police subculture contain a gay identity? It is by, simply, understanding heterosexuality,

the given of sexual theorizing, the natural form by which we judge others...In itself it describes nothing except the fact of object choice. The meanings of this may be diverse. But if the privileging of heterosexuality obscures real differences, then similarly a total rejection of it is more than misguided (Weeks, 1986: 83).

Why would a gay person become a police officer?

"The institution is set up to be ritualized. Police officers disassemble their own personality and reassemble it in their own way, but only so far as what they've been told in training will allow. They remain a constant reminder of the paradigm of old-school policing, of exploiting gayness as a way of keeping it out of the mainstream, and out of policing!" (gay male 1).

It remains a difficult task to penetrate the "armour" of "copness" of which an officer is equipped. Wrought by peers, who in the police role do not connect publicly to gay individuals, one is left to interpret the double enmity of those in the police occupational subculture. While in a position (law enforcement officers) to make a difference, the vast majority (fearful of the shame directed at "gayness") abide by "professional neutrality" in police-gay encounters and opt to contain a gay identity from police protocol.

4.2.2 "Gayness" and Non-Conformity

The gay community is considered deviant because heterosexuality is prescribed as the norm, with other sexual preferences and similar lifestyles deemed abnormal and non-conformist. Gays are outright separated from straights

on the basis of presumed differences in attitudes in attitudes, appearance, and behavior. Frequently, negative characteristics include dislike of women, effeminacy, the relative ease with which homosexuals may be identified, promiscuity, sado-masochistic practices, cross-dressing, and the tendency to be either active or passive in sexual behavior... Less frequently cited are positive characteristics such as creativity, better taste, higher intelligence, virtuosity in certain occupational performances, and heightened sensitivities (Plasek and Allard, 1985: 25).

If indeed the police are affected by the stigmas associated with possessing a gay identity, and have harboured uncomfortable feelings about gays, the ideological rationale goes beyond a police officer's call of duty. One must delve deeper for an explanation.

When straights and gays interact, there is immense curiosity by the former because "gayness" is so inhibited in the straightworld. As gay subjects reveal, in relation to police containment of a gay-positive image in their group, "we have come to represent a hidden, somewhat exotic element of the wider society." On more than one occasion gay respondents led this researcher to believe that there is an envy (if not confusion) in police officers (or straights in general), for gay men offer straight men something they cannot have with straight women. Some are very outspoken:

"There are police who simply don't like or are jealous of gay males (even lesbians are liked by most straight males in their porn videos and magazines). They try to justify their fear and hate by using stupid religious and theoretical examples. Nothing can hold water to reality. Does it bother them to see two hot males embraced? They can't compete with that pure masculinity. Just say you can't handle the power involved with a male-male or female-female relationship. It bothers police to see people with that capability, and naturally set to be that way. Sorry, but two gay guys together is not a lowering of one's masculinity (like fairyness, wimpyness), but rather a doubling of one's masculinity" (gay male 7).

The other argument is that this simply rejects the power dynamic of hetero-masculinity and makes "compulsory heterosexuality" (Weeks, 1986: 83; see also Rich, 1984) into "the enemy. This position is simply the mirror image of our cultural privileging of heterosexuality" (Ibid.). Even so, the "gayness as deviant" symbolism is no less pervasive ideologically, and substantiates Goffman's (1963) assertion that sometimes we are ashamed to be shamed in intimate situations (non-sexual) with a gay man.

"I can't imagine working alongside someone for years, only just to find out he's gay. In an office setting, fine. But in the same car, that's too close. In theory I can accept someone being gay, but in the practicum, their sexual acts, I'm really uncomfortable and am sure many officers do not want to hear or even think about them. I suppose we get this from what is said about gay promiscuity and unprotected gay sex. With the risk of getting AIDS we police see impersonal gay sex as rebellious, self-destructive behaviour. Why do they continue to do this?" (male officer 6).

In terms of police-gay interaction, the gay community projects its non-conformist stand and ideal concept of

hegemony (how power ought to be distributed) best under the rubric of what Dahl (1970) names "influence-terms". So operationalized, power in wider society (and in its sub-systems) is not directly associated with a power elite or a class structure; there exists instead not a concentration of power, but a diffusion of power as advocated in gay liberation. The gay community is, by virtue of its absence from Canada's list of protected groups under human rights and work equity, considered unworthy of equal status alongside heterosexuals. This premise triggers the "underlying current of heterosexist attitudes and its structural base," says one lesbian respondent, and "makes the police inevitable conformists under such a structure. Police end up acting the way they are supposed to act around gays because they are trained to think a certain way, for example macho or homophobic." Officers are then guilty by association to their occupational structure because their role requirements in direct interaction with gays are never quite clear. Wider society, like police, is a power-oriented structure and one that impacts heavily on the attitudes of the straight population in the latter like a conscience.

Marginalization of the gay community is common. How will the LC and now David Pepper (in his administrative role with the highest ranking officers of the OCPS) as a community mediator and gay-positive symbol to officers and ambivalent gays provide a fundamental structural change in the nature of

a police-gay interactive network that is ritualized? Gays do express concern.

"I'm just afraid that the hegemony⁵ giving up a little power, say ten percent, might not be enough. Who's the next group these cultures are going to focus on? Is tolerance enough? But consider, so we get some cops assigned to a BCU and made to attend gay-positive training sessions, and the beatings are cut by ninety percent. Is that enough? We're still surrounded by cultural constructs that continue to hurt us in other ways, reinforced by the hegemony" (gay male 5).

A deviant community is one that is "engaged in some kind of collective denial of the social order" (Goffman, 1963: 144). Police, upon meeting gays who in their estimation defy accepted images of "gayness", are forced to question meanings of being gay (and deviation) presented to them. Moreover, it becomes apparant to police that anyone can be gay without them even knowing this! Consider the effects when gays tell police officers of married men and women who "come out" in middle age, and gay couples of both sexes who arrange somehow to have children. There are two examples to start with. While the one is becoming less common, the other is becoming more so. Neither case is an example of exclusive homosexuality. Either for social or biological reasons the homosexual relationship is made to include sexual relations with the opposite sex, though it may be by proxy. To safeguard their manliness, male officers have in turn perfected a kind of "gay" humour at the station. Common banter is for a male officer "to come up behind another male with a nightstick and simulate anal intercourse. That happens a lot" (male officer 4). It

appears the more threatening gays are made out to be to a straight person, the more gays are "deviantized".

Gay shame and "gay pride", two feelings that surface in gays when they are separated from heterosexuals, are hard to fathom for officers because as an unwritten rule police "cannot be proud of something they personally regard as horrible" (gay male 3). A straight officer has no idea of what it is like to be set apart, contained, "of getting to the point, after having worked through personal struggles with identity, of being proud of something else" (Ibid.). As a police officer, one is placed high on wider society's social stratum (gays remark about symbols like "state funerals" held for officers who die in the line of duty). "He is never in a place with others where, or put in a place with others where he will be ashamed of who he is" (Ibid.). The cynicism of, ambivalence toward, and isolation from "gayness" are the most permeable police gay interaction effects here.

The symbolism of honour in policing is then kept sacred, and overarches everything.

It is a quality of groups, not only of individuals
--rather a single person symbolizes the group whose
collective honour is upheld by its different
individual members (Goddard, 1987: 167).

Any activity or persons identifiable to something that separates one from the rest of the group will not be tolerated. Universal responses to gays (negative) grow out of a group psychology. What the police officers object to is gays saying

"no, you each have to possess a range of ideas and choices when faced by groups other than police, in your occupational culture and out on the beat where you will meet them the most" (gay male 1).

