Labour/Le Travailleur

"Character Weaknesses" and "Fruit Machines": Towards an Analysis of The Anti-Homosexual Security Campaign in the Canadian Civil Service

Gary Kinsman

Cite this article

Article abstract

This investigation interrogates state documents that were part of organizing the anti-homosexual security campaign in the late 1950s and 1960s in the Canadian civil service that led to hundreds of men and women being dismissed and transferred from their jobs. This critical analysis provides an entry point into the textually-mediated social organization of this security campaign. Crucial to this were ideological conceptualizations of 'national security' and 'character weakness' that were used to mandate practices of surveillance, dismissal, and transfer. This security campaign led to the identification of thousands of suspected gay men and lesbians that moved far beyond the civil service; to state-funded research on identifying homosexuals called the 'fruit machine'; to debates within the security regime over how broad-ranging this campaign should be; and to non-cooperation from lesbians and gay men.

"Character Weaknesses" and "Fruit Machines": Towards an Analysis of The Anti-Homosexual Security Campaign in the Canadian Civil Service

Gary Kinsman

Introduction

"SEXUAL ABNORMALITIES appear to be the favourite target of hostile intelligence agencies, and of these homosexuality is most often used" stated a 1959 Canadian Security Panel memorandum. The memo went on:

The nature of homosexuality appears to adapt itself to this kind of exploitation. By exercising fairly simple precautions, homosexuals are usually able to keep their habits hidden from those who are not specifically seeking them out. Further, homosexuals often appear to believe that the accepted ethical code which governs normal human relationships does not apply to them. Their propensity is often accompanied by other specific weaknesses such as excessive drinking with its resultant instabilities, a defiant attitude towards the rest of society, and a concurrent urge to seek out the company of persons with similar characteristics, often in disreputable bars, night clubs or restaurants.[1]

The memo continues pointing out that

From the small amount of information we have been able to obtain about homosexual behaviour generally, certain characteristics appear to stand out — instability, willing self-deceit, defiance towards society, a tendency to surround oneself with persons of similar

---

[1]D.F. Wall, Memorandum to the Security Panel, "Security Cases Involving Character Weaknesses, with Special Reference to the Problem of Homosexuality," 12 May 1959, 12. This document was secured through a Canadian Security and Intelligence Service (CSIS), Access to Information Request (AIR).

propensities, regardless of other considerations — none of which inspire the confidence one would hope to have in persons required to fill positions of trust and responsibility.[2]

These quotes are from one of the previously secret government documents on the anti-gay/anti-lesbian security campaigns in the Canadian civil service that Canadian Press secured in 1992 through the Access to Information Act.[3] In the ways these texts were mobilized within state security regime relations they could have been devastating for the lives of those identified as gay or lesbian. They were part of constructing gay men and lesbians as a particular type of social problem and were an integral part of the construction of heterosexual hegemony[4] within Canadian state formation.[5]

During the late 1950s and early 1960s these texts were used to organize problems for hundreds of lesbians and gay men who lost their jobs or were demoted to less 'sensitive' positions in the federal civil service. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) collected the names of thousands of possible homosexuals, and the government funded and sponsored research into means to detect homosexuals. Homosexuals were designated a 'national security threat' because of their 'character weakness' which supposedly left gay men and lesbians open to blackmail by Soviet agents. While I analyze the security regime more generally the focus in this paper is on the impact of these campaigns on gay men and lesbians and on the conception of "character weakness" which was used against lesbians and gay men as an integral part of this campaign.

A critical reading of these state security documents as pieces of textually-mediated social organization[6] gives us insights into the social organization of this major anti-gay/anti-lesbian campaign in the history of Canadian state formation.[7]

[2]*Ibid.*, 13. In the language used in this excerpt the author is building on earlier notions of homosexuals as psychopathic personalities. See Gary Kinsman, "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation: The Social Organization of the Sexual Policing of Gay Men," PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 1989, 71-89.
[3]See the Canadian Press stories by Dean Beeby which were based on these documents. They were printed in *The Globe and Mail*, 24 April 1992, 1-2 as "Mounties staged massive hunt for gay men in civil service" and "RCMP hoped 'fruit machine' would identify homosexuals." I will refer to the individual documents that the Canadian Press secured the release of through Access to Information requests throughout these notes.
[4]On heterosexual hegemony see Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire* (Montreal 1987) and "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation."
[5]On state formation, see Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch, English State Formation As Cultural Revolution* (Oxford 1985).
[6]See Dorothy E. Smith, "Textually-mediated Social Organization" in *Texts, Facts and Femininity* (London 1990), 209-24.
[7]There is already some journalistic, historical, sociological and legal investigation of these terrains in Canada. Aside from my own work in my book and PhD thesis see John Sawatsky, *Men In The Shadows* (Toronto 1980), 111-40 and his *For Services Rendered* (Markham

In doing this I am drawing on the social organization of knowledge approach of marxist feminist Dorothy E. Smith and power/knowledge and genealogical approaches derived from the work of Michel Foucault.[8] In this paper these texts of the Security Panel and reports of the RCMP are interrogated from the standpoints of lesbians and gay men who were investigated, transferred and purged. We have to be very critical of this ruling social construction of knowledge — these texts are not neutral or 'objective,' — they were part of the textual practices mandating and organizing problems for gay men and lesbians during these years. Texts do not have power on their own. They are produced through human activities and gain social power through their activation and use by people in specific social relations — in this situation within the security regime. It is through these textual practices that this security campaign was organized.[9]

1983); Reginald Whitaker, "Origins of the Canadian Government's Internal Security System, 1946-52," *Canadian Historical Review*, LXV 2, (1984), 154-187 and his, *Double Standard, The Secret History of Canadian Immigration* (Toronto 1987); Len Scher, *The Un-Canadians: True Stories of the Blacklist Era* (Toronto 1992); and Philip Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation: Homosexuals and the Immigration Act, 1952-1977," *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 2 (1987), 1-27 and his "Gays, Lesbians and the Legal Process Since 1945," 1985, unpublished paper; and David Kimmel and Daniel Robinson "The Queer Career of Homosexual Security Vetting in Cold-War Canada," in *Canadian Historical Review*, 75, No. 3, (1994), 319-45.

[8]On Dorothy E. Smith and her social organization of knowledge approach see *The Everyday World as Problematic* (Toronto 1987); *The Conceptual Practices of Power* (Toronto 1990) and *Texts, Facts and Femininity*. On 'power/knowledge' relations and genealogical approaches see the work of Michel Foucault including M. Foucault (ed. by Colin Gordon), *Power/Knowledge* (New York 1980). Also see Adam Ashforth, "Reckoning Schemes of Legitimation: On Commissions of Inquiry as Power/Knowledge Forms," *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 3 (March 1990), 1-22. Unfortunately valuable insights in Foucault's work such as 'power/knowledge' are limited by his lack of attention to social standpoint and the deletion of active subjects from his discourse analysis. Foucaultian derived notions of 'power/knowledge' often tend to be relatively ungrounded from the social practices that produce them. Sometimes 'power/knowledge' almost seems to be self-generating and not produced through social practices. For some useful critical analysis of this see Dorothy E. Smith, "The Social Organization of Textual Reality," in *The Conceptual Practices of Power*, 70, 79-80.

[9]In my reading of these security regime texts I am looking for traces of the 'extra-discursive' (or at least what is outside official discourse) within these pieces of ruling discourse. What is outside official discourse shapes the ground upon which ruling discourse is constructed. Aspects of my approach are similar to that developed by Jennifer Terry in her innovative article "Theorizing Deviant Historiography," in *differences*, 3 (Summer 1991), 55-74. She reads the documents she is examining for 'effects' of the violence of dominant discourses. (57) At the same time Terry's perspective is limited to a critical deconstructive reading of medical research texts since she is unable to specify the basis for the 'extra-discursive.' She only notes "that the deviants' clash with medicine is not entirely dependent on the medical

I am reporting on a first stage of research based on an analysis of these texts from a preliminary construction of a standpoint outside the relevancies of the ruling security regime.[10] This is based on my previous historical sociological research.[11]

My objective is to begin to explore how this security campaign was socially constructed. To do this I am reading these texts for contradictions, for lines of rupture, for residues of resistance, for traces of the problems the security regime was confronting and had to contend with.

---

discourse for its enunciation" in note four on 72. We, however, need more than a critical reading from within dominant accounts. We also need to interrogate critically official discourse from standpoints beyond the confines of ruling discourse. We need to investigate the formation of cultures of resistance among people engaging in same-gender eroticism, along with the social spaces they were able to seize through the transformation of capitalist and patriarchal social relations. We need to break free from the standpoints of ruling accounts and adopt the standpoints of the 'deviants' themselves.

