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Abstract

This thesis takes the Sydney 2002 Gay Games: Under New Skies '02, as a case study into the production of global queer citizenship. In the existing body of work around the Gay Games they are analysed as an international gay and lesbian sporting event (Cramer, 1996; Krane et al., 2001; Pronger, 2000; Waitt, 2005), as a gay and lesbian community event (Krane & Waldron, 2000; Symons, 2002, 2004; Waitt, 2003, 2006), and as a cultural site where discourses of nationality, sport and sexuality converge (Miller, 2001; Probyn, 2000; Rowe et al., 2006; Stevenson et al., 2005; Waitt, 2005; Waitt & Markwell, 2006). This thesis builds on these investigations, asking specific questions about the ways in which discourses of sexuality and citizenship are produced and governed within and across the Sydney 2002 Gay Games promotional and media materials. The analysis is guided by Michel Foucault’s notion of governmentality (1991) and the works of related theorists who map the disparate array of neo-liberal mechanisms of government that ‘conduct the conduct’ and ‘act on the actions’ of individuals and certain populations (Bratich et al., 2003; Gordon, 1991; Larner, 2000; Larner & Walters, 2002, 2004; Miller, 1993; Rabinow & Rose, 2003; Rose, 1996a, 1999). The analysis begins by asking how discourses of the autonomous, neo-liberal subject converge with discourses of ‘global living’ such that individuals are invited to imagine themselves as increasingly flexible, freedom-loving (Rose, 1999), self-assured, cosmopolitan global citizens. The idea of the global imagination is then used to explore the ways in which the Gay Games commitment to ‘total inclusion’ and its promise of personal and community transformation rely on similar neo-liberal renderings of the subject. It argues that the event’s ‘political’ promises not only normalise certain forms of identity-based consumption (Chasin, 2000), they also (re)produce and normalise a very entrepreneurial, western-centric, cosmopolitan ‘brand’ of global queer citizenship. The thesis also emphasises the important role that images and image-related technologies played in upholding normative meanings around queer sexuality and queer citizenship at the Games. In doing so, the thesis argues that images and technologies do more than simply represent individuals’ lived experiences. Images, it argues, are (inter)active entities that produce and shape individuals’ understanding of the ‘real’ and how they come to know themselves as certain types of subjects. Where the Sydney 2002 Gay Games were concerned, images were integral in producing normative meanings around gender, sexuality and citizenship and in governing participants’ experiences as ‘locals’, ‘global visitors’, ‘athletes’, ‘cultural participants’ and consumers.

Perhaps...one mourns when one accepts that by the loss one undergoes one will be changed, possibly forever.

Judith Butler, *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*
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Chapter One

Global queer communities and the games ‘we’ play: An introduction

Figure 1.1: ‘Blood, sweat and queers’, Sydney 2002 promotional item (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board [SGGB])

Figure 1.1 shows a flyer I received when I first began my fieldwork on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, when the event was still very much in its planning stages. Initially this small leaflet joined the piles of print media that made up my ‘data collection’. The significance of the slogan Blood, sweat and queers was lost in my early efforts to gain a sense of what the Gay Games were or what they had done in the name of gay and lesbian politics. Five years later, having invested my own blood, sweat and tears in the event as a researcher and as a Games participant, I feel quite differently about the rhyme and rhythm of these particular words. The range of affective responses I had around the Games – joy, relief, sadness, anger, shame, regret – coupled with the level of physical labour that has bound me to this event, continuously returned me to an interview transcript where Gilles Deleuze suggests to Michel

---

1 I competed for New Zealand in the Gay Games half marathon. I also volunteered at the SGGB office in the lead-up to the event and at the sporting venues during the Games. I acknowledge my position as an insider at the Games, but do not believe that I am entitled to use my experiences to offer a definitive narrative of the event. The chapter’s title, with its use of the personal pronoun ‘we’ is not an attempt to reference a stable or uniform queer community. In contrast, this chapter critiques the tendency of identity-based organisations to hang their politics on singular and unproblematised categories such as ‘gay and lesbian’, ‘queer’, ‘we’, ‘us’ or ‘them’.
Foucault that “the relationships between theory and praxis are being lived in a new way” (Deleuze & Foucault, 2004, p. 206).

Doing ‘queer research’ so often finds scholars entangled in questions of how one can possibly reduce the struggles, desires or violences that mark ‘real lives’ (sometimes a researcher’s own life) to a set of institutionalised and inaccessible theoretical concepts. Since its inception, queer theory has been charged with losing sight of what gay and lesbian lives are all about (Jagose, 1996; Turner, 2000). I am cautious of the absoluteness that marks the division between queer theory and the ways ‘queer’ is practised at the level of the everyday. In the same conversation, Deleuze offers: “that’s what a theory is, exactly like a tool box. ...A theory has to be used, it has to work. And not just for itself. ...You don’t go back to a theory, you make new ones. . .” (Deleuze & Foucault, 2004, p. 208). Deleuze and Foucault propose that theory never exists in some essential or fixed manner. Theories are not simply ‘out there’ for scholars to pick and choose from and then apply to practical situations. Instead, theory is another way of labouring as one attempts to make sense of one’s life – one’s blood and sweat as a (queer) subject. In the case of queer theory, there is hard work involved in questioning the habits, comforts and safety nets that have come to structure how gender and sexuality are played out at the level of everyday living. This hard labour, the type that throbs in one’s head and tirelessly pulls at one’s skin, often registers as desire or demand for the practical over the theoretical. In trying to make sense of ideas or terms related to one’s ‘sexuality’ – pleasure, identity, desire, shame – one takes recourse in the practical rather than the theoretical. All of these terms are thought to rein in the body and the body is that which is defined in opposition to the realm of ideas or knowledge. The logic that orders Cartesian dualities aligns bodies with the organic or natural and minds with rationality and thinking. As such, the corporeal is not always given ‘serious’ theoretical or scholarly attention.