Granted, this study is concerned with the varied effects of deployed masculine hegemony on police-gay interactions regarding the containment of "gayness" in the police and gay subcultures. However, the practice of masculine hegemony is systemic as a state apparatus, evidenced here, at a micro-level, by a fraternal-like bond by police to reference signifiers of heterosexist ideology ("homophobia", or "machoism") augmented in para-military systems (groups like the police subculture, and then comported to the gay community/subculture). This researcher theorizes a change in the "cultural values and social order on which the [police-gay] interactional ceremonies rest" (Martin, 1987: 318) is a first priority if, for example, the "blue wall" secured by the deployment of masculine hegemony (the shaming of "gayness" especially) is to become unconditional for gays, or, most important, the presentation of a gay self.

PART THREE: SELF-INTERACTION

There are indeed many precautions to imprison a man in what he is, as if we lived in perpetual fear that he might escape from it, that he might escape from it, that he might break away and suddenly elude his condition (Satre, 1956: 59).

The gendered identity is an interactional production (Denzin, 1992: 29).

The irony of identity politics is that in creating an opposition to state oppression, the state's power to define and regulate sexuality is inadvertently increased; yet not to

have an identity is to retreat into defeat, retire into obscurity, or even vanish into invisibility. Consequently, the question becomes one not of 'identity or not' but of 'what identity, where, why and how'?
(Edwards, 1994: 15).

The self is an ambidextrous signifier in symbolic interactions. This final part focuses on the collision between masculine hegemony and confrontations with "heterosexuality", and how the self is either uninhibited or compromised in police-gay interactions.

5.3 THE STRUGGLE WITH SELF FOR IDENTITY

Social actors grow up to be homophobic and that, to wit, constitutes the starting point of internalized homophobia, an interactive effect of the containment of a gay identity. It is heterosexuals who experience internalized homophobia, by name, but for gays, it is the possession of a gay "homognosis".⁶ This implies special knowledge of something, not necessarily positive or negative, and is based on unique insight. The concentration in the following sections centers on how one presents his or her self amid the deployment of hegemonic masculinity. Ultimately, individuals act toward themselves, others, and social objects on the basis of meanings these people (including the given social actor) and objects have for them personally. Such meanings can be superficial, and invented or learned in socialization with significant and generalized others. To this end, Nathanson (1992: 299) contends gay pride is "shame denied, warded off,

reversed, occasionally transcended."

One's self-identity is paramount in the interpretation of sexuality, involving a great deal of introspection from police officers and the gay civilian public in the process of determining just who they are in relation to others. In most cases the actions and/or specific traits of someone can be subject to different interpretations, symbolically.

To...define oneself implies not just that one sleeps with another man or woman, but also that one derives a certain sense of identity, from the fact...it is the act rather than the gender of one's partner that is seen as significant...so that a man who fucks other men but is not himself fucked is not viewed as a homosexual (Altman, 1982: 47).

Consider the murder of a male prison inmate by another (see Norton, 1982: 152) whose genital area had been touched homoerotically by the victim: "this was an assault on his manhood!" The murderer's motive was to provide to his peers a blatant example of symbolic interaction to establish an identity for himself. For men, masculine (heterosexual) hegemony, as a practice, makes homosexual behaviour tolerable only when the man is the sexual aim, and not the sexual object (see Altman, 1982) of a same-sex encounter.

Identity is the lifeblood of self. Gender/sexuality is the most recognizable component of understanding one's position and orientation as he or she charts the course of his or her life. One who is male must learn to be a *man*. One who is female must learn to be a *woman*. And, heterosexual nonetheless, distinctions abound.

Homosexuality (homoeroticism) is far more negatively sanctioned in males than in females and is disapproved of more so by men. This is due largely to the dominant culture's more rigid and binding male gender role ascriptions (masculine hegemony). Gay men, lesbians, and independent women (straight) are the extreme non-conformists as they reject "the program for marriage, family, and home that our society holds up as normal" (Altman, 1993: 25). At a very early age nearly all social actors are taught the evils of those who engage in "perverse" forms of sexuality from their elders or from a pulpit. This lesson then reaches intimate peer-group situations, where words like queerbait, faggot, homo, or even sissy enter one's standard vocabulary (at first) as symbols of someone who is different than the majority of others. Boys especially are strongly discouraged from experimenting in behavioural practices which are considered feminine.

Police-gay interaction effects have lent credence to the idea that "the confrontation that takes place daily between different parts of our society gives a frustrating picture of people who cannot communicate" (Douglas, 1983: 217). Self-interaction, as internalized homophobia, is discussed according to the presentation of the gay self and the identity politics of gays and straights.

5.3.1 The Gay Self

For gays, adolescent years (and onward) are a constant struggle with what some respondents describe as absolute

isolation in attempting to realize their self-identity and coming to grips with the shaming that accompanies a gay identity. Troiden (1979) coined the phrase "gay identity" to refer to the fusion of homosexual sexuality and emotionality into a meaningful whole. However, wider society's traditional view of homosexuality as a stigma prevents the easy attainment of this identity. Pain and suffering are but two of the identity conflicts endured by young gay people, whom society is allegedly protecting under the rubric of containing the spread of "gayness" and of treating the gay person for his or her illness. Do gays accept wider society's invitation to deny them their self-identity or do they reap the benefits (mere acceptance in the mainstream) of turning away from their choices as a sexual being? Being shamed eats away at the self, and by that token launches an all-out assault on self-esteem if the latter pales in comparison to the shame being thrust at the gay community.

"Someone described self-esteem to me as being lovable and capable, and there is nothing reflected to us in our young years that we are worthy of love or that we are capable of living or fulfilling a satisfying life" (gay male 1).

Those in the gay community must work through this, because gays are so susceptible to internalized homophobia from the false images and false beliefs handed them by heterosexuals, who also distance themselves from a gay identity for fear of appearing gay to others. The magnitude of the effects of homosexual containment are not comparable for the two sides.

Sometimes an attribute by which an individual is assigned membership in a group is a label so discrediting (homosexual) that the effects reduce or deny individuals other social identities. Homosexuality is such a stigma in multitudes of social systems and is so discrediting that gay persons are sometimes not entitled to social identities outside the sexual sphere. It has been declared by clerics that gays are not Christians, and we have already discovered that gays were once considered risks to national security. How would they fare as police? For the police officers approached in this study, a pertinent factor is the need for the police subculture to have a strong sense of its own community. There appears a mild sort of paranoia that they must look after their own kind to protect law enforcers from the community at large. This tightly-knit sense of self means that there must be a degree of identity between officers for camaraderie. Having an avowed gay in this small community would force a tension in that fellow officers could not project their own self-image onto the gay officer without somehow accepting a homosexual part of themselves (that, this researcher believes, happens more at a subconscious level). To a lesbian respondent, "given the personality structure of most policemen this causes quite a bit of anxiety."

Quite vehemently and in this way "shame becomes basic to the sense of [a masculine] identity" (Kaufman, 1985: 66) and "forms the foundation around which other feelings about the

self will be experienced" (Ibid.). What, then, are the effects of this masculine personality? By helping to keep the policing system (internally) as much heterosexual as is possible, officers then find themselves rarely having to entertain introspective queries or doubts ranging from their measures of manliness and a straight self. When containment of a gay identity is focal to the actions and mind sets of the police (even those closeted), gays realize the sexual disparities in masculine hegemony and find it inevitable that

"homosexuality is something that is very alien to many police officers simply because it is so diametrically opposed to what they have been taught and been living all their lives. And people fear what they do not understand. In addition, many people are too lazy to understand their reasons for fearing and hating gays, or to question the very assumption culture and society have instilled in them" (gay male 8).

Both the police and gays aid in the suppression of "gayness" by their tendency to refuse acknowledgement of a gay identity and its very existence in many social settings. The police subculture is prime. The "shame" of being gay is internalized on either side: with the police, the self is vested in masculine hegemony, while gays remain closeted for the most part (rampant in policing, as one lesbian officer admitted to this researcher "doesn't it tell you something that I do not want anyone but the two of us to know we had our conversation?" with a definite look of fear in her eyes).