[10]Examining these texts also raises the crucial problem of historical sources for critical social analysis. With the release of these documents we now have more of an account of how these security campaigns were discussed from 'above.' Analyzing these texts requires resisting the apparent stability and the confines of the textual history from 'above' they carry. At the same time we still have little sense of how these campaigns were experienced and resisted from 'below'. We do, however, have first-hand accounts from people purged from the military during these years. For instance see H.F. Sutcliffe, *Herbert Frederick Sutcliffe, MBE, CD: An Autobiography* (Toronto 1981) (in holdings of Toronto Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives), especially 157-8; Dana Flavelle, "Homosexuality Destroyed Decorated Soldier's Career," *Toronto Star*, 15 March 1986, A15; the interview with George Marshall, *Two*, (Toronto), July/August, 1966, 12 and the interviews dramatized in Lisa Steele's and Kim Tomczak's video *Legal Memory* 1992 (available through V-Tape, Toronto). These military investigations involved the RCMP as well as military security and although they would have had many similarities with the investigations in the federal civil service there would also have been differences. We also have the very insightful critique by early Canadian gay activist Jim Egan of US Senate investigations of homosexuals as "undesirable" government employees. See Jim Egan, "Most Fantastic Witch-hunt Since Inquisition Was Followed by Dismissal of Homosexuals by the Hundreds From U.S. Government Offices," *Justice Weekly* (Toronto), 13 March 1954, 13 and his "Persecution of Homosexuals Gets Blamed For Their Increased Activity in Public," *Justice Weekly*, 3 April 1954, 13. On Jim Egan see *Jim Egan, Canada's Pioneer Gay Activist* (Compiled and introduced by Robert Champagne), (Toronto, Canadian Lesbian and Gay History Network Publication No. 1, 1987) and *The Regulation of Desire*, 119-20.

[11]See *The Regulation of Desire* and "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation." A second stage of this research will entail interviews with and an examination of first hand accounts of people who were purged, transferred, or were forced into informing on others, to broaden out and further ground this analysis. This would provide the basis for a more extended analysis of the social organization of this security campaign. I will pursue interviews with

Homosexuals as a national security danger

THE 1950S AND THE EARLY 1960S were years of the social construction of homosexuality as a national, social and sexual danger in Canada. This occurred in the context of the reconstruction and transformation of patriarchal and heterosexist hegemonic relations after the 'disruptions' of the war mobilizations. There were at least three aspects of the construction of homosexuals as a danger in Canada during these years: the purge campaigns in the civil service, military and the RCMP; the related immigration legislation changes of 1952 which prevented homosexuals from immigrating to Canada and were tied into 'security' concerns; and the construction of homosexuals as a 'sexual danger' (especially to young people) through the extension of criminal sexual legislation and through mass media coverage.[12] In this paper I focus on this first aspect.

In the context of the Cold War, McCarthyism and 'national security' scares, homosexuals were designated a "threat to national security." The anti-homosexual campaigns were linked to anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaigns in the US and Canada. One of the dominant political themes in much of the western world from the late 1940s through the 1960s and beyond was that of the Cold War and the construction of 'communism' and the 'Soviet empire' as a major threat.[13]

In Canada, the anti-communist campaigns were less public and extensive than in the US,[14] although they made the work of socialists and progressives in unions,

and the first hand accounts of those directly affected by the security campaigns in the future in research funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

[12] On this general social context see *The Regulation of Desire*, 113-33; "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation" and Kinsman, "'Inverts,' 'Psychopaths,' and 'Normal' Men: Historical Sociological Perspectives on Gay and Heterosexual Masculinities," in Tony Haddad, ed., *Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology* (Toronto 1993) 3-35. On the immigration law see Philip Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation: Homosexuals and the Immigration Act."

[13] On the US experience see U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Expenditure in Executive Departments, *Employment of Homosexuals And Other Sex Perverts in Government*, Washington, 15 December 1950, reprinted in Jonathan Katz, ed., *Government Versus Homosexuals* (Arno Reprint, New York 1975); Committee on Cooperation with Governmental (Federal) Agencies of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, "Report On Homosexuality With Particular Emphasis on this Problem in Governmental Agencies," Report No. 30, January 1955; John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities* (Chicago 1983), especially 40-53; John D'Emilio, "The Homosexual Menace: The Politics of Sexuality on Cold War America," in John D'Emilio, *Making Trouble* (New York 1992), 57-73; and Richard Cleaver, "Sexual Dissidents and the National Security State, 1942-1992," in Richard Cleaver and Patricia Myers, eds., *A Certain Terror, Heterosexism, Militarism, Violence and Change* (Chicago 1993), 171-208.

[14] Philip Girard has argued that the anti-homosexual witch hunt in Canada was much stronger than the campaign against leftists, socialists, or communists. See Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation," 5. More research is needed to determine whether this claim is justified.

the peace movement and community groups extremely difficult and dangerous at times. Immigrants and artists were also targeted. In right-wing, conservative, and often liberal discourse, homosexuals were either associated directly with communism and spying for the USSR or were seen as an easy target for blackmail and therefore a risk to 'national security.' Whose security? we might ask. Homosexuals were often constructed not only as violators of sexual and gender boundaries, but also as violators of class and political boundaries.[15] And there were leftists who were lesbian and gay and early gay organizations such as the Mattachine Society formed in 1951 in the US did have a number of ex-Communist Party members as founders.[16] Through a series of trials and spy scandals in England, homosexuality came to be associated with spying and treason affecting how homosexuality was portrayed in official circles in Canada.[17]

This anti-homosexual campaign was informed not only by 'national security' concerns narrowly defined but by other regulatory practices regarding same-gender sexuality as well. These other courses of action regulating homosexuality were the continuing (and during this period extending) criminalization of male homosexual activity (lesbian practices were not as directly affected by criminalization, although they were first criminalized in 1953) and exclusionary practices against gay men and lesbians in state institutions.

The strategy of extending criminalization included the existing offenses of 'gross indecency' and 'buggery' and the new sentencing procedure of Criminal Sexual Psychopath, especially following 1953 when 'buggery' and 'gross indecency' were added as 'triggering' offenses. This procedure which was continued in Dangerous Sexual Offender legislation enacted in 1961, made consensual homosexual activity discovered by the police (or able to be 'proven' by the police in court) into grounds for indefinite detention. This constructed homosexuality, more specifically, as a criminal sexual danger.[18] These criminalization practices, oriented the work of the RCMP and other police forces. Police work, including the work of the RCMP, is textually-mediated through the criminal code. It was crucially through the criminal code and the activities it mandated for the police that homosexuals were constructed as a criminal problem.[19]

[15]See The Regulation of Desire, 121.
[16]See John D'Emilio, Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities especially 57-91; and John D'Emilio, "Dreams Deferred, The Birth and Betrayal of America's First Gay Liberation Movement," in John D'Emilio, Making Trouble, 17-56.
[17]See The Regulation of Desire, 121. On the English experience also see Simon Shepherd, "Gay Sex Spy Orgy: The State's Need For Queers," in Simon Shepherd and Mick Wallis, Coming On Strong, Gay Politics and Culture (London 1989), 213-30 and L.J. Moran, "The Uses of Homosexuality: Homosexuality for National Security," International Journal of the Sociology of Law 19 (1991), 149-70.
[18]See "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation."
[19]See George Smith, "Policing the Gay Community: An Inquiry into Textually-mediated Social Relations," International Journal of Sociology of the Law, 16 (1988), 163-83.

There were also continuing prohibitions against homosexuals within the military and the RCMP. Homosexuality (especially between men) was officially viewed as a threat to discipline and bureaucratic hierarchy. This was especially the case in the military and in para-military forms of organization like the police where heterosexual masculinity was a major organizing ideology. Fighting men were identified with heterosexual masculinity, not with homosexuals who were visualized as 'gender inverts' and not 'real men'.[20]

In the military lesbianism was seen as a threat to the 'proper' femininity of female recruits and the policing of 'lesbianism' was a way of regulating the activities of all women in these institutions. In the armed forces there were policies and procedures for excluding and 'disposing' of 'sex deviates'.[21]

The organization of this campaign also included the major impact of US state policies on Canadian state practices — especially given the referenced and often derived character of Canadian developments to US 'national security' practices in the post-World War II years. There was considerable pressure from US security elites to get Canadian officials to take up similar 'security' campaigns to those in the US that were more broad-ranging, more public and were specifically directed against 'sex perverts.' Through NATO, Canadian and American officials shared common concerns over 'internal security.' Canadian and US security officials engaged in a common security language, and they shared similar organizing concepts and discourse as well as information.[22]

As part of this interaction the Security Panel sent D.F. Wall, secretary of the Security Panel, along with Professor Wake who was studying detection strategies for homosexuality for the panel, to the US in 1961 to study 'security' procedures there. This included quite centrally policies regarding homosexuals. Wall's report focused on some of the differences between Canadian and US security screening policies and procedures and became one of the texts leading up to the new Cabinet Memorandum on "Security in the Public Service" in 1963.

