

Title	Marriage equality time: Entanglements of sexual progress and childhood innocence in Irish primary schools
Authors	Neary, Aoife;Rasmussen, Mary Lou
Publication date	2020
Original Citation	Neary, A. and Rasmussen, M. L. (2020) 'Marriage equality time: entanglements of sexual progress and childhood innocence in Irish primary schools', <i>Sexualities</i> , 23(5-6), pp.898-916. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460719861819
Type of publication	Article (peer reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1177/1363460719861819
Rights	© 2019, the Author(s). - https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/
Download date	2026-09-20 22:47:10
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/17626

Sexualities

Marriage Equality Time: Entanglements of sexual progress and childhood innocence in Irish primary schools

Journal:	<i>SEXUALITIES</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Marriage Equality, Sexual Progressivism, Childhood Innocence, Primary Schools, Queer Temporality
Abstract:	Ireland is a Catholic country that has, in recent times, been held up as a model of sexual progress internationally. We employ the term Marriage Equality Time (MET) to signify the tensions related to temporality, sexuality and children that emerged as Marriage Equality (ME) was introduced in Ireland. Drawing on a study with six primary schools during the ME referendum, this paper captures MET in its emergent state, exploring how parents, teachers and principals were processing what ME might mean for children and schools. This analysis of MET illustrates how it mediates imaginaries of childhood innocence, sexuality and the nation-state.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Title

Marriage Equality Time: Entanglements of sexual progress and childhood innocence in Irish
primary schools

For Peer Review

Abstract

Ireland is a Catholic country that has, in recent times, been held up as a model of sexual progress internationally. We employ the term *Marriage Equality Time* (MET) to signify the tensions related to temporality, sexuality and children that emerged as Marriage Equality (ME) was introduced in Ireland. Drawing on a study with six primary schools during the ME referendum, this paper captures MET in its emergent state, exploring how parents, teachers and principals were processing what ME might mean for children and schools. This analysis of MET illustrates how it mediates imaginaries of childhood innocence, sexuality and the nation-state.

Key Words

Marriage Equality; Sexual Progressivism; Childhood Innocence; Primary Schools; Queer Temporality

Review

Marriage Equality Time: Entanglements of sexual progress and childhood innocence in Irish primary schools

Introduction

Timelines of sexual progress have positioned some nation-states as backward and others as advanced based on whether they have introduced ‘Marriage Equality’ (ME). For instance, in Ireland, in the lead up to the ME referendum in May 2015, government and mainstream political support for ME invoked a vision of Ireland as an advanced, modern nation free from its conservative, religious past (Author 1, 2016). Announcing the passing of the referendum, Amnesty International noted that the sexual progressivism inherent in the passage of the referendum would have an impact beyond Irish borders: ‘It will obviously have profound significance to people here in Ireland, but it will also echo around the world. It sends a message to LGBTI people everywhere that they, their relationships and their families matter’ (Amnesty International, 2015). Indeed, Australian commentators frequently referenced the Irish experience in arguing for ME. For example, Carol Johnson (2015), in a piece in *The Conversation* entitled ‘Why Australia is so far behind the times on same-sex marriage?’ observes: ‘Ireland’s recent constitutional referendum vote in favour [of ME] makes Australia look particularly backward in comparison with most other developed, English-speaking countries’.

But this story of progress is not straightforward. For instance, in an introduction to an analysis of a survey of LGBT+ young people, commissioned by BeLonGTo and GCN and entitled *Budding Burning Issues: The issues facing Ireland’s LGBT+ young people*, Brian Finnegan (2017:1) argues that while the

1
2
3 referendum vote in 2015, gave the impression of an Ireland that had become, in the
4 majority, accepting of its lesbian and gay citizens... anecdotally, the young people who
5 responded to our survey spoke of a lack of acceptance, both in their families and wider
6 society, and particularly in their schools.
7
8
9
10

11
12 These survey results speak to young people's sense that imaginaries of progress in Ireland
13 were not fitting with their own expectations of what progress might look like. Such uneven
14 narratives of progress point to the production of what we are calling *Marriage Equality Time*
15 (MET). MET is not inherently progressive or conservative, transforming or conforming.
16 MET might be affiliated with, but is not limited to, progress, delay, backwardness, readiness
17 and innocence. The value of MET is as a heuristic; it enables us to demonstrate how MET has
18 become a shorthand for various understandings of relations between 'the child', the nation,
19 schooling and sexual progress.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The figure of the child has been central to the production of MET. In public debates
31 about ME in many contexts, the emblem of the child has been conjured in different ways by
32 proponents and opponents of ME (Polikoff, 2005). Conceptualisations of the child as *ready*
33 *for ME* (because children are naturally progressive), *protected by ME* (because of ME's
34 symbolic reach) or *in need of protection from ME* (because children are innocent and easily
35 suggestible) are all pivotal in the production of MET. In Ireland, Tanya Ward, chief executive
36 of the Children's Rights Alliance in Ireland noted:
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Voting yes will send a really powerful message to every child in Ireland, to all the
47 LGBT children in Ireland today that they belong, that they are respected and that if they
48 choose to get married and live with someone and commit themselves for the rest of
49 their lives to that person that that choice and that relationship will be valued and
50 respected (Ward cited in Carr, 2015).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ward draws readers' attention to the benefits that would be bestowed on children with the
4 passing of the referendum, but, at least in this quotation, the benefits highlighted are those
5 that young people would accrue when they are older – when they may choose to be
6 monogamous and married. ME discourse reinforces childhood innocence by deferring
7 imaginings of LGBT children's sexuality to a projected homonormative adulthood when the
8 children of today might choose to marry and live in a committed relationship. Child and
9 adolescent sexuality, non-monogamy and polyamory are not part of the 'powerful message'
10 continuously evoked by supporters of ME.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The figure of the child was also continuously invoked by the 'No' campaign.
22 Arguments such as those of Michael Neary, Archbishop of Tuam, echoed through public
23 debates:
24
25
26

