

# The veil and the closet: Islam and the production of queer space

Ibrahim Abraham

School of Political and Social Inquiry, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

## ABSTRACT

Just as complex discourses have developed around the metaphor of ‘the closet’ and ‘coming out of the closet’, the metaphor of ‘the veil’ and the concept of ‘lifting the veil’ have developed their own political debates. Locating itself in the borderland of queer theory, cultural studies and Islamic studies, this paper engages with the metaphors of the closet and the veil in an exploration of the construction, policing and subversion of sexualised, queered space in the context of Islam. Using the work of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Steven Seidman, Michel Foucault, Fatema Memissi and, above all, Henri Lefebvre, this paper suggests similar spatial logic informs the regime of the closet and the regime of the veil. Equally, it is argued that the veil also exists within a series of interlinked and intertextual heterotopias in Islamic spatial production and as such, has the subversive and critical potential of escaping the disconnected space of capitalism.

This paper explores the production of queer space, within, and alongside, the gender and sexual logical of Islamic space, focusing on the lived metaphors of the closet and the veil. The key constitutive drive in the process of spatial production that has given rise to the closet is heteronormativity - the denial of homosexual visibility and equality. Equally, the driving force within spatial production in Islam is the separation of male and female - the ‘splitting of Muslim space’<sup>i</sup> which I locate around the metaphor of the veil. This paper argues that just as the institution of the closet brought about the development of particular sexual identities, keenly aware of the construction and policing of public and private space, within the discourse of Islam - especially Islam in the ‘west’ - the veil may open up a variety of possibilities for critiquing and transgressing the cultural and political norms of both heteronormativity and newly defined ‘homonormativity’, of which Islamophobia is a common trope.

Thus, as well as queer theory and Islamic studies, this paper is informed by Henri Lefebvre’s Marxist sociological inquiries into the production of space, and the relationship between spatial production, spatial perpetuation and spatial potential. It is

less Lefebvre’s engagement with explicitly religious space that interests me - he’s too Gallicly Catholic in his approach, with his ‘images of heaven and hell, of the devil and the angels and so on’<sup>ii</sup> to be helpful in that regard - so much as his cantankerous approach to the abstract space of capitalism, and his denunciation of all things ‘vulgar’. Lefebvre seeks an understanding of the material production of space, leading to its transformation, which will come about through the recognition of, and interplay within, the contradictory functions of space in capitalist societies. Interestingly enough, Lefebvre argues that such an understanding will only come about through ‘exposing’ the contradictions of capitalism, ‘not by covering over them with a veil’.<sup>iii</sup>

Exploring various constructions of the metaphor of the closet reveals certain similarities with the patterns and complexities of the production of gendered space within the spatial logical of Islam. For Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick the closet is ‘that curious space that is both internal and marginal to the culture: centrally representative of its motivating passions and contradictions, even while marginalized by its orthodoxies’.<sup>iv</sup> Here we en-

counter the suggestion, as we will again encounter it in the case of Islam, that the closeted or veiled space functions as something a heterotopia.<sup>v</sup> Sociologist Steven Seidman offers a good working definition of the closet, arguing that it is a “‘life-shaping” social pattern’, that, therefore, must necessarily go beyond the mere strategic decision not to proclaim one’s sexuality at any opportunity. The closet functions both outwardly and inwardly, Seidman insists. Outwardly, there becomes a need to conceal the true self which leads to ‘deception and duplicity’ in positing an artificial identity. However, the most damaging effects are internal with the closet affecting ‘the psychological and social core of an individual’s life’ through the internalisation of social prejudice, fear and shame, and emotional distance from others.<sup>vi</sup>