[20]On this see *The Regulation of Desire*; "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation" and "'Inverts,' 'Psychopaths,' and 'Normal' Men."

[21]On lesbians and women in the military see Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You?* (London 1983) and the interview with Cynthia Enloe, "Heterosexist Masculinity in the Military," *Sojourner*, 18 (June 1993), 2-4; Alan Berube and John D'Emilio, "The Military and Lesbians During the McCarthy Years," *Signs*, 9 (1984), 759-75; and Leisa D. Meyer, "Creating G.I. Jane: The Regulation of Sexuality and Sexual Behaviour in the Women's Army Corps During World War II," *Feminist Studies*, 18 (1992), 581-601. More generally see *The Regulation of Desire* and "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation."

[22]See Reginald Whitaker, "Origins of the Canadian Government's Internal Security System," 169-70 and Len Scher, *The Un-Canadians*, especially the interview with Reginald Whitaker, "The FBI and the RCMP," 238-9.

The Security Panel

IN RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL SECURITY concerns a Security Panel was established in Canada in 1946. The investigative powers of this new panel were officially authorized by a cabinet directive in 1948.[23] This panel soon formulated a policy of transferring civil servants about whom there were "doubts" to less sensitive posts. The setting up of this interdepartmental panel was influenced by the recommendation for increased co-ordination on security measures that came out of the 1946 Royal Commission into the Igor Gouzenko affair and largely followed British rather than American precedent and procedures. Initially Canadian security officials — with some opposition from officials in the RCMP and the military establishment — opted for a more British influenced security response as opposed to the much more public security campaign then being initiated south of the border.[24] This related to the character of Canadian state formation that was influenced during these years by both British and US developments. Canadian state practices increasingly became influenced by US developments in the 1950s and 1960s, especially in the realm of 'national security.'

In 1948, the departments of national defence and external affairs were designated by security officials as vulnerable to subversion. Dismissals of homosexuals had started by 1952.[25] In the two decades that followed, every homosexual in the civil service had reason to fear discovery and dismissal as hundreds of people were fired or transferred. Hundreds lost their jobs for 'security' reasons but clearly not all lesbians and gay men in the civil service were affected or detected.

The firings and transfers were carried out at the urging of the Security Panel, a small, secret committee of top civil servants, Mounties, and National Defence officials. The panel was chaired by the Secretary to the Cabinet and reported directly to the Cabinet. The panel was part of the ruling regime with important links with broader state relations. Permanent representatives on the panel included the Privy Council and the departments of National Defence, External Affairs and the RCMP with others more occasionally represented.[26] The RCMP was the investigative agency for the panel and was mandated by cabinet to perform security investigations. The RCMP had the sole authority to make inquiries in all civilian departments

---

[23]This section is generally based on Philip Girard, "From Subversion to Liberation," 6-8 and Reginald Whitaker, "Origins of the Canadian Government's Internal Security System."
[24]See Reginald Whitaker, "Origins of the Canadian Government's Internal Security System."
[25]Sawatsky, *Men In The Shadows* (Don Mills 1983), 124.
[26]Its composition at a meeting in 1959 was — Secretary to the Cabinet (the chair), Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Deputy Minister of National Defence, Deputy Minister of Defence Production, Deputy Minister of Justice, Commissioner of RCMP, Under-secretary of State for External Affairs, member of Civil Service Commission, and a member of the Privy Council Office (who was the secretary). Minutes of the 68th meeting of the Security Panel, 6 October 1959 by D.F. Wall, Secretary of the Security Panel.

(in the armed forces military intelligence was also involved) and the panel had to negotiate with the department involved if an employee was identified as a security risk by the RCMP. Deputy ministers often made the decisions about dismissals or transfers.

The emphasis in the workings of the panel was on secrecy and the proceedings in Canada were much less public and visible than in the US. Given this secrecy there was no appeal from a denial of security clearance. There was no possibility for independent review. In what were seen to be serious cases, civil servants were asked to resign or were dismissed with no opportunity to defend themselves against the allegations that had been made. While initially the Security Panel's focus was on people with political 'disloyalties' the RCMP soon began to uncover civil servants with 'moral' or 'character' failings which it was argued made them vulnerable because they had something to hide.

Thousands of lesbians and gay men and suspected homosexuals were affected by this security campaign. A 1961 memo reported that "During the course of these investigations, the R.C.M. Police have identified some 460 public servants as confirmed, alleged or suspected homosexuals. Of these about one-third have since left the service through resignation or dismissal."[27] In 1961-62 the RCMP reported having identified 850 suspected and proven homosexuals in the civil service.[28] After this there is no count of the numbers of homosexuals specifically in the civil service in these documents.

One of the objectives of the RCMP investigations was to move alleged or suspected homosexuals into the proven category. Alleged homosexuals were seen as "those who have been named as homosexuals by a source or sources whose information is considered to be reliable." Suspected homosexuals were "those who [were] believed to be homosexuals by a source or sources whose information is considered to be reliable." Confirmed homosexuals were defined as those "who have been interviewed and admitted being homosexuals or who have been convicted in court on a charge of sexual deviation with another male."[29]

These investigations were not only conducted in 'high' security areas like External Affairs, or the higher echelons of the military but also in such 'low' security areas as the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Department of Public Works and the Unemployment Insurance Commission.[30] This affected not only the middle-class elites in the civil service but also clerical and other workers. Much of the security campaigns were conducted prior to the rise of unions in the civil service. The shape of the security campaigns needs to be explored further

[27]R.B. Bryce, Memorandum for the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, "Security Cases Involving Homosexuality," 26 January 1961, 2.
[28]Directorate of Security and Intelligence Annual Report, 1961-1962, 22.
[29]Bella to RCMP Commissioner, 29 April 1960.
[30]*Ibid.*

regarding its impact on activists in professional associations and early union organizing efforts.[31]

Total RCMP reports of homosexuals — including those outside the civil service — went up from 1,000 in 1960-61, to 7,500 in 1965-66. In the RCMP Directorate of Security and Intelligence (DSI) annual report of 1966-67 it was reported that "Through interviews of known homosexuals and increased co-operation with other police forces, the index of known and suspected homosexuals has been expanded to approximately 8,200 names."[32] By the 1967-1968 report the total reports were close to 9,000, only about one-third of whom were federal civil servants.[33] This was based in the Ottawa area.

The external affairs department in Ottawa and its embassies around the world were seen by right-wingers as "a notorious cess-pool of homosexuals and perverts" in the 1950s.[34] No department, with the possible exception of the Navy, was perceived to harbour more 'queers.' By 1960 particular scrutiny was being focused on suspected homosexuals in external affairs.

In the Security Panel texts there was a clear sense from all sides that all homosexuals stationed outside Canada were vulnerable to 'blackmail'.[35] These investigations led to the resignation of David Johnson, Canada's ambassador to Moscow, and may have contributed to the death of his predecessor, John Watkins who died of a heart attack after being interrogated by the RCMP in 1964.[36]

Usually the Security Panel texts and the practices they helped to organize focused on men, given it was predominantly men who were in these 'security' positions in the Canadian civil service during these years and given the more public construction of male homosexuals as a social threat. At the same time more women were being employed in the civil service and the impact of this needs to be investigated more thoroughly. The notion of 'character weakness' did include lesbianism but lesbianism was rarely distinctly written about in these texts. Usually the references to 'homosexuals' referred to gay men. At the same time they seemed to be more specifically concerned with lesbians when it came to developing mechanisms for detecting homosexuals as I suggest later. The RCMP seemed to have little understanding of or contact with lesbians.

[31]I will explore this in my SSHRC funded research.

[32]Directorate of Security and Intelligence (DSI) Annual Reports from 1960 to 1967. The last quote is from the DSI Annual Report, 1966-67, 27.

[33]DSI Annual Report, 1967-1968.

[34]For instance see Pat Walsh in *Speak Up* (Toronto), 9 (Aug./Sept. 1981). Walsh was an executive member of the far-right World Anti-Communist League.

[35]As can be seen in both the 19 December 1960 and 26 January 1961 versions of the R.B. Bryce, Chair of the Security Panel, "Memorandum to the Prime Minister and the Minister Of Justice."

[36]See Sawatsky, *For Services Rendered*, 172-83.

The Conceptual Organization of the Security Campaign

DURING THE 1950S there was movement from "psychopathic personality with abnormal sexuality" in military regulations which had been used to purge lesbians and gay men to homosexuals as "sexual psychopaths" within the criminal code and psychiatry,[37] to homosexuality as a 'character weakness' in national security discourse. In part this was related to the developing critique of the vagueness of 'psychopath' that was emerging in professional circles and was a replacement of the vague collecting category[38] of psychopathic personality with the more security defined one of character weakness.