27 One of the most important and fundamental questions that each of us has to consider is
28 the rights of the child... We should be aware of what is at stake here. We are in fact
29 redefining the family. Throughout history and across all cultures, marriage has been
30 consistently understood to be the union of male and female with procreative potential
31 (thejournal.ie, 2015).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Underlined here is the emblem of the child in need of protection because of ME's capacity to
40 change the definition of the family. This need for protection was reiterated by Brendan Leahy,
41 Bishop of Limerick in a letter read at Masses across Ireland querying the impact of ME on
42 children in schools: 'What will we be expected to teach children in school about marriage?
43 Will those who sincerely continue to believe that marriage is between a man and a woman be
44 forced to act against their conscience?' (Leahy cited in Hayes, 2015).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Such diverse appropriations of the figure of the child in the ME debates in Ireland beg
53 close attention to how MET is produced in, and productive of, new relations of childhood and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sexuality in Irish primary schools. We believe it is valuable to consider how debates about
4 these issues become entangled, mediating imaginaries of childhood, sexuality, progress and
5 the Irish nation-state.
6
7
8

9
10 This paper is organized in the following way. First, we introduce how theorizing on
11 queer temporalities might inform an analysis of the ways that MET mediates imaginaries of
12 childhood, sexuality and the nation-state in and through sexuality/school relations in Ireland.
13
14 We then briefly consider how Catholicism shapes formation of children in Irish primary
15 schools before explicating the methodological details of this study. And, in the main body of
16 this paper, we put queer time to work in exploring the ways in which parents, teachers and
17 principals, in the midst of the ME referendum in May/June 2015 in Ireland, were processing
18 what ME might mean for gender and sexuality diversity and children in their primary
19 schools. In attending to MET, we illustrate the ways in which narratives of progress and
20 childhood innocence are entangled. We discuss how narratives of progress can obscure and
21 detract from persisting chrononormative, heteronormative logics of growing up. At the same,
22 we acknowledge how moments created by ME point the way for newly shaped imaginaries of
23 childhood and sexuality.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Queer temporality, progress and innocence**

42
43 Time is ‘an invisible and silent relation of power’ (Sharma, 2013: 315) an ‘always-already
44 intersecting form of social difference’ (Sharma, 2013: 317). For example, biological,
45 reproductive and family time are all ‘heteronormative time/space constructs’ (Halberstam,
46 2005, p. 10). Queer — understood as that which is unassimilable, destabilising and troubling
47 of the totalizing logics underpinning normativity — facilitates an interrogation of the
48 normative logics of time. Halberstam (2005) asserts that queer temporality involves ‘a
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

counterintuitive critique, one that works against the grain of “the true”, “the good”, and “the right”. In Halberstam’s (2005: 3) view, queer time facilitates alternative temporalities to emerge whereby futures can be imagined outside of normative social scripts prescribed by the ‘paradigmatic markers of life experience’ — birth, marriage, reproduction and death. Of course, thinking time queerly is no guarantor of realising queer political projects (Jagose in Dinshaw et al. 2007: 191). But queer temporality allows considered attention to the productive effects of how people become ‘bound to one another, engrouped, made to feel coherently collective’ (Freeman, 2010: 3) through specific configurations of time such as MET.

For instance, in Ireland, headlines signaled that ‘It’s Time for Marriage Equality in Ireland’ (Walsh, 2015) and declared that for Northern Ireland ‘it was also ‘only a matter of time’ (Hayden, 2015). Imaginaries of Irish progressivism boomed and Ireland was held up as a temporally advanced beacon of sexual progress echoed in campaign videos such as ‘Hey Australia – It’s Time for Marriage Equality’ (GetUp, 2015). Eamon Gilmore, Tánaiste (Deputy Prime-Minister) at the time, announced that ME was ‘quite simply, the civil rights issue of this generation’ (thejournal.ie, 2012). Such mainstream political consensus about the introduction of ME in Ireland and investments in imaginaries of Irish sexual progressivism (Author 1, 2016) alert us to the ways that temporal schema mark out the boundaries of normativity and belonging. This paper attends to these logics of MET and the particular forms they take when they meet with the figure of the child in primary schooling.

Schooling has played a crucial part in the naturalisation and normalisation of time. Author 2 et al. (2017) provide a useful explication of the various narratives of progress circulating in the relationship between schools, gender and sexuality. They problematize articulations of progress underpinned by developmental models whereby individual LGBT+ development is understood as happening through a series of chronological identity stages on