A number of feminist scholars have extended Foucault’s understanding of the body as an epistemological field, arguing that the body has been neglected in philosophy, cultural studies and the social sciences primarily because of its oversimplified affiliation with the feminine and/or the biological (Bordo, 1993; Braidotti, 1994; Butler, 1993; Cixous, 1984; Davies, 2000; Gatens, 1996; Grosz, 1995; Minh-ha, 1999; Price & Shildrick, 1999; Spelman, 1999). Elizabeth Grosz (1995) is concerned with “the role the body plays in the production and evaluation of knowledge” (p. 26). She maintains that one cannot dismiss the importance of theory to questions of the body, for it is at the level of the corporeal that one can glimpse the conditions of production and material effects of certain knowledge systems.
This thesis interrupts the logic of binary thinking that sets up a dichotomy between the practical (linked to the body) and the theoretical (associated with the mind). The aim is not to move ‘beyond’ binary thinking; that would be, I think, a rather ambitious goal. Instead, the aim of the project is to call attention to the ways in which binaries of this kind frame western thinking and govern the relationship between theory and practice. The discussions that frame the thesis do not simply use theory to offer a critique or interpretation of the Gay Games, they ask how the ordering of various bodies of knowledge limits or makes possible what is ‘knowable’ about an event of this kind. The aim of the thesis is thus twofold: to provide readers with an alternative perspective on the Gay Games as an international gay and lesbian sport and cultural event, while, at the same time, offering a new set of tools with which to analyse other queer events, objects, images or spaces. The work of this thesis illustrates that using critical, analytical frameworks to understand an event like the Gay Games is in many ways empirical. Deleuze’s suggestion that “you don’t go back to a theory, you make new ones” (Deleuze & Foucault, 2004, p. 208) is an experimental and inventive line of thought. Theory acts as a force that resists power relations and calls attention to the capacity of ideas, concepts and theories themselves to produce normative subjectivities and to structure and govern the realm of the intelligible (Bratich, 2003; Butler, 2004d; Deleuze & Foucault, 2004; Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982).

It is in an effort to locate myself within the project and to establish my approach to theory that I begin the thesis with Figure 1.1. The promotional slogan ‘blood, sweat and queers’ is also useful in outlining the key problem driving this research. I borrow the term ‘problem’ from Foucault, who suggests that critical engagement does not necessarily start with the invention of concepts or frameworks that judge or evaluate, but by identifying problems (see Rabinow & Rose, 2003). The over-arching problem guiding this piece of work pertains to the issue of governance: how power ‘acts on [the] actions’ of individuals or populations and how individuals ‘conduct their conduct’ in order to be counted as acceptable, exemplary and consumable citizen-subjects (Balibar, 1991). The thesis makes use of Foucault’s analytics of governmentality to map the diffuse technologies that produce and manage certain truths about

---

2 The thesis makes use of Etienne Balibar’s notion of the citizen-subject. Balibar’s figuration reminds us of the ways in which subjectivity is always conferred through national policies and practices. How an individual defines himself or herself as a subject depends on how he or she is defined and framed as a citizen. Likewise it implies that citizens are granted rights and freedoms in exchange for certain responsibilities: orderly conduct, service in the national military, obeying the laws and voting (Rodowick, 2002). In linking citizenship to subjectivity, Balibar also acknowledges that when one does not register as an acceptable type of subject, one is often excluded from the status of full citizen. Likewise, when one is denied full citizenship rights, one becomes unintelligible as a human subject and is thus relegated to the status of ‘non-human other’ (see also Butler, 2004b).
three particular subject positions: the normative 'gay and lesbian' or 'queer' subject, the
global citizen, and the Gay Games athlete/participant.

Nikolas Rose's work, in particular his reflections on governmentality in *Powers of
freedom: Reframing political thought* (1999), acts as a backdrop for this analysis with its
concern for the intersections between sexuality, citizenship and the Sydney 2002 Gay Games.
For Rose (1999), studies of governmentality,
are studies of a particular stratum of knowing and acting. Of the emergence of
particular 'regimes of truth' concerning the conduct of conduct, ways of speaking
truth, persons authorized to speak truths, ways of enacting truths and the costs of so
doing. Of the invention and assemblage of particular apparatuses and devices for
exercising power and intervening upon particular problems. (p. 19)

Throughout the thesis Rose's concern for the intersections between 'knowing', 'acting',
'regimes of truth', 'the conduct of conduct' and 'apparatuses of power' are taken up to
address three key research questions:

- How, that is, through what tactics, technologies, rationalities and mechanisms, are
normative and regulatory models of global queer citizenship produced, circulated and
consumed at global queer events like Sydney 2002 Gay Games?

- How are normative models of the global queer citizen-subject *produced* and *governed*
by image-based technologies and media apparatuses that claim to merely *represent*
queer bodies and lives?

- Considering the importance of fixed and stable 'identities' to the global gay tourist
industry and to the logic of gay niche marketing, and given the reliance of global
queer community events on the sustainability of this niche market, how might studies
of governmentality offer a new approach to discussions of queer citizenship and/or
queer identity-based community events?

These three research questions are addressed across five key chapters (Chapters Two – Six).
To some extent they unfold in what could be described as an analytics of governmentality
(Rose, 1999) as the focus herein is on the micro-distribution of power rather than state-
centred structures of force and regulation. That said, the thesis also speaks to the macro-
structures of power, in particular, it teases out what one means by globalisation, neo-
liberalism, and to a much lesser extent neo-colonialism. However, the focus on macro-level
governmental structures or political systems is not about identifying cohesive or uniform
mechanisms of control or regulation, but about understanding the dispersed and scattered
network of technologies that come to be named by singular political frameworks. The thesis maintains that micro and macro forces of power, and the relationships between them, are constantly transforming, impacting upon the subject in hitherto unimagined ways.

