

Depoliticizing Sex Education: Capitalism and the Limits of the Liberal Discourse on Sex Education

Caitlin Howlett and Quentin Wheeler-Bell

Indiana University

INTRODUCTION

The liberal tradition dominates the philosophical discussion around sex education, which aims to advance sexual justice within and outside of schools. However, the liberal discourse on sex education operates on the assumption that the problems around sexuality are merely aberrations within the status quo, rather than structural injustices within society. In this paper, we critique the ways in which the liberal discourse on sex education systematically neglects *the class dimensions of sexuality*—the ways in which sexual identities are partly determined by capitalism’s class relations.¹ We focus on the class dimension of sexuality for two reasons. First, the liberal discourse on sex education systematically fails to account for capitalism’s role in shaping sexual identities, and therefore inadequately diagnoses the dynamic nature of sexual oppression. Second, by misdiagnosing the class dimensions of sexuality, the liberal approach advances a depoliticized sex education—that is, a sex education that mis-frames structural inequalities as personal and/or cultural problems.

To develop this argument, our paper proceeds as follows. First, we shall explain the class dimension of sexuality, focusing specifically on capitalism’s structural impact on the performance of sexual identities. We will then analyze three approaches to sex education: *liberal pluralism*, *liberal paternalism*, and *queer liberalism*. These analyses will show how each approach neglects the class dimensions of sexuality, and thus purposes a depoliticized sex education. Finally, we conclude with questions for

future philosophical investigations raised by this analysis.

Before proceeding, two cautionary notes are in order. First, this paper is *not* a normative justification of a radical approach to sex education. While we believe a radical approach to sex education is necessary and normatively defensible, our paper only aims to *critique* the limits of the liberal discourse on sex education. Second, we avoid developing a normative alternative approach to sex education in order to challenge, like Raymond Geuss, the assumption that “criticism must be constructive.”² Constructive approaches can often hastily move to explain what sex education “ought to be” without adequately analyzing the relationships between sexuality and power, specifically between sexuality and capitalism. Thus, we employ the method of critique to free us of the imperative to say what “ought to occur,” which in turn allows us space to expose the limits of the liberal discourse on sex education.

THE CLASS DIMENSIONS OF SEXUALITY

Sexuality is commonly interpreted as having a performative dimension.³ While we agree that sexuality is performed, such performances occur within structurally unequal and antagonistic capitalist class relationships, which means sexuality is also shaped and limited by capitalism. Therefore, a sex education program that ignores the role of capitalism also inadequately teaches children to understand and challenge the complex nature of sexual oppression. However, to understand how class intersects with sexuality, we first need an operating definition of capitalism. *Capitalism*, as Erik Olin Wright argues, is a way of organizing economic activities, and can generally be defined along two axes: *class relations* and *economic coordination*.⁴ For our purpose, we shall focus only on class relations.

Class relations, Olin Wright argues, are “the social relations through which the means of production are owned and power is exercised over their use.”⁵ Within capitalism, the means of production are primarily owned through private property, which creates *antagonist class relations*. The classic example of this is the relationship between capitalists and workers: the capitalists control the means and distribution of production, while the workers, in order to survive, must sell their labor to the capitalists at a price determined by the market. The capitalist and the worker are then locked in the following antagonist relationship: the capitalist acts in his/her best interest and extracts more profit from labor, thereby decreasing the worker’s means of subsistence, while the worker seeks to eradicate capitalism’s profit motive, or at least receive a fair share of the profit, which conflicts with the interest of capitalists.

Of course, modern capitalist economies are more complex than this simple class relationship. Nonetheless, complex capitalist societies still create or magnify structurally antagonistic class relationships, and do so by creating conditions in which the interests of individuals occupying different class positions are structurally at odds. Within capitalism, we can identify at least two overlapping antagonist class relationships: *class exploitation* and *class domination*. *Class exploitation*, following the classic Marxist example above, occurs when the capitalist exploits the surplus labor from workers. *Class domination*, on the other hand, refers to the ability of one class to arbitrarily control the activities of another class. One way in which class domination occurs is through forms of *opportunity hoarding*. Capitalism incentivizes opportunity hoarding by allowing individuals who occupy one class position to maintain objective interests in accessing certain limited social positions or goods. However, the more one class accesses said goods or social positions, the less access is provided to individuals in another class position. Opportunity hoarding within education is a prime example of this. Within most capitalist societies, education is