1
2
3 a linear trajectory from vulnerability to pride. They are critical of versions of progress that
4 (re)produce stereotypes and simplify complex and varied experiences into universalizing
5 truths of LGBT+ subjecthood reiterated as only achievable in a post-school context. Such
6 observations prompt this inquiry into the discourses of sexual progress and truths of LGBT+
7 subjecthood that circulated and entangled with existing temporal logics of childhood
8 innocence as Irish primary school communities processed the new rhythms of MET.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Queer theory has long attended to how discourses of innocence constrain and restrict
17 childhood. For example, Bond Stockton (2009: 30) explains how, configured through the
18 adult's retrospective 'gauzy lens of what they attribute to the child', childhood innocence is
19 constructed as at once a-sexual and proto-heterosexual. Following Dyer (2017: 300), we
20 assert that 'strengthening a conceptual relation between "queer" and "childhood" can help to
21 cultivate a culture of critique concerning the interruptive force of heteronormativity on the
22 child's development and, more broadly, expose asymmetries in how children are treated and
23 the rhetoric of innocence is distributed. Such a queer analysis of the 'rhetoric of innocence'
24 offers a refusal to 'calculate the child's future before it has the opportunity to explore desire'
25 (Dyer 2017: 292). Indeed, many working in early childhood and elementary education
26 contexts have begun to explore how the trope of the innocent child regulates and constrains
27 what children may learn about sexuality (DePalma and Atkinson, 2009; Davies and
28 Robinson, 2010; Robinson, 2013) and sustains a heteronormative timeline that idealizes the
29 good future heteronormative sexual citizen-subject (Robinson, 2012; Renold, 2000).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In Ireland, primary education is an eight-year cycle (ages 4-12): junior infants, senior
48 infants, and first to sixth classes. Mirroring contexts such as Canada and Australia (Author 2,
49 2016a), the primary mode of addressing the topic of gender and sexuality diversity in primary
50 schools in Ireland has been to focus on homophobia and transphobia, reproducing LGBT+
51 subjectivities as always 'at risk' (Bryan and Mayock, 2016). While the notion of bullying
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

prevention appeals to those in schooling contexts, the persistence of notions of childhood innocence ensures that education about sexuality and gender diversity continues to be seen by school staff and parents as a much more explosive topic (Author 1 et al., 2016) than bullying prevention. In Ireland, teaching about gender and sexuality mostly occurs within Relationships and Sexuality Education (RSE) — a compulsory part of the curriculum at both primary and second level in Ireland. While some of the aims of the primary school programme bear scope for teaching about difference — for example, ‘to enable the child to be comfortable with the sexuality of oneself and others while growing and developing’ (Department of Education and Skills, 1996) — silences abound throughout the curriculum guidelines in relation to LGBT+ identities. Such aims are further hampered by teacher anxiety and discomfort in relation to preventing homophobia/transphobia and educating around gender and sexuality in Irish primary schools (Author 1 et al., 2016).

Catholic time and the formation of the child

The temporal schemas around childhood innocence in Ireland are further complicated by the ways in which a kind of *Catholic time* is embedded in the very fabric of primary schooling. Effectively, a publicly funded denominational primary education system exists and education policy, schools and a significant proportion of teacher education has been shaped by a Catholic religious ethos (Harford, 2010). Currently in Ireland, 97.4% of primary schools are denominational; they have a religious patronage and faith formation happens within the school day. Multi-denominational (MD) schools make up 2.3% of primary schools in Ireland. These are predominantly run by a non-profit company called ‘Educate Together’ where religious education takes the form of a multi-denominational ethics curriculum called ‘Learn Together’. Reflecting historically intertwined church/state relations in education, there are no

non-denominational schools in Ireland. Despite attempts at divestment since 2012, 91% of primary schools are currently under Catholic patronage.

Normative logics of Catholic time are embedded in the everyday practices of these schools. Religious education (in the form of Catholic faith formation) is taught at 12pm each day — a time originally established so that the priest could visit the school unannounced to observe the teaching of religious education. The Catholic school timeline is also plotted by several highly gendered and heteronormative religious celebratory life-moments. As part of the school day, children receive preparation for the sacraments of Confession and Communion in second class and Confirmation in fifth or sixth class. The past, present and future of primary schooling is articulated through a linear trajectory of these life-moments (Kitching, 2017), firmly establishing a *before Communion—after Communion—before Confirmation—after Confirmation* timeline. Parents have the right to remove their child from these aspects of the day but, often, children of a minority religious faith or children who have no religious affiliations remain in the classroom for these instructions (Smyth and Darmody, 2011).

This predominantly Catholic architecture and its associated heteronormative timeline sit in constant tension with state-sponsored investments in Irish sexual progressivism (Bailey, 2017; Author 1, 2017; Author 1 et al., 2017; Fahie, 2016; Author 1, 2013). But we also acknowledge that reluctances to teach about gender and sexuality persist in education contexts where the influence of Catholicism is quite differently configured (Author 2, 2016b). Furthermore, while invoking discourses of child protection and childhood innocence in Catholic schools might be interpreted as Catholic resistance to changes in the heteronormative timeline of growing up, these discourses should also be understood in light of historical and on-going revelations of child abuse associated with the Catholic church. Such happenings potentially heighten the caution and reticence of those working in Catholic

schools to raise issues of childhood sexuality, adding further layers to the already complicated relationship between childhood innocence, sexuality and schooling.

Before taking forward queer temporalities’ potential for grappling with the complex entanglements of sexual progress, childhood innocence and MET, we first provide a brief discussion of the methodology underpinning the empirical research upon which this paper draws.

Methodology

The qualitative study upon which this paper draws sought to capture multiple perspectives on gender and sexuality diversity in primary schools. We are fortunate that this study was undertaken at a time when it wasn’t at all clear to participants how the ME referendum might impact primary education and it is precisely the negotiation of these uncertainties that are of interest to us in this paper. It was conducted by Author 1 in May and June 2015 — coincidentally, at the time of the ME Referendum in Ireland. Following a letter of invitation providing information about the study sent to 200 randomly selected schools in Ireland, six schools volunteered to take part: two ‘denominational’ (Den.)schools (schools under Catholic patronage), one ‘interdenominational’ school (schools under Christian patronage - Catholic and Church of Ireland) and three multid denominational (MD) schools (schools under the patronage of the ‘Educate Together’ organization). Throughout this paper, the interdenominational school is categorised together with the two denominational schools under the abbreviation of ‘Den.’ (denominational) in order to protect the anonymity of participants. Five of the schools in this study were co-educational and one was a single-sex boys’ school. In each school, the principal acted as a research gate-keeper, communicating

with teachers and parents and sending an open invitation to take part in the study. All of these school types are publicly funded.

