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CONTACT INFORMATION AND EDITORIAL POLICY
The Gender and Sexuality Center publishes this newsletter monthly for the campus community and friends. Information in the newsletter is based on the best available information at the time of publication. Items in the newsletter are provided for informational purposes only, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Gender and Sexuality Center or its employees, nor do they represent the views of the students, staff, faculty, or administration of Carleton College.

Please submit articles, calendar entries, letters and news to the Gender and Sexuality Center or via e-mail to billsk. We reserve the right to edit for clarity and space.

MARK YOUR CALENDARS!

SPRING TERM 2011!

APRIL
29th: Pride Banquet: 5:30 PM, Great Hall.

MAY
3rd: Faith and Feminism Panel: Leighton 305, 4:30 PM
6th: Transnational/Transcultural/Transgender Performances of Identity: Boliou 104, 6-8 PM
7th: Bagels and Kegels: Page House East, 11:30 AM
11th: Transgeneration/T.J. Jourian Q&A: Leighton 304, 7:00 PM
12th: Speak UP! The Bald Spot, 8:30 PM
12th: HCR Lunch Discussion: 12-1 PM Sayles-Hill 252

And don’t forget about ongoing events at the GSC like LGBT Tea time, and meetings student orgs like CIAO, CWI, GDG, the Sex Positivity Group, SaGA and Men Talking About Masculinities!

Student Org Meetings:
Sex-Positivity Discussion Group: meetings will start again next fall
Carleton In and Out (CIAO): Tuesdays, Leighton 330 7:30 PM
Sexuality and Gender Activism (SaGA): Wednesdays, GSC 8:00 PM
Collective for Women’s Issues (CWI): Thursdays, WA (Berg House), 8:00 PM
Gender Discussion Group (GDG): contact althausb for more info
Men Talking about Masculinities (MTAM): contact silvestrm for more info
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With the recent election success of conservative representatives in Minnesota, new Anti-LGBTQA legislation is being introduced and gaining traction in the state government. Among these developments is an increasing interest in outlawing ALL recognition of same-sex couples, including civil unions and domestic partnerships.

Following the success of Proposition 8 in California, the National Organization for Marriage (NOM) has been looking to expand anti-LGBT legislation to other states. Proposition 8 was passed in November 2008 (the same day that Obama was elected) and amended the California state constitution to specify that marriage was valid and recognized only between a man and a woman. The success of Prop 8 in California was largely due to the large amounts of money that came from out of state sources. Recently, more outside money is being directed into Minnesota, and NOM has just hired a PR firm to start working here.

OutFront Minnesota, an organization for LGBT equality, has been leading the fight against the adoption of such an amendment. In its annual lobby day at the capitol this year, OutFront encouraged people to talk with their representatives about the injustice of putting forth a constitutional amendment that bans same-sex marriage. Some republican legislators have argued that it should be up to the people to decide how marriage is defined. However, OutFront and its supporters believe that equality among people of different sexual orientations is a civil and human right, which should be guaranteed by the law, not left up to a vote. This is especially important to remember given how often it is that today’s voting results reflect money and media power, rather than the true desires of the people.

Although the legislation has not yet been officially introduced, it is expected to be put forth in the State congress next March. It’s important that we start getting the word out early, as there will likely be a major media deluge when NOM decides to go public with its intentions. Our representatives need to know that this is not the will of the residents of Minnesota. They need to know that this is a matter of human and civil rights. If government and laws should do anything, it should be to protect such rights, not leave them up to rich corporations and organizations to manipulate and decide. The fundamental rights of LGBTQA people to equal protection under the law, equal opportunity to live a safe and happy life, and the equal chance to control our own destinies can not be put to a vote. They need to be given. They need to be a guarantee.

While supporters of the centers have said that they are needed to provide support for students who are in a minority on campus, McDonald said that it is actually traditional students who lack power. "If I were to walk through UT law school with a shirt on that said, ‘Homosexuality is immoral,’ if I were to do that, there would be an uproar. People would be upset, and it would be considered out of place and not acceptable to do that. I’d probably get a talking to. But if you go through campus to promote homosexuality, that is the norm."

While McDonald said he hoped that, if the bill is enacted, public colleges eliminate existing sexual-identity centers, he said that there are good programs that could be sponsored by a traditional values center. He said that they might offer programs to encourage chastity or marriage between male and female students, for example.