the primary means for bettering or maintaining one's class status. This relationship between education and access to the capitalist labor market necessitates middle and upper-class families' vested interest in ensuring their children's access to education.⁶ The interests of the middle and upper-classes, however, conflicts with the interests of lower-class families, because the more the former employs their capital to access elite forms of education, the less opportunities are available for working and lower-class families.⁷

To clarify how class intersects with sexuality, we shall focus on three distinct ways in which capitalism affects sexual identities: *exacerbating antagonist sexual identities*, *causing sexual alienation*, and *limiting sexual identities*. These three examples will help clarify how the liberal discourse on sex education neglects the class dimensions of sexuality, and why such neglect leads to depoliticized sex education.

Class Exacerbating Antagonist Sexual Identities

A *social antagonist identity* is an identity based upon social status, in which the performance of the identity depends in part upon how an individual distinguishes themselves from others. Such identities are antagonist because the privileged status of the performed identity is partly based upon its distinction from less-esteemed identities.⁸ Antagonist sexual identities can be performed independent of class factors; however, when such identities are performed within class dominating relationships, these antagonist identities are exacerbated. One example here is slut-shaming on college campuses. As sociologists Elizabeth A. Armstrong, Laura Hamilton, and Elizabeth M. Armstrong explain, upper-class high-status women in a mid-west college institution, referred to as "MU," use slut discourse to make class distinctions between themselves and lower-class low-status women.⁹ These antagonist sexual identities are structurally

reproduced at MU, because like many other elite state institutions MU most actively recruits middle and upper-class students who can afford higher tuition costs. To recruit and retain these students, MU structures its campus environment to benefit their interests, including leasing and selling prime real-estate around campus to fraternities, sororities, and private companies who rent expensive student housing.¹⁰ In sum, when universities are the primary mechanism through which individuals maintain or better their class status within capitalism, and colleges are increasingly dependent upon middle and upper-class families' ability to pay higher tuition costs, then colleges have an objective interest in ensuring their environment panders to middle and upper-class students.¹¹ However, these are the same students most likely to engage in slut-shaming and other antagonist gendered performances.¹²

Class Causing Sexual Alienation

The next case is one in which class causes sexual alienation. A person experiences an *alienating sexual lifestyle* when they are forced to identify with a sexual lifestyle they find difficult or impossible to endorse.¹³ Capitalism incentivizes opportunity hoarding by maintaining a strong link between one's ability to live and one's engagement in paid labor; by requiring people to engage in paid labor to survive, capitalism pushes individuals into alienating sexual lifestyles, and simultaneously creates structural inequalities that limit who can access certain forms of paid labor. This means individuals who occupy upper and middle-class positions have an objective interest in ensuring that they, and their children, can access socially-esteemed, well-paying, and personally fulfilling jobs. Even more, they have the class privilege to secure this reality.¹⁴ Conversely, those who occupy lower-class positions are afforded fewer opportunities to access socially-esteemed, well-paying jobs. As a result, lower-class individuals

are more likely to be pushed into forms of paid-labor (legal or illegal) they find personally alienating. Sex work is an example of how class can cause sexual alienation.¹⁵ Sex work is a reasonable sexual lifestyle in which individuals from all classes participate, and can be personally fulfilling and generously paying; however, not all individuals participate in sex work for the same reasons nor under the same conditions. For instance, lower-class women often feel pushed into sex work even when they find it difficult or impossible to endorse. They are more likely to participate in more dangerous forms of sex work, and compared to middle and upper-class women, they lack the same resources to exit sex work.¹⁶

Class Limiting Sexual Identities

Capitalism not only pushes individuals into alienating sexual lifestyles by incentivizing inequalities in wealth and income, but it also structures and limits how individuals can perform their sexual identity.¹⁷ For instance, performing a queer identity as an affluent youth is quite different from performing a queer identity as a homeless youth, because performing queerness requires access to certain kinds of material goods, like clothing, which are difficult for queer homeless youth to acquire. In addition, queer homeless youth experience higher rates of mental illness and sexual and physical abuse, and are more likely to engage in “risky” behavior, like sex work and substance abuse.¹⁸ Unlike middle and upper-class queer youth, homeless queer youth lack the material resources and/or access to social services to mitigate these problems.