The project maps a variety of technologies that are variously described as techniques of neo-liberalism – freedom, choice, active citizenship, mobility, fluidity, creativity, cosmopolitanism, risk management, entrepreneurialism, etc. It attempts to understand how these various “neo-liberal strategies of rule” (Larner, 2000, p. 11) not only govern the operations and structures of corporations and government institutions, but also how they produce and shape national, regional and global citizenries. I am cautious, however, not to position neo-liberalism as a grand or totalising political theory.\(^3\) While some scholars approach (neo-)liberalism as a historical period or a political doctrine that defines effective government, in this thesis neo-liberalism describes “a certain ethos of governing” that tries to strike a balance between not governing too much and governing just enough (Rose, 1999, p. 70). As Wendy Larner (2000) points out, “while neo-liberalism may mean less government, it does not mean less governance” (p. 11). Larner’s distinction between governance and government is a point of emphasis for a number of neo-Foucauldian scholars concerned with questions of governmentality (see, for instance, Barry, Osborne & Rose, 1996; Burchell, Gordon & Miller, 1991; Rose, 1996a, 1996b, 1999). While the state’s power and control are diffuse and scattered within a neo-liberal political regime, and although neo-liberalism aims to foster individual freedom and choice, it also relies on individuals and various institutions adhering to the norms of the market (Larner, 2000). This thesis is concerned with mapping this tension as it unfolded at Sydney 2002. It seeks out what Wendy Larner (2000) calls the “messy articulations” of neo-liberalism and thus acknowledges the ways in which neo-liberal thought is opposed and transformed by new, less state-based organisations or oppositional groups. ‘Technologies’ is a term used frequently throughout this project as it works to tease out the relationships between neo-liberalism, governance, sexuality and citizenship. In using this terminology, I deploy Toby Miller’s (1998b) definition, which refers to both the

\(^3\) In an interview discussion with Toby Miller and Jeremy Packer (see Packer, 2003a), Lawrence Grossberg insists that a narrow reading of neo-liberalism, and an oversimplified articulation of the relationship between governmentality and liberalism are two of the shortcomings of Rose’s work in *Powers of Freedom*. Boris Franklin has made a similar charge against Rose (in Larner, 2000). While I acknowledge Grossberg’s point, I follow Wendy Larner (2000), who makes an important contribution to these discussions in her paper entitled “Neoliberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality”. Larner rearticulates neo-liberalism as a term that is taken up in multiple ways: first, as a set of political justifications and/or effects of government policies; second, as a group of political ideologies; and third, as a system of governmental mechanisms. She maintains that understanding neo-liberalism as governmentality accounts for the ways in which it is unevenly distributed. Neo-liberalism in Rose’s account is being read as a system of governmental mechanisms and thus is not attempting to address all of the missing links that Grossberg identifies.
operations and modalities that order and manage normative and popularised sets of truths and the various communicative and image-based mediums that produce and disseminate various truth effects.

One of the key points the thesis makes is that questions of governance are bound to questions of labour and output: How is one governed? How does one govern others? How does one govern oneself (Miller, 1998b)? All of these acts of governance involve discipline, routine, surveillance, management and certain consumptive practices. As Figure 1.1 (see p. 1) suggests, the Gay Games are very much about bodily exertion, discipline and regimentality. The Gay Games are about various modes of production and about innumerable ways of labouring. The slogan ‘Blood, sweat and queers’ brings together practices of governance, queer identity politics and discourses that position sport as a space of reform and self-improvement. It links blood and sweat to queer sporting bodies. Both the queer body’s interiority or content (blood) and its exteriority or output (sweat), are implicated in practices of order, discipline and management. One of the distinguishing features of Foucault’s theory of governmentality and of his understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge is that he is not simply concerned with external or exterior mechanisms that govern individual subjects. Foucault maintains that individuals learn to self-govern, developing a variety of technical (and often labour intensive) ways of managing and ordering their lives so as to remain acceptable and intelligible ‘human’ subjects (Foucault, 1991a; see also, Butler, 2004c; Miller, 1998b; Rabinow & Rose, 2003; Rose, 1999).

By focusing on technologies that govern global queer citizen-subjects, this project does not suggest that sexual subjectivities are managed through singular, luminous forces of power, nor does it suggest that the now ‘globalised’ mechanisms that order day-to-day living are somehow more insidious than they were in previous times. Following Foucault, the thesis maintains that power is best understood as a series of dispersed operations that continuously shift and change across time and space. Foucault envisioned power as “open, more-or-less coordinated ...clusters of relationships” (Foucault, 1980f, p. 199) rather than as a singular force easily traced to a cause or origin. Power is not held or enacted by a certain form or structure; institutions do not produce or enact power, it is materialised through power effects or relations which allow for, or necessitate certain governmental structures or institutions to hold. Elemental to Foucault’s analytics of power is that the ‘Other’ of power, the subject whose actions are being ‘acted upon’, is always an active subject/agent, capable of responding to a relationship of power in a variety of ways (Foucault, 1982). This project is thus also concerned with the ways in which individuals and communities both uphold and resist power
relationships in order to maintain order and normalcy in their lives. It also considers how individuals and/or communities disassemble and rearticulate existing technologies of governance.⁴

The remainder of this introductory chapter expands on the various ideas evoked by Figure 1.1 and is guided by three primary aims: The first is to offer some background information about the Gay Games while, at the same time, asking how these narratives shift within an analytics of governmentality. The second is to clarify how categories of identity such as gay, lesbian and queer will be used throughout this project and why this project is particularly interested in the ways in which participants are constituted as ‘queer’ athletes, community members and/or global citizens at/ by an event that calls itself the Gay Games. The third and final aim of the chapter is to provide some sense of how the three key research questions outlined above will be taken up in Chapters Two – Six and in the concluding comments offered in Chapter Seven.