Similar patterns of the internalisation of shame and social prejudice can be seen in the case of the regime of the veil, with Daphne Grace suggesting that in attempting to allude the male gaze, women wearing *hijab*, especially the literal veil, the face-covering *niqab*, run the risk of internalising male surveillance – a self-imposed panopticon.<sup>vii</sup> Indeed, Moroccan sociologist Fatema Mernissi argues that *hijab* was an ill-suited solution to a lack of (heterosexual) male ‘internal control’.<sup>viii</sup> Just as the ‘closet’ is no solution to the socio-political problem of heteronormativity and homophobia, the regime of the veil offers only a partial, superficial solution to the aggressive masculine gaze. However, Seidman argues that the closet only makes sense when used towards explicit political ends, and hence it becomes a ‘regime’. The political end in question is that of ‘heterosexual domination’.<sup>ix</sup> In this same way we can argue that *hijab* means very different things when worn because of state imposition, such as in Iran or Saudi Arabia, than it does when worn from within a feminist framework.<sup>x</sup> In either case there is a specific political end being advanced, but there exists the crucial difference between the veil as a regime, employed in the political cause of male dominance, and the veil as a choice, employed in the cause of feminism for example. The heteronormativity of the regime of the closet and the patriarchy of the regime of the veil function on the levels of both ideology and repression, to use Louis Althusser’s terminology.<sup>xi</sup> Heteronormativity is ideological in the sense of ‘demonizing homosexuality’ and repressive in that homosexuals are ‘suppressed by means of laws, policing practices, civic disenfranchisement, and harassment and violence’.<sup>xii</sup> Similar things can be said of the regime of the veil, through the ideological repression of the socialisation and internalisation of male dominance Grace noted, and the extreme cases of disenfranchisement and violence seen in situations such as the Taliban’s Afghanistan, or the limits placed on women’s social and political involvement in Gulf Arab states.

The prerequisites for the ‘world of the closet’ according to Seidman, are the social construction of homosexual menace; exclusion from open participation in society; and the public removal of any trace of homosexuality.<sup>xiii</sup> One can certainly see similar approaches in the behaviour of fundamentalist Islamist regimes towards women. Meryem Ouedghiri notes that in extreme cases, such as the ongoing civil conflict in Algeria between the government and Islamist insurgents, routines of violence are utilised to deny women’s public presence.<sup>xiv</sup> Not unlike the Taliban who reduced women to the private space of the home, and the private personal space under the *burqa*, Algerian fundamentalists’ campaigns of violence illustrate a complex understanding of the relationship between the body and public

and political space. But it is on this point of violence and terrorist regimes that I want to bring in Lefebvre. Part of Lefebvre’s critique of the commodified, dislocated and contradictorily abstract space of capitalism is the violence that this spatial formulation enacts against everything, including sexuality, which itself becomes a site of alienated, abstracted specialisation and fetishisation (in the negative Marxist sense), distanced from what he calls the culture of the body.<sup>xv</sup> Lefebvre argues that in the special logic of capitalism, the body – especially women’s bodies – become ‘pulverised’ and broken into pieces for the consumer market, so that legs sell stockings, breasts sell bras, etc. It is thus an ‘aggression’ that the body is subject to in the very production of capitalist space. He borrows a phrase from Helmut Schelsky in summing this regime of violence – ‘the iron law of commercial terrorism’.<sup>xvi</sup> I would argue that this violence under capitalism is not so far removed from more basic acts of violence – that is, acts that are simply more recognisably violent from within capitalism – committed against the body, especially the female body, by fundamentalist Muslim regimes. Whilst the regime of the closet or the veil is predicated on the literal denial of their victims’ public presence, capitalist spatial logic is predicated on the ubiquity of the sexualised female form, but arguably to an identical political end – the silencing, subordination and fetishistic reduction of women to the level of signification.

This argument, that capitalism, religious fundamentalism and heteronormativity have similarly motivated – but differently realised – agendas leads us to the issue of ‘homonormativity’. First theorised by Lisa Duggan,<sup>xvii</sup> ‘homonormativity’ refers to the realisation that an elite minority of lesbians and gay men in the west have far more in common with their wealthy heterosexual confederates than anyone else, and that assimilation into and complicity with the system is the best way to preserve those privileges. We can locate this within the broader framework of the partial – if not total – failure of queer theorists to articulate a viable political epistemology to eclipse old-fashioned class and nationalism.<sup>xviii</sup> Jasbir Puar notes a definite strain of Islamophobia present in homonormativity, with solid support from queer conservatives for western intervention in the Middle East, and values-laden rhetoric that sees the Judeo-Christian/secular occident in inevitable conflict with the inferior Islamic orient.<sup>xix</sup> Ironically, amidst the ‘war on terror’ and ‘clash of civilisations’, Puar argues that it is the Muslim Other – the Muslim terrorist Other, precisely – who emerges as the queered subject. In ‘the normative script of the US war on terror,’ Puar writes, the Muslim terrorist is the ‘queer, non-national, perversely radicalized other’,<sup>xx</sup> not the queer constabulary cheering on the American invaders. This curious approach by western gay and lesbian organisations to the Islamic world – thoroughly imbued with the ‘creative chaos’ and interventionist logic of neo-conservatism, as charted by Joseph Massad<sup>xxi</sup> – is an interesting historical reversal. The Islamic world now becomes a site of repression, in need of unveiling and liberating by a western world which, not too long ago, was passionately attempting to civilise, with its Victorian morality.