CRITIQUE OF LIBERAL SEX EDUCATION

In the abovementioned cases, capitalism structurally shapes how and under what conditions sexuality is performed. A robust sex education,

then, must teach children how capitalism impacts sexuality. However, the liberal discourse on sex education neglects capitalism, and as a result, proposes depoliticized approaches to sex education: a sex education that assumes structural injustices can be addressed by changing personal behaviors or cultural dispositions. Our critique of the liberal discourse on sex education is not a critique of liberalism *per se*—we remain agnostic on liberalism’s ability to construct a sex education that challenges the class dimensions of sexuality. Instead, we argue that by misdiagnosing the class dimensions of sexuality, the liberal approach to sex education advances a depoliticized education.¹⁹ To justify our argument, we shall analyze three liberal approaches to sex education: *liberal pluralism*, *liberal paternalism*, and *queer liberalism*.

Liberal Pluralism

Our first case is Josh Corngold’s *liberal pluralism* approach. For Corngold, the central question for sex education is: *How should common schools in a liberal pluralist society approach sex education in the face of deep disagreements about sexual morality?* Dealing with unremitting sexual discord in a liberal society, according to Corngold, requires an autonomy-promoting education, which he defines as “develop[ing] the emotional strength, as well as critical thinking, and social skills necessary to resist manipulation and coercion” and to “empower students, cognitively and emotionally, to exercise sovereignty over their own sexuality.”²⁰ Only by teaching children to be autonomous agents can we ensure they will be capable of sexual self-determination and of reasonably handling moral disagreements. By assuming that individual changes, like being more autonomous, are sufficient for challenging the class dimensions of sexuality, Corngold depoliticizes sex education. The limits of Corngold’s approach become clear when we apply his argument for an autonomous education to the cases of *class incentivizing antagonist identities* and *class causing sexual alienation*.

First, Corngold’s liberal pluralist approach inadequately deals with

cases in which capitalism incentivizes moral disagreements around sexuality. For example, when slut-shaming is used to make class distinctions, such moral disagreements are based upon sexuality and class tensions over whose and which sexual practices are deemed “reasonable” and “worthwhile.” In this case, teaching children to autonomously handle moral disagreement is necessary, but insufficient. While an autonomy-promoting education might lessen the degree to which individuals engage in harmful and antagonist class practices, such an education is insufficient for challenging the role of class domination in incentivizing these disagreements. Second, Corngold’s approach also inadequately addresses cases in which capitalism pushes individuals into alienating lifestyles. For example, empowering individuals to resist manipulation and coercion does not challenge the class factors that push individuals into sexual lifestyles they cannot personally endorse, like sex work. And without a sex education that challenges these structures of class domination, individuals forced into such lifestyles will be unable to exercise sexual sovereignty. In the end, Corngold’s approach to sex education is depoliticized, as it focuses too much on changing individual behaviors and dispositions and insufficiently addresses the class dimensions of sexuality.

Liberal Paternalism

The next case we shall investigate is Paula McAvoy’s *liberal paternalist* approach.²¹ For McAvoy, the key question is: *How can we design a justifiable sex education under conditions of inequality?* According to McAvoy, sex education should demote autonomy and promote mutuality because individuals acting autonomously can still reproduce gender inequalities, thus making autonomy an insufficient value for sex education. To adjudicate between “good sexual choices” and “bad sexual choices,” McAvoy argues that sex education should take a liberal paternalist approach, which places limitations on some choices in order to help people “live freer and more fulfilling lives.”²² On face, the liberal paternalist approach appears well positioned to address the class dimensions of sexuality because it

focuses on conditions of inequality; however, McAvoy misdiagnoses gender inequalities within capitalism, and as a result, advances a depoliticized approach to sex education.