If one assumes shaming, as the product of deployed masculine hegemony, makes an individual raise to a public

level his or her personal self-ideals or personal expectations, the need to have an identity amid adversity becomes a more repressive quest in social interactions. The gay person may ask: why am I doing this to myself? A parent may ask: why are you doing this to us? For anyone, "failing to meet or fulfill a parent's expectations" (Capps, 1993: 72) illuminates the effects of masculine hegemony and shame levied on one's image of self, as it begins to absorb the self totally here. Therefore, by recalling former RCMP commissioner Simmond's words, that the police subculture is also paternalistic in nature, gays are faced with more questions: have I let my straight colleagues down? (taking into consideration that OCPS officers who have said "I'm gay" or "I'm lesbian" have done so only in confidence to the LC staff, as one staff member notes "I can't tell you how many, [grinning] which says a lot, doesn't it?"). Have I not met their expectations of me? And, have I knowingly and intentionally done so? By not being in this particular position, one cannot say for certain.

As an analogy, take the perspective of someone's being "openly" gay in a senior professional role where superiors are not supportive of gay symbols in one's orientation:

"Basically, I try to make sure that we stick to business whenever we are at work. I focus away from my personal life. This suits most senior staff people just fine, as they are so busy, there isn't a lot of time for communication" (gay male 10).

In the police subculture there are a lot more chances for interaction, and self-image is very important. There are two routes a gay officer can take: be "out", or not.

"If they choose not to be out, then they can occasionally make hetero remarks and the like to put forward the image of a playboy. Personally I couldn't stand to live that sort of lie for the long term, so as relationships develop and mature I suspect that gay policemen can indeed come out to some of their close acquaintances and maintain a playboy-type image to others. I once met a senior policeman on the Nepean force who had recently come out to his boss, the police chief! Everything was cool. Of course, like anything else, this particular guy was very good at his job and so his sexual orientation was basically overlooked, more than accepted (gay male 7).

A cultural change (acceptance of gays) will take a generation to overcome, and the key to breaking this down is the elimination of internalized homophobia, as many of the gay fears are not legitimate and thrown out of proportion, and an adoption of society's symbolism of gays. One states "we internalize it routinely, I do believe this, but who do we turn to?" (gay male 1). It has been observed that notably for gay youths there is a desperate need for role models to complement development of the self.

"What strikes me about all of them is how desperate and miserable so many of them seem. We really don't seem to be giving them much positive support. That means the gay and straight communities. For some of them gay support phone lines are their only means of coming out and talking to other gays. Guess I am just a little disappointed. We used to think we'd be behind this now. Now that I have a good job and a lover of fifteen years, it's easy to forget your roots, just mad at myself for not doing more" (gay male 6).

The effects of gay containment on the gay self (in the gay community), it was learned, are much more defined in terms of differentiation and identification, Kaufman's (1985) principal concepts in the attainment of self-identity:

"Gay business leaders and professionals will sometimes cut loose from the drag queens, the male hustlers, the leather culture, as a way of cleansing themselves of a dirty gay identity. I keep telling them not to internalize the problem and remind them that their first gay experience was likely in a park or a washroom. Maybe it's their way of being accepted in the straightworld at the expense of their own" (gay male 3).

Reaction to a gay person coming out to a peer in the police subculture would be damaging to the former. The "sudden impediment to mutuality" (Miller, 1985: 298) here would be costly, for (Capps, 1993: 87)

shame experiences threaten this unity of the inner self, often causing us to feel that we have regressed to an earlier stage in our self-evolution when we were not as congruent as we have subsequently come to believe ourselves to be.

"Outing" falls under scrutiny from the politically adept in the gay community. Do the aftereffects produce proper role models and a viable identity, or do they instead feed (ideologically, emotionally, and symbolically) into the normalcy model perpetrated by the practice of masculine hegemony?

"Outing serves no purpose. Does it stop those closeted from denying their sexuality from being inflammatory? Does it stop the hate and injustice caused by the heterosexism, does it stop the inequality and discrimination? No. We cannot fall prey to those that would sell our own people for the sake of a dollar. Let those in the closet

use their voices to hurt us, let those of us scared of reality feel safe. But never take and sell your people out. Never give in and never give up is easier said than done. We should look to both the white and black races and the methods they have employed to demoralize and disband their inheritance. We must not fall, we must stand fast. And most importantly, if we react in anger we lose" (gay male 7).

The same sentiments hold in the police subculture, wherein police officers are often acting toward a social system that involves interacting with people from a very demanding public domain of influence. As a result, the police are sometimes caught in the middle of public concerns. Certainly, in a small town where homosexuality is not condoned, police enforce and reflect the attitudes of the majority of citizens (slightly comparable to Ottawa, determined by a gay male subject to be too awkward in community size to facilitate widespread outing. Career-wise, this affirmation of self, "outing", may not be career-threatening, but no one will be liked or accepted the same as one of the boys with fellow officers). Suffice to say the police uphold the shared values and mores of that community's internalized meaning systems.

"Senior police officials hold great influence over their group; look at the Airborne regiment. I work a lot with the RCMP and see the influence of the police power structure. If there is an unwritten attitude, it is that all fags deserve what they get. Thus it is difficult for a policeman to reject this notion publicly without fear of being identified with gays. Given the need for strong ties between force members, this effectively cancels out the natural counter-balancing force" (gay male 5).

As one officer reports,

"change can't happen from the inside. If the public doesn't raise hell about perceived homophobia then it will never stop."

Similarly,

"homophobia is both insitutionalized and internalized in our society. If we cannot expect the police to hold the line amongst themselves how can we expect the society at large which is much less likely to adhere to the rule of law?" (lesbian 4).

Gay respondents who know the closeted officers at the Ottawa station and the adversity posed on their respective selves (the gay self and the internalized homophobe), both symbols of the containment of "gayness" in police-gay interactions, explain that "gay pride" is what will neutralize the masculine hegemony exuded in symbolic interaction:

"the officers who know [gays] will see, understand, and respect the fact that [gays] have cleared the obstacle of machismo. Also, years from now, when it is not unusual for a gay man to go into policing⁷, [gays] will be able to have that warm feeling [as opposed to shame] that they are part of the history of social change⁸, that [gays] have made a difference and improved [their] community" (gay male 5).

The containment of a gay identity is much more self-absorbing for gays in the social world of the police. As this realization becomes more pressing, they are faced with three options for their self: hide their gay identity; attempt to change the prevailing gay stereotypes they feel are self-destructive; or, in fact, accept themselves as gay sexual beings and maintain their sexual identity. Accepting "gayness" as normal would be optimal since this would make it

possible for gays (officers) to reach the needed fusion of sexuality and emotionality, or a gay identity. For most, self-containment and attempts to change are the strategies of coping with the categorical *subordinated masculinity* as a delegation in wider society and in policing. Masculine hegemony uses its resources to reinforce the above strategies and prevent gay self-acceptance.

5.3.2 Gay Identity Politics

A pattern usually associated with high levels of masculine hegemony, and in turn internalized homophobia, is the delayed development of a gay identity. The extreme effects of self-rejection from members of the gay community (Slater, 1993) that are applicable to shameful situations nurtured from police-gay encounters are a gay's feeling of self-hatred and, as Miller (1985: 138) describes them, "interactions between shame and feelings of superiority or triumph" (explored in the section to follow), a trait common among heterosexuals. As one state increases, so does the other. What are the effects on the gay self, initially?

"Rejection by the community, but mostly of themselves! I wonder if this is any different from the first black to join the police force. The real problem with a really closeted person is that they are so homophobic themselves that they identify with the aggressor and therefore feel that they deserve the consequences of being found out. There is a certain amount of humiliation that I suspect they may feel" (gay male 7).