Indeed, as Jarrod Hayes, following Edward Said, argues, there has always been a distinct tendency to fall back on the (neo-)colonial assumptions of the absolute otherness of the non-western subject.<sup>xxii</sup> Thus, for much of its history – I would argue until the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1979 – the Islamic world was something of a sexual heterotopia for the west. It was home

to, if not a superior sexuality, then at the very least a different one<sup>xxxiii</sup> wherein which western travellers could cavort beyond the boundaries of European morality. John Boswell's 1980 tome *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*<sup>xxxiv</sup> notes that depicting Muslims as rampant homosexual predators preying on innocent Christians was a very effective tool of propaganda in the time of the crusades. For classical Orientalists like Sir Richard Burton and his spatial theory of the 'sodatic zone' (a psycho-geographic phenomenon that circles the world, taking in most of the Muslim majority world and rendering those who dwell within liable to all manner of vices, namely the 'popular and endemic' practice of sodomy<sup>xxxv</sup>) the Islamic world was a *civilisationally*-queered space.

Sociologist of Islamic sexualit(y/ies), Abdelwahab Boudhiba<sup>xxxvi</sup> continues with this notion of a queer civilisation, arguing - albeit in arcane language such as 'inversion' - that the central productive truth of Islamic space, the separation of genders, means that queer spaces - or potentially queer spaces - are the norm for young people growing up in traditional Arab and Islamic societies. There are, however, several key sites within normative Islamic space that served as explicitly queered locales, existing as a series of interlaced and intertextual heterotopias. *Different* spaces, that exist concurrent with normal spaces, wherein not only does the spatial, political and cultural logic of the everyday not strictly apply, but wherein the spatial and rhetorical discourse shifts, such that the heterotopia becomes a space - real or imagined - that critiques the everyday. It is not dissimilar, in certain regards, to the logic of 'camp'. There are numerous examples of sexual heterotopias in Islam and Lefebvre refers specifically to the *al Hambra* palace in Spain and the *Arabian Nights* stories as places of 'pure pleasure within the broader context of 'invent[ing] a "new life"'.<sup>xxxvii</sup> And, what is queer space other than the calling for a newly imagined, material mode of existence that goes beyond sublimated or embodied desire, to reshape - however one understands it - the natural and lived environment?

The most obvious queer heterotopia is the bath house, the *hammam*. Just as veiled space, Grace argues, embodies something of an in-between-ness<sup>xxxviii</sup> the *hammam* works as an intercessional space between the sacred space of the mosque and the potentially corruptible space of the body.<sup>xxxix</sup> The *hammam* is the place where bodies meet and where bodies are flaunted; where they're remodelled, remade and re-imagined. The *hammam* works then as something of a *heterotopia* where queer desires beyond the everyday are made possible. Hence the common association and assumption that life in the *hammam* was linked with homosexuality, be it male suspicion of rampant lesbianism when women are loosened from the male gaze, or the *hammam* as the setting for a subgenre of the famed erotic verse of the height of Islamic civilisation.<sup>xxx</sup> The insularity of the *hammam*, predicated like all heterotopias on a sometimes complicated axis of open and closed,<sup>xxxi</sup> or in Islamic terms, permitted (*halal*) and forbidden (*haram*) was somewhat broken up by the process of European colonisation that brought with it not just strange, Victorian bourgeois morality, but also something worse: tourists. Such as those in Schmitt and Sofer's<sup>xxxii</sup> collection, *Sexuality and Eroticism amongst males in Moslem societies*, which primarily consists of sex tourism commentaries, and academic sympathies for the closing of the great Orientalist sexual frontier, notably from Jeffrey Weeks, who suggests the Islamic world has two options,

elevation to western secular civilisation, or further descent into Islamic barbarity.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