To understand how McAvoy misdiagnoses gender inequality within capitalism, we examine a case she uses to justify her liberal paternalist approach: *Girls Gone Wild*. According to McAvoy, the women (and men) who participate in *Girls Gone Wild* are not making autonomous choices because their choices are “unduly shaped by the preferences of others.”²³ More specifically, “these women [and men] are behaving in ways defined by the marketplace (more specially, the porn industry),” and “because this culture is so pervasive and begins with advertising and products targeted at young children, these preferences get shaped subconsciously over time and so cannot be considered autonomous.”²⁴ McAvoy’s critique of *Girls Gone Wild*, as well as of the market, is inaccurate because it fails to understand the connection between the market and capitalism. As we noted above, participation in sex work is connected to the structural injustices within capitalism. For instance, when *Girls Gone Wild* was in business, it solicited and hired women who were and women who were not in college, which means it was a capitalist company profiting from voluntary participants and from women capitalism pushed into such work.²⁵ In this regard, McAvoy is incorrect to reduce participation within *Girls Gone Wild*, or other forms of sex work, to simply having one’s preferences “unduly shaped” by the market. Indeed, individuals participate within sex work for various reasons: while some participate because their preferences have been unduly shaped, some participate because it empowers them, and others are forced into sex work because of capitalism.²⁶

When McAvoy reduces participation in *Girls Gone Wild* or other forms of sex work to unduly shaped preferences, she *culturalizes sexual injustices*. By that we mean she treats sexual injustices primarily as a cultural

problem, rather than one reproduced through personal, cultural, and structural practices.²⁷ McAvoy's culturalizing sexual injustices manifests in her argument for mutuality. As noted above, McAvoy demotes autonomy for mutuality in order to account for the ways in which individuals internalize oppressive sexual norms and make choices that reproduce sexual oppression. However, promoting mutuality over autonomy just shifts the aims of sex education from the personal level (i.e., autonomy) to a cultural level (i.e., mutuality); such a shift still rests upon the assumption that changing individual behaviors and cultural norms can adequately address the class dimensions of sexuality. While McAvoy correctly notes that individuals internalize oppressive sexual norms, she neglects capitalism's role in reproducing oppressive norms: not only does capitalism incentivize oppressive gender norms, but it also creates unequal conditions that push individuals into oppressive sexual situations. As a result, McAvoy's argument for mutuality over autonomy is too weak to help children challenge the structural injustices within capitalism that reproduce gender domination.

Finally, McAvoy's liberal paternalism would also reproduce the class and sexual domination she aims to eradicate. For example, liberal paternalism rests upon three assumptions: a predetermined conception of "good sexual choices" and "bad sexual choices"; that a legitimate process for determining "good sexual choices" from "bad sexual choices" exists; and that a criterion for determining "good moral choosers" and "bad moral choosers" exists. Based on these assumptions, however, those who participate in a predetermined "bad sexual practice" are effectively excluded from the process of determining good sexual choices from bad sexual choices. Based upon McAvoy's argument, those who participate in sex work do so because their preferences are unduly shaped by the market, which makes them "bad sexual choosers." Once an individual is labeled a bad sexual chooser, there is no reason to include them in the

process of distinguishing between good and bad sexual choices. Taking this argument to its logical conclusion, women (and men) empowered by activities deemed “bad sexual practices” would also be excluded from democratically determining what should be taught to children. And because of heteronormative and class biases embedded within the predetermined conception of sexual practices, the exclusionary mechanism inherently built into the liberal paternalist approach is likely to reproduce gender and class injustices.²⁸

Queering Liberalism

Finally, we turn to Cris Mayo’s work, which we term *queering liberalism*.²⁹ Mayo’s work has disrupted normative discourses on sex education by foregrounding the experiences of marginalized and stigmatized LGBTQ youth in education and society. Using Judith Butler and Michel Foucault, Mayo critiques the liberal discourse on sex education for misunderstanding the relationship between power and identity—specifically, for uncritically assuming heterosexuality as the basis of politics and thus neglecting the experiences of queer youth.³⁰ A central theme running through Mayo’s work is: *To what extent can liberal theory address the animus against queer-identities within education?* According to Mayo, in order for liberal theory to address the issues of queer youth, sex education must be more inclusive and invoke a sense of ethical curiosity. That is, sex education must exhibit a concern for diverse identity categories and a willingness to build sexual alliances.³¹ However, this solution also neglects class dimensions of sexuality and thus depoliticizes sex education in two ways.