One respondent in particular (a closeted lesbian officer) indicated that if her sexual orientation was revealed she

would become, and thus be known as, the *dyke*. The effect of this is very damaging to morale, not to mention the self. The interaction enjoyed in the police subculture would diminish: "I would be cut off. No one on the force would openly support or help me through the isolation that lies ahead. There would only be my partner (*not an officer*) and my friends in the gay community." Another expands on the open-closeted dichotomization of self presentations, or generally one's self-interaction.

"Extremely closeted people, including officers, suffer more abuse and are more intimidated by others than those gays and lesbians that are a little happier with themselves. People who accept themselves to a great degree are more likely to be accepted by others. Do I have a study to show this? No. So, extremely closeted people suffer more when they are found out, not primarily because of the way the community reacts to him or her but more how they react to the community" (lesbian 2).

Outside of the gay community (subculture) there is no real mainstream community for gays until they can retreat from the straightworld. Policing is a stark example. It is a case of "if you are gay or lesbian, do it and talk about it on your own time" (male officer 4). "Homophobia" is heavily internalized:

"It has more to do with us rather than the police. I'm not saying more action on their part would not help anti-gay crimes diminish, but that we need to stand up and demand equal treatment in the eyes of the law. We are not very good at this sort of thing as a subculture. The problem with us is that we do not feel entitled to equal treatment, more in an unconscious way, and therefore do not seek it" (gay male 8).

Foucault's (1979; 1980; 1994) musings on identity politics clarify the role of self as a point of reference in police-gay interactions. Power, in relation to the deployment of masculine hegemony, is again central. When attached to self-identity, power allows one to define himself or herself most strongly. The effects of these police-gay encounters raise two major concerns. In one, the police, prisoners of their occupational choice (Vincent, 1990: 109), and gays, with the "everything I do is gay!" (Bawer, 1993: 153) syndrome, arrive at a resolute dependency on their in-group. This distances the two groups more.

The other concern is for both the police and gays to reconsider, seriously, the meaning of the term "sexual orientation", and the words "heterosexual" and the clinically-inclined "homosexual". One is raised to think of himself or herself and act as normal, or "different" (sexually and emotionally), and not to dismiss the dichotomous categorization of sexuality. Identity is an either/or situation, as a label determines one's self-concept.

We know what theoretical problems are presented to logic by the material constancy of the symbols used (how to define the identity of a symbol through the various substances in which it may be embodied and the variations of form that it can tolerate? How to recognize it and make certain that it is the same, if it must be defined as 'a concrete physical form'?); we know too what problems are presented to logic by the very notion of a series of symbols (what do 'precede' and 'follow' mean? Come 'before' and 'after'? In what space is such an order situated? (Foucault, 1994: 100-1).

In policing this method is still used by officers for them to see themselves and others. The police subculture and the gay community/subculture are in-groups for their members. Each is a form of social identity dependent on material status that has within it the seeds of discrimination and misuse. This aspect of police-gay interactions is vital to the gay political movement,

whose aim is its own demise: "gay liberation will have achieved its full potential when it is no longer needed." And it will no longer be needed when the categorical differences between the "normal" and the "abnormal" disappear (Altman, 1993: 12).

Once one categorizes a group of people, one loses important information about that group and simultaneously assigns misinformation one believes one has about the group.

In particular, attention must be paid to men's politics, to gays an incredibly paradoxical and irrational movement found in the social circles of dominant male gender relations/identity politics. It compels them to ask: how do members of the most privileged segment of wider society, straight men, justify such a movement?

The guilt of finding yourself unknowingly exploitative of and sometimes rejected by women you love, the terror of our fears about gayness and proving masculinity, the horrible competitiveness that pits us against each other in ego power plays that inhibit expressions of vulnerability, weakness; all these things and many different motivations have turned each of us to other men to collectively struggle past our sexual identities (Dubross, 1971, in Altman, 1993: 233).

In all, this is one of the few hetero-male admissions to the effects of shame, in following the precepts of masculine

hegemony, on record. But one can see the gays' point of view, identity-wise. Look at Dubross' list once again. A gay man, at various times in his life, will experience every one of these effects, which leads this reasearcher to believe that instead of accentuating straight-gay differences the proponents of identity politics should be consolidating them to a suitable means to an end in the hetero-homo debate. Tolson (1977: 143), an anti-sexist theorist, agrees, and gives to the reader an understanding, albeit cynically, of how relevant these thoughts are, even today.

As men, as the agents of a patriarchal culture, we remained the dominant gender. In a certain sense, we were imperialists in a rebellion of slaves--concerned, defensively, about the threat to our privilege. The very notion of 'men's politics' was paradoxical. We had no experience of sexual oppression, violence, jokes at our expense. There were no issues to unite us--no basis for action against a system that already operates in our favour. This paradox was driven home by gay men at Men Against Sexism conferences. Above all, we had not 'come out'--we remained heterosexual, embarrassed at being gay, typical liberal men.

This containment of the gay self-identity has wider consequences, according to some police questioned. These officers believe that the present age of consent (four years higher than for heterosexuals) makes young gay men and women distrustful of a law that criminalizes them and makes them less co-operative with the police, thus having an adverse effect on the entire law enforcement system, no matter how far ahead the gay community comes as far as gaining full acceptance in policing. But is the gay self-hatred that can

overshadow gay identity politics really the fault of becoming too involved in the gay movement, or fanatically proclaiming "gay pride"?

"Heterosexism is a relatively natural state for a society to adopt. After all, we are in a small minority, probably five-to-six percent of the population. Being raised in such a society naturally has consequences in our psychosocial development. Accepting that we are less in some way can easily be an outcome. Regardless of the developmental pathways that got many gays and lesbians to this insidious state of mind, I think a lot of us carry these attitudes with us" (gay male 8).

When influential societal institutions contain "gayness", they foster violence. As social actors, gay or straight, one is not taught to handle growing up gay in this society, so one engenders violence and hatred against it. That is why the proper development of gay identity in gays must include a great amount of power in the defining process of self-interaction to avoid the internalizing of homophobia.

5.3.3 The Straight "Superior Self"

Some police approached believe gays seek special treatment, and insist all people possess the same rights (civil and legal) and have equal access to institutions and services in place (police services, for example) to help them if an injustice occurs. This piousness relates to the presentation of a heterosexual self, in this instance a feeling of superiority (the police) that segregates gays from the straight populace. Police etiquette and self-control is dependent on its occupational identity: the stalwart officer,

like the "real man" who never cries. Also, in the case of police, the "shift from shame to superiority feelings maintains attention on the character of the self. Superiority feelings...signify a state in which one tells oneself that one has *disengaged* from the other, who is seen as not being worth the bother of a sustained relationship" (Miller, 1985: 138). Basically, the process entails shielding police pride through internalized homophobia, captured vividly in the area of power strategies involving sexuality.

A police system is a system that features both the "deployment of alliance" and the deployment of sexuality" (Foucault, 1980: 106). In particular, the police are bound by rules which tell them what is right and what is wrong. In a deployment of alliance the power to control "the interplay of relations and maintain the law that governs them" (Ibid.) is omnipresent; a "continual extension of areas and forms of control" (Ibid.) is offered by the deployment of sexuality. The first process caters to the heterosexual, as does the second.

Police officers (many gays claim) have a public obligation to better the communities they vow to protect and serve, and represent by their public self-image a supportive agency for widely unpopular groups, the gay community included. A concern is raised over officers responding to calls involving gays: at how police interpret the situation that confronts them and how they organize their collective

actions, based on this interpretation (the actions originate from a July 21, 1994, call to an incident of gay domestic violence involving two gay males).

- police were wearing rubber gloves
- officers threw the gloves into the flower bed as they left
- the 911 dispatcher repeated "cheating" four times; officer asked for "wife"
- asked for a male officer, got a woman and a man, a black man
- the officers stood outside and laughed
- a total of three officers responded
- officers left when the complainant said he did not want to press charges (LC minutes, October 24, 1994).