This conceptualization of 'character weaknesses' became a part of personnel selection and screening practices as new forms of administration and management of the civil service were put in place in the early 1960s. This was part of the continuing entry of psychiatric and psychological knowledge into social and state administration which had begun in the military and other sites and was intensified during the World War II mobilizations and post-war reconstruction.[39]

This security campaign was organized through a number of ideological conceptualizations. I use ideological here not as 'biased' or 'non-objective' knowledge but as a social practice of knowledge production which attends to ruling and managing people's lives and which is separated from people's lived experiences.[40]

Concepts are key to how ruling gets organized including for the security regime. The ideological concepts of 'national security' and 'character weaknesses' were crucial to how this 'security' campaign against homosexuals was organized and how these practices were mobilized and held together.

First there was a concept of 'national security' which was defined in opposition to 'threats' from communists, socialists, peace activists, unionists and 'sex perverts' among others. The concept of 'national security' rests on notions of the interests of the 'nation'[41] which in the Canadian context is defined by capitalist,

[37]See "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation."

[38]On collecting categories and devices which bring together a range of different activities, practices or groups under common administrative categories so that they can be dealt with by state and other ruling agencies see Philip Corrigan, "On Moral Regulation," *Sociological Review*, 29 (1981), 313-6.

[39]See Nikolas Rose, *The Psychological Complex* (London 1985) and "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation."

[40]"Ideology refers to all forms of knowledge that are divorced from their conditions of production (their grounds)." Roslyn Wallach Bologh, *Dialectical Phenomenology: Marx's Method* (Boston, 1979), 19. Also see the work of Dorothy E. Smith including *The Everyday World as Problematic*, especially 54-6 and *The Conceptual Practices of Power*, especially 31-104.

[41]On some of this see Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You? Militarization and Women's Lives* (London 1983) and her *Bananas, Beaches and Bases, Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (London 1989) and also some of the articles in Andrew Parker, *et. al.,*

racist and patriarchal relations; the features of Canadian state formation which were historically based on the subordination of the indigenous peoples, the Québécois and the Acadians; and historically had been allied with the British empire and later with US imperialism.

Rather than simply accepting or taking for granted constructs of the 'national interest' and 'national security' we always need to ask whose national security is being articulated through these conceptualizations. We also have to ask whether this 'national security' was the 'security' of Canadian working-class women and men, lesbians and gay men and others during these years or was it directed against them by the security regime?

In this sense we have to go beyond explanations suggesting that a mistake based on stereotypes or backward homophobic ideas was made in the security regime since homosexuals were not 'really' a threat to national security. We must ask more profound questions about how lesbians and gay men were socially and historically constructed as a 'national security threat' as part of the heterosexist character of Canadian state formation.

The definition of 'national security' in this context had a special relation to the security regime which was composed of the Security Panel, the political and bureaucratic elite, the military hierarchy, the RCMP and extended into the management of the federal civil service. The standpoint of 'national security' taken up was defined by the security police, the military, concerns over 'national' defence, and the anti-communist, anti-Soviet and anti-'third world' liberation alliance the Canadian state was then engaged in under the leadership of US imperialism. Through NATO the Canadian state was part of a military alliance involving most of the world's former colonial powers, some of whom were still engaged in bloody wars against national liberation movements. Canadian immigration legislation which prohibited the immigration of homosexuals also overtly specified a racist preference for white Europeans over people of colour in the building of the Canadian 'nation.'[42]

This construction of 'national security' was the first ideological construction that informed the practices of the security regime. This was the conceptual basis mandating the operation of the security regime.

In the context of defence of 'national security' homosexuals were then inscribed into an ideological collecting category of 'character weaknesses' which supposedly made them vulnerable to blackmail. This collecting category also

Nationalisms and Sexualities (New York and London 1992). On the construction of the nation in the Canadian context see comments in Roxana Ng, "Sexism, Racism, Canadian Nationalism," in Himani Bannerji, ed., *Returning the Gaze, Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics* (Toronto 1993), 182-96 and Annalee Golz, "Family Matters, The Canadian Family and the State in the Postwar Period," *Left History*, 1 (Fall 1993), 9-49.

[42]See Reginald Whitaker, *Double Standard, The Secret History of Canadian Immigration* (Toronto 1987) among others.

included drunkenness, adultery and 'promiscuity' although it became increasingly homosexualized in the discussions and practices of the security regime. This was the second 'moment' of the conceptual construction of the anti-homosexual security campaign. Let us see how this emerges from a critical analysis of these security regime texts.

ANALYSIS OF THE SECURITY PANEL TEXTS -THE ACTIVE DEBATE OVER HOW WIDE
THE CAMPAIGN SHOULD BE

Possible limitations in previous security procedures[43] were raised in May 1959 in a memo by D.F. Wall, secretary of the Security Panel, to other members of the Panel.[44] This memo was in response to an apparent request from Prime Minister Diefenbaker for clarification. Wall wrote that "It is the Prime Minister's wish that the matter be examined to determine whether it might be possible to treat cases of character weaknesses differently from those involving ideological beliefs, without of course weakening present security safeguards."[45]

This constructed a clearer separation in the security discourse between political disloyalty and character weaknesses. This began to separate out 'communists' from 'homosexuals' who often had earlier been conflated together in right-wing and security discourse. The 1955 cabinet directive had not made such a clear distinction although it did state in reference to character defects that "such defects of character may also make them unsuitable for employment on grounds other than security."[46]

Wall's memo also began to homosexualize the character weakness category. 'Character weaknesses' almost seem to become homosexuality since it is the main 'character weakness' that is referred to. The title of the memo is "Security Cases Involving Character Weaknesses with special reference to the Problem of Homosexuality." Despite very little cited evidence Wall established that homosexuality was the most frequently used 'character weakness' and was the major route used by Soviet intelligence.[47] In investigating this Wall referred to US and United

---

[43]This was rooted in Cabinet Directive 29, "Security Screening of Government Employees," 1955.

[44]D.F. Wall, Memorandum to the Security Panel, "Security Cases Involving Character Weaknesses, with Special Reference to the Problem of Homosexuality," 12 May 1959.

[45]*Ibid.*, 1.

[46]*Ibid.* This provided a broader opening for campaigns against homosexuals or others with 'character weaknesses' in the civil service on other than security grounds.

[47]Wall memo, 12 May 1959, 12. This was argued even though little evidence was ever put forward to defend this claim. For instance — "In only one of the cases investigated has there been evidence that an attempt has been made to blackmail any of these persons for intelligence purposes." (R.B. Bryce "Memorandum For the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, Security Cases Involving Homosexuality," 19 December 1960 version, 2). And "there is one case on file where an attempt was made to compromise a Canadian government employee" (Report of the Directorate, 1959-1960, Part II Security Branch "A," Appendix G, Appendix to Annual Report on Homosexuality Among Federal Government Employees, 42).

Kingdom procedures and reports. He took up homosexuals as a security risk from US state discourse in the 1950s and we can see an important US security influence in this text. He mentioned that the Department of National Defence (DND) believed that homosexuality made a person unsuitable for employment whether there is access to classified information or not.[48] The DND was a major force for pushing further with the anti-homosexual campaign partly because of influence from US military officials.

In this memo we can discern some of the contours of debates and struggles then occurring in and around the Security Panel. There is a separation of 'ideological' and 'character weakness' security threats, a homosexualization of 'character weaknesses' and a debate over how wide-spread the screening and investigation of this 'character weakness' should be.

These were crucial terrains of debate in the Security Panel for the next few years. In 1959 the homosexual screening program had been initiated in the federal civil service. The RCMP struggled to defend and expand this campaign and engaged in an extension of the campaign to investigations outside the civil service where thousands of names were collected. Since all homosexual acts where then against the law the RCMP approach was also shaped by the criminalization of homosexuality. The RCMP tended to overlay security discourse with the criminalization discourse to create a wider basis for the anti-homosexual campaign.

Others on the panel including representatives of External Affairs and the Civil Service Commission articulated a more specific approach which differentiated between a narrower 'security' frame and the broader criminalization frame of regulation. This suggested that the security campaign should be tighter in its scope and impact than the criminalization course of action. These people did not want to extend the security campaign outside the civil service and they only wanted to transfer homosexuals if they were discovered in security positions. This is not to suggest that this more restricted position was supportive of homosexuals or that they took up a 'liberal' position in this historical context. They shared the same general heterosexist assumptions with those who wanted to extend the campaign further and they never raised the need to partially decriminalize homosexual acts in private between two consenting adults along the lines proposed in the liberal 1957 British Wolfenden report.[49] They did, however, believe that the security campaign should be narrower in its impact.