‘Let the Games begin’: An overview of the Gay Games movement

The Gay Games are a quadrennial international sports and cultural festival. To date there have been seven Gay Games held in six different cities around the world.⁵ In the limited body of work written for or about the Gay Games or the event’s parent organisation, the Federation of Gay Games (FGG), each Games is described in terms of the organisational and financial struggles, the political triumphs and the celebratory sporting moments that shaped each event. Caroline Symon’s (2004) doctoral work provides one of the most thorough overviews of the Games to date.⁶ Symons did extensive archival research and interviewed a large number of event organisers and participants who were involved in one or more of the first five Games. Her study also does the important work of mapping women’s peripheral place at each of the Games. She emphasises the importance of women’s Outreach projects in increasing the number of lesbian participants at each event and in shifting the male dominated cultures of gay sporting organisations like the Federation of Gay Games.⁷ There is a growing body of

⁴ Resistance here, however, is understood as a set of counterforces that do not always occur in direct opposition to power, but rather take place in moments of rupture, breakage or slippage and in the spaces of liminality. As such it is possible that what at one point in time acted as a tool or mechanism of resistance has been rearticulated as a strategy of order, control and regulation. For a more detailed reading of resistance, see Chapter Two.
⁵ Sydney 2002 was the sixth Gay Games. In July 2006 Chicago, USA hosted the seventh Gay Games and in 2010 Cologne, Germany, will host the eighth Games.
⁶ The video documentary Gay Games: Grace, Grit & Glory, Take the Flame (Secter, 2006) provides an equally as important visual assemblage of archival footage from the first six Games. It also includes interviews with Tom Waddell and with various professional athletes who have come out in their sporting careers and who are involved in the Gay Games movement as participants, organisers or ambassadors.
⁷ For other work concerned with the exclusion of lesbians at the Gay Games, see the Lenskyj 2002a & 2003.
scholars who, much like Symons, analyse the Games as a way of gaining insight into the experiences of participants and/or evaluating its political or cultural significance (Cramer, 1996; Krane, Barber & McClung, 2002; Krane & Waldron, 2000; Lenskyj, 2002a; Messner, 1994; Pronger, 2000; Rowe, Markwell & Stevenson, 2006; Symons, 2002a, 2004; Symons & Hemphill, 2002, 2006; Waitt, 2003, 2005, 2006). The focus of the thesis is less on describing the Gay Games and more on analysing the event as a site of production, where normative meanings around sex, gender, citizenship and global living are constructed and contested. There are three important critical responses to the Gay Games that inform the content and direction of the thesis. The first is offered by Toby Miller in Sportsex (2001a). Miller uses a number of examples from the 1994 New York City Gay Games to trouble the tidy relationships between gender, sexuality, sport and consumption. In addition, Sportsex begins to rethink the ways in which the male sporting body is commodified and sexualised within the global marketplace. The second critical reading of the Games that informs the analysis of the thesis is from Elspeth Probyn (2000) who asks how the Sydney Gay Games Board (SGGB), the authority established to oversee the event, mobilised discourses of pride and inclusiveness in order to secure their bid for the 2002 Games. Probyn highlights the importance of sport in constructing an exclusive, masculinist national culture, and positions sexual shame as the starting point for critically rethinking the politics of pride. Coming at the Gay Games from a slightly different, but equally important perspective, Deborah Stevenson, David Rowe and Kevin Maxwell (2005) trace the event’s ecology and offer a close reading of print media materials from Sydney 2002. This work asks important questions about the role that large-scale events play in redefining community and in the establishing of normative models of citizenship.

These three analyses are particularly useful to this project for four main reasons: First, they all use the media and promotional cultures of the Gay Games as their key source of ‘data’. Second, they are all concerned with the multiple and contradictory ways that normative meanings around gender and sexuality are produced at cultural events like the Games. Third, each of these texts asks what role sport plays in the ‘making’ of monolithic national cultures and in establishing the conditions for ‘good’, ‘healthy’, ‘productive’ citizenship. Finally, collectively these three texts open up a space from which to rethink the complex relationships

---

8 The term ecology is particularly useful for this project’s aim of understanding Sydney 2002 as an assemblage of various connecting and competing forces. The Games’ ecology thus refers to both the five previous international Gay Games and the various internal and external features of Sydney 2002. This could include everything from tourism trends to local venues, team costumes, flags, weather conditions, government involvement or entertainment. Although this project does not take up this term specifically, it has interesting links to the Foucauldian notions of assemblage or dispositif, both of which are explored in detail in Chapters Three and Five of this thesis.
between sport, normative models of masculinity, the exclusionary mechanisms of national citizenries and the various technical mechanisms that define sex and gender in binary terms.

It should be stated here that throughout the thesis global queer events like the Gay Games are understood to be multiple assemblages that cannot be defined or described in simple or absolute terms. As such, the idea that one can trace a singular, linear history through the Gay Games movement is highly problematic and one that this project resists. Foucault (amongst others) cautions against the use of linear approaches to history, arguing that:

It should never be possible to assign, in the order of discourse, the irruption of a real event; that beyond any apparent beginning, there is always a secret origin – so secret and so fundamental that it can never be quite grasped in itself. Thus one is led inevitably, through the naivety of chronologies, towards an ever-receding point that is never itself present in any history; this point is merely its own void; and from that point all beginnings can never be more than recommencements or occultation (in one and the same gesture, this and that). (Foucault, 2002a, p. 27)

An important part of Foucault’s project is to disrupt the idea that events can be traced back to a beginning or an origin. He not only challenges the possibility of finding such beginnings, he also asks why it is that scholars desire linearity and crave rational models for thinking and/or modes for analysing questions around subjectivity. Sketching out some of the details of each of the Games is thus not an effort to establish what the Gay Games movement is or is not, nor is it an attempt to link the individual Games to one another in a neat and linear gay ‘story’ of progress. Instead, the overview below highlights major dates, locations and issues that made each of the Games ‘newsworthy’. The aim is to provide the reader with some background information about the event and illustrate what details the ‘history’ of the Games tends to draw upon. There are certain ‘facts’ within the story of the Gay Games that are deemed relevant to its storytellers whilst others remain peripheral or untold. In various ways, the chapters in the thesis focus on reworking the ‘stories we know’ about the Gay Games movement. By utilising an analytics of governmentality the chapters in the thesis offer a new way of analysing queer events of this magnitude and scale. This thesis is thus committed to rethinking not only the stories repeated again and again about the Gay Games, but also the tools used to assemble both popular and scholarly accounts of queer cultural and sporting events of this kind.

