

# Gay scene, queer grid

Robert Payne

School of Humanities and Languages, University of Western Sydney, Australia

## ABSTRACT

Following Michel de Certeau's theory of spatialising, tactical practices of the everyday, Bryan Reynolds and Joseph Fitzpatrick argue for a distinction between "subjective" and "transversal" kinds of territory. Transversality acts to cut across the gridded lines of hegemonic place which serve to bind intelligible subject positions. If the terms of transversal territory can be applied to the production of queer space as the mobile appropriation of place across and beyond normative bounds, how do we theoretically conceive the urban, gay community-imagined zone known as "the gay scene" in relation to sexual and gender norms? Moreover, as these social and sexual dynamics are increasingly located on websites such as *Gaydar*, to what extent is the utopian promise of cyberspace fulfilled in activating a queer ethics of identification? Taking evidence from both "scenes", this paper concludes that *Gaydar* works to reinstall a normative grid of intelligibility of gendered, sexual and racial subjects.

"What you want, when you want it": this is the promise made on the entry page of the dating website *Gaydar*.<sup>i</sup> The tagline speaks of a neo-liberal fantasy of consumerist success. Positioned next to alternating images of attractive and mostly semi-clad men in couples, the website begins to construct a utopian space of sexual availability, variety and continuity. In this way, and given its widespread popularity, *Gaydar* provides a technologically convenient extension of the social and sexual possibilities offered within the so-called "gay scene" of urban centres and their circuit of bars, clubs and other premises. But where the gay scene might be imagined as a mobile elaboration of queer space, and where its transition into the cyberspace of websites such as *Gaydar* might seem to enhance the liberatory potential of queer identification, evidence of reductive gender and sexual categorisation in both spaces troubles this picture.

From their interviews with various gay, lesbian and other queer subjects in the UK, Gill Valentine and Tracey Skelton conclude that the concept of the "gay scene" is experienced as a paradoxical space. The young men and women reported two broad themes. First, the scene is a space in which to "find" oneself, commonly associated with processes of coming out and achieving social connection and a sense of belonging with other young queers. At the same time, this sociality may result in a sense of risk and "losing" oneself in relation to expectations of behavioural, sexual and bodily conformity.<sup>ii</sup> These important

but familiar observations can be rendered more complexly, I argue, by acknowledging the existence of "the scene" not as an unproblematically verifiable social entity but as a rhetorical construction, produced discursively through a number of key spatial tropes as location, home, stage. In particular, the scene is figured as destination – a place of arrival and welcome for social and sexual subjects.

My use of the term "gay scene" should not be taken to indicate an empirical approach to such a space any more than that I am claiming to fix the term's referential limits. At the very least, it must be acknowledged that different kinds of gay scene exist, constructed around different identities and practices. Just as space is elaborated in critical theory as a conceptual category, my interrogation of the space of the gay scene attends to its intangible existence as an "imagined community" and therefore one that might comprise ambiguities and contradictions rather than coherent realities.<sup>iii</sup> My use of the term gestures to a kind of meta-category of practice and identification, and one which is subject to various social and cultural norms although not entirely reducible to them. Before turning to the relationship between gay scenes and queer space, it is important to interrogate the theoretical context of queer space itself and the ways in which it may overlap with conceptions of cyberspace. Guiding all of these investigations is a larger question: where queer social and sexual practices and identifications are

sometimes heteronormatively complicit, how might the spaces of their conception be reimagined beyond a normalising grid of intelligibility?

\*

Michel de Certeau's now familiar distinction between "place" and "space" rests on the transformative significance of cultural practices. Everyday use of the institutions and enterprises of place opens up individualised spaces of tactical operation. As de Certeau's famous example of walking in the city outlines, pedestrian itineraries are spatial appropriations within and across officiated bounds of urban place.<sup>iv</sup> Inherent in the concept of appropriation, spatialising tactics pose a challenge to the stability of "proper" place, a term blending connotations of ownership and propriety. Questions of moral as much as civic or legal propriety are especially pertinent when considering productions of queer space, as the work of Michael Warner elaborates. His broad conception of "public sex" – meaning the visible spatialising of sexual cultures as well as sex in public spaces – aims to upset the "proper" order established by

the dominant segregation of spaces, which allows a tacit heterosexuality to be endlessly visible and publicly supported, while non-normative sexualities must be privatized to the point of invisibility and inaccessibility.<sup>v</sup>