The early 1960s was the beginning of the period when different strategies in Canadian state agencies were taken up in response to the expansion of lesbian and gay networks and community formation. The 1957 British Wolfenden regulatory

[48] From D.F. Wall, "Security Cases Involving Character Weakness With Special Reference to the Problem of Homosexuality" 12 May 1959, 14.
[49] See the Wolfenden Commission *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution* (London 1957). On the Wolfenden Report and its impact in Canada see *The Regulation of Desire* 139-172.

frame of the partial decriminalization of homosexual acts began to be used to contest the influence of the expanding criminalization strategy by the mid-1960s in Canada. At the same time in the early 1960s the hegemonic regulatory strategy was still one that defined homosexuality as a national, social, sexual and criminal danger.

How wide this security campaign should be was the key terrain of debate within the security regime as it addressed homosexuality during these years. This was an active debate and process with struggles over the wording and interpretation of different texts.[50]

In October 1959 there was discussion of Wall's memo at the Security Panel where the basic debate was again over how narrow or wide the security campaign against homosexuals should be.[51] Robert Bryce, chair of the Panel, argued for a relatively wide-ranging approach but he did not think that homosexuals should be dismissed from the public service but instead should be transferred to less 'sensitive' positions. The RCMP and deputy ministers of Justice and National Defence argued for a wider interpretation with the deputy minister of National Defence questioning "whether persons suspected of homosexuality should be permitted to enter the public service in any capacity."[52] As a result of these disagreements they could not recommend any change to existing security policy.

A common belief held by all on the Security Panel was that homosexuals were vulnerable to compromise by Soviet agents. This was constructed as taken-for-granted, and as 'common-sense.' This is not to suggest that the fear of blackmail was not an important problem for gay men and lesbians during these years since we know it was from first hand accounts[53] but that it was located very differently in their lives. For gay men and lesbians blackmail was often linked with fears of police harassment or official sanction which were being actively constructed precisely through the practices of this security campaign and the policing practices criminalizing same-gender sex. The social space of 'the closet' which makes gay men and lesbians 'vulnerable' to blackmail and 'subversion' was in part constructed through these regulatory practices.[54]

[50]See Dorothy E. Smith, "The Active Text: A Textual Analysis of the Social Relations of Public Textual Discourse," in *Texts, Facts and Femininity*, 120-58.
[51]D.F. Wall, Secretary of the Security Panel, Minutes of the 68th meeting of the Security Panel, 6 October 1959.
[52]*Ibid.*, 5.
[53]See Axel Otto Olson's testimony to a private session of the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, "Report of the Private Sessions, Royal Commission on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, Montreal and Toronto," commencing 6 February 1956, 137-47; also see "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation," 253-7.
[54]This allows us to both recognize and to begin to move beyond Eve Sedgwick's insightful notion of the centrality of 'the closet' in the construction of contemporary western culture. She locates this construction of 'the closet' largely on a literary and 'cultural' terrain. See Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, (Berkeley 1990).

The construction of 'blackmail' as a problem facing homosexuals came from two different directions and was articulated by two different logics. Firstly, it was raised as a concern by early gay activists. They argued that it was only because of laws criminalizing homosexual sex that such blackmail was possible. This was used as part of an argument for law reform to begin to remove the social basis for blackmail threats. But 'blackmail' was also a crucial part of the construction of the 'national security' scares which were often linked with the criminalization of homosexual sex. These practices were part of the construction of the very need for secrecy, and living in 'the closet' that created problems in many lesbians' and gay men's lives.

Through a critical reading of the Security Panel texts we discern an understanding within the security regime of the existence of *and* also their own use of 'the closet.'[55] But how the practices mandated by the security regime actually created some of these secrecy needs is never made visible. They can therefore define the need for secrecy as the 'threat' making homosexuals vulnerable to 'subversion' while not noticing how they are creating and mobilizing this very need for invisibility as part of their security campaign. Rather than removing the social basis for the threat of blackmail through calling for the repeal of anti-homosexual laws and heterosexist social practices they instead intensify the construction of the need for secrecy as the problem which requires the mobilization of surveillance and detection strategies.

In a Foucaultian power/knowledge sense the security regime was both part of producing the space for 'the closet' and also used this social space for its security investigations and these practices produced even more reasons for closetry. The security regime fed on the terror produced through the threat of discovery in this very heterosexist social context.

There were different emerging strategies within Canadian state relations, organizing different responses regarding the regulation of same-gender sexualities. Heterosexual masculinity was more integral to the ideological organization of some sites within state relations than others. Generally those most tied into defending 'national security' and policing like the military and the RCMP were the most hostile to 'queers'.

The RCMP — Extending the Campaign

IN MAY 1960 THE RCMP submitted its contribution "Homosexuality within the Federal Government Service" to the Security Panel discussion. They requested clearer terms of reference and argued that existing policy restrictions "which prohibit our interviewing homosexuals should be set aside from this type of

---

[55]For instance remember this excerpt from the quote this paper started with — "By exercising fairly simple precautions, homosexuals are usually able to keep their habits hidden from those who are not specifically seeking them out." From D.F. Wall, "Security Cases Involving Character Weakness With Special Reference to the Problem of Homosexuality."

investigation." They argued that "necessary provision be made for us to interview at our discretion any person who we may consider to be of assistance to our enquiry."[56]

In a slightly earlier text they reported that

During the period under review an extensive investigation was started into the identification of known and suspected homosexuals employed in federal government departments and agencies. The investigation was precipitated by the knowledge that persons with this particular character weakness are highly susceptible to compromise and blackmail.[57]

In the same document they reported that they investigated 393 suspected homosexuals confirming 159 and that "New names continue to come to light and it is felt that only a fraction of the total number of homosexuals in the federal government service has been identified to date. One self-admitted homosexual estimated there are 3,000 homosexuals in the Ottawa area."[58]

RCMP policy was to fire all known homosexuals. The RCMP was an integral part of both the security regime and security investigations. Despite the ebb and flow of security scares the RCMP along with the military hierarchy were consistent in their stance that homosexuals should not be in government service. The RCMP set up an investigative unit within the force, called A-3, to hunt down and purge homosexuals within its ranks and within the government more generally. Informants would watch bars and parks frequented by gays and they attempted to get homosexual men to inform on others. Reportedly this met with some initial success.[59]

The RCMP also developed interrogation techniques to unearth homosexuals who were then forced to either resign or were transferred. By 1963, the A-3 unit had produced a map of Ottawa using red dots to designate sites where homosexual activity took place. The map was soon covered with so many red dots in so many

[56]Here they are referring to a general prohibition on directly interviewing alleged homosexuals presently in the civil service implied in Security Panel directives. They also wanted the decision over when departments should be provided with information about homosexuals in their ranks left to the RCMP's discretion and "we would also appreciate clarification on whether or not we should provide the department concerned with information on a homosexual who is not employed on duties having access to classified material." These quotes come from Appendix C "RCMP Request for Terms of Reference — May 1960, Brief for Discussion on Reports of Mr. Don Wall and Dr. F.R. Wake on Personnel Security Matters in the USA," 4 March 1963.
[57]"I" Directorate Annual Report, 1959-1960, Report of the Directorate, Appendix G, "Appendix to Annual Report on Homosexuality Among Federal Government Employees," 42.
[58]Ibid.
[59]Ibid., 42-5 and John Sawatsky, Men In The Shadows 125-7.

different parts of the city that it became practically useless.[60] The Security Service investigations extended to the universities and the community at large.

In June 1960 there was a Security Panel discussion on the RCMP memo, "Homosexuality Within the Federal Government Service."[61] There was only a quorum of the Security Panel in attendance as R.B. Bryce reported they tried to keep the discussion "limited to the smallest circle possible."[62] In the discussion the Commissioner of the RCMP reiterated the RCMP request for more explicit guidance especially given how "recent investigations indicated that the problem [of homosexuality] was becoming increasingly widespread, and the accumulation of the names of persons against whom allegations had been made was growing with each new enquiry."[63]

This posed administrative difficulties for the RCMP about how to handle and use this information. There were some initial problems with the 'ideological' construction of homosexuals as a tiny minority with certain identifiable characteristics (like marks of gender inversion) that didn't fully prepare them for the numbers they began to uncover. They were beginning to unearth gay and lesbian networks during a period in which these networks were expanding and becoming more visible.

In response to this extended campaign the Under-secretary of State for External Affairs pointed to "the danger of this kind of investigation developing into a sociological survey in which the security aspects were lost sight of, and suggested that it did not serve our present purpose to make a determination of the probable proportion of homosexuals in the population."[64] He stressed that the RCMP should only be concerned with investigating homosexuals if it was a security matter.