This is evidence of the straight "superior self", and symbolizes the importance of how one tests his or her conception of people in another role (a gay couple, not the expected heterosexual pairing). What gays are subject to is the process of definition whereby an officer will present his or her self to sustain or alter the impression of him or her desired by the victim when police-gay interactive encounters like the above occur.

A doubtful, outspoken respondent (rhetorically) tells of how, as he termed it, "gay-positive public relation stunts" by the police service (David Pepper's promotion, for one) shatter any meaningful police-gay interactions if the officers are inclined to present a "superior self":

"Current laws do indeed protect our human rights, and that goes without mentioning the age of consent law for anal intercourse. The question is, just who is human and who isn't? Throughout history people have been denied their rights by the simple process of classifying them as less than human. Slavery was upheld by those who insisted

blacks occupied a niche somewhere between animals and humans. The concept of human rights held no hope for them until they were given special protection under a constitution. In military war, we rationalize the killing of our enemies by reducing them to sub-human levels. Ask any GI what a gook is, or an Airborne what a nigger is" (gay male 7).

The gay community contends this model of the self continues as a powerful symbol in the policing system:

"gays, branded as immoral, godless, lecherous, diseased, depraved, and undeserving of the treatment afforded to decent normal (straight) people are being de-humanized by their enemies in order to make them acceptable victims of violence and discrimination. Just substitute fag for gook or nigger. So, do gays need special protection? Unfortunately, yes. And they'll continue to need it until straight society extends them recognition and full equality instead of mere toleration. No one should have to live as a guest or a semi-citizen in their own country, and surely to God not behind a badge of law" (Ibid.).

The effects of the straight "superior self" are definately felt in the gay community, illustrated by how easily the internalized homophobia of heterosexuals (with the latter's attempts to rid themselves of the shame of being gay while maintaining the power to do this as a symbol of what not to be) causes dissention among the gay community and all too often makes gays seem like special status seekers.

"The gay community is quickly losing the battle for equality. When was the last time you heard someone who is gay explain to you the empowerment technique of gays using the words queer, fag, dyke, etc. Unfortunately, these references to derogatory meanings only hurts the gay community. Until the gay community is concerned only about helping the gay community and no one else, we fall short of changing the perceptions of those who view the gay community as fags, dykes, and queers.

And they aren't Christians or Breeders, but instead people who know little about sexual orientation and identity. What we hate being done to us, we are all too often doing to ourselves. We must make our community strong enough through good ethics, morals--religious or personal--and examples. Pro-lifers haven't won over the majority because they've been promoting a radical, protest-in-the-streets agenda. The gay community cannot afford to do the same" (lesbian 5).

The straight notion of portraying gays as selling the idea of gay special rights by the deployment of power with the superior self as its guide, is transcended to heterosexist society and provides the latter social system with more support in the containment of "gayness". The problem with instilling conformist ethical, political, and moral values within the gay community (and presenting them as a gay identity in interactive and social encounters) is that they are people of different backgrounds, races, ideals, religions, and so on. As for the protest-in-the streets agenda and the usage of the terms fag, dyke, or queer, opinions vary. Are they of use as positive symbols of a distinct group? They do, however, end up helping the gay community in efforts to interact with the police. These actions open up lines of communication otherwise not there, actual round-table discussions, and makes it known that the gay community--and the gay lifestyle--do, in fact, exist, and that there is no real need to be ashamed by it.

The topic of an *in-your-face* gay identity is one in which the truth has become a casualty. With the imposition of masculine (heterosexist) hegemony in the wider social world,

the majority is, to a police officer, seen as safe.

"Opponents of gay-rights ordinances argue that such measures open the door to rampant paedophilia, public love-making, and other horrible acts. They also argue that these ordinances will among other things frighten away new businesses and let hordes of gay teachers into the schools. I can't think of the public's reaction to openly gay and lesbian police officers. The truth is that in communities where gay-rights ordinances have been adopted, none of these trends has occurred. Not a single study shows that the passage of gay-rights laws brings out the worst in gay people or corrupts the populace. Gay people simply go about their lives, mainly closeted, I might add, with the added comfort that they are legally protected from discrimination. Nothing more" (gay male 5).

What gays emphasize in identity politics is that a policeman "believes implicitly that his group is right and any concessions to the opponents is a generous gesture and not an increasing belief in the veracity of their case" (Douglas, 1983: 217). And, majority rights are protected by masculine hegemony.

Closeted officers and civilian gays who did voice an opinion arrive at a mutual agreement and understanding on the previous dictates over a decade later. The conclusion: internalized homophobia of any kind aside, until the gay community is accepted by wider society and is guaranteed absolutely of civil and legal rights gays have little chance of gaining them while donning the police uniform. Thus, one must never underestimate the interactive effects of shaming on both gays and straights, foreshadowed by the deployment of masculine hegemony, that in police-gay interactions tells us a lot about ourselves and how we perceive, judge, internalize

homophobia, and "contain" others who conventionally are said to deviate from an established (sexual) norm: heterosexuality.

The gays in this study themselves identify their biggest problems as originating from the need for secrecy (of a gay identity) and disapproval of the heterosexual world. The only visible way to absolve the resulting containment of "gayness" is to change the basis for the shaming process, the practice of masculine hegemony. Police officers are absorbed into the status quo that has reduced "gayness" to sexual caricatures and has elevated police to a position of power: *hegemonic masculinity*. Like some policewomen, a gay's sex role behaviour is "circumscribed by the sex stereotyped roles into which they are cast" (Martin, 1987: 318), making both groups susceptible to "harassment yet held responsible for the outcome of the interaction" (Ibid.). The shaming and containment of a gay identity has endured in policing and wider society from years of ignorance and fear of gay sexual beings (as opposed to the negatively-sanctioned "sexual orientation"). Education (OCPS diversity training) and the example of gay role models will be the meaningful way to attack masculine hegemony at its foundation, for as Pharr (1988: 2) reminds the reader,

its power is great enough to keep ten to twenty percent of the population living lives of fear (if their sexual identity is hidden) or lives of danger (if their sexual identity is invisible) or both. And its power is great enough to keep the remaining eighty to ninety percent of the population [police included] trapped in their own fears.

Here lies the most lingering of all police-gay interaction effects.

Notes:

¹Alan Packwood (1993) takes the theme of homosexual bodies as a contagion to gay and bisexual men living with AIDS. Highly recommended reading, the focus here is on "The Homosexual Body as Site of Contagion", Chapter Two, pp. 17-26) in his unpublished M.A. thesis Narratives of Identity and Resistance: Gay and Bisexual Men Living with HIV and AIDS, completed while a student at Carleton University.

²The former chief of police in Ottawa could not say the word "gay" without choking first! (see Pepper, 1993a).

³Meaning straight people are the lone men on the totem pole (symbolic of hegemonic masculinity).

⁴The respondent is making reference to Bawer's (1993) A Place at the Table: The Gay Individual in American Society.

⁵Ironic that the respondent used this word!

⁶This researcher wishes to thank Professor John Shearer for the use of this term.

⁷While quite possibly utopian, there may be some credence in the respondent's statement. Although sentiments in Ottawa's gay community more times than not describe the OCPS as "non-homophobic" (due to carefully constructed police-gay public relations), an Internet search revealed police services on either side of the border which include fully recognized groups for "openly gay" officers.

In Canada, the most well-known of these is the Law Enforcement Gay Alliance (LEGAL) within the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force (MTPF). Recently embroiled in a legal squabble with its straight colleagues, LEGAL appealed to the Ontario Human Rights Commission against the MTPF's refusal to distribute and make available to officers, at 13 Division, its newsletter.