A total of 46 people took part in this study. One-to-one semi-structured audio-recorded interviews were conducted with one principal and two teachers in each school. Out of the six principals, three were women and three were men. Out of the twelve teachers, nine were women and three were men. Interviews lasted an average of one hour and questions focused on understandings of and approaches to homophobia and transphobia as well as teaching and learning about gender and sexuality. A focus group on the same topics was conducted with a total of 28 parents contacted by the principal in each school. 25 were women and three were men and the groups ranged from including three to seven people. Rooted in a queer, post-structural epistemology, the accounts arising in this study and gathered together in this paper are deemed to be bound up in ‘the historical processes that, through discourse, position subjects and produce their experience’ (Scott, 1992: 25). They are not ‘brute data waiting to be coded, labelled with other brute words’ (St Pierre and Jackson, 2014: 715) in order to represent a Cartesian ‘reality’. Rather they are generative starting points for thinking about the function and effects of discourses of sexual progress and innocence in and through education contexts.

In the remainder of this paper, informed by theorizing on queer temporality, we explore how school communities were processing MET and trace the entanglement of discourses of sexual progress and childhood innocence, providing new insight into how MET mediates imaginaries of childhood, sexuality and the nation-state.

Marriage Equality Time (MET) in Ireland

The emergence of MET in Ireland shunted temporalities of sexuality to the foreground, forcing the participants in this study to wrestle with new visibilities of sexuality in primary schools. The following conversation provides a rich introduction to how, as MET emerged in Ireland, imaginaries of sexual progress and discourses of childhood innocence were thoroughly entangled:

P2: I wouldn't like children in the school, if they have two moms or two dads, to not be able to be themselves and be open about it.

P1: But I think that will all change now because of the Referendum. Like, it's open and it's —

P3: You can be who you are.

P4: But how do you explain to child...just say there was a kid in the school that has two dads, well where did the child come from, like, how do you explain? Like, the IVF and the surrogate mother and I just, I just find that hard to go into detail about it.

P3: That's more complicated actually, that's a lot more complicated.

P4: Yea, 'cos that's what they will ask.

P3: But they don't really need to know that 'til secondary school.

P2: No they need to ask, they ask.

P4: It's fifth and sixth, as soon as their hormones start kicking in and as soon as they, I would just find that hard to explain.

...

P3: You could say it's adoption

1
2
3 P4: I know but they want to know...that would just be the issue that I'd have. How
4
5 do you explain?
6

7
8 P2: Think about it objectively, to explain to your child where they came from is a
9
10 weird concept for them anyway...so this is just another weird concept.
11

12
13 P1: Yea.
14

15
16 P3: Yea.
17

18
19 P4: I just wouldn't know how to explain it.
20

21
22 ...
23

24
25 P2: Do they understand the concept of people donating blood or giving
26
27 kidneys?...just explain it in the same way that somebody might give their kidney to
28
29 somebody they really loved. That they would be happy to host their baby for nine
30
31 months.
32

33
34 P3: [Laughing] Good luck with that.
35

36
37 P1: It will get easier in time with the Referendum...it will get easier in time because
38
39 Ireland has voted yes so it's not a taboo any more, it's out there and it's great.
40

41
42 (Parents, School C, Den.)
43
44

45
46 This conversation is emblematic of how this paper captures a very fluid moment in time —
47
48 MET — whereby participants were processing, grappling and wrestling with what ME might
49
50 mean for children in primary schools. Parent voices move back and forth between
51
52 imaginaries of Ireland as a beacon of equality and concerns regarding appropriate timelines
53
54 for children to learn about sexuality at school.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the conversation above, one parent assumes that the ME referendum will somehow
4 (dis)solve all of these issues with time. Another parent appears eager to think through
5 possible ways of broaching these topics with children. For some parents, the notion of
6 educating about LGBTQ identities is ‘complicated’ and ‘hard to explain’. This diversity of
7 voices and others who assert that ‘you’re not going to sit down with a six-year old and start
8 saying “well, you know, you can have two mummies or you can have two daddies”’ because
9 it might expose certain children as ‘different’ (Parent 2, School B, Den.) might be read as
10 mechanisms of avoidance or active attempts to prevent the disturbance of heteronormative
11 logics. Such perspectives point to the complexities of modern day reproductive technologies
12 and how they might complicate explanations given to children about where they came from,
13 regardless of their parents’ sexual identity. But, on the contrary, another parent radically
14 levels the playing field with the suggestion that *any* explanations about where children ‘came
15 from’ is a ‘weird concept’, regardless of the child’s parentage. Such commentary is, at the
16 same time, a powerful signal of the kinds of new imaginaries of childhood and sexuality that
17 might be made possible through MET.

18
19 In the following two sections, we follow up and tease out the diversity of perspectives
20 signposted by this rich conversation above as the participants in this study grappled with the
21 newness of MET. First, we turn to explore the participants’ investments in Irish imaginaries
22 of ME as sexual progress. Then we turn to explore the entanglement of these imaginaries
23 with well-rehearsed arguments about childhood innocence as participants processed what ME
24 might mean for schools.