Although clearly homosexuality was seen to be a problem by all participants it was recorded that they felt "that the question of prosecutions for homosexual offenses would probably not arise through present investigations..."[65] In the clash between the broader criminalizing and more narrow security frames the majority of the panel members at this meeting sided with the narrower security frame. The minutes stated "that where security was not a factor, there did not appear to be any reason for the RCMP to report allegations of homosexuality to the employing department."[66]

For the RCMP whose work was also shaped by the criminalization of homosexuality, or for the military with their policies against homosexuals in any position,

[60]Referred to in Directorate of Security and Intelligence, Annual Report, 1963-1964, 31, and Sawatsky *Men in The Shadows*, 127.
[61]Security Panel minutes, A special meeting of a quorum of the Security Panel, 24 June 1960, taken by D.F. Wall, issued 26 July, 1960.
[62]*Ibid.*, 1.
[63]*Ibid.*, 2.
[64]*Ibid.*, 2.
[65]*Ibid.*, 4.
[66]*Ibid.*, 4.

their practices would also have been shaped by their institutional policies. But at the same time the minutes recorded "that there appeared to be some reduction in the risk to security if the RCMP and the employing department were aware that an employee had homosexual tendencies."[67] This provided an opening for the RCMP extension of the campaign suggesting certain struggles, negotiations and compromises in the panel. This allowed the RCMP to continue its extended investigations without the Security Panel as a whole giving direct approval to what it was doing. The Panel minutes concluded with a call for its secretary to prepare a report setting out these proposals and a further recommendation that direct consultation with the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice begin.

This led to the memo for the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice by R.B. Bryce. In the initial December 1960 version of this memo there was a fairly strong defence of the expanded character of RCMP security·investigations, including moving beyond the civil service.[68] This expanded role, however, still did not satisfy the RCMP. In the second version in early 1961 a long section was added which stated:

> The Commissioner of the RCMP has explained that for a number of reasons the scope of these investigations was further expanded to include the investigation of homosexuals who were not employed in the government service on classified work or were employed outside the government service entirely. In the early stages it became evident that the homosexual, irrespective of employment, was the most productive source in identifying and providing factual information on other homosexuals employed in or by the government. Employees not having access to classified information were included in the expanded investigation on the assumption that they obtain access at some future date through promotion or change of employment. Homosexuals outside the government service were investigated and interviewed because existing security screening policies were interpreted as precluding any extensive interviewing of homosexual government employees on the grounds that as the subject of a security investigation they, as individuals should not be made aware of the reason for any subsequent action taken against them. Another reason for investigating homosexuals outside the government service was based on the possibility that they could be used by a foreign intelligence service to identify and perhaps otherwise assist in the compromising of homosexuals employed in the government on classified work.[69]

Here the RCMP was attempting to provide a broader reading of 'security' concerns that extended far beyond 'sensitive' positions in the civil service and far beyond the civil service itself. This provided more justification for the RCMP position on extending the campaign and we can see the very active influence of the RCMP in

[67]*Ibid.*, 4.
[68]R.B. Bryce, "Memorandum for the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, Security Cases Involving Homosexuality" 19 December 1960 version, 1.
[69]R.B. Bryce, "Memorandum for the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, Security Cases Involving Homosexuality," 26 January 1961 version, 1-2.

the Security Panel through the addition of this section in the revised version of the memo.

The memo also stated that investigations "should not be widespread, but limited to those persons who were vulnerable to effective exploitation by foreign intelligence services, except in cases where further investigation was necessary to establish the validity of information concerning employees in vulnerable positions" and the government was asked to give the RCMP a clear directive to the effect that, "where security was not a factor, the R.C.M. Police were not required to report allegations of homosexuality to the employing department."[70]

They asked for Ministerial approval for "the following proposed courses of action." The first priority was "that the Security Panel ask those departments with missions abroad to classify according to risk those positions whose nature and location is such that their incumbents might be subjected to pressure for intelligence purposes" and "that these departments, with whatever assistance the RCMP are able to provide, make a careful study of the incumbents of these positions to ensure, in so far as possible, that they are not susceptible to blackmail, either through homosexual activity or other indiscreet behaviour" and "that in cases where the incumbent of a vulnerable position is found to be a homosexual, departments be asked to consult the Secretary of the Security Panel before any action is taken concerning the employee."[71]

The second priority included considering whether positions other than those abroad are vulnerable and that

consideration be given to setting up a program of research ... with a view to devising tests to identify persons with homosexual tendencies. It is hoped that such tests might aid in the identification of homosexuals already employed in the government service, and eventually might assist in the selection of persons who are not homosexuals for service in positions considered vulnerable to blackmail for intelligence purposes. (The Commissioner of the R.C.M. Police feels that these tests should be extended to prevent, where possible, the initial engagement of homosexuals in the government service on the grounds that they are usually practising criminals under Sections 147 and 149 of the Criminal Code of Canada.)[72]

This was the proposal that would lead up to the development of the 'fruit machine' research. The revised memo by Bryce was discussed by the cabinet on 26 January, 1961.

[70]*Ibid.*, 3.
[71]*Ibid.*, 3-4.
[72]*Ibid.*, 4. Notice how the RCMP raises the criminalization of homosexuality course of action in their support for extending the campaign to encompass all government workers.

A New Cabinet Directive

THESE MEETINGS, memos and the cabinet discussion led up to a new Cabinet Directive on "Security in the Public Services of Canada" in December 1963.[73] Public announcements were made by the new Prime Minister and Minister of Justice regarding this. This text referred to good personnel administration and distinguished between those who were politically disloyal and those who were unreliable. At the same time the language used in this text is somewhat different from that used in the Security Panel and RCMP documents. Rather than using homosexual it refers to "illicit sexual behaviour."

In a covering memo to the new Cabinet Directive the Secretary to the Cabinet stated that "The most important modifications in the new Directive involve an attitude of much greater frankness with employees whose reliability or loyalty is in doubt, and provide related procedures for reviewing such cases both within the responsible department or agency and if necessary by a Board of Review composed of members of the Security Panel."[74] In a number of areas they attempted to bring Canadian procedures more into line with current US procedures as a partial outcome of Wall's 1962 report.

This directive laid out procedures and a mandated course of action. The course of action went along these lines. A person applied for a position in the civil service where they would have access to what was designated to be 'classified' information or was promoted into such a position. Either the Civil Service Commission or departments and agencies (where the employment is not under the Civil Services Act) would then initiate security investigations. The RCMP would be called in with the possible involvement of a deputy minister or head of the agency concerned.

If the person was discovered to be a homosexual or to have some other sort of 'unreliability' they would then be transferred to a less 'sensitive' position or they would be dismissed. There was now the possibility for review within the department or agency including review by the deputy minister or head of the agency or by a review board of members of the Security Panel.[75] At the same time there was also the research on detecting homosexuals that the Security Panel was simultaneously engaged in.

ATTEMPTING TO DEVELOP A 'FRUIT MACHINE'

The Security Panel also mandated research on the detection of homosexuals. In doing this there was an important reliance on psychiatric and psychological knowledge which was premised on the assumption that gay men and lesbians were either psychologically 'abnormal' or suffered from a 'disorder.' As in most other

[73]Cabinet Directive No. 35, "Security in the Public Service of Canada," 18 December 1963.
[74]R.G. Robertson, Secretary to the Cabinet, "Memorandum for Deputy Ministers and Heads of Agency, Revised Cabinet Directive on Security," 27 December 1963, 1.
[75]Cabinet Directive No. 35, "Security in the Public Service of Canada," 18 December 1963.

research the 'normality' of heterosexuality was assumed and homosexuality was defined as the problem.

Following up on the approval for such a study in the Security Panel memo to cabinet in early 1961 Professor F.R. Wake (who died in November 1993) of Carleton University was funded to go to the US by National Health and Welfare to research and study detection tests and technologies regarding homosexuality. Previously Wake had been the first chair of the Psychology Department at Carleton and a researcher for the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths in the 1950s. [76] He produced a report in 1962 which got the actual 'fruit machine' research going. This research was funded by National Health and Welfare. A critical analysis of Wake's special project proposal gives us insight into the social character of this research and its interrelation with the social power relations mobilized through the security campaign.

The 'fruit machine' research arose both from an apparent interest by Wake in doing research on homosexuality (usually articulated as an interest in 'suitability' for employment) and also to establish a more effective and efficient mode of surveillance and investigation than that of costly and labour intensive RCMP field investigations. This research was an attempt to find a more 'scientific' means of detection of homosexuals.

The name 'fruit machine' was given to this project, according to John Sawatsky, by members of the RCMP who did not want to be recruited to be among the 'normals' to be tested on it. [77] The 'fruit machine' project involved psychiatrists, psychologists and the departments of National Defence and Health and Welfare for four years but it never worked and the Defence Research Board eventually cut its funding. The research suffered from major technical problems as well as problems with getting the required numbers of 'research subjects'.