The Gay Games as we ‘know’ them

It was Olympic decathlete Tom Waddell who came up with the concept of an international gay and lesbian sporting competition, and it is Waddell who retains the title of ‘founding
father' of the Gay Games (Krane & Waldron, 2000; Messner, 1994; Secter, 2006; Symons, 2004; Waddell & Schaap, 1996). Waddell founded San Francisco Arts and Athletics (SFAA) in 1981 and the group immediately began to organise for the first Gay Olympic Games. Waddell’s intention was to create a space where gay men and lesbian women could enjoy the spirit of an international sporting competition like the Modern Olympic Games, only within a non-heterosexual milieu, free of the homophobia inherent in mainstream sporting cultures. For Waddell and members of the SFAA, the Games represented an opportunity to challenge dominant media representations of gays and lesbians. In Tom’s semi-autobiographical life story, the early objectives of the Games are framed against Tom’s desire to improve the public image of the gay and lesbian community:

Too often, Tom felt, the gay community was represented in public only by its most outrageous elements, by drag queens and leather boys, who were, in his view, only a small percentage of the community. The majority of the gay men, Tom knew, were, like himself, professionals, doctors, lawyers, advertising men, salesmen, men who went to the theatre and the cinema, voted and ate out, bowled and played softball and rooted for the 49ers. They were not flamboyantly lusting for attention. (Waddell & Schaap, 1996, p. 145)

Closely linked to this aim was the SFAA’s hope that the Games would foster international goodwill and friendship amongst the various participants, encourage gays and lesbians to be fit and active, and to provide an international sporting space where being ‘in the closet’ was not a mandatory requirement. The Gay Games were intended to provide an alternative sporting experience where participation, team effort and the building of international community bridges were valued over national rivalries and competitiveness.

Despite the alternative ethos of the Games, Tom Waddell and the SFAA went to great lengths to replicate both the format and the spirit of the mainstream Modern Olympic Games. For instance, each of the Gay Games has begun with a formal ceremonial welcome and concluded with a similar closing celebration. Many of the Games (all but Sydney) have formalised the opening ceremonies with the lighting of the Gay Olympic Flame. Likewise, in the four-year period between each of the Games, the official Gay Games rainbow flag is debuted at a series of local gay and lesbian fun runs around the world as it makes its way from

---

9 On June 15, 1980 Tom Waddell, Mark Brown and Paul Mart held the first official Gay Games planning meeting. The SFAA was established as plans got under way and there was an obvious need for a larger and more formal organising committee. It should also be noted that the SFAA was primarily a sporting organisation; however, it included the word ‘art’ in its name in order to qualify for certain tax incentives and exemptions (Symons, 2004).

10 It should be noted that Waddell himself was critical of the way in which athletes competed under their national flag and was resistant to having the athletes march into the opening ceremonies by country. However, other members of the SFAA thought that this was in fact one of the most appealing facets of the Olympics and fostered pride and a sense of community within local/national teams.
the previous Games’ host city to the next host city. This is intended to raise awareness about the event and to emulate the mainstream Olympic torch relay. The Games have also adopted the tone, theatrics and production scale of the Olympics’ opening and closing ceremonies (see Chapter Five). Official speeches are blended with large-scale theatrics and athletes are ushered into the opening ceremonies stadium by country, dressed in matching team attire. The Gay Games also offer medals for achievement (gold, silver and bronze) and sporting performances are accredited with national and international sporting organisations.

Each of the seven Games has been organised under the banner of the same motto: ‘participation, inclusion and personal best’. As the succeeding subsections will demonstrate, each of the individual events follows a rather standardised format. Despite over two decades of political, social, economic and environmental change, organisers tend to hold on to the legacy and mandates of the first Games, and the SFAA’s original vision for the event. That said, despite only minor changes in the events’ programme structure and regardless of the fact that each host team has adopted very similar promotional strategies, a great deal has changed in terms of the events’ conditions of production. One need only compare the footage of San Francisco 1982 and of Sydney 2002 to acknowledge that being a Games participant today is a very different experience than it was when the Gay Games movement was in its formative years. To begin with, at the first Games there was barely a whisper around Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) or Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS); the world was yet to feel the impact of that epidemic. Furthermore, organisers depended upon ‘snail mail’ or word of mouth to promote the Games as they did not have access to the types of new media technologies that organisers do today. The first Games relied on local sponsorship to fund the event’s modest budget whereas SGGB drummed up millions of dollars to stage its program by establishing government, media and corporate partnerships.

In tracing these changes, it is not my intention to reinvent progress narratives. Neither am I arguing that the Games have failed to change with the changing world around them. What the thesis is concerned with, however, are the ways in which progress narratives are used to both frame the ‘political’ nature of the event and as a way of maintaining a normative public/media image. It argues that the repetition of a singular and progressive Gay Games history is a key

---

11 See Figure A1 ‘Gay Games flag arrives in Sydney for the 2002 Gay Games’, and A2 ‘Gay Games flag at Sydney’s Mardi Gras ’06, official send-off to the Chicago 2006 Gay Games’, Appendix A.
12 This is often strictly adhered to. Athletes must buy city or country uniforms in order to be permitted to march into the stadium under their chosen banner. This, of course, poses a series of questions around accessibility. The uniforms are by no means inexpensive and they seldom can be used after the event. For examples of Team Sydney uniforms at Vancouver ’90 and Sydney ’02, see Figures A3 and A4 in Appendix A.
13 This footage can be viewed in David Secter’s Take the Flame! (2006). For comparisons in production size and quality of the two events see analysis in Chapters Five and Six of this thesis.
sales strategy for organisers who do not want to ruffle the rainbow coloured feathers of international participants, corporate sponsors or the Federation of Gay Games (FGG).

**Gay Games I: Challenge '82**

The first Games were called *Challenge '82* and were held in San Francisco. In the lead-up to these Games, event organisers made national headline news when a lawsuit was begun against the SFAA. The United States Olympic Committee (USOC) wrote to the SFAA, citing copyright over the word ‘Olympic’ and requesting that it remove the word from all of its promotional items. At that time, the SFAA sought legal advice and was told to proceed as planned. After all, there were over a dozen American businesses and events that used the word Olympic in their titles: Olympic BBQ, The Xerox Olympics, The Crab Cooking Olympics, The Diaper Olympics, The Dog Olympics, The Special Olympics (Miller, 2001a; Secter, 2006; Siegel, 1994; Waddell & Schaap, 1996). Why would the Gay Olympic Games be any different? The USOC then filed suit against the SFAA in the Federal District Court, where it was successful in getting a restraining order and preliminary injunction against the SFAA, both of which were upheld in the Circuit Court of Appeals.