The budget measure is prompting derision from Texas liberals. A column in The Texas Observer began this way: "Imagine the plight of the heterosexual student stepping onto a college campus for the first time. How will he fit in? Should he tell his new roommate about his alternative hetero lifestyle? Will he be bullied, just like he was in high school, where he was mercilessly teased for being a sexual deviant? Where does a straight person turn?"

While centers in Texas await the outcome of the budget bill, the debate has already accelerated at Texas A&M University, where the leadership of the Student Senate is pushing the university to go on record by saying that it would not increase student fees to create traditional values centers, but would cut the existing Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Resource Center in half to finance a new center. In debate over the issue, advocates for traditional values centers said that straight students who may be questioning their sexuality need a center just as much as gay students do. Students said it was important to create "an equal playing field" for those who may disagree with the gay center.

Lowell Kane, program coordinator for the gay center at Texas A&M, said that he could not comment on the state legislation. But he said it was hard for him to accept the idea that gay students somehow have it better than their straight counterparts because of the center at Texas A&M or elsewhere. He noted that in various surveys of gay students about how welcoming the university is, Texas A&M does not do well.

"I'm sure there are instances where an individual heterosexual person might feel oppressed," he said, and that's wrong. But it's also not the norm, he added. "What we are talking about is the difference between an individual instance and societal homophobia."

"If you walk into any campus classroom or student health services, most of what you find is geared toward a heterosexual population and not a GLBT population," Kane said. Noting the suicide last year of Tyler Clementi, a student at Rutgers University, Kane said, "I have never heard of any student who took their life because their college roommate outed them as being a heterosexual student."

And turning to comments from students at Texas A&M, he added, "I have never had a student come up and complain that someone comes up and out of the blue calls them a ‘hetero’ and slapped them, but that happens to my students, who are called ‘dyke’ and ‘fag.’"
The Texas House of Representatives has passed a budget bill that would require any public college with a student center on "alternative" sexuality to provide equal funding to create new centers to promote "traditional values."

While the Senate has yet to adopt a version of the budget bill, the inclusion of the measure in the overall budget bill and the dominance of social conservatives in Texas politics means that the measure could well be enacted. The House vote in favor of the amendment on the campus sexuality centers was 110-24.

Many Texas public colleges -- as is the case at many colleges elsewhere -- have centers within student affairs departments that serve gay and lesbian students. These centers sponsor programming, refer students who need counseling or support groups, and serve as advocates for gay and lesbian students on their campuses.

Representative Wayne Christian, a Republican, proposed the amendment, which would apply to any public colleges with a center "for students focused on gay, lesbian, homosexual, bisexual, pansexual, transsexual, transgender, gender questioning, or other gender identity issues." According to The Dallas Morning News, lawmakers "cracked jokes and guffawed" during debate, with one representative asking Christian what "pansexual" means. Christian urged the lawmaker to visit the centers at the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M University to find out.

Lawmakers supporting the bill have said that they favor only equal time for all kinds of sexuality.

But the Young Conservatives of Texas, a group that worked with Christian on the legislation, did so with the hope that public colleges would respond to a law, if the bill passes, by ending support for existing centers. Tony McDonald, senior vice chairman of the group and a law student at UT Austin, said in an interview that "we could try to get these groups defunded" in a law, but that the equal funding approach was viewed as more likely to pass (perhaps with the same impact).

McDonald said that he doesn’t believe universities should be funding centers on any sexuality or values -- traditional or otherwise. He said that students "who want to promote a homosexual lifestyle" can do so "on their own time and with their own money."

Requiring the creation of traditional values centers would "give the left a taste of its own medicine," he said. He charged that these centers "are encouraging folks who consider themselves homosexuals to go on considering themselves as such. That’s the point of the centers, and that’s not something Texas taxpayers should spend their money on."

FemSex is a collaborative, student-facilitated class that seeks to engage participants in discussions on female sexual health and sexuality. Adapted from a course created at the University of California at Berkeley, *FemSex* explores topics such as the history and culture of female sexuality, sexual anatomy, body image, pleasure, the effects of power and privilege on female sexuality, reproductive health, and the intersections of race, class, sex, and gender. The class is offered annually spring term.