Clear conceptual relationships thus exist between the notions of proper place, tactical space and subjectivities – whether sexual or other – and my interest in space in this paper lies in this nexus. In particular, following de Certeau's use of Foucault's ideas on disciplinary regimes of subjectivation, we must critique the seeming distinction between the constitutive constraints to subjectivity imposed by proprietorial place and the limits of spatial/subjective appropriation, if the latter are only to be understood relative to the former. Moreover, following Foucault, if we are to consider that the proprieties of place are produced by and reproduce regulatory norms, do appropriations of space within this regime including the non-normative necessarily contribute to the force of that regulation? If applied to the idea of queer space, the presumed precedence of place over space needs to be interrogated. Might space be produced on its own terms, that is to say not as the ultimately constrained improvisation of possibilities conceived only within prior heteronormative boundaries?

Bryan Reynolds and Joseph Fitzpatrick outline the ways in which de Certeau destabilises his initial distinction between space and place, in a discussion of cartography as the geographical rendering and fixing in knowledge of particular uses of space. The officiation of the map-making process involves a proprietorial over-writing of earlier spatial practices:

The forgetting of these original spatializations, their erasure from the increasingly geographical (and geometrical) maps, makes it possible for maps to become arbiters of what is "proper" – makes it possible, in short, for spatial constructions to be perceived as "places".<sup>vi</sup>

The point at which an "original" use of space becomes a "proper" marking of place is clearly one of political and ideological contingency. On whose terms does this marking literally take place and in whose script? To whom is it legible?

What happens to those forgotten spatialisations, erased from view? What traces of the colonised, the repressed, remain and how might they re-emerge?

In Reynolds and Fitzpatrick's terms, movements of "transversal power" activate this potential. Their reading of de Certeau begins with the idea that the plural, cultural practice of space is a "'cutting across' of boundaries" or a series of tactical movements of "transversality".<sup>vii</sup> Such practices are a direct challenge to the ideologically driven apparatuses, emblematised by the cartographic impulse, which aim to contain individuals within the bounds of "subjective territory". Each subject belongs in his or her proper place, mapped as it were on to what Foucault famously calls "a grid of intelligibility of the social order".<sup>viii</sup> Transversality explicitly acts to cut or cross the lines of geometrically normalised subjectivity, "to deviate from the vertical, hierchicalizing and horizontal, homogenizing assemblages of any organizational social structure".<sup>ix</sup> In that transversal territory is a necessarily conceptual space which "contains all the possibilities that are precluded or excluded" by the apparatus of subjective territory, Reynolds and Fitzpatrick argue that it may be shaped by an ethics of remembering or "anamnesis": "a recollection of the spatial practices that the creation of maps attempted to forget".<sup>x</sup>

Remembering in this sense might also be conceived as remembering, that is reversing the dismemberment of the body politic, recuperating membership of the realm of subjectivity of those systematically dis-placed. The restoration of subjective status, however, may risk re-placing erased subjects, that is relegating to a "proper" place within the respective hegemonic order. The transversal power of anamnesis must attend therefore to reconceiving the spatiality of subjectivities rather than restablising them into place on the grid. For this to take effect, the conceptual space opened up by transversality must be imagined not as necessarily relational to a pre-existing subjective territory but as a space independently of the grid and beyond its rigid logic. The wider project of queer theory has attempted to refigure subjective spaces in this way: to dismantle the self-styled priority of heteronormative subject positions by refusing them originary status and thereby unsettling the very grounds upon which all identities are supposed to stand. The spatial irreferentiality heralded by queer theory is explicit in David Halperin's assertion that the term "queer" does not designate anything determinate so much as describe "a horizon of possibility whose precise extent and heterogeneous scope cannot in principle be delimited in advance".<sup>xi</sup> Likewise, the trans dynamics of transgender identities have sometimes been theorised as metonymic of queer incoherence more generally because of their production of an interstitial space of gender "that is not reducible to the normative insistence on one or two".<sup>xii</sup>