Following from Weeks' neat little dichotomy between the enlightened, secular western world, and the fundamentalist Muslim world, I want to bring in the question of Islam in the west, and the question of the 'world of the closet' that required a discourse of menace, public exclusion and the denial of any public trace.<sup>xxxiv</sup> I want to suggest here that the regime of the closet as it applied to sexuality now also applies to Islam. For we certainly have a vibrant Muslim menace discourse developing around the war on terror and domestic versions thereof, notably the Lebanese menace.<sup>xxxv</sup> We also have degrees of public exclusion - although the far more popular rhetoric is that any form of exclusion is the choice of the individuals and communities, who don't want to be a part of mainstream society. But it is the final aspect of the 'world of the closet' that interests me the most, the denial of public traces of the closeted subject. There have certainly been instances of the denial of public indices of an Islamic presence, notably around debates concerning bans on *hijab* in Europe, and to a lesser degree Australia and the United States,<sup>xxxvi</sup> as well as controversies over the building of mosques. All of which clearly relate to the spatial logic of closeting or veiling, albeit with the ironic twist of a society seeking to either veil the veiled, or to veil difference, through its very unveiling. As with the 'world of the closet', we can locate the operation of anti-veiled space as both ideological, notably through the common argument that any woman who would want to wear *hijab* is being forced to by a man, and repressive, such as the bans in place in France, Turkey and elsewhere.<sup>xxxvii</sup> We also have the more nebulous unofficial repression of non-state actors, such as the abuse and intimidation that women in *hijab* are subject to. One woman narrated her experiences of wearing a headscarf in Sydney following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001:

I thought long and hard about taking the scarf off after September 11 like many women ... I remember within one hour of going out I had been spat on, had someone threaten me as if they were going to hit me, the shop assistant at Coles [supermarket] would swipe my card and would not look at me in the eye. I remember coming home crying my eyes out and asking myself, 'Do I take this scarf off?'<sup>xxxviii</sup>

Significantly, it has been suggested that the 'stigma' of Otherness and its attendant violence has, post-September 11, 2001, been passed from one group, 'queers', to another, 'Arabs' - including those who just look like Arabs, such as South Asians and Latinos all of whom have been victims of supposedly retaliatory violence. Indeed, one of the first victims of this retaliatory violence after the September 11 attacks was a gay Latino man, and his white partner, who was attacked in San Francisco by other Latino men, who thought his less macho behaviour marked him out as an Arab.<sup>xxxix</sup>

This fear of the other - and the others sexuality - goes both ways. Indeed, as Christopher Reed<sup>xl</sup> argues, with queer space being defined by its very immanence, the focus is inevitably on its threatening character. This is the same sense we get of Islamic space in the west, when it manifests in the personal space of the veiled individual, the built environment, or when it asserts itself in the midst of seemingly non-Islamic space, such as Muslim-inspired women-only sports spaces (enjoyed by

many, if not mostly by, non-Muslim women as well) or prayer space. Indeed, in France, around the same time as the assault on headscarves was taking place, both queer groups and Muslim groups were attacked for their alleged ‘communitarianism’ – otherwise known as a drift towards insidious American identity politics – manifesting itself around the question of the creation of separate spaces.<sup>xli</sup> This was unintentionally produced by poverty, in the case of Muslim ghettos in volatile suburbs of Paris and the rest of the country, and quite deliberately, through affluence in the case of queer Parisian ghettos. The same debates are occurring in Australia, with university queer-only spaces and Muslim women-facilitated women-only sports sessions attracting fierce opposition, with opponents questioning whether members of these groups truly desire to participate in Australian society.<sup>xlii</sup>