Dr. Wake, in his 1962 "Report on Special Project"[78] focused on the "problem of suitability" in employment, and stressed from his review of the research in the US that there was no single method of tests that could detect homosexuality. Instead a battery of tests was needed. Wake's report and research were based on a review of the professional literature and his investigations of detection research while he was in the US. He took up a general position that there was something wrong with homosexuals which makes them unsuitable for certain positions, that they can be identified, and their behaviour treated and controlled.

He argued that control of homosexuality is much more likely than cure, and he reported "encouraging trends" working with anti-depressant drugs and reported

[76]See Bill Walther and David Berndhart, Department of Psychology, "In Memoriam, Robert Wake and Russell Wendt," *This Week at Carleton* (20 January 1994), 3 and *The Report of the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law Relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths* (Ottawa 1958).

[77]Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows*, 133.

[78]Dr. F.R. Wake, "Report on Special Project," 19 December 1962.

reversal in direction of desire by means of aversion therapy.[79] He argued that "while a great deal of research needs to be done, much of it might be paid for by early moderate success reducing the current load on investigative staffs."[80]

Under the heading of "The Numbers Involved" he referred to the Kinsey reports. Although he mostly dealt with men he sometimes brought in women and he focused on how lesbians are different from male homosexuals. In general he suggested that fewer females are 'deviant' perpetuating lesbian invisibility.

As a result of his research he argued that there is no distinct homosexual personality type. This was part of a shift away from homosexuals as gender inverts and from notions of homosexuals as psychopathic personalities. This paralleled a shift that was then taking place in psychological and sexological circles with the articulation of homosexuality as a 'sexual orientation' based on sexual object-choice.[81]

Since Wake argued there was no single, distinct homosexual personality type there could be no single test. Under "Methods of Detecting Homosexuality" he surveyed the various detection tests and procedures that had been used to try to identify homosexuals. These ranged from psychiatric interviews, to medical examinations, to various tests for changes in emotional conditions. These included the Polygraph (lie-detector) test which Wake argued had too many problems to be useful; the Plethysmograph which measures blood volume in the finger by electronic or pneumatic means; the Palmer Sweat test, which responds to perspiration; the Projective Tests; Word Association Tests; the Pupillary Response Test; the

[79]See Dr. F.R. Wake, "Report on Special Project," 16. The aversion therapy he referred to was conducted by B. James in 1962 (16). He also discussed a number of treatments to alter behaviour (14). and stated that "Mental health personnel these days prefer not to speak of a cure (a change from homosexuality to heterosexuality) but rather of a change to controlled sexual behaviour, which would be more comfortable for the subject, for he is now divested of anti-social activities" (15). Wake opted for homosexuality being caused in most cases by "a combination of environmental circumstances during the years of childhood or early youth" (1). He stated that it was "not a matter of heredity or of the individual's perverse choice" (1). He was quite aware of the 'liberal' psychological and sexological work then going on in the US and mentioned the work of Evelyn Hooker who critiqued the notion of male homosexuals as 'unstable' and the Kinsey reports (1-3). He even was aware of the distinction being made between overt and covert homosexuals Hooker used that was developed in the work of Maurice Leznoff on male homosexuals in Montréal. On Leznoff see The Regulation of Desire, 117-9 and Maurice Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society," MA thesis, McGill University, Montréal, 1954. Although Wake knew about and used this more 'liberal' work he articulated it to a more 'investigative' and 'control' oriented perspective. Later he stated that "The general run of opinion ... is that homosexuals almost always are maladjusted" (15) even though he referred to Hooker as holding a contrasting opinion.

[80]Wake, "Abstract of the Report," for the "Report on Special Project."

[81]See The Regulation of Desire, 132.

Span of Attention Test, based on the time spent attending to various images (which Zamansky of Northeastern University had constructed as an apparatus to test for homosexuality in 1956); and Masculinity/Femininity Tests with all their gender and sexuality assumptions.[82]

In his commentary Wake suggested that the Palmer Sweat test would be best used in conjunction with a 'word association' test. Words with definite homosexual meaning according to the appended list include queen, circus, gay, bagpipe, bell, whole, blind, bull, camp, coo, cruise, drag, dike (dyke), fish, flute, fruit, mother, punk, queer, rim, sew, swing, trade, velvet, wolf, blackmail, prowl, bar, house, club, restaurant, tea room, and top men.[83]

Wake found the Pupillary Response test to be quite 'productive' in looking for homosexuals. It measured different interest patterns by means of a machine which simultaneously projected a visual stimulus and photographed the pupil of the eye at half second intervals. This procedure was supposed to produce an involuntary "response that cannot be controlled by the subject." Wake discovered this procedure and technology through his research in the US. E.H. Hess and J.M. Polt, researchers at the University of Chicago, had developed this test and apparatus. Professional and academic knowledge relations were directly tapped into in this security-based research.

Wake's report referred to a study done using the Hess-Polt apparatus by graduate student Allan Seltzer who was studying under Hess. In Seltzer's study the "stimuli were slides made of pictures from physical culture magazines (some of which were near pornographic) plus neutral pictures of good paintings and at least one modified picture of Christ on the cross."[84] This use of physique magazines, which often had a large gay male readership,[85] seems to have become common in the US by this point and was used in aversion therapy. This also suggested some awareness of the formation of gay men's cultures during these years. Wake argued that the "Results clearly permitted Seltzer to distinguish the homosexual subject when the results of *all* pictures were compared..." Wake reported that "Not only

[82]On the development of masculinity/femininity tests see Joseph H. Pleck, "The Theory of Male Sex Role Identity: Its Rise and Fall, 1936 to the Present," and Miriam Lewin, "Psychology Measures Femininity and Masculinity" in Miriam Lewin ed., *In The Shadows of the Past: Psychology Portrays The Sexes* (New York 1984).
[83]Dr. F.R. Wake, "Report on Special Project," Appendix A, Word Association List, 1-3.
[84]*Ibid.*, 12.
[85]Physique photos and magazines were ostensibly designed to display the non-erotic physical beauty of the male body but came to be eroticized by and produced by gay men. See Tom Waugh, "A Heritage of Photography," *The Body Politic*, 90 (January 1983), 29-33, his "Photography, Passion and Power," *The Body Politic*, 101 (March 1984), 29-33 and his "Gay Male Visual Culture in North America During the Fifties: Emerging from the Underground," *Parellelograme*, 12 (Fall 1986); Alan Miller, "Beefcake With No Labels Attached," *The Body Politic*, 90 (January 1983), 33; and Michael Bronski, *Culture Clash, The Making of a Gay Sensibility* (Boston 1984), 160-74.

was the change in size of pupil indicative of the direction of sex interest but the pattern followed by the eyes (and recorded on film) was very important (eg. the homosexual who could not take his eyes away from the genital area of the vaguely-seen Christ on the Cross)." Wake went on that "Perhaps the most important incidental finding in this experiment was the confession of a homosexual subject who reported that he had done his best to defeat the machine but knew he had failed." In conclusion Wake stated that "Here, then, is a most promising instrument for detection, not only of homosexuals but of homosexual potentiality."[86]

In his conclusions Wake argued that more research was needed. He proposed a research experiment that would combine

the Hess-Polt pupillary test with suitable visual stimuli; a measure of skin perspiration ...; the plethysmograph with a modification to measure pulse rate. Subjects: Fifteen normal males; fifteen normal females; fifteen homosexual males; fifteen homosexual females. As the experiment progresses, additional normal and homosexual subjects in unspecified numbers. All subjects to be supplied by the RCMP...[87]

The RCMP, the chief investigative arm of the security campaign, was also to provide the 'research subjects.' Here we have another side of the construction of power/knowledge relations in this research context. Also notice the language through which heterosexuality is constructed as 'normal.' Heterosexuality is not specifically named as such since this was prior to 'heterosexuality' more fully emerging as a 'popular' term which historically follows the rise of gay liberation and lesbian feminism in the 1970s and 1980s. Also notice the equal emphasis placed on "homosexual females" in the research design.

Then Wake outlined the procedure to be used —

The experimental stimuli will be pictures designed to elicit the subject's interest in males and females...The first sixty subjects will be processed to determine the reaction patterns of normals and homosexuals. Then, using these patterns as criteria, the experimenter will attempt to distinguish homosexuals presented by the RCMP, where nothing of the subject is known to the research team. Those methods proving successful will be retained for continuing research.[88]

[86]Wake, "Report on Special Project," 12-3.
[87]Ibid., 17.
[88]Ibid. Wake also urged that connections be maintained with the network of sex researchers in the US including Evelyn Hooker, Wardell B. Pomeroy, William H. Masters and John Money. He suggested that the Department of Health and Welfare assume this liaison role. It was clear that this liaison was not to take place on security grounds as Wake wrote that "anyone effecting this liaison probably will have to have a front to cover his interest in 'suitability'" (18). A critical reader can get a sense here that 'suitability' was a term that could be coded with security concerns and also with more 'liberal' research concerns. It seems that the sex researchers Wake had contact with in the US would have had little idea of who was supporting his research or of its direct security connections.