One point of interest to me in this paper is how the spatial indeterminacy and becomingness of queer appear consistent with particular constructions of cyberspace. Moreover, that the conceptual abstraction of cyberspace produces various semiotic and sometimes anxious efforts to ground it in articulations of place (*homepage*, *website*, *chatroom*) seems analogous to the moves of cartographic and subjective determination discussed above. Mark Nunes, for instance, has argued the performative function of common metaphors of the Internet works to bring about or "substantiate" cyberspace as "a virtual topography".<sup>xiii</sup> Figures of surfing, browsing, navigating, exploring and the like

imagine an engagement with the material and the objective, sometimes through terrestrial or elemental tropes. Nunes divides this vocabulary into two competing models corresponding to Deleuze and Guattari's distinction between "smooth" and "striated" space, where the former describes dynamics of distribution through flow and the latter allocation within structure. What Nunes discusses as the ultimately dialectical rather than strictly oppositional relationship between these two topographies provides a useful frame for considering the necessary and constitutive tension that exists in the partly overlapping dualisms already discussed: place/space and subjective/transversal territory. More especially, what emerges from each analogises the central problematic of queer/grid relations: the mutuality of constraint and possibility played out within and around the lines of normative matrices of identity.

Elsewhere, I have begun to read the poststructuralist image of the grid (via Foucault and Butler) alongside the more electronically inspired representation of the Internet as a grid-like structure of transmission.<sup>xiv</sup> The following questions emerge. If, as Butler argues, subjectivity is constituted within a regulatory grid of intelligibility which determines recognition of the subject in relation to given norms, are online identities and practices similarly bound? Is transmission of the self constituted as online subject possible off the grid? What might be understood to be the queerness of cyberspace, then, is its often celebrated *potentiality* for the conception of identities and practices beyond, not reducible to, and perhaps destabilising the priority of existing grids of intelligibility. Following Nunes's argument for the existence of competing and mutually generating models of smoothing and striating enunciations of cyberspace, it is crucial not to characterise all of the Internet monolithically as a coherent, normative grid. But it is equally simplistic to imagine cyberspace offering an open field of performative queer identity play where normative alignments between sex and gender and gender and sexuality no longer apply. As Nina Wakeford asks of the often claimed correspondence between particular tenets of postmodern and queer theory and cyberidentity:

Perhaps the closeness of fit is a bit too convincing?  
What is lost if cyberqueer research becomes merely a celebration of parody and performance, or the simplistic application of an author's reading of *Gender Trouble* or *The Epistemology of the Closet*?<sup>xv</sup>

Part of what is lost is a necessary acknowledgment of the various constraints – ideological and economic, for instance – that limit if not foreclose the possibility of cyberspace as a wholly experimental realm equally accessible to all users. But as Nunes also identifies, different kinds of spatial interaction follow from different constructions of online interface architecture, some of which are given to passage and flow while others allow movement only between determined points. The "regime of signs which, at the level of the user, determines cyberspace" also determines the possibilities of recognition of identities and interactions.<sup>xvi</sup> Whom one can be in cyberspace, as in all social spaces, will depend on the recognition of the other which will itself depend on the context's established semiotic codes – a discursive structure both enabling and constraining the availability of subjectivities as culturally intelligible performances.

The semiotic codes comprising interactions and performances in various cyberspace locations need to be understood in broad terms. Interface architecture may most obviously direct the possibilities of whom and how to be in a given location, in other words the "place" materialised by interface design. But less tangible parameters are equally established by the location's social dynamics – norms of communication, interaction and identification. While a chatroom, for instance, may appear to allow open category performance of identities not limited by the set variables of drop-down menus or profile templates, discursive limits will be imposed by the room's practised conventions – its vernacular, discussion topics, power dynamics and so on. It is these actively produced elements of subjective space to which I will now turn. In particular, I want to begin to investigate how the performance of specific kinds of masculinity construct website *Gaydar* as an extension of the normative grid of "the gay scene".

\*

*Gaydar* is a personals website mostly used by men looking for social and sexual connections with other men in the same geographical location. The site originated in the UK and is now used internationally, particularly popular in so-called "gay capitals" such as Amsterdam, Manchester and Sydney. In Sydney, popularity amongst gay men living in the inner city appeared to increase hugely in the early 2000s such that most gay men of my own acquaintance used or had used *Gaydar* regularly at this time; currently, up to 1500 users are logged in on any night of the week. Each *Gaydar* user constructs a personal profile similar to homepages on other popular networking websites such as *myspace* and *Friendster*. Profiles are based on a template which requires certain basic information. As I discuss in more detail elsewhere, the options available to users in describing several key aspects of themselves are categorically limiting, sometimes in ideologically problematic ways. For instance, users must identify ethnically as Arab, Asian, Black, Caucasian, Hispanic, Middle Eastern, Mixed Race, South Asian or Other, and sexually as Active, Passive, Versatile, Active/Versatile or Passive/Versatile.