The SFAA was ordered to ensure that the word ‘Olympic’, and any other word associated with the Olympic Games, was removed from the promotional items for the event (see Figure A5 ‘Gay Olympic Games Ticket, San Francisco 1982’, Appendix A), a process requiring a great deal of time and volunteer labour. The name Gay Olympic Games was simplified to the Gay Games, and has remained unchanged since. But again, the erasure of the word Olympic from the Games materials in no way erased the spirit of Olympia, in fact, one could argue it made it stronger. The case of *USOC v. SFAA* continued until 24 March 1987, when the United States Supreme Court ruled that the USOC had exclusive proprietary rights over the

---

14 Waddell had in fact written to the USOC to seek permission to call the event the Gay Olympic Games, making the case that the two events shared a commitment to peace and greater understanding between peoples. When they did not hear back from the USOC, the SFAA began planning with the word very much a part of their vision and their promotional efforts.

15 In many of the official addresses at the opening and closing ceremonies references were made to the fact that despite the name ‘Olympic’ being erased, the athletes at *Challenge 1982* demonstrated that the Olympic traditions and values were central to the event. This was perhaps most evident in the speeches made by United States Congressman Philip Burton and San Francisco Supervisor Doris Ward, who described the Games as ‘Olympic’ Games.
word and a permanent injunction was issued preventing the use of the Olympic mark by the SFAA.\textsuperscript{16}

Gay Games I: \textit{Challenge '82} attracted 1,350 athletes from 11 nations, competing in 16 sporting events (Symons, 2004).\textsuperscript{17} As mentioned above, one of the primary aims of \textit{Challenge '82} was to shift the stereotypes of gays and lesbians within mainstream circles and demonstrate to the wider community that gays and lesbians were virtuous and upstanding members. The virtuous vision that organisers had in mind for these Games was widely publicised throughout the event. At the opening ceremonies Waddell established the values and spirit that were central to \textit{Challenge '82} in his welcoming address, which began with these words:

\begin{quote}
Welcome to a dream that is now reality. Welcome to a celebration of freedom. These Gay Games, the first of their kind, are offered to gay and enlightened people from all over the world. They are a departure from other events of this scope and magnitude in that the underlying philosophy is one of self-fulfilment and a spirit of friendship. This is a first; it is our beginning, and as such, we expect these games to set a solid precedent for future games that are exemplary for wholesome and healthy athletics, devoid of the notion that beating someone is the criterion for winning. Participation makes us all winners. (Krane & Waldron, 2000, p. 149)
\end{quote}

His choice of words, “celebration of freedom”, “gay and enlightened people”, “wholesome and healthy athletics”, “participation makes us all winners” again speak to the SFAA’s efforts to challenge the stereotypes that have resulted in gays and lesbians being treated as second-class citizens. Sport is positioned as a space where the stereotypic image of the homosexual sissy and the queer social misfit could be contested.\textsuperscript{18} In a similar vein, in the \textit{Challenge 1982 Official Programme}, SFAA members John Gildersleeve and Linda Wardlaw (1982) wrote:

\begin{quote}
The Gay Games are one way to say, ‘come and see how alike Gays and straights are. There are more similarities than differences.’ The Games are open to everyone; that’s a statement about love and acceptance. (p. 16)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} After winning its case, the USOC went on to file a number of cases against various establishments that used the word Olympic. For a complete description of International Olympics Committee vs. San Francisco Athletics 1982, see Siegel, P. (1994). On the owning of words: Reflections on San Francisco Arts and Athletics vs. United States Olympic Committee. In R. J. Ringer (Ed.), Queer words, queer images: Communication and the construction of homosexuality (pp. 30-44). New York: New York University Press.

\textsuperscript{17} These countries were Australia, Belgium, Canada, England, France, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand, the United States of America and West Germany. It should be noted that at the Gay Games athletes march as England, Scotland and Wales rather than the United Kingdom. It should also be noted that the number of Games participants, spectators, volunteers and budget figures vary from one source to another. In each case I tried to obtain the numbers from ‘official’ Games archives; in the cases where this was unavailable I used Symons’s (2004) figures.

\textsuperscript{18} Mainstreaming discourses that stress the importance of ‘being normal’ and ‘gaining acceptance’ have been a trademark of the gay and lesbian movement. These will be discussed in some detail in Chapter Four.
While participants were encouraged to be ‘out and proud’, they were also given clear instructions around what did and did not constitute ‘appropriate’ Gay Games behaviour. Tom Waddell was especially committed to presenting a clean-cut image of Games participants to mainstream media and sponsors, and he shamelessly worked to ensure that the community’s ‘undesirables’ either conformed to this desired image or were excluded. Waddell visited members of San Francisco’s drag and leather communities, urging them to alter their image if they wanted to be a part of the event. If they were unwilling, they were asked to sit the event out so as not to ‘ruin’ it for the rest of the community (Waddell & Schaap, 1996). It is ironic that Waddell espoused the importance of friendly competition, inclusiveness and goodwill, values that remain central to the Gay Games movement today. The first Games had a modest budget of US $380,000 and finished with a surplus of US $15,000, assuring organisers that an international gay and lesbian sporting celebration was a financially viable option.

**Gay Games II: Triumph in ’86 & Gay Games III: Celebration ’90**

It was not long before planning was underway for Gay Games II: *Triumph in ’86*, that was to be hosted again by San Francisco. Organisers felt there was a need to “refine [the Games] and work out the ‘bugs’ before they [travelled] to other international sites” (Waddell, 1984, p. 1). The SFAA then split Waddell’s roles as SFAA President, Chair of the Board of Directors and Chief Executive Officer for the Games into two portfolios (President/Chair and Executive Director) and a more formal committee structure was set up. The aim of these Games was to continue to challenge the idea that gays and lesbians were abnormal, sexually deviant and socially irresponsible. They welcomed 3,500 sporting participants from 17 countries who were joined by thousands of Games spectators. The year 1986 was a precarious time to be staging an international gay and lesbian event and the SFAA was well aware of this. With the AIDS epidemic taking its toll on most of the western world, border regulations in the United States had tightened up, and people who were HIV positive (HIV+) and People With AIDS (PWA) were forced to identify themselves on immigration documents and most were denied entry visas. It should come as no surprise then that *Triumph in ’86* was met with a great deal

---

19 Symons (2004) suggests that the change in the SFAA structure was born out of concerns around Waddell making a small salary as acting chair/president of the organisation. Some members felt that because Waddell was a wealthy medical doctor this was not appropriate. Waddell suggested that a CEO and president be elected. Al Schaaf took over the portfolios of president and chair. He worked hard to promote the ’86 Games to both the mainstream and gay press in America. Tight reins were also placed around committee expenditures.