Staying with Reed’s insights from art criticism, he notes a central problematic of queer space is the need to think beyond bourgeois notions of the private-public dichotomy.<sup>xliii</sup> I would suggest that this is especially in the context of seeking some sort of parity or comparison between queer and Islamic space. For in Islamic space, the public and the private have been essentially established through what Mernissi poetically calls the ‘descent of the veil’. Mernissi sees a modern day middle class moral panic at work in the early Muslim community around the status of women – slaves or aristocrats? how can we tell? – giving rise to the institution of *hijab* and its corollary, the division of the hitherto ‘limitless horizons’ of the spatial logic of the Islam of the Prophet (something akin to Lefebvre’s ‘absolute space’), into the heavily partitioned public and private, sacred and profane space. The very thing the Prophet sought to avoid.<sup>xliii</sup>

Now, like most Marxists of his ilk, Lefebvre detested the hypocritical morality of the middle class and its public pretensions. Actually, Lefebvre detested the middle class altogether. For him, the private world of the bourgeoisie was ‘where Eros dies’;<sup>xliii</sup> hidden away at the end of darkened corridors, lay sexual censure and the ‘filtering of the erotic’.<sup>xliii</sup> Against the neo-assimilationism of aforementioned homonormativity, the very notion of a queer *public* space as much as a Muslim public space, is something that challenges supine assimilation, and resists a recourse to notions of liberal tolerance that amount to an ethic of ‘do what you like, but don’t do it here’. The corollary of which is not just the limitation on tolerance – which itself is a rather limited notion – but a disavowal of the public reality of possibly dysfunctional aspects of minority communities. Lefebvre argues that an essential part of sociality, or we might say coherent group identity, is the production of one’s own space. It’s the stabilising and normalising alternative to both polite repression and, at the other end of the spectrum, a lifetime of ‘pseudo-transgressions’.<sup>xliii</sup> Lefebvre contrasts this social existence, a concrete materiality, with mere ideological or cultural existence.<sup>xliii</sup> Leaving aside the vexed question of ideology in western Marxist thought,<sup>xlix</sup> we see echoes of this in the calls for assimilation within the ethics of homonormativity and the liberalism of so-called ‘boutique multiculturalists’,<sup>l</sup> who delight in limited, essentially superficial forms of difference, but cannot or will not accept difference at the more fundamental level, including the notion of spatial difference or exclusion.

This notion of spatial difference and exclusion ties in with my earlier remark that the threat of queer space exists alongside the threat *to* queer space from the forces of homophobic repression. We saw that the same is true for Muslim space, it is considered

a threat to secular or non-Muslims space by the mere fact of its impenetrability. When the logic of capitalism calls for absolute (but absolutely superficial) disclosure at the level of the sign, we can see a return to Fanon’s<sup>li</sup> analysis of the veil that ‘frustrates the colonizer’, through the suggestion that the subject has a privileged, hidden space – and with it the suspicion of a privileged epistemology – which the powers-that-be have no stake in.<sup>lii</sup> There’s more than a hint of the clandestine coming through here, not unlike the ‘small, shadowily identified group’ that Sedgwick associates with the closet, holding to ‘dangerous truths about a culture’.<sup>liii</sup> It’s within the reality of what Grace suggests is a male world constructed around fear, that there becomes a logic to the formation, after Elaine Showalter, of a (veiled) women’s space, wherein agency can be rediscovered.<sup>liii</sup> And the unthinkable could even occur, the production of a space that escapes the reach of global capital.

Lefebvre is interested in the possibilities that any particular spatial formation may allow for – especially the possibility of overcoming capitalism.<sup>liv</sup> But in tempering the bullish optimism of post-structuralists, or (early) queer theorists, we need to recognise that the possibilities of that spatial formation will be limited by its material antecedents. That is, the possibilities of, and limitations of, the relationships of production that give rise to a spatial formation run through it. It’s the easiest thing in the world to contradict the logic of capitalist space, based as it is on accommodating and sublimating any number of contradictions, but surpassing it is something else entirely. And here’s where the origins of Islam come into play, for Mernissi takes an (unacknowledged) Levi-Straussian approach to the history of *hijab*, correctly identifying it as an attempt at a symbolic solution to a social problem: patriarchal violence rooted in economic inequality that, for all his attempts, the Prophet Muhammad, being all too human, could not fix.<sup>lvi</sup> Equally, we can see the closet as a symbolic solution to the problem of heteronormativity and, again, economic injustice. It’s something that the celebration of (mere) ‘lifestyle’ as the next stage of queer existence has no chance of remedying, unless one has faith in individuals to consume their way out of trouble. So I would suggest that any adequate investigation of queer space needs to ensure that we are not merely working in the realm of the symbolic, that there are, rather, abiding material differences and alternatives embodied therein.