The first way Mayo’s work depoliticizes sex education is by assuming that inclusion sufficiently addresses animus against queer students.³² By *inclusion*, Mayo means adequate representation of queer identities within education.³³ For example, according to Mayo, to properly

address the animus against queer students, schools must work “to ensure that learning environments are not spaces of bullying, and to work so that curricula, school activities, and school facilities represent diverse sexualities, genders, and forms of relationship.”³⁴ Here, the assumption is that the *exclusion* faced by queer youth can be mitigated by rethinking, expanding, or reinterpreting sexuality. The logic of inclusion may be appropriate for dealing with some of the animus against queer youth, but inclusion is an ill-suited response to cases in which class structures limit sexual identity.³⁵ For instance, if we apply Mayo’s argument for inclusion to a case of queer homeless youth, we are compelled to assume the best way to address their experience is to represent and include their diverse identities into sex education. In this case, the logic of inclusion is both inappropriate and demeaning because being homeless is not a praiseworthy diverse experience. We should not teach children to be more accepting or inclusive of homelessness, queer or otherwise; instead, we should teach children to dismantle the structures within capitalism that perpetuate homelessness and unjustly limit how individuals perform their sexual identities.³⁶ Because Mayo neglects cases in which class restricts an individual’s performance of their sexual identity, her argument for inclusion also ultimately depoliticizes sex education.

Second, by neglecting capitalism’s role in limiting an individual’s performance of their sexual identity, Mayo tacitly reproduces the *myth of gay affluence*—that is, the assumption that all queer individuals occupy the same class position and thus have the same material resources to perform their queer identities.³⁷ Mayo reproduces the myth of gay affluence because her primary aim is to address queer subjectivities within our existing society, but this prevents her from thinking through the ways in which capitalism structurally prevents some queer individuals from being included within society. For example, while Mayo aptly critiques the liberal approach to sex education for assuming queer youth have a stable and recognizable

identity, she ignores capitalism's role in preventing queer youth, especially lower-class queer youth, from developing a stable sexual identity.³⁸ As a result, Mayo's proposed solution to sex education assumes that all queer youth occupy the same class position, and can therefore form a stable identity once they are included in schools and society. Because she fails to challenge capitalism's role in further marginalizing queer youth, Mayo's reliance upon the myth of gay affluence depoliticizes sex education.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

So far, we have shown how three main liberal approaches to sex education neglect the class dimensions of sexuality, and in so doing advance a depoliticized sex education. We have actively avoided offering an alternative approach to sex education for several reasons. First, an insufficient understanding of sexual domination, especially within capitalism, will result in depoliticized solutions. An incomprehensive diagnosis of a problem can often result in misidentifying the social institutions capable of addressing said harms. Second, society often demands that schools address most social ills, including educating children to challenge sexual oppression, without interrogating the structural changes that must occur within society and the educational system for such ills to be successfully addressed. Thus, our critique is intended to provoke the question: How do society and the educational system need to be transformed in order to ensure everyone receives an education that effectively teaches them about the complexities of sexual oppression?

1 For simplicity, sexuality will refer to both the gendered and sexual dimensions of identity.

2 Raymond Geuss, *A World without Why* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016), 68–91.

3 Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, 1st ed. (New York: Routledge, 2006); Georgia Warnke, *Debating Sex and Gender*, 1st ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

4 Erik Olin Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias* (Brooklyn, NY: Verso, 2010).

5 Ibid., 34.

6 Annette Lareau, *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Stephen Ball, *Class Strategies and the Education Market: The Middle Classes and Social Advantage*, 1st ed. (New York, N.Y.: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003). and Family Life} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003

7 Ball, *Class Strategies and the Education Market*; Lareau, *Unequal Childhoods*.and Family Life} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003

8 See Murray Milner Jr., *Freaks, Geeks, and Cool Kids*, 1st ed. (New York: Routledge, 2006).

9 Elizabeth A. Armstrong et al., “‘Good Girls,’” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 77, no. 2 (June 1, 2014): 100–122.