While the template format of profiles can be said in spatial terms to close *Gaydar* users into a kind of subjective architecture or territory, mapped in advance, two important points must be made. First, instances of how users operate semiotically within this architecture, in those areas of a profile that allow freer self-expression, also suggest a less directed conventionalisation of identity along hegemonic lines. But second, these forms of closure must always produce some attempts at subversion. A few examples of both will start to give a clearer sense of the semiotic practice of space in relation to subjective norms.

Phrasing taken from the "Looking for" section of users' profiles offers evidence of a continued categorisation of kinds of sexual subject. Perceptions of race and ethnicity are commonly located in a hierarchy of sexual attractiveness which matches Eurocentric assumptions familiar from other contexts. One user I will call "rocky" writes: "No asians or black guys... No offence, just not my thing...".<sup>xvii</sup> This disavowal of overt discrimination is frequently undertaken in other profiles in which negated subjective categories are grouped together in a spuriously self-evident alliance. The trio "No fats, fems or

GAMs [gay Asian males]”, for instance, features prominently across the website. Another user I will call “gameboy” explicates a more complex set of racial and sexual assumptions. He writes: “U must be nice to good looking, well kept body, sense of humour and under 40 (or dont look older than 40)” followed directly by “no fatties or asians” both of whom are presumably to be excluded from the preceding attributes. Shortly below, however, in a very differently valorised racialisation, “gameboy” continues: “Oh and if you are lebanese or middle eastern.. message me now!”

This construction of Asianness as distinct from Lebaneseness or Middle Easternness plays into wider Eurocentric assumptions of masculine social and sexual agency amongst these populations and speaks of the complexity of hierarchies of racism in Australia, particularly of the complex and shifting intersections of gender and of sexual desire with perceptions of race. Recent political debates and media representations of Lebanese and other Middle Eastern Australian males, feeding in part from racially essentialising accounts of terrorism internationally, may provide a context which allows “gameboy” to fetishise a kind of masculinity amongst such men that necessarily opposes his perception of “Asians”, constructed very differently in political and media discourse.

Sexual objectification by race is common enough in *Gaydar* profiles to invite comment and sometimes attempts at subversion by other users. One user I will call “funky\_funboy” critiques the opportunistic use of online profiles to make discriminatory preferences more overt, not less than in offline spaces. He writes: “I dare anyone online here to walk into a bar with a tag on them saying ‘NO GAMS’ and see how many people take offence to that.” Identifying ethnically as Asian, “funky\_funboy” further describes himself as a “spunky chink” – a political tactic of discursive reclamation more often deployed by self-identifying “wogs” than any other non-Anglo ethnicity. In this way, “funky\_funboy” opens a subversive subjective space which recodes the social and sexual value of users identifying as Asian. His profile gives one example of possible challenge to the widespread mapping of desire along established categorical lines, in which normative gender and sexual identification constructs a purportedly neutral space of white masculinity only possible through the active marginalisation of various negated others. Examples like these suggest *Gaydar* may not fulfil the utopian promise of discursive and subjective openness that is set up within some conceptions of cyberspace. As a newer, extended version of gay scene – and functioning interconnectively with offline social and sexual networks and spaces – *Gaydar* appears to extend the scope of subjective discipline which regulates “real space” gay scenes.

The term “gay scene” operates discursively and performatively as the emblematising label for an accumulation of fictions of urban gay social and sexual life. A variety of popular cultural texts depend on images which manufacture rather than reflect commonalities of gay experience and identity within urban spaces. Examples range from the continuous nightlife depicted in the British television series *Queer as Folk* and its US spin-off to the weekly photographic digest of bar and club patrons in local community newspapers such as the *Sydney Star Observer*. In each case, the selective representative frame enacts a necessarily exclusionary procedure, demarcating a mythic, coherent inside zone valuing particular bodies, styles and practices and marginalising or erasing devalued others. From

their research into gay scene participation in Melbourne, Damien Ridge et al. conclude: “Assumptions of unity underpinning gay community conceal the extent to which power operates at an interactional as well as structural level, in scene-based sexual and social relations”.<sup>xviii</sup> Notably, many of their informants from Southeast Asian backgrounds reported that “not being integrated into a valued group” – that is, one based on hegemonic middle class and Anglo norms – “was to risk invisibility, otherness and exclusion”.<sup>xix</sup>