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 **MET and Irish imaginaries of sexual progress**
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Echoing across the vast majority of participants in this study was the idea that enacting ME
4 was a symbol of sexual progressiveness that marked a 'New Ireland' (Parent 4, School B,
5 Den.). The following quote is reflective of dominant discussions around ME in this study:
6
7

8
9
10 So I said it to my mam...and my dad. My dad would be the cranky old man...And I
11 said "so are you going out voting there Da?"
12

13
14 "Oh I am, yea, yea, yea, yea"
15

16
17 "So how would you be voting?"
18

19
20 "I'm going out there now and I'll be fucking voting yes...and the fucking eejits out
21 there, and them going voting no?" And he went on a little rant.
22

23
24 And I went "oh, right" and this is grand. Anyway and I says to Mam..."what about
25 you?"
26

27
28 And she was "God, yea, I'm going out voting yes, we're all going out and voting
29 yes". All the Bridge club - they were all going out and voting yes.
30
31

32
33
34 (Principal, School E, Den.)
35

36
37 The vehement, common-sense tone of this account alludes to and presumes consensus about
38 ME as a progressive step on Ireland's timeline of sexual progress. It echoes mainstream
39 political support for ME and embraces Ireland's new identity as an international beacon of
40 sexual progressivism. Those voting 'no' are 'eejits' (idiots), which, if taken literally,
41 signifies an ignorant or out-dated mode of existence.
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 In many participants' accounts, Ireland's introduction of ME is deemed to be a beacon
49 of equality for the rest of the world to follow: 'But sure Ireland has opened up now the gates
50 for the rest of the world' (Parent 4, School C, Den.). Here, ideas about progress that we see
51 being attached to individual subjects — moving from a place of shame and ignorance to a
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

place of pride and commonsense — are transposed to the nation state. Such workings of MET position Ireland as an advanced nation-state leading the world in equality. A ‘sense of being and belonging that feels natural’ (Freeman, 2010: 18) is engendered through this commitment to a particular kind of progressive timeline with ME as a significant turning point both for individuals and the nation, safeguarding a path to sexual progress that no longer separates citizens, but acts as a unifying force.

In many ways, participants in this study portrayed progress in relation to gender and sexuality diversity at school to be inevitable over time. Time — conceptualised as a forward-moving, evolutionary trajectory — would bring sexual progressivism. For example, one parent said ‘I just think time will change it all...’ (Parent 1, School C, Den.) and a principal echoed this, saying: ‘I think it’ll be an evolutionary process and people will accept it [being LGBT+] and we’ll all move on’ (Principal, School C, Den.). Such perspectives signify a passive, teleological understanding of progress related to gender and sexuality where the topic will eventually be declared over as a result of the passage of time. They also contribute to a vision of time as ‘seamless, unified and forward-moving’ (Freeman, 2010: xxii) with ME as a natural step on this timeline of inevitable sexual progress:

...this last weekend [ME referendum] is so momentous. And I think children need to be aware of that. And I would always try and explain to my kids what it was like when I was in school...so they recognise that they're coming from a much better place (Parent 2, School B, Den.).

Emphasised here is the time-oriented, generational aspect of progress — how this generation is disconnected from the ills of the past, how ME proves that things are so much better now. ME is conceptualized as both a cause of progressive change in Ireland but also as a resulting

effect of an Ireland that was 'ready' for change. At any rate, both narratives project a linear timeline of LGBT+ subjecthood (Author 2 et al., 2017) with ME as a step towards a brighter future and remind that MET is actively mediating and conditioning particular imaginaries of sexual futures and reinforcing homonormative trajectories of sexual subjectivity.

Across the participants in this study, there was also the sense that ME would slowly and innocuously instigate change in relation to gender and sexuality diversity, 'dripping its way in' (Parent 2, School B, Den.) to primary schools. One teacher recalled a conversation with a group of six-seven year old children in her classroom as an example of how ME was slowly changing mindsets at school:

she was telling me that her aunt is getting married and she said 'but to a girl, like to another girl'.

And so another boy said 'a girl? Is she mad?'

And the little girl said 'no, a girl can get married to a girl'.

And then another boy said 'yea, they can and boys can marry boys' and the little fellow said 'oh right'.

And he was playing and then he just went back to it and it was just totally accepted.

(Teacher 2, School E, Den.)

Clearly, the girl in this account whose aunt is getting married to a woman is getting very different messages about sexuality and relationships to the boy who believes the aunt is 'mad'. The introduction of ME produced this moment where the boy was forced to process this new information and the conversation, as recalled by the teacher, suggests that this new information was 'just totally accepted' by him. There are two points of interest raised by this

excerpt above. Firstly, same-sex intimacy is conflated with marriage here. In this move, the normativity of marriage smoothes over and de-sexualises the same-sex relationship and we wonder whether this is what has been ‘totally accepted’ by the boy. Such accounts are illustrative of how MET generates opportunities for new dialogue with destabilizing potential at school but such interactions can also gloss over and leave heteronormativity largely intact.

Secondly, this and other teachers’ accounts in this study that cast children as ‘open to anything’ (Teacher 2, School E, Den.) make assumptions of progress via the a priori progressive child. These common-sense discourses of sexual progress associated with ME also assimilate dissenting voices and this was powerfully evident in the account of one parent:

You don't really want to give your opinion...the vote yes, I thought came across very strong and very pushy, to be honest...That anybody that was gonna vote no was gonna just stand back and say nothing or it was like you were gonna be attacked
(Parent 4, School C, Den.)

This reticence to outwardly disagree with ME alerts us to how public pedagogies of ME as sexual progress worked to assimilate, such that certain voices were alienated and silenced. They also remind that 37.9% of people voted ‘no’ in the ME referendum, quickly dismantling fantasies of the ‘yes’ consensus.