Finally, then, I would like to suggest that the connections between Islamic space and queer space appear, hopefully, rather intriguing. Even if only because, as Lefebvre argues, the most interesting spaces are those that are neither completely available, nor completely unavailable.<sup>lvii</sup> Those spaces, in other words, that require some careful navigation. Hopefully this paper has shown that the journey is worth taking.

<sup>i</sup> Mernissi, *Women in Islam: An historical and theological inquiry*, Translated by Mary Jo Lakeland, Oxford: Blackwell, 1993, p. 92.

<sup>ii</sup> Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Oxford: Blackwell, 1991 (1974), pp. 40-41.

- <sup>iii</sup> Henri Lefebvre, 'Preface to the new edition of *The Production of Space*,' in Stuart Elden, et al. (eds), *Henri Lefebvre: Key writings*, London: Continuum, 2003 (1986), pp. 206-213, at p. 213.
- <sup>iv</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the closet*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990, p. 56.
- <sup>v</sup> Michel Foucault, 'Different spaces,' in James D. Faubion (ed), *Michel Foucault: Aesthetics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1998 (1984), pp. 175-185.
- <sup>vi</sup> Steven Seidman, *Beyond the closet: The transformation of gay and lesbian life*, New York: Routledge (2002), pp. 7-8.
- <sup>vii</sup> Daphne Grace, *The woman in the muslin mask: Veiling and identity in postcolonial literature*, London: Pluto Press, 2004, pp. 204-205.
- <sup>viii</sup> Mernissi, *Women in Islam*, p. 185.
- <sup>ix</sup> Seidman, *Beyond the Closet*, p. 30.
- <sup>x</sup> Charissa Terranova, 'Ni putes ni soumises! Neither whores nor submissives! An emerging body politic and its freedom,' *Women and Environments International* 62-63 (2004): 24-5.
- <sup>xi</sup> Louis Althusser, 'Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards and investigation)' in *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays*, Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972: 85-126.
- <sup>xii</sup> Seidman, *Beyond the Closet*, pp. 30-31.
- <sup>xiii</sup> Seidman, *Beyond the Closet*, p. 28.
- <sup>xiv</sup> Meryem Ouedghiri, 'Writing women's bodies on the palimpsest of Islamic history,' *Cultural Dynamics* 14.1(2002): 41-64, at pp. 41-42.
- <sup>xv</sup> Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, pp. 309-310.
- <sup>xvi</sup> Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 310.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Lisa Duggan, 'The new homonormativity: The sexual politics of neo-liberalism'. In Russ Castronovo and D. Nelson Dana (eds), *Materializing democracy: Toward a revitalized cultural politics*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 2002: 175-94.
- <sup>xviii</sup> On the rejection of queer identity outside the academy, see Matthew Waites, 'The fixity of sexual identities in the public sphere,' *Sexualities* 8.5 (2005): 539-569.
- <sup>xix</sup> Jasbir K. Puar, 'Mapping U.S. homonormativities,' *Gender, place and culture* 13.1 (2006): 67-88.
- <sup>xx</sup> Puar, 'Mapping U.S. homonormativities', p. 67.
- <sup>xxi</sup> Joseph Massad, 'Re-orienting desire: The Gay International and the Arab world,' *Public Culture* 14.2 (2002):361-85.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Jarrod Hayes, 'Queer resistance to (neo-) colonialism in Algeria,' in John C. Hawley (ed) *Postcolonial, queer*, Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2001, pp. 79-97.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Edward Said, *Orientalism*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995, p. 190.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- <sup>xxv</sup> Richard Burton, 'The Terminal Essay,' in Paul Hallam (ed) *The Book of Sodom*, London: Verso, 1993 (1886), pp. 211-220.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Abdelwahab Boudhiba, *Sexuality in Islam*, Translated by Alan Sheridan, London: Saqi Books, 2004 (1970), pp. 200-204.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 379.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Grace, *The woman in the muslin mask*, p. 30.
- <sup>xxix</sup> Foucault, 'Different spaces', p. 183.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Boudhiba, *Sexuality in Islam*, p. 167.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Foucault, 'Different spaces', p. 183.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Arno Schmitt and Jehoeda Sofer (eds). *Sexuality and eroticism amongst males in Moslem societies*, Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press, 1992.
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> Jeffrey Weeks, 'Forward', in Arno Schmitt and Jehoeda Sofer (eds). *Sexuality and eroticism amongst males in Moslem societies*, Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press, 1992: ix-xi.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Seidman, *Beyond the Closet*, p. 28.
- <sup>xxxv</sup> See, *inter alia*, Jock Collins, et al., *Kebabs, kids, cops and crime: Youth, ethnicity and crime*, Sydney: Pluto Press, 2000; Scott Poynting, et al. *Bin Laden in the suburbs: Criminalising the Arab other*, Sydney: Sydney Institute of Criminology, 2004.
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> Ibrahim Abraham, 'Hijab in an age of fear: Security, secularism and human rights,' *Australian Religion Studies Review* 19.2 (2006): 169-89.
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> Abraham, 'Hijab in an age of fear'.
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 'Isma □- Listen: National consultation on the elimination of prejudice against Arab and Muslim Australians', Sydney: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 2004, p. 78.
- <sup>xxxix</sup> Anjali Arondekar, 'Border/line sex: Queer postcolonialities, or how race matters outside the United States,' *Interventions* 7.2 (2005): 236-50, at pp. 242-243.
- <sup>xl</sup> Christopher Reed, 'Imminent domain: Queer space in the built environment,' *Art Journal* 55.4 (1996): 64-70.
- <sup>xli</sup> Michael Sibalís, 'Urban space and homosexuality: The example of the Marais, Paris' 'gay ghetto', *Urban Studies* 41.9 (2004): 1739-58.; Thomas Albrecht, 'Can one be 'gay' and French?' *The Gay and Lesbian Review Worldwide* 12.3 (2005): 20-21.
- <sup>xlii</sup> Jane Metlikovec, 'Women win pool privacy,' *Herald Sun* (Melbourne), August 9, 2004: 6; Annalise Constable, 'University queers succeed in finding own space,' *Illawarra Mercury* (Wollongong, NSW) August 9 2005: 25; Shannon McRae, 'Keep out if you're straight.' *Herald Sun* (Melbourne) January 19 2006:2; Lillian Saleh, 'Leave men out to dry - Women-only sessions going swimmingly,' *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney) March 10 2006: 25.
- <sup>xliiii</sup> Reed 'Imminent domain', p. 68.
- <sup>xliv</sup> Mernissi, *Women in Islam*, pp. 100-114).