This spring, there are a totally of 60 participants, divided into four sections and led by nine student facilitators. This past week FemSex-ers got crafty, making posters that displayed something they have learned in the class that they wanted to share with campus. Below is a compilation of a few of the messages, contributed by Caitlin Wood, Casey Markenson, and Talia Goldenberg. The text reads: Fat does not equal unhealthy, sex does not equal intercourse, vulvas are beautiful, girls masturbate too, and the word ‘slut’ is not helpful.
“She is Robyn. The most killingest pop star on the planet. A pint-sized atom bomb dosed to the tits on electric and dispensing wisdom in three-minute modernist pop bulletins on the post-adolescent condition.” This blurb from her MySpace page very accurately describes the above named Swedish electro-pop sensation. I first discovered Robyn not three months ago, and ever since then I have been in awe of her passion, her energy, and her ability to make me want to dance. But what has fascinated me most about Robyn is the unique way she expresses her sexuality and femininity both in her song lyrics and in her music videos.

A lot of the songs on her album Robyn and in her newest project Body Talk focus on depicting the singer as a tough and confident woman who will put you in your place; who doesn’t take orders from anyone. She sings lyrics like “Don’t fucking tell me what to do”, “It’s a simple fact that you can’t seem to handle me”, “Even the Vatican knows not to fuck with me”, and my favorite: “I’m so very hot that when I rob your mansion, you ain’t call the cops you call the fire station”. Her “don’t-mess-with-me” attitude is one that is usually associated with masculinity. These are not phrases one would normally expect to hear coming from a 5’3” blond woman. She further defies gender expectations in her music videos by refusing to sexualize herself in the ways most female pop artists do. She does not wear revealing clothes and does not dance in an overtly sexual manner. Even in her highly sexual music video for “Indestructible”, she is the only one who does not engage in sexual activity. Instead she sings on a bed while wrapped in tubes with different colored liquid inside them. Also, in her music video for “Dancing on My Own” several sweaty couples make out on the dance floor but she is not among them. In fact, she rarely interacts with anyone in her music videos.

The theme of isolation in her music videos and in her lyrics represents a different sort of sexuality to me. Robyn is alluring not because she presents herself as being sexually needy or available, but because she presents herself as sexually confident and independent. Robyn is saying to us “You have to show me you’re worth it, because I don’t need you to validate my sexuality.” That is sexy in its own radical way, and a refreshing change from the way women pop stars have been portrayed in the past.
2Fik, is a Moroccan-French performance artist based in Montreal, Quebec. As an interdisciplinary artist that works in photography, videos, and live performance in order to capture the tension of various identities, 2Fik identifies himself as a stateless person, caught between the poles of his three competing nationalities: Canadian, French, and Moroccan. He describes his photography work, in which he plays each character in a wide cast, as “a photo-soap-opera where people from different cultures meet and evolve.” In playing every unique character himself, 2Fik questions his own identity as well as more general facets of identity. He also provokes thought in his work by introducing stereotypes which encourage viewers to discuss the idea of identity performances, hoping that everyone can recognize a part of themselves in his stories.

Dr. Denis M. Provencher, Associate Professor of French Studies at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) is the author of queer French: Globalization, Language, and Sexual Citizenship in France (Ashgate 2007), and co-editor of a special issue of Contemporary French Civilization on the Ambiguous Legacies of the Liberation of France, Provencher examines linguistic and semiotic (visual) representation of homophobia, citizenship, national identity, gender and sexuality in literature, mass and popular culture (television, film, graphic novels, maps, school manuals), and language data derived from ethnographic field work in France. He is currently working on a new monograph in which he is examining issues of language, sexuality, Islam, and Maghrebi cultures in France, and this research will largely inform the content of his portion of his presentation.

This winter break, I walked into my bedroom to find “Guide to Getting It On: Fifth Edition” lying on my bed. My mother, a very frank woman, had written a note saying that I should “give it a look.” And did I ever. It was great! It was like an actually instructive, significantly less offensive version of Cosmo: all the glorious detail, minus the ridiculous assumptions that women need more intimacy, men only want sex, etc, etc. GTGIO includes a comprehensive array of information on issues such as how to perform sex acts, what sexual anatomy looks like, and how adolescence affects desire. The book itself is enormous: at 846 pages, including an impressive glossary of slang terms, and plenty of illustrations, this book surely approaches the oft-sought after title of ‘comprehensive. I first heard about this book from a sex educator in my hometown, who uses it as a particularly inclusive and ‘hip’ text, particularly around issues of gender and sexual orientation. However, while I loved this book for its detailed honesty, I found that it makes significant assumptions about the gender of its readers, and in particular, the cis-gender status of readers. It also makes a number of hetero-sexist assumptions about who is performing which sex acts.