The vast majority of participants in this study were deeply invested in imaginaries of Irish progressivism and the common-sense narratives of ME as sexual progress that were espoused in mainstream political support and public debates. But also evident in these participants’ accounts is how such discourses demand consensus and assimilation, smothering dissonance and sweeping up the complexity of LGBT+ lives into linear sexual futures (Author 2 et al., 2017) often with heteronormative and reductive effects. Furthermore,

the glimpses of dissenting voices interrupt the notion that sexual progress is somehow inevitable with the passing of time. At the same time, we understand the identification of such fissures in these temporal schemas of sexual progress as points of resistance; queer temporalities that discombobulate ‘normative temporal conditionings’ (Freeman, 2010: 169) with the potential to yield ‘other possibilities for living in relation to indeterminately past, present and future others’ (Freeman, 2010: xxii). Exploring MET in this emergent state offers such generative possibilities. We now turn to focus our attention on how, as MET emerged, imaginaries of Irish sexual progressivism entangled with the temporal schemas of childhood innocence in primary schools.

MET: ‘Progress’ meets ‘childhood innocence’

ME debates clearly provoked participants’ engagements with and investments in Irish imaginaries of sexual progressivism but most seemed less sure about what the affirmation of LGBT+ rights through ME might mean for gender and sexuality in primary schooling. For example, one principal said: ‘I know it was a yes vote and I think that will be huge...[but] it’s same-sex marriage, it’s not the same as accepting people that are gay’ (Teacher 1, School B, Den.). Similarly, in contradiction to earlier characterizations of Ireland as sexually progressive, one parent said: ‘We’re a long way from that [reading stories with LGBT characters in primary school classrooms] in Ireland, I think. I do think we’re a long way, that’s a long way ahead of us, a long way ahead of us. Which is sad to say’ (Parent 1, School B, Den.). Such perspectives warn of the limitations of ME in disrupting heteronormative trajectories of childhood and prompt close attention to the specific ways that imaginaries of sexual progress mingle with discourses of innocence in primary schools.

Across the study, reflex responses of participants' to the concepts of 'childhood innocence' and 'excess' complicated and constrained visions of the impact that ME might have on primary schools. Many suggested that childhood innocence commanded and fueled a great level of caution and watchfulness: 'there's...a great respect for the innocence of children so you're careful' (Principal, School C, Den.). Mirroring other contexts (Robinson 2012; 2013), the regulation of 'difficult knowledges' was also ever-present: 'you don't want to be, their young little brains, putting too much information' (Parent 1, School A, MD). Such reactions were likely influenced by how sexuality education is primarily understood in hetero-physiological/reproductive terms in Ireland and as beginning in the latter end of a child's time in primary school — fifth and sixth class (aged 11-12). Furthermore, as one principal pointed out, the idea that sexuality identity or sexual orientation is very often understood as 'something that is completely sexualised' and so 'not child friendly' (Principal, School A, MD) most likely features in such discussions.

As dialogue ensued in interviews and focus groups, perspectives in relation to the concept of childhood innocence became more nuanced. For instance, one teacher emphasised how children could be educated about LGBT+ identities in an age-appropriate manner: 'two men love each other, two women love each other, I do think that's acceptable for their age range' (Teacher 2, School B, Den). Many parents also suggested that teachers could educate about LGBT+ identities within the latter end of primary school: 'I think it should be part of the curriculum from fourth class up' (Parent 4, School C, Den.).

And so, as is evident from these quotes, initial reflex protection-of-childhood-innocence responses were re-articulated as an age-appropriate timeline that sought to add 'it' [the LGBT+ 'other'] into sex education at what were deemed to be appropriate points in the child's learning trajectory. At one level, the introduction of ME appears here to be opening up new possibilities for LGBT+ identities to be present in sexuality education in primary