20 These countries were: Australia, Brazil, Canada, England, France, Greece, Guam, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, The Netherlands, Nicaragua, New Zealand, Samoa, the United States of America, the Virgin Islands and West Germany.
of disapproval and protest.\footnote{According to Symons (2004), some of this resistance came from within the gay and lesbian community. Some community members felt that holding an event of this kind was inappropriate and a waste of community resources at a time when so many members of the San Francisco community were either sick and/or dying from AIDS.} Despite the obstacles that visa granting posed, organisers felt that the Games were an excellent opportunity to renew the community’s spirit, to promote healthy and safe lifestyles and to challenge the stereotypes around PWAs.\footnote{People/Persons with AIDS are now more commonly referred to as People Living with AIDS (PLWA). The insistence that people don’t just 	extit{have} AIDS, but instead live with AIDS, challenges the social and medical pathologies around the disease. This change focuses on the ways in which positively diagnosed people now live happy and fulfilling lives. This acronym emphasises the importance of the person who has HIV/AIDS rather than just seeing his/her body as a vessel/host of the virus/disease.}

Apart from the 17 sporting events on the sports programme, a ‘Procession of Arts’ that included conferences, exhibitions, concerts and plays was added to the programme. Recognising the importance of the arts through the addition of this small cultural programme was a significant change for the event. While Waddell himself was never entirely in support of the idea, many of the other organisers felt that it was important to provide a space for those who were less interested in sport to get involved in the spirit of the Games.\footnote{Symons (2002a) points out that the cultural programme was never a priority for Waddell, who saw sport and ‘the arts’ as two very different cultural spheres. For Waddell, the emphasis needed to be on changing the image of athletes in mainstream culture. He believed that individuals who participated in cultural sectors did not experience the same sets of discriminations or homophobia as athletes did. Elsewhere, Symons (2004) recounts a conversation that Waddell had with one of the 	extit{Triumph ‘86} board members where he acknowledged the significance of the Procession of the Arts to the week’s festivities and the way that it complemented the sporting competitions. It was not until the 1998 Games in Amsterdam that cultural participants received equal treatment to athletes, participating in registration and opening and closing ceremonies.} The Outreach Program that had got off to a slow start at 	extit{Challenge ‘82} became the portfolio of the SFAA’s only African-American member, Lloyd Jenkins. The focus of the Outreach Program was to encourage gays and lesbians of colour, those living in ‘disenfranchised American neighbourhoods’ and delegates from ‘Third World countries’ to attend the event. Two other groups were targeted by the Outreach program: women and gay and lesbian senior citizens in the community. The event had a budget of US $650,000 and finished with a small surplus. At the closing ceremony of 	extit{Triumph in ‘86} Waddell handed over the Gay Games flag to the Metropolitan Vancouver Arts and Athletics Association (MVAAA) and announced that the third celebration of the Gay Games would move across the 49th parallel from the United States to Canada.

Although the crowd at Kezar Stadium in San Francisco did not know it at the time, these would be Tom Waddell’s last Gay Games. In the years between the second and third Games, Waddell was diagnosed HIV positive and died in 1987 (at the age of 50) after a life of athletic and activist triumphs, including a sixth place finish in the decathlon at the 1968 Mexico City
Olympic Games and several gold medal finishes at the first two Gay Games. This was not the only significant change that took place in the years between 1986 and 1990. The SFAA was reconfigured and renamed the Federation of the Gay Games (FGG), the international organisation that continues to oversee the Games today.

Organising for Gay Games III: Celebration '90 was not an easy task. The vast majority of participants at the first two Games were from the United States and this was the first time the event had left its host city. Vancouver was a much smaller city than San Francisco and the MVAAA had drafted an enormous budget of CN $1.5 million. Failure to secure any significant sponsorship deals from large corporations, coupled with a lack of financial support from the British Columbia provincial government, meant that the MVAAA were working uphill from the start. As organisers would come to learn, without a sizeable amount of the event's income generated in sponsorship, it would be hard to break even. There were 7,250 athletes in attendance, registered in the 23 sports on the programme. In addition, there were 750 participants taking part in the cultural festival (Forzley & Hughes, 1990). Despite efforts to manage the budget, Vancouver was left with a CN $100,000 deficit.

Gay Games IV: Unity '94

The 1994 Gay Games: Unity '94 were held in New York City; the event also commemorated the 25th anniversary of the Stonewall Riots through a series of parallel conferences, protests and parties. The fourth Games were certainly much more elaborate than the previous three Games, and they were also far more controversial. Debates around HIV+ participants entering the US continued to be a major hurdle in event planning and this was mobilised as an issue