In the United States, police-gay alliances appear to be running more smoothly. New York boasts the Gay Officers Action League (GOAL), members of which made up the sample for sociologist Stephen Leinen's Gay Cops (1993). The Golden State Peace Officers Association is an organization made up of gay and lesbian peace officers in the San Francisco Police, Sheriff's Deputies, California Highway Patrol, Corrections, and several other police organizations. Chicago also has a

gay police organization formally recognized within its department; their members march in the Gay Pride parades and do other very public things. In 1994 the police chief in Chicago marched with the gay officers; meanwhile, in 1995 some members of the Ottawa Police Association and the OCPS are calling for the resignation of Ottawa-Carleton's chief of police, one of the main reasons being his efforts to placate "gay" interests at the expense of "police" interests.

'But, speaking with reference to the police services in Ottawa (and Canada), they are still very much male-macho-oriented, and most of the time, officers who want any form of promotion do not "come out" if they are a gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered person. Stated a gay male respondent: "it is a sad fact, but that is the way things are, even in the politically correct 1990s."

CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusion

We play our parts not only according to our scripts prepared from past response to group experience, but also to our interpretation of our current situation and it is also developed and maintained by our past experience. We are much more tramlike than most of us care to admit, but unlike trams we have the capacity to change if we want to if and when we become aware of our tramlike progress through life (Douglas, 1983: 215).

This thesis has attempted to examine the issue of masculine hegemony emanating, at a micro-level, from the police occupational subculture, by looking at the deployment of this dominant ideology in the police system and on the gay community/subculture, and by looking at various interaction effects surfacing from police-gay encounters. This thesis argues that masculine hegemony, when exercised, "contains" a gay identity in the police and gay subcultural settings. The city of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, serves as a case-study.

How can this circumstance be accounted for? Despite the OCPS's precedents in affecting positive police-gay liaison, the gay community's culture, lifestyle, and sexuality are tolerated (not accepted) only pseudo-legally. Policing began as a male occupation solely; and while women may "feminize" a police service, gays symbolize something else all together. How are these valid generalizations, and not accusations?

The study presents a symbolic interactionist account of police-gay interaction effects. Briefly summarized are the strategies of containment of "gayness" examined:

1. Through the examination of the social construction of masculine hegemony by church and state it was shown that this form of gendered power is institutionalized and is inherited by dominant para-military systems like the police, and affected in the gay community. Today, the OCPS is moving more toward political correctness and effective liaison with members of the gay community. Having every police officer subject to anti-homophobic diversity training, led by gays, is a step forward in relieving negative police-gay interaction effects.

2. An adage holds that perceptions are more harmful than the truth. "Gayness" is contained by police because gays are usually reduced to sexual caricatures, for a lot of people a hard conception to see through during interactive encounters with them. Gays still find the police to be somewhat "macho", "power-tripping" individuals whose trust is not easily secured. With the LC and the diversity training, the frequency of police-gay interactions is higher and the nature of them are, at surface level, "gay-positive". Beneath the veneer of politically correct exchanges between these groups there lies the possibility for sustained internalized homophobia.

3. To restate the problem, masculine hegemony is exercised to maintain the superiority of male groups over the alleged "fairer" sex. Aside from societal discrimination, in the policing system (and even within the gay community) women are the targets of sexism and heterosexism. Lesbians are tolerated more so than gay men, but included in this "token" acceptance are many harsh perceptions: the thought of two women together symbolizes a male sexual fantasy; or, women are given a "tomboy" image, making them "one of the boys" in the police subculture.

4. Each police service, while maintaining a separate identity, is an element of a uniform, transparent system that amounts to the sum of its parts. Thus, police officers come across as "conformist" to minority groups (and "deviant" groups), like the gay community. There are three main reasons for continued containment of "gayness" in the police subculture, or in the gay community: gays are afraid to "come out"; gays do not feel it important for themselves to do so (self-assurance); and, gays feel trapped within an unaccepting microcosm of wider society. The police subculture in particular is intense, and to go against its dominant values and norms is a risky sojourn. And, there is the locker-room talk between officers in the police station's "backstage". The "prevailing gay jokes" told there (as one officer describes them) are evidence that the police subculture will never relinquish its masculine ethos, as in: "would these gays use the same showers we do?" (male officer 4).

5. Identity politics of heterosexuality and homosexuality in police-gay interactions are complex, as are presentations of self. The police code of conduct is a give and take relationship with the welfare of public morality: relationships between officers and interactions with gays they meet reflect what wider society approves. Sociologists point out what is echoed by many gays, of the rewards for being "normal" so astronomical that those who are able to pass as normal will do so without hesitation. In order to remain an accepted member in different social settings and to retain certain relationships, symbols of a gay identity must be hidden/contained. On the OCPS no gay or lesbian officers are "open" in the police system. The LC staff have been frequented by officers "in the closet", and the identities of these individuals are kept confidential. Gays in and out of the police subculture not wanting their "gayness" to be privy information to other officers and/or acquaintances is proof enough of the internal (police) and external (the wider society) pressures they must fend against.

Then there is the issue of examining the "shame" of being gay in this study. How is it relevant to sociological research?

In a free society, one cannot and should not have enough police to enforce this morality (masculine hegemony), so it has to be internalized in the individual citizen. Shame, the negative feeling resulting from violating an internalized moral code, is thus an important means of regulating (sexual) behaviour. The question is what moral beliefs are required, which can be mediated through the political process, and which must be left to individual conscience. Many people are indifferent to the use of the word "shame", no doubt wondering how police officers could advocate the use of an emotion (in itself a symbol) to enforce the public morality they "serve and protect".

Consider the police officer who interacts with gays, and who knows firsthand the stigma of homosexuality, both within the law and in areas where gay impersonal sex takes place. How does one keep from engaging in behaviour which one considers immoral, if not to a great extent the negative emotion--*shame*--one feels when one does so, or wishes to do so? In this sense, that negative emotional response deters one from engaging in immoral behaviour contrary to masculine hegemony. If this occurs at the individual level then it holds true, at the aggregate level, for larger social groups, the police subculture included.

In conclusion, "homophobia" may appear inevitable when this ideology affects the interaction rituals between straights and gays from all walks of life. However, in any particular social context, with policing being no exception, a lot of homophobic practices are current--that is, "homophobia" is a relatively new concept. Therefore, in response to the question of how the police system contains a person's sexual (gay) identity in interactions with gays, it would be of interest in a major piece of follow-up sociological research to take this study further and encapsulate the relationship between community attitudes, senior police attitudes, and the police service to understand better the roots of police homophobic attitudes and behaviours in the proliferation of masculine hegemony.

The argument posed by this thesis and by the interaction effects between police officers and members of the gay community raises one more important question. What direction will (sexual) identity politics take as we head toward the millennium? Police-gay interactions intertwined by the effects of masculine hegemony encompasses "the regulation of desire" about which Kinsman (1987) writes. Whether this ideology is deployed by the police or the wider society as a whole, it is right for either body to abhor sexualities which harm individuals, but also wrong when the simple fact of someone being gay denies that person a self-identity. A gay individual should not have to live a life of "containment", and a straight officer should not have to judge another's sexual preference. Processes of socialization are made up of symbolic interactions, and should not be categorized by the words "straight" and "gay" when they are used as identity labels to sequester "gayness". That, in so many words, is the point this researcher has tried to get across.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill, and Bryan S. Turner
1988 The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Penguin Books.
- Adam, B.D.
1987 The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement. Boston: Twayne Publications.
- Adlam, R.C.A.
1981 "The Police Personality." In Pope and Weiner (eds.) Modern Policing. London: Croom Helm.
- Althusser, Louis
1971 Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. New York: Monthly Review.
- Altman, Dennis
1982 The Homosexualization of America. The Americanization of the Homosexual. New York: St. Martin's Press.
1993 Homosexual: Oppression and Liberation (new edition). New York: United Press.
- Anonymous
1994 Fact Sheet on Lesbians' Concerns with the Criminal Justice System in Ottawa-Carleton. Ottawa.
- Babbie, Earl
1994 The Practice of Social Research (seventh edition). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Bartley, Jim
1983 "Morality: Fishing For Victims." The Body Politic Jan/Feb (90): 9.
- Bawer, Bruce
1993 A Place at the Table: The Gay Individual in American Society. New York: Posiedon Press.
- Becker, Howard
1963 Outsiders. New York: Free Press Glencoe.
- Blumer, Herbert
1969 Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Bobak, Laura
1995 "Hazing: 'Ritual of Humiliation' Designed to Strip Away Individuality." The Ottawa Sun March 12: 24-5.