As Valentine and Skelton also point out, Benedict Anderson’s well known formulation of nations has some relevance to the ideological construction of the gay scene; that it is, as he writes of the nation, “imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail...[it] is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship”.<sup>xx</sup> Conventional discourses of gay pride, for instance, are deployed to form a cornerstone of such community. Analogies between constructions of gay scene and of nation become more pertinent in considering notions of citizenship, which describes the nominally equal yet necessarily qualified acknowledgment of individual rights, responsibilities and duties. Much recent research elaborates on this sense of qualification, noting ways in which queer people are restricted from full citizenship rights; and further, that the very notion of citizenship may presume heterosexuality and rest upon the abjection of non-heterosexual otherness.<sup>xxi</sup> Following these insights, geographers of sexuality have outlined dominant cultural mappings of citizenship co-extensive with presumptively heterosexual and heteronormative public space. Such spatial regimes relegate queer bodies and practices to less visible locations and hence a lesser citizenship status.

Urban gay scenes constructed around bars, clubs, sex venues and other commercial locations of queer sociality clearly belong to this category. David Bell and Jon Binnie argue that the production of gay urban spaces operates in collaboration with globalising forces of consumer capital and tourism to regulate “sexual citizenship agendas” which privilege certain kinds of sexuality and sexual space at the exclusion of others.<sup>xxii</sup> In addition to the ‘queers as second-class citizens’ thesis, then, limited access to full status of belonging to the imagined ideals of gay scene community may also suggest a kind of internal hierarchy of citizenship. As Shane Phelan discusses, drawing on feminist critiques of universalising and gendered accounts of citizenship, a hierarchical imaginary of embodiment metonymises Western conceptions of the ideal citizen: “Not only is the citizen delineated by race, gender, and sexuality; the body politic as a whole shares the attributes of the citizen”.<sup>xxiii</sup> If gay scene participation also involves limitations to full “citizenship”, this too is evident through structures of racialised and gendered sexual embodiment. Ridge et al.’s sample of men who reported marginalisation within and by the “community” of their urban gay scene provides a pertinent example: racialised as “Asian” and thereby feminised in relation to Eurocentric norms of cultural and sexual embodiment.

The socially and sexually practised nature of online and offline scenes as discursive spaces would appear to confirm a kind of queering: in de Certeau’s terms, a tactical appropriation within and in some ways contrary to existing hegemonic disciplinary controls of place. Premises, streets and neighbourhoods undergo a process of cultural transformation when temporarily inhabited as zones of social, sexual and commercial practice by queers,

even if this may not always equate exactly to queer practice. The regulatory grid of gender and sexual subjectivities sketched above suggests a very different ideological picture, in which the power-infused social relations which operate to maintain these spaces as a “gay scene” may foreclose queer transformative or transversal potential. Moreover, to suggest that the scene is a product of the arrival and subsequent agency of gay subjects, as if already formed, is to overlook the crucial and generative role of power relations in inaugurating these subjects in a combination of sexual, racial, gender and economic terms. As Judith Butler theorises, power acts on the subject as “the condition of its possibility and its formative occasion”, in effect bringing the subject into being as such.<sup>xxiv</sup> Only then, as the subject *of* power, and after a point of “reversal and concealment”, is the subject empowered to act, giving the effect of agency and “making the subject appear as if it belonged to no prior operation of power”.<sup>xxv</sup> In this sense, “the scene” becomes understood as a scene of power and subjection and not as a space of liberation from these dynamics.

A point of queer critical intervention appears to be possible, therefore, where the tactical and fugitive practice of space begins to solidify into a more institutionalised and strategic construction of place. This is not to suggest that queer social scenes and practices (particularly those shaped around sex and intimacy) do not in themselves merit the structural permanence implied by place, or that the two are inherently incompatible. Berlant and Warner argue that queer culture “has almost no institutional matrix for its counterintimacies” unlike heteronormative cultures of intimacy which are supported in pervasive and overt discursive and material ways relating to all aspects of family, work and politics.<sup>xxvi</sup> By way of queer redress of this imbalance, they imagine a project “to support forms of affective, erotic, and personal living that are public in the sense of accessible, available to memory, and sustained through collective activity”.<sup>xxvii</sup> In its ideal form, cyberspace offers possibilities for such a queer public, in which websites like *Gaydar* might contribute to reducing the negative impact and (in Berlant and Warner’s terms) the political vulnerability associated with queer culture’s current dependence on “ephemeral elaborations in urban space and print culture”.<sup>xxviii</sup> The process of publicly solidifying what has of necessity been ephemeral, particularly in spatial terms, must attend to maintaining something of that culture’s mobility such that it does not lock itself into the same ideological grid which enforced its ephemerality.