10 Elizabeth A. Armstrong and Laura T. Hamilton, *Paying for the Party: How College Maintains Inequality*, Reissue edition (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015).2015

11 Ball, *Class Strategies and the Education Market*.

12 For a discussion on pandering see: Meira Levinson, “The Ethics of Pandering in Boston Public Schools’ School Assignment Plan,” *Theory and Research in Education* 13, no. 1 (March 1, 2015): 38–55.and (b

13 See Rahel Jaeggi, *Alienation*, ed. Frederick Neuhouser, trans. Alan E. Smith (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014).

14 I would like to thank Gizelle Fletcher for making us clarify this point.

15 Sex work is defined as any activity that exchanges money, goods, or services for sexual activity or pleasure.

16 For literature on sex work, including its sometimes empowering, fulfilling, and radical possibilities, see: Mirelle Miller-Young, *A Taste for Brown Sugar: Black Women in Pornography* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014); L.H. Stallings, *Funk the Erotic: Transaesthetics and Black Sexual Experiences* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2015); Elizabeth Bernstein, *Temporarily Yours: Intimacy, Authenticity and Commerce of Sex* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007); Kamala Kempadoo, *Sexing the Caribbean: Gender, Race, and Sexual Labor* (New York: Routledge, 2004); and Cynthia Blair, *I’ve Got to Make My Livin’: Black Women’s Sex Work in Turn-of-the-Century Chicago* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010).

17 Class relationships are not the only power relationships limiting how sexual identities are performed.

18 Bryan N. Cochran, et. al., “Challenges Faced by Homeless Sexual Minorities: Comparison of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Homeless Adolescents with Their Heterosexual Counterparts,” in *American Journal of Public Health* 92, no. 5 (May 2002): 773–775.

19 Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008): 1–25.

20 Josh Corngold, “Moral Pluralism and Sex Education,” *Educational Theory* 63, no. 5

(October 1, 2013), 479.

21 Paula McAvoy, "The Aims of Sex Education: Demoting Autonomy and Promoting Mutuality," *Educational Theory* 63, no. 5 (October 1, 2013): 483–96.

22 Ibid., 492.

23 Ibid., 489.

24 Ibid.

25 For a larger discussion on nightlight, class, and gender see: David Grazian, *On the Make: The Hustle of Urban Nightlife* (Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press, 2011); Reuben A. Buford May, *Urban Nightlife: Entertaining Race, Class, and Culture in Public Space* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014).

26 See Amy Allen, "Pornography and Power," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 32, no. 4 (January 1, 2001): 512–31.

27 Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, xx.

28 Such class biases are already built into McAvoy's critique of *Girls Gone Wild*. For a larger educational discussion on this issue see: Deborah Youdell, *Impossible Bodies, Impossible Selves: Exclusions and Student Subjectivities*, 2006 edition (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006); Deborah Youdell, *School Trouble: Identity, Power and Politics in Education*, 1st ed. (Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2010).

29 This is not how Mayo describes her work.

30 Cris Mayo, *Disputing the Subject of Sex* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004), 5.

31 Ibid., 159.

32 Mayo uses the terms "inclusion" and "representation" interchangeably.

33 Cris Mayo, "Pushing the Limits of Liberalism: Queerness, Children, and the Future," *Educational Theory* 56, no. 4 (2006), 487.

34 Cris Mayo, *LGBTQ Youth and Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2013), 18.

35 For a critique of the logic of inclusion see: Enrique Dussel, *Twenty Theses on Politics* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2008).

36 Diana Coole, "Is Class a Difference That Makes a Difference?," *Radical Philosophy* 77 (1996): 17–25; Andrew Sayer, *The Moral Significance of Class* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

37 Amber Hollibaugh and Margot Weiss, "Queer Precarity and the Myth of Gay Affluence," *New Labor Forum* 24, no. 3 (September 1, 2015): 18–27.

38 Cochran, "Challenges Faced," 773–775.