1
2 schools. However, as Dyer (2017) asserts, a truly queer approach to childhood studies would
3 not only be concerned with the erasure or presence of LGBT+ identities in the curriculum. It
4 would also involve a queering of childhood innocence itself; an interrogation and disruption
5 of 'teleologically constructed narratives of growth that require a developmental sequence
6 which culminates in normalcy' (Dyer 2017: 292). The age-appropriate timelines articulated
7 by some parents and teachers point instead to the continuing underlying problematic
8 assumption that children are somehow free of sexual knowledge until introduced to sexual
9 knowledge by adults. Such logics of course also reinforce a (hetero)normative timeline
10 wherein there is an 'appropriate' moment, later in childhood, for the presumed heterosexual
11 child to be introduced to alternatives to heterosexuality.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The potential for the discussion of LGBT+ identities to stray into physiological
25 territory was an ever-present threat to childhood innocence. Some worried about the timing of
26 education about LGBT+ identities happening in the same years as education about
27 heterosexual reproduction (fifth and sixth class):
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 But...you don't go into any of the mechanics of those kind of relationships at ten,
35 why do you have to go into the mechanics of it if it's a same-sex relationship or a
36 transgender relationship or something. It's not, you know, there's no need to, just
37 because it's a gay relationship, like, they don't have to know the bloomin'
38 physiology of it (Parent 2, School B, Den.).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The image of the malleable and impressionable child who might be persuaded to be gay hung
46 in the backdrop to such accounts. The 'open to anything' child conjured in collective
47 imaginaries of sexual progress is the same child whose childhood innocence must be
48 protected. This was explicitly conjured by one parent: 'Well I can tell you when I told my
49 mother that I was coming here to do this today... "oh for God's sake" she says, "talk about it
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in school, and put the ideas into their head...and then they'll definitely be gay" [laughing]
4 (Parent 4, School B, Den.). Its utterance in such an explicit manner and the laughing that
5 ensued amongst the parents seemed at once a release of continuously latent fears about
6 making non-heteronormative trajectories visible and a soft mocking of those fears expressed
7 by older parents. The parents here appeared to be concerned about what the ME debates
8 might expose their children to, but they also sought to distance themselves from attitudes that
9 depict gayness as something that might be caught. Such accounts are illustrative of the
10 simultaneous rigidity and elasticity of the temporal schemas at work through MET.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 We see how the dialogue generated within focus groups sent fractures through the
22 veneer of childhood innocence, surfacing ambivalence, as well as a desire to be seen as
23 sexually progressive in relation to ME and discussions with children about sexuality and
24 family formation. At the same time, participants in this study were focused on appropriate
25 timeframes and suitable speeds through which to educate children about LGBT+ identities.
26 Here we can see how 'age-appropriate' timelines act as technologies of governance wrapping
27 up, tidying up and re-directing anxieties around children and sexuality (especially non-
28 normative genders and sexualities), while simultaneously working to preserve the veneer of
29 'progressive' orientations. Such temporal schemas most often recede to the backdrop of
30 everyday life of primary schooling but MET makes visible the ways in which they are
31 predicated upon and invested in a linear heterosexual future. While well-rehearsed arguments
32 about childhood innocence continued to permeate participants' thinking regarding gender,
33 sexuality and primary schooling in Ireland, this was not without some modification in relation
34 to ME. Our hope in foregrounding these tensions related to conflicting affects associated with
35 MET is that discussions about children, education and sexuality might be imagined
36 otherwise.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For instance, Bond Stockton (2009: 12) calls attention to the ‘brutality of the ideal of the innocent child’, interrogating the ‘vertical, forward-motion metaphor of growing up’ explaining that ‘one does not “grow up” from innocence to the adult position of protecting it’. Instead, she posits the metaphor ‘growing sideways’ suggesting that ‘the width of a person’s experience or ideas, their motives or their motions, may pertain at any age’ (Bond Stockton, 2009: 11). Similarly, informed by Deleuze and Guatarri’s work on children, Hickey-Moody (2013: 282) argues that childhood ‘is not a state that can be plotted on a teleological trajectory’. Deterritorializing the psychological singular subject of the child and removing childhood from the constraints of a particular age-bracket, Hickey Moody (2013: 283) outlines how the becoming-child is a multiple subject that occurs in blocks, collective subjectivities zigzagging across time. Such perspectives point to how close attention to the multiple temporalities of childhood states can be employed to ‘deterritorialize childhood itself, the partial mixture which holds up individual figures of youth’ (Hickey-Moody: 284), thereby opening up the potential for the timeline of ‘growing up’ to be imagined otherwise.

Conclusion

In attending closely to the workings of MET in primary schools in Ireland, we have exemplified how national imaginaries of sexual progress become tangled up in discourses of childhood innocence related to gender and sexuality. Across this study there was an aura of consensus that ME was a significant step on the timeline of sexuality progress. However, these state-sponsored imaginaries of progress — when positioned alongside the passive presumptive notion of progress as inevitable — alert to how such temporal ‘hidden rhythms’ mark out particular boundaries of belonging and normativity (Freeman, 2010: 3). Time works through these discourses in such a way that the promise of progressive change is interspersed with delay and holding back.

What the data drawn upon in this paper does not tell us is whether participants' views regarding sexual progressivism reflect what they thought prior to the referendum or if the public pedagogy of ME was really shifting people's perceptions of LGBT+ rights, children, schooling and sexuality. Nevertheless, summoning the de-stabilising and generative potential of theorizing on queer time, this paper's examination of this emergent MET in the specificity of sexuality/schooling relations in Ireland contributes new insights into the ways in which MET mediates imaginaries of childhood, sexuality and the nation-state.

We have demonstrated how 'childhood innocence' and 'age-appropriateness' became entangled with Marriage Equality debates which we perceive as utterly rooted in heteronormative chronological logics. These logics continue to be used to legitimise the enactment of timelines and speeds through which children should learn about gender and sexuality diversity. The assumed progressiveness of MET maybe provides cover for the continuation of heteronormative/homonormative scripts under the banner of a kind of progressive age-appropriateness, often leaving the taken-for-granted temporal logics of childhood innocence and thus the path towards the heteronormative citizen subject intact.

At the same time, we're not denying the transgressive potentiality brought about by events such as ME in contexts such as Ireland and Australia with their capacity for knock-on effects in schools. For instance, this quote from a parent in this study goes beyond an age-appropriate approach to taking the Marriage Equality moment as an opportunity to completely reimagine sex education in primary schools: 'this is a huge opportunity to change...most sex education is about the mechanics really...I think it would be amazing to just turn the whole thing on its head' (Parent 3, School F, MD). Notwithstanding how such efforts are always bound up in the constraints of heteronormativity (and indeed the data in this paper clearly illustrate this entanglement) such 'reimaginings' are hopeful political provocations that are potentially generative.

1
2
3 Finally, this paper has underlined how time is 'itself material for critical and cultural
4 practices that counter the insistent rhythm of (re)production' (Freeman, 2012: 169).

5
6
7 Attending, to the 'uneven temporalities' (Sharma, 2013: 315) of MET foregrounds the ways
8 in which imaginaries of childhood, sexuality and the nation-state are mediated. It points to the
9 necessity for meaningful engagement with the present moment of childhood in all its
10 messiness and complexity and the potential in opening up to the 'expansive now' of time
11 (Dinshaw et al. 2007: 185) and enacting a 'slow time' with an emphasis on how modernity
12 *feels* (Freeman, 2012) — in particular for those to whom these logics do not appear as
13 natural. Such moves promise alternative conditions of possibility for children 'that are not
14 fuelled by fear' (Bond Stockton, 2009: 12) and the potential for sexuality/schooling relations
15 to be imagined otherwise.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Amnesty International (2015). *Ireland makes history and says 'yes' to marriage Equality*. Available at: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2015/05/ireland-makes-history-and-says-yes-to-marriage-equality/> (accessed 2 Feb 2018)

Author 1 (2017)

Author 1 (2016)

Author 1 (2013)

Author 1 et al (2017)

Author 1 et al (2016)

Author 2 et al (2017)

Author 2 (2016a)

Author 2 (2016b)

Bailey S (2017) From invisibility to visibility: A policy archaeology of the introduction of anti-transphobic and anti-homophobic bullying guidelines into the Irish primary education system. *Irish Educational Studies* 36(1): 25-42.