- Bogdan, Robert, and Steven J. Taylor
 1975 Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Phenomenological Approach to the Social Sciences. New York: Wiley.
- Boswell, John
 1980 Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bouza, Chief Anthony V. (Ret.)
 1990 The Police Mystique. New York: Plenum Press.
- Braithwaite, John
 1989 Crime, Shame and Reintegration. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, Marc
 1994 "Homosexuality as Deviance: The Case of the Gay Police Officer." British Journal of Criminology 34 (2) Spring: 192-203.
- Byne, William
 1994 "Biological Evidence Challenged: Even if Genetic and Neuroanatomical Traits Turn Out to be Correlated with Sexual Orientation, Causation is far from Proven." Scientific American 270 (5) May: 44-9.
- Canada
 1958 Report of the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Capps, Donald
 1993 The Depleted Self. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Carrigan, Tim, Bob Connell, and John Lee
 1985 "Hard and Heavy: Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." Pp. 139-87 in H. Brod (ed.), The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Charon, Joel M.
 1985 Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cohen, Ed
 1993 Talk on the Wilde Side: Toward a Genealogy of a Discourse on Male Sexualities. New York: Routledge.

Coleman, Eli

- 1988 "Assessments of Sexual Orientation." Pp. 9-24 in Eli Coleman (ed.), Integrated Identity for Gay Men and Lesbians: Psychotherapeutic Approaches for Emotional Well-Being. New York: Harrington Park Press.

Comstock, Gary David

- 1988 "Victims of Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence." Journal of Interpersonal Violence 4 (1): 101-6.

Connell, R.W.

- 1987 Gender and Power. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
1990 "A Whole New World: Remaking Masculinity in the Context of the Environmental Movement." Gender and Society 4: 452-78.
1992 "A Very Straight Gay: Masculinity, Homosexual Experience, and the Dynamics of Gender." American Sociological Review 57: 735-51.
1993 "The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History." Theory and Society 22 (5): 597-623.

Dahl, R.A.

- 1970 Modern Political Analysis (second edition). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Deegan, Mary Jo

- 1987 "Symbolic Interactionism and the Study of Women: An Introduction." Pp. 3-18 in Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill (eds.), Women and Symbolic Interactionism. Boston: Allen & Unwin Inc.

Denzin, Norman K.

- 1992 Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The Politics of Interpretation. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Donaldson, Mike

- 1993 "What is Hegemonic Masculinity?" Theory and Society 22 (5): 643-57.

Douglas, Tom

- 1983 Groups. New York: Tavistock Publications.

Edwards, Tim

- 1994 Erotics & Politics: Gay Male Sexuality, Masculinity and Feminism. New York: Routledge.

Ellis, A.L.

- 1993 "Prior Interpersonal Contact With and Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians in an Interviewing Context." Journal of Homosexuality 25 (4): 31-45.

- Finn, P., and T. McNeil
 1987 The Response of the Criminal Justice System to Bias Crime: An Exploratory Review. Cambridge: Abt Associates, Inc.
- Forcese, Dennis P.
 1992 Policing Canadian Society. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Foucault, Michel
 1979 Discipline and Punish. New York: Vintage Books.
 1980 The History of Sexuality Volume 1. New York: Vintage Books.
 1994 The Archaeology of Knowledge. London: Routledge.
- Gannon, Mo
 1995 "Sticks and Stones: Rooting Out Hate With the Bias Crime Unit." The Ottawa X Press. Wednesday, June 14, 1995.
- Glassner, Barry
 1980 Essential Interactionism. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Goddard, Victoria
 1987 "Honour and Shame: The Control of Women's Sexuality and Group Identity in Naples." Pp. 166-92 in Pat Caplan (ed.), The Cultural Construction of Sexuality. London: Tavistock Publications Ltd.
- Goffman, Erving
 1959 The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Anchor Books (Doubleday).
 1961 Encounters. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
 1963 Stigma. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
 1967 Interaction Ritual. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goldman, Nathan
 1950 Police Selection of Juvenile Offenders. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Gough, Jamie, and Mike Macnair
 1985 Gay Liberation in the Eighties. London: Pluto Press.
- Gramsci, A.
 1975 Letters from Prison, L. Lawner (ed.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Greenberg, David F.
 1988 The Construction of Homosexuality. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson
1983 Ethnography: Principles in Practice. London: Tavistock.
- Hart, Fiona
1990 "The Construction of Masculinity in Men's Friendships: Misogyny, Heterosexism and Homophobia." Resources for Feminist Research 19 (3-4): 60-7.
- Herek, Gregory M.
1984a "Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men: A Factor-Analytic Study." Journal of Homosexuality 10 (1/2): 39-51.
1985 "Beyond Homophobia: A Social Psychological Perspective on Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men." Pp. 1-22 in John P. Ce Cecco (ed.), Bashers, Baiters & Bigots: Homophobia in American Society. New York: Harrington Park Press.
1986 "On Heterosexual Masculinity: Some Physical Consequences of the Social Construction of Gender and Sexuality." American Behavioral Scientist 29: 563-77.
- Holmes, Bob
1994 "Gay Gene Test 'Inaccurate and Immoral'." New Scientist 141 (1915) March 5: 9.
- Hultberg, Peer
1988 "Shame: A Hidden Emotion." Journal of Analytical Psychology 33: 109-26.
- Humphreys, Laud
1970/ Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places.
1975 Chicago: Aldine.
- Humphries, Martin
1985 "Gay Machismo." Pp. 70-85 in A. Metcalf and Martin Humphries (eds.), The Sexuality of Men. London: Pluto.
- Jackson, Margaret
1987 "'Facts of Life' or the Eroticization of Women's Oppression? Sexology and the Social Construction of Heterosexuality." Pp. 52-81 in Pat Caplan (ed.), The Cultural Construction of Sexuality. London: Tavistock Publications Ltd.
- Kaufman, Gershen
1985 Shame: The Power of Caring. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Kinsman, Gary
1987 The Regulation of Desire. Montreal: Black Rose.

- 1993 "'Inverts,' 'Psychopaths' and 'Normal' Men: Historical Sociological Perspectives on Gay and Heterosexual Masculinities." In Tony Haddad (ed.), Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Kirby, Sandra, and Kate McKenna
1989 Experience Research Social Change: Methods from the Margins. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Leahy, Terry
1992 "Positively Experienced Man/Boy Sex: The Discourse of Seduction and the Social Construction of Masculinity." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 28 (1): 71-88.
- LeBlanc, Denis
1982 "Gays and Police Meet." GO INFO 9 (1) May: 2.
- Leinen, Stephen
1993 Gay Cops. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Martin, Susan E.
1987 "Sexual Politics in the Workplace: The Interactional World of Policewomen." Pp. 303-22 in Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill (eds.), Women and Symbolic Interactionism. Boston: Allen & Unwin, Inc.
- McConville, Michael, and Dan Shepherd
1992 Watching Police, Watching Communities. New York: Routledge.
- Mead, George Herbert
1934 Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Meltzer, Bernard N., John W. Petras, and Larry T. Reynolds
1975 Symbolic Interactionism. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Menaker, E.
1992 "Are We Ashamed of Shame?" Contemporary Psychology 37 (2): 127.
- Messerschmidt, James W.
1993 Masculinities and Crime. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Mestel, Rosie
1994 "X Marks the Spot (A Genetic Link to Homosexuality)." Discover 15 (1) January: 71.

