Record Nr. UNINA9910809641503321 Autore Pierceson Jason Courts Liberalism And Rights [[electronic resource]]: Gay Law And **Titolo** Politics In The United States and Canada Pubbl/distr/stampa Philadelphia,: Temple University Press, 2008 1-281-09399-8 **ISBN** 9786611093990 1-59213-402-5 Descrizione fisica 1 online resource (265 p.) Collana **Queer Politics Queer Theories** Disciplina 306.7660973 342.7108/7 342.71087 Soggetti Canada Courts Gay rights Homosexuality Law and legislation Liberalism **United States** Homosexuality - Law and legislation - United States Gay rights - Law and legislation - United States Homosexuality - Canada Gay rights - Canada Constitutional Law - U.S Law - U.S Law, Politics & Government Lingua di pubblicazione Inglese **Formato** Materiale a stampa Livello bibliografico Monografia Description based upon print version of record. Note generali Nota di contenuto Contents; Acknowledgments; 1 Introduction; 2 U.S. Federal Courts and

Gay Rights: A History of Hesitancy; 3 Liberalism and Gay Politics: Rights and Their Critics; 4 Toward a Better Liberalism; 5 Sodomy Laws, Courts, and Liberalism; 6 Lessons from Continued Sodomy Adjudication; 7

Courts and Same-Sex Marriage in the United States: Hawaii and Alaska; 8 Courts and Same-Sex Marriage in the United States: Vermont; 9 Developments after Vermont: An Evolving Jurisprudence and Its Backlash; 10 Canada: Rethinking Courts, Rights, and Liberalism; 11 Courts, Social Change, and the Power of Legal Liberalism 12 ConclusionNotes; Index

## Sommario/riassunto

In the courts, the best chance for achieving a broad set of rights for gays and lesbians lies with judges who view liberalism as grounded in an expansion of rights rather than a constraint of government activity. At a time when most gay and lesbian politics focuses only on the issue of gay marriage, Courts, Liberalism, and Rights guides readers through a nuanced discussion of liberalism, court rulings on sodomy laws and same-sex marriage, and the comparative progress gays and lesbians have made via the courts in Canada. As debates continue about the ability of court