BeLonGTo and GCN (2017) *Budding burning issues: The issues facing Ireland's LGBT+ young people*. Dublin: BeLonGTo and GCN.

Bond Stockton K (2009) *The queer child, or growing sideways in the twentieth century*. London: Duke University Press.

Bryan A and Mayock P (2012) Speaking back to dominant constructions of LGBT lives: Complexifying 'at riskness' for self-harm and suicidality among lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth *Irish Journal of Anthropology* 15(2): 8-15.

Carr A (2015) *Children's rights groups urge yes vote in same-sex marriage referendum.*

Available at: <http://www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/children-s-rights-groups-urge-yes-vote-in-same-sex-marriage-referendum-1.2190832> (accessed 2 Mar 17).

Davies C and Robinson K (2010) Hatching babies and stork deliveries: Risk and regulation in the construction of children's sexual knowledge. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 11(3): 249-262.

DePalma R and Atkinson E (2009) 'No outsiders': Moving beyond a discourse of tolerance to challenge heteronormativity in primary schools. *British Educational Research Journal* 35(6): 837-855.

Department of Education and Skills (1996) *Relationships and Sexuality Education Policy Guide for Primary Schools*. Available at: <http://www.pdst.ie/sites/default/files/RSE%20Policy%20Guide.pdf> (accessed 12 Apr 2017)

Dinshaw C, Edelman L, Ferguson RA, Freccero C, Freeman E, Halberstam J, Jagose A, Nealon, CS and H.T. Nguyen (2007) Theorizing queer temporalities: A roundtable discussion. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 13(2-3): 177-195.

Dyer H (2017) Queer Futurity and Childhood Innocence: Beyond the Injury of Development. *Global Studies of Childhood* 7(3): 290-302.

Fahie D (2016) 'Spectacularly exposed and vulnerable' - how Irish equality legislation subverted the personal and professional security of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Teachers. *Sexualities* 19(4): 393-411.

Freeman E (2010) *Time Binds: Queer temporalities, queer histories*. London: Duke University Press.

Freeman E (2012). Turn the beat around: Sadomasochism, temporality and history. In: D.E. Hall, and A. Jagose (eds) *The Routledge Queer Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, pp236-261.

GetUp (2015) *Hey Australia: It's time for marriage equality*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aLCSd4JmMYM> (accessed 16 Apr 2017)

Hayden J (2015) *Marriage equality: It's only a matter of time*. Available at: <https://www.headstuff.org/topical/marriage-equality-ni-its-only-a-matter-of-time/> (Accessed 2 Feb 2018)

Halberstam J (2005) *In a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives*. New York: New York University Press.

Harford J (2010) Teacher education policy in Ireland and the challenges of the twenty-first century. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 33(4): 349-360.

Hayes K (2015) *Bishop of Limerick says changes to marriage will affect role of family*. Available at: <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/social-affairs/bishop-of-limerick-says-changes-to-marriage-will-affect-role-of-family-1.2206799> (Accessed 2 Feb 2018)

Johnson C (2015) *Why Australia is so far behind the times on same-sex marriage*. Available at: <http://theconversation.com/why-australia-is-so-far-behind-the-times-on-same-sex-marriage-42327> (Accessed 2 Feb 2018)

Kitching K (2017) A thousand tiny pluralities: Children becoming-other than the requirements of postsecular neoliberal policy recognition *Critical Studies in Education*: 1-16.

Polikoff ND (2005) For the sake of all children: Opponents and supporters of same-sex marriage both miss the mark. *New York City Law Review* 8: 573-598.

- Renold E (2000) 'Coming out': Gender, (hetero)sexuality and the primary school. *Gender and Education* 12(3): 309-326.
- Robinson KH (2013) *Innocence, knowledge and the construction of childhood: The contradictory nature of sexuality and censorship in children's contemporary lives*. London: Routledge.
- Robinson KH (2012) 'Difficult citizenship': The precarious relationships between childhood, sexuality and access to knowledge. *Sexualities* 15(3/4): 257-276.
- Scott, J. (1992) Experience. In: Butler J and Scott JW (Eds) *Feminists Theorize the Political*. York: Routledge, pp.22-40.
- Sharma S (2013) Critical time. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 10(2): 312-318.
- Smyth E and Darmody M (2011) Religious diversity and schooling in Ireland. In: *The changing faces of Ireland*. Bedfordshire: Sense Publishers, pp. 125-144.
- St Pierre EA and Jackson AY (2014) Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(6): 715-719.
- Thejournal.ie (2015) *Catholic leaders are out in force arguing against same-sex marriage*. Available at: <http://www.thejournal.ie/catholic-church-same-sex-marriage-2094773-May2015/> (accessed 5 Apr 2017)
- Thejournal.ie (2012) *Eamon Gilmore: 'The time has come on gay marriage'*. Available at: <http://www.thejournal.ie/eamon-gilmore-gay-marriage-same-sex-marriage-government-506078-Jul2012/> (accessed 5 Apr 2017)
- Walsh, G. (2015) *Less no more: why it's time for marriage equality in Ireland*. Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/80248/> (accessed 2 Feb 2018).