This research was more psychologically oriented than earlier studies that sometimes focused on biological anomalies (like marks of gender inversion on the body).[89] It was directed at finding a 'scientific' means to test 'involuntary' responses that demonstrated sexual orientation. This was based on a series of assumptions about the relation between stimulus and response, about the power of visual images as simulators, about common responses of homosexuals and hetero-sexuals as viewers, and an assumption of there being two, and only two, dichoto-mous and essential sexualities. Men or women who were sexually interested in both men and women would have undermined their assumptions.

Predictably there were many problems in trying to get this experiment to work. In a 1963 memo to the secretary of the Security Panel, J.R.M. Bordeleau, RCMP Assistant Commissioner, and Director of Security and Intelligence, wrote, "We are in the process of contacting known male homosexuals in this area [Ottawa] and soliciting their co-operation in the proposed tests, however we are not yet in a position to determine how many will volunteer for the project." He went on to point out that "We have no contacts within the female homosexual community in this area and no safe ground upon which an approach might be made to these persons" and that "we would suggest that other government departments ... might be requested through your office, to solicit the co-operation of female homosexuals known to them." He also reported that the RCMP had "some doubts also as to the propriety of our soliciting normal females to participate in the tests. We believe that this should be undertaken by some government department or departments which have a large pool of female employees under their control. ... Similarly we believe that the required number of normal males should be drawn from the government service at large."[90]

The RCMP seems to have had very little contact with lesbian networks and was quite apprehensive about approaching 'normal' women for this research. This account also suggests that there was resistance to participation in this research from RCMP members themselves. As Sawatsky suggests RCMP members did not want to be determined to be 'fruits' through participating as 'normals' in this experiment.[91] The RCMP response was to try to get other government departments involved in enroling 'subjects' for the research.

The 1965-66 Directorate of Security and Intelligence(DSI) Annual Report noted that "To date the tests have been inconclusive, the main obstacle to the Program being a lack of suitable subjects for testing purposes."[92] In the same report of 1966-67 they stated that, "Although the research group has made some progress,

---

[89] This can be contrasted with the research technologies and strategies examined in Jennifer Terry's previously mentioned article, "Theorizing Deviant Historiography," 60.

[90] A memo to D.F. Wall, Secretary of the Security Panel, 25 January 1963, from J.R.M. Bordeleau, Assistant Commissioner, Director, Security and Intelligence, RCMP, 1.

[91] See Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows*, 133-6.

[92] Directorate of Security and Intelligence Annual Report, 65-6, 33.

the objective has not, as yet been achieved."[93] A major problem in the operation-alizing of the experiment was with perfecting the technology itself which had to be adapted to deal with people of different heights, with different sized pupils and different distances between eyeballs.[94] The 'fruit machine' never worked and it was eventually abandoned in 1967.

Signs of Resistance

FROM THIS CRITICAL READING of official discourse we begin to get a sense of some of the obstacles the security regime was confronting. To be sure, there are certain signs of resistance within this official discourse. But this resistance, ultimately, had its social basis outside official discourse in gay and lesbian cultural and community formation.

The RCMP faced problems in its investigations with non-cooperation from homosexual informants. In 1962-1963 they reported that "During the past fiscal year the homosexual screening program" was "hindered by the lack of cooperation on the part of homosexuals approached as sources. Persons of this type, who had hitherto been our most consistent and productive informers, have exhibited an increasing reluctance to identify their homosexual friends and associates."[95]

For 1963-64 they reported a "growing reluctance on the part of homosexuals to identify their associates." In response they put additional emphasis "on estab-lishing close liaison with the morality branches of police forces, particularly in the larger centres..."[96] This reluctance or 'resistance' of homosexuals in the face of this security campaign forced the RCMP to devise a new strategy to secure the cooperation of homosexual informants. The RCMP responded by developing work-ing relationships with the morality branches of various police forces and enlisting local police support to procure homosexual informants. Given the criminalization of homosexual activity this meant that the police could 'lean on' those who had committed 'offenses,' and on street informants, in order to get them to provide information to the RCMP. This extended RCMP powers of surveillance through local police forces and once again gives us a sense of the 'power/knowledge' relations actively constructed through this campaign. Later DSI reports suggest that the situation 'improved' in terms of getting homosexual informants to talk after this relation with morality branches was put in place. More research is clearly needed on these forms of resistance and regulatory responses.

We also know that Doug Sanders on behalf of Vancouver's Association for Social Knowledge (ASK), Canada's first lesbian and gay group, made a submission to the Royal Commission on Security in 1968. In this brief he critiqued two main arguments used to deny homosexuals security clearances — that homosexuals

---

[93]Directorate of Security and Intelligence Annual Report, 66-7, 27.

[94]Sawatsky, *Men in the Shadows*, 135-7

[95]Directorate of Security and Intelligence Annual Report, 1962-1963, 19.

[96]Directorate of Security and Intelligence Annual Report, 1963-1964, 30.

suffer from a character weakness and are not emotionally stable and that they are more subject to blackmail.[97]

Some Conclusions — Heterosexual Hegemony and the Security Regime

THIS INVESTIGATION of official texts points us towards an analysis of the social organization of the anti-homosexual security campaign within Canadian state formation. We can begin to see the impact this campaign had on thousands of people's lives and we begin to see aspects of how it was organized through the textually mediated practices of the security regime. There were struggles within the security regime between a broader framework for the anti-homosexual campaign and a narrower security framework. While in general the narrower security frame won out by 1963, there was also an allowance for the wider campaign to take place through the practices of the RCMP. There was also the development of research on the detection of homosexuals as part of the security campaign. We need interviews with and first hand accounts from those who were directly affected to flesh out and further ground this analysis.

Despite significant changes as a result of social struggles there remains today a continuing and deeply rooted heterosexism in Canadian state institutions shaped in part by the active legacies of these conceptions and policies. There continues to be major problems that lesbians and gay men encounter in job-related discrimination. The historical and social roots of these policies need to be exposed more clearly, and much more critical research remains to be done. Finally this historical work also poses important questions of redress and compensation for those whose careers and lives were destroyed by these policies. Doing this research is thereby linked to current struggles to dismantle heterosexual hegemonic relations.

[97]See *The Regulation of Desire*, 157, and Doug Sanders, Association for Social Knowledge submission to the Royal Commission on Security, 29 February 1968.

bear any responsibility for what I have written here. Earlier versions were given as papers and presentations at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association meetings at Carleton, 5 June 1993; for the Saint Mary's University Centre for Criminology, 20 October 1993; and for the Acadia University History Department, 24 November 1993. As general references for this article see Gary Kinsman, The Regulation of Desire (Montréal 1987); "Official Discourse as Sexual Regulation: The Social Organization of the Sexual Policing of Gay Men," PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 1989; and "'Inverts,' 'Psychopaths,' and 'Normal' Men: Historical Sociological Perspectives on Gay and Heterosexual Masculinities," in Tony Haddad, ed., Men and Masculinities: A Critical Anthology *(Toronto 1993) 3-35.*

Canadian Public

Analyse de POLICY

POLITIQUES

Canada's foremost journal on social and economic policy

Published quarterly, the journal provides a wealth of information and ideas on current policy topics. Issues contain articles and book reviews, as well as commentaries and review articles on important policy documents. Submissions are welcome.

The journal also distributes free to subscribers special supplements on topics of current interest; a special issue on capital gains taxation will be published in 1994. Individual copies are also available for sale.

XX no. 3 September/septembre 1994

Alan C. Cairns An Election to be Remembered: Canada 1993
Rolf Mirus, Roger S. Smith and Vladimir Karoleff Canada's Underground Economy Revisited: Update and Critique
William Cross Regulating Independent Expenditures in Federal Elections
Timothy C.G. Fisher and Jocelyn Martel Will the Bankruptcy Reforms Work? An Empirical Analysis of Financial Reorganization in Canada
Janet Greb, Larry W. Chambers, Amiram Gafni, Ron Goeree and Roberta Labelle Interprovincial Comparisons of Public and Private Sector Long-Term Care Facilities for the Elderly in Canada
Peter Gardner Aboriginal Community Incomes and Migration in the NWT: Policy Issues and Alternatives
Sadettin Erksoy The Effects of Higher Unemployment on the Distribution of Income in Canada: 1981–1987

Subscriptions/abonnements: (1994)

	In Canada	Outside Canada
Members	$40	$52
Individuals	$45	$57
Students	$16	$34
Institutions	$58	$84

Please forward subscription payments to Business Office, Room 039, MacKinnon Building, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON Canada N1G 2W1

Submissions: Please send 5 copies and a 100-word abstract to the Editor, Department of Economics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC Canada