For example, the section on handjobs is written almost exclusively for female-bodied people performing manual stimulation on male-bodied people. While those of us who do not possess penises may find a bit of extra information helpful or practical, it would be easy to provide this info without referring to ‘gals,’ ‘women,’ or ‘ladies,’ as though being in possession of a vulva makes one lady-like. The gendered language is unnecessary, and not only assumes cis-status, but also creates a sense of the book being less-than-gay-friendly. Anyone who wants to give a fun handjob—man, woman, neither, in possession of a vulva or not, straight, gay, or totally uncertain— should be able to access fun and detailed information on how to enjoy their sexuality. While GTGIO provides this information in a readable and comprehensive way, here’s to hoping that the sixth edition quits with the unnecessary gender assumptions!
"Women should avoid dressing like sluts in order not to be victimized." This statement, issued by Toronto police constable Michael Sanguinetti to a personal security class at York University in Toronto, sparked a phenomenal response from the Canadian people.

Only six weeks later, on April 3rd of this year, an estimated 3,000-4,000 marchers took to the streets of Toronto, dressed in their finest slut attire, to force police and citizens alike to re-evaluate the notion that a short skirt or tight jeans are tantamount to ‘asking for it.’

While at first glance, this response may seem disproportionate, given the constable’s apology and a series of statements released by the Toronto Police Department. Yet viewing this community action in such a narrow light does not do it justice. The offensive statement can’t be viewed as the work of a single man, or even a single police force, but rather should serve as a reminder of the persistent effects of rape culture on our norms and values surrounding sexual violence.

Consistently, our culture reinforces a number of false notions about rape that contribute to our collective ability to ignore the lived experiences of the millions directly impacted by sexual violence. In this instance, our gendered understanding of ‘slut’ reinforces the concept that only (straight) women are affected by violence, always perpetrated by (straight) men. Furthermore, monitoring our clothing choices reinforces the popular (but false) conception that women are attacked by strangers in dark alleys. This image ignores the reality that a significant majority (71%, by conservative Department of Justice figures) of women are assaulted by an individual they already know—frequently intimate partners. When women are at the greatest risk of violence in their own homes, the notion that their clothing choices impact their partner’s actions is not only false, it is victim-blaming.

By teaching women about their ‘responsibility’ to not get raped, instead of teaching men (and all people) about their responsibility not to perpetrate assault, our culture reinforces norms that allow sexual violence to thrive while attempting to silence and shame survivors. SlutWalk Toronto was more than a reaction to a single constable; it was a visible and forceful rejection of the victim-blaming beliefs that constitute rape culture.

As we consider our own responsibilities in rejecting rape culture, I encourage you to look ahead to Carleton’s Speak Up!, Denim Day (sponsored by Women’s Awareness House), and the Healthy Communities and Relationships group on campus. Ending sexual violence will always be a collective responsibility, but as individuals, we have an amazing potential to positively impact our communities, peers, and the social fabric of this campus.

As a queer identified person I've always been disappointed by the romantic subplots in video games. Well rather I've always been disappointed in the romantic subplots for role-playing games. I hated that even though I was creating this fictional character, I still was limited in how I could interact with the other characters and I was always by default a heterosexual character. More recently video game designers have bucked this trend and added more queer characters to their games. Fable introduced queer relationships back in 2004, and the Sims also allowed you to have queer relationships as well. But in both these cases they felt like mere token gestures, never really developing the characters and just saying “here look we can be queer friendly.”

Most recently though, Dragon Age II has incorporated queer characters into the virtual world, and while Dragon Age I also had queer characters here we see an expanded cast of queer characters. Really though the most noticeable difference between the queer allies in this game and those in other games is the fact that they don’t feel tokenized. They aren’t just the stock queer characters we see in other games, where their queerness is used to make homophobic jokes. They have feelings and they get upset at your character if you do something wrong, or they fall for you if you woo them. As someone who has been playing video games for as long I can remember, I’m glad to see that they have started to be more progressive.