<sup>xlv</sup> Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 315

<sup>xlvi</sup> Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 315.

<sup>xlvii</sup> Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 320.

<sup>xlviii</sup> Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, p. 53.

<sup>xlix</sup> See Slavoj Žižek (ed), *Mapping ideology*, London: Verso, 1994.

<sup>1</sup> See Stanley Fish, *The trouble with principle*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001, pp. 56-74.

<sup>li</sup> Franz Fanon, 'Algeria unveiled,' in David Bailry and Gilane Tawadros (eds) *Veil: Veiling, representation and contemporary art*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003 (1959), pp. 74-85.

<sup>lii</sup> See also Grace, *The woman in the muslin mask*, pp. 208-10; Kathy Acker, 'Algeria', in Chris Kraus and Sylvère Lotringer (eds) *Hatred of Capitalism*, Los Angeles and New York: Semio-text(e), 2001, pp. 97-104.

<sup>liii</sup> Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the closet*, pp. 56-57.

<sup>liv</sup> Grace, *The woman in the muslin mask*, pp. 7, 24, 202-18.

<sup>lv</sup> Henri Lefebvre, *Critique of everyday life: Vol. 3: From modernity to modernism*, Translated by Gregory Elliott, London: Verso, 2005 (1981), pp. 134-135.

<sup>lvi</sup> Mernissi, *Women in Islam*.

<sup>lvii</sup> Henri Lefebvre, *Critique of Everyday Life: Vol. 2: Foundations for a sociology of the everyday*, Translated by John Moore, London: Verso, 2002 (1961), p. 131.