Middleton, Peter

1992 The Inward Gaze: Masculinity & Subjectivity in Modern Culture. New York: Routledge.

Miller, Susan

1985 The Shame Experience. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Mohr, Richard D.

1988 Gays/Justice: A Study of Ethics, Society, and Law. New York: Columbia University Press.

Morrison, Andrew P.

1989 Shame: The Underside of Narcissism. Hillsdale: Analytic Press.

Mouffe, C. (ed.)

1979 Gramsci and Marxist Theory. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Namaste, Ki

1993 Transgendered and Violence: An Exploration. A Brief submitted to the Quebec Human Rights Commission, in conjunction with their public hearings on Discrimination and Violence against Lesbians and Gay Men.

Nardi, Peter M.

1992 "Sex, Friendship, and Gender Roles Among Gay Men." Pp. 173-85 in Peter M. Nardi (ed.), Men's Friendships. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Nathanson, Donald L.

1992 Shame and Pride: Affect, Sex and the Birth of Self. New York: Norton.

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF)

1986 Anti-Gay Violence and Victimization in 1985. Washington: NGLTF.

1987 Anti-Gay Violence and Victimization in 1986. Washington: NGLTF.

1988 Anti-Gay Violence and Victimization in 1987. Washington: NGLTF.

1989 Anti-Gay Violence and Victimization in 1988. Washington: NGLTF.

1990 Anti-Gay Violence and Victimization in 1989. Washington: NGLTF.

1991 Anti-Gay/Lesbian Violence, Victimization and Defamation in 1990. Washington: NGLTF Policy Institute.

Neisen, Joseph H.

1990 "Heterosexism or Homophobia? The Power of the Language We Use." Out/Look (Fall) 3 (2): 36-7.

- Neuman, W. Lawrence
1991 Social Research Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nimmons, David
1994 "Sex and the Brain (Genetic Basis for Homosexuality)." Discover 15 (3) March: 64-8, 70-1.
- Norton, Joseph L.
1982 "The Effect of Changing Sex Roles on Male Homosexuals." Pp. 151-64 in Kenneth Solomon and Norman B. Levy (eds.), Men in Transition. New York: Plenum Press.
- Nuttin, Jozef M. and William D. Crano
1989 "Proposal for a Heuristic Quasi-Social Analysis of Social Behaviour: The Case of Harlow's 'Nature of Love'." European Journal of Social Psychology 19 (5) September/October: 371-83.
- Ottawa-Carleton Police Service Bias Crime Unit and the Liaison Committee
1995 Brief submitted to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs respecting Bill C-41, an Act to Amend the Criminal Code (Sentencing) and other Acts in Consequence Thereof. Ottawa (February).
- Ottawa-Carleton Police Service Liaison Committee
1994 Minutes of monthly meeting. (Ottawa, October 24).
- Ottawa Police Bias Crime Unit
1994 "Ottawa Police Bias Crime Unit." Ottawa (May).
- Owen, Craig
1987 "Outlaws: Gay Men in Feminism." In Alice Jardine and Paul Smith (eds.), Men in Feminism. New York: Methuan.
- Packwood, Alan N.
1993 Narratives of Identity and Resistance: Gay and Bisexual Men Living with HIV and AIDS. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Page, R.M.
1984 Stigma. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pepper, David
1993a "A Criminal Negligence: Making Police Respond to Gay Bashing." Outcomes 1993: 34-7.
1993b Community Based Responses to Bias Crimes: Some Critical Steps. Submission to the Quebec Human Rights Commission on Anti-Gay and Anti-Lesbian Violence in Montreal.

- Pharr, Suzanne
1988 Homophobia: A Weapon of Sexism. Inverness: Chardon Press.
- Plasek, John Wayne, and Janicemarie Allard
1985 "Misconceptions of Homophobia." Pp. 23-38 in John P. DeCecco (ed.), Bashers, Baiters & Bigots: Homophobia in American Society. New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Pleck, Joseph
1980 "Men's Power with Women, Other Men, and in Society." Pp. 417-33 in E.H. Pleck and J.H. Pleck (eds.), The American Man. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Plummer, Kenneth
1975 Sexual Stigma: An Interactionist Account. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
1981 The Making of the Modern Homosexual, ed. London: Hutchinson & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.
- Reuss-Ianni, Elizabeth
1983 Two Cultures of Policing: Street Cops and Management Cops. New Brunswick: Transition Books.
- Rich, Adrienne
1984 "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." In Ann Snitow, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson (eds.), Desire: The Politics of Sexuality. London: Virago.
- Rock, Paul E.
1979 The Making of Symbolic Interactionism. London: Hutchinson.
- Sartre, Jean Paul
1956 Being and Nothingness. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Schefflen, A.E.
1974 How Behaviour Means. New York: Anchor.
- Segal, L.
1990 Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Sewell, John
1985 Police: Urban Policing in Canada. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.

Shearing, Clifford D.

1981 "Subterranean Processes in the Maintenance of Power: An Examination of the Mechanisms Coordinating Police Action." The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 18 (3): 283-98.

Simmonds, Commissioner R.H.

1985 "RCMP Policy in Respect of Homosexual Conduct." GO INFO 79 July/August: 3, 6.

Skolnick, Jerome H.

1966/ Justice Without Trial. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
1975

Skolnick, Jerome H., and James J. Fyfe

1993 Above the Law: Police and the Excessive Use of Force.
New York: The Free Press.

Slater, Barbara

1993 "Violence Against Lesbian and Gay Male College Students."
Journal of College Student Psychotherapy 8 (1-2): 177-202.

Smith, George W.

1988 "Policing the Gay Community: An Inquiry into Textually-Mediated Social Relations." International Journal of the Sociology of Law 16: 163-83.

Stoddard, Ellwyn R.

1968 "The Informal 'Code' of Police Delinquency: A Group Approach to 'Blue-Coat Crime'." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 59: 201-13.

The Tea Party

1994 "Correspondences." Copyright Eternal Publishing
(SOCAN)/Warner Chappell Music Canada Ltd. (SOCAN).

Tolson, Andrew

1977 The Limits of Masculinity. London: Tavistock Publications.

Troiden, Richard R.

1979 "Becoming Homosexual: A Model of Gay Identity Acquisition."
Psychiatry 42 (4): 362-73.

1988 Gay and Lesbian Identity: A Sociological Analysis. New York: General Hall, Inc. Publishers.

Vincent, Claude L.

1990 Police Officer. Ottawa: Carleton University Press Inc.

- Vogels, Josey
1994 "Shame on You." Montreal Hour Magazine. April 14: 12.
- Waters, Malcolm
1994 Modern Sociological Theory. London: Sage Publications.
- Weeks, Jeremy
1986 Sexuality. Chichester: Horwood.
- Westley, William A.
1952 The Police: A Sociological Study of Law, Custom and Morality. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago.
1956 "Secrecy and the Police." Social Forces 34 (3): 254-7.
- Wexler, Mark N.
1974 "Police Culture: A Response to Ambiguous Employment." In C.L. Grindstaff and P.C. Whitehead (eds.), The Administration of Criminal Justice in Canada. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Whyte, Don
1993a "Homophobia." Everyman: A Man's Journal 5 Dec/Feb 93-94: 14.
1993b "The Homosocial Factor in Male Violence and Masculine Subjectivity." Men's Studies Review 9 (1): 27-31.
1994 Masculinity and Power course outline.
- Wolfenden, J.
1963 The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution. New York: Stein and Day.

END

0|4-0 6-9|6

FIN