To activate their transversal power as truly ethical queer space, constructing gay scenes must incorporate a process of what Reynolds and Fitzgerald call “anamnesis”: to continuously re-mobilise and re-member those identities and practices overwritten by proprietorial mappings of the space; to continuously intervene at those points where the fluidity of the transversal begins to solidify into a normalising grid of subjective territory.

---

<sup>i</sup> www.gaydar.com.au

<sup>ii</sup> Gill Valentine and Tracey Skelton, ‘Finding Oneself, Losing Onself: The Lesbian and Gay “Scene” as a Paradoxical Space’, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27, 4 (December 2003): 849-66.

<sup>iii</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso, 1983.

<sup>iv</sup> Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984, pp. 91-110.

<sup>v</sup> Michael Warner in Annamarie Jagose, ‘Queer World Making: Annamarie Jagose Interviews Michael Warner’, *Genders*, 31 (2000): 30.

<sup>vi</sup> Bryan Reynolds and Joseph Fitzpatrick, ‘The Transversality of Michel de Certeau: Foucault’s Panoptic Discourse and the Cartographic Impulse’, *Diacritics*, 29, 3 (1999): 69.

<sup>vii</sup> Reynolds and Fitzpatrick, ‘The Transversality of Michel de Certeau,’ p. 63.

<sup>viii</sup> Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Volume One*, trans. Robert Hurley, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978, p. 93.

<sup>ix</sup> Reynolds and Fitzpatrick, ‘The Transversality of Michel de Certeau,’ p. 74.

<sup>x</sup> Reynolds and Fitzpatrick, ‘The Transversality of Michel de Certeau,’ p. 74.

<sup>xi</sup> David Halperin in Annamarie Jagose, *Queer Theory*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1996, p. 131.

<sup>xii</sup> Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender*, New York: Routledge, 2004, p. 43.

<sup>xiii</sup> Mark Nunes, ‘Virtual Topographies: Smooth and Striated Cyberspace,’ in Marie-Laure Ryan (ed.), *Cyberspace Textuality: Computer Technology and Literary Theory*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999, p. 62.

<sup>xiv</sup> Robert Payne, ‘Grid: On Being-as-Transmission and Normativity,’ *M/C Journal*, 9, 1 (2006) <<http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0603/06-payne.php>>.

<sup>xv</sup> Nina Wakeford, ‘Cyberqueer’ in David Bell and Barbara M. Kennedy (eds), *The Cybercultures Reader*, London: Routledge, 2000, p. 412.

<sup>xvi</sup> Nunes, ‘Virtual Topographies,’ p. 71.

<sup>xvii</sup> The profiles sampled here were selected during various occasions of online browsing and have been renamed for privacy reasons.

<sup>xviii</sup> Damien Ridge, et al., “‘Asian’ Men on the Scene: Challenges to “Gay Communities”,” in Peter A. Jackson and Gerard Sullivan (eds), *Multicultural Queer: Australian Narratives*, New York: Haworth Press, 1999, p. 62.

<sup>xix</sup> Ridge et al., “‘Asian’ Men on the Scene,” p. 62.

<sup>xx</sup> Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, p. 7.

<sup>xxi</sup> Shane Phelan, *Sexual Strangers: Gays, Lesbians, and Dilemmas of Citizenship*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001; Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner, 'Sex in Public' in Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*, New York: Zone, 2005.

<sup>xxii</sup> David Bell and Jon Binnie, 'Authenticating Queer Space: Citizenship, Urbanism and Governance,' *Urban Studies*, 41, 9 (2004): 1807.

<sup>xxiii</sup> Phelan, *Sexual Strangers*, p. 45.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997, p. 14.

<sup>xxv</sup> Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power*, p. 15.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Berlant and Warner, 'Sex in Public,' p. 203.

<sup>xxvii</sup> Berlant and Warner, 'Sex in Public,' p. 203.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Berlant and Warner, 'Sex in Public,' p. 203.