24 Much is said about Waddell's role as a visionary leader, activist and inspirational athlete. However, in the small body of literature around the Gay Games there is very little critical engagement with the significance of Waddell's death from AIDS. The exception to this is the biography of Tom Waddell; see Waddell, T., & Schaap, D. (1996). Gay Olympian: The life and death of Dr. Tom Waddell. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
25 The population of Vancouver was just over 1.5 million in 1990.
26 The Canadian national government provided a substantial grant of CN $45,000 to the event. Likewise, the city of Vancouver provided free transportation for Games participants. Symons (2004) criticises Canada's funding of the Vancouver Games, arguing that other major sporting events held in Canada at that time received much larger grants despite attracting significantly fewer athletes. While this is an excellent point, it is also important to point out that Canada was the first country to provide federal funding for a Gay Games festival. The symbolic gesture of a nation putting 'their money where their mouths are' is very important in unpacking the ways in which national governments strategically involve themselves in queer community activities. It would seem that the national government not only saw the importance of the Games to the local economy, but also saw it as an important political and cultural event. The national government's financial support and official endorsement are even more significant when, nearly a decade later, the national government of Australia refused to provide any type of official endorsement for the Games and did not provide a single cent towards financing them.
27 The Stonewall Riots took place in June 1969 at a bar in Greenwich Village, New York City. When police aggressively raided this downtown community establishment, patrons fought back. Their efforts to resist the homophobic police brutality is memorialised as the first time gays and lesbians made a stand against their oppression in a public way and is said to have initiated a broader anarchic militancy within the community.
for political action by Unity '94 organisers. After a number of formal appeals, the US government temporarily lifted the immigration restriction to allow people living with HIV into the United States in order to compete in the Games.\textsuperscript{28} Over a million people attended Unity '94, with official sports participant numbers rising to 10,864 and the cultural festival participants numbering just over 4,000. There were 40 countries represented at these Games, 31 sporting events were on offer and the event budget had grown to US $7 million.

‘Bigger and better’ was the guiding principle of these Games as organisers worked to put on the most elaborate Gay Games to date. They emphasised the positive impact the Games would have on the city’s local economy and used this as a selling point to secure a number of major sponsorship deals.\textsuperscript{29} It is estimated that US $316 million was injected into New York’s economy over the eight-day sports and cultural festival. Max Harrold of Team New York, commenting on the role that sponsorship deals and global tourism played in the success of Unity '94, stated plainly that “...Corporate America [had] finally discovered [the gay community]” (Harrold, 1994, p. 98). Harrold’s comment can be located within a broader move towards aligning queer events with involvement from mainstream sponsors. This type of involvement has not only helped events grow in size and reach but it has also dictated the public image that organisers choose to portray to the rest of the (straight) world. The role of corporate sponsors at queer events is an issue that will be addressed throughout this chapter and indeed throughout the broader focus of the thesis (see Chapter Four in particular).

There are a few other significant factors that made the New York Games larger and more spectacular than its predecessors. The event opened and closed with headline performances by Cyndi Lauper and Patti LaBelle. Sporting and cultural events took place in renowned locations such as Madison Square Garden, Carnegie Hall, Yankee Stadium, Rutgers University, New York University and Central Park. As part of their Outreach efforts, a small number of assistance scholarships were offered to athletes who would otherwise have been unable to attend the event. Other distinguishing moments for Unity '94 included the ‘The Rainbow Roll for the End of AIDS’, an inline skating expedition that carried the Gay Games flag from San Francisco to New York and raised money for national HIV/AIDS research. The ‘roll’ covered 4,500 miles and 18 US states.\textsuperscript{30} During the Games another rainbow event took

\textsuperscript{28} Interestingly, over a decade later, the organisers of the 2006 Chicago Gay Games (see discussion below), had to tow the same string of political arguments in order for government officials to sign a waiver that allowed athletes to compete at the seventh Gay Games.

\textsuperscript{29} These include APP Health Insurance, Miller Lite Beer Company, Calistoga Bottled Water and Out Magazine.

\textsuperscript{30} There was actually a similar run from San Francisco to Vancouver in 1990 but this is not recorded in Symons’s work. Video footage of this run is taken from the commemorative video of the 1990 Games and is used in David Secter’s Take the Flame! Gay Games: Grace, Grit & Glory (Secter, 2006).
place, called ‘Raise the Rainbow’. On the 26th of June a mile-long and 30-feet wide rainbow flag snaked its way around the streets of Manhattan with more than a million people carrying it along. According to event organisers, this enormous flag, the largest flag ever made, was a symbol of the strength of queer unity both locally and globally and was dedicated to the fight against AIDS.\(^{31}\)

The spirit of the 1969 Stonewall Riots was kept alive through a series of demonstrations by the Lesbian Avengers and the national ACT UP network (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power). Most notable perhaps was the ‘alternative’ gay pride parade route where several hundred thousand marchers deviated from the scheduled Unity '94/Stonewall 25 route. The scheduled march began at the United Nations building and culminated at Central Park; when marchers reached the original site of the Stonewall Riots a large group branched off and headed straight up Fifth Avenue until they reconnected with the original march. The deviation from the ‘approved’ route was intended to send out the message to queer community leaders that not everyone was onboard the new mainstreaming ‘queer’ agenda of the Games. There was concern that important political opportunities were being missed within the community because of the drive to please government officials and/or large corporate sponsors who often participated in the more commercial/party aspects of the community. So while Stonewall 25 was celebrated in conjunction with the 1994 Games, there were clearly struggles around what organisers of each event believed was the appropriate public image to put forth. Despite the increased interest of Corporate America in the Gay Games, Unity '94 suffered a significant deficit (US $700,000) and eventually was declared bankrupt.

**Gay Games V: Friendship '98**

Amsterdam was the next city to host the Gay Games; these Games were called Friendship '98. The 1998 host city was selected through a formal bid process. When Amsterdam won the bid, the Games were truly committed to becoming a global event and only time would tell as to whether or not the event could be successful outside the North American context. With New York such a success in terms of generating corporate interest, there was debate around whether or not European sponsors would cash in on their piece of the pink guilder as eagerly as their American counterparts had the pink dollar in '94. The Netherlands national government and the European Parliament both endorsed Amsterdam’s bid and pledged US $2

\(^{31}\) The flag weighed 7,550 lbs (that is approximately 3,432 kgs!), incorporated 176,000 yds\(^2\) of fabric and took three weeks to fold. It measured three times the height of the Empire State Building. See Figure A6, Appendix A and the discussion in Chapter Six of the ways in which the rainbow features as an important symbol of pride and one that gets mapped onto/into personal and public queer spaces.
million upfront to support Team Amsterdam’s early stages of planning. Team Stitching, the hosting team, was working with a budget of over NLG 14 million (approx. US $7.68 million).

Despite this generous support, in the year leading up to the 1998 Games there was talk that Team Amsterdam was having dire financial problems and ‘back-up cities’ were organised in the event that the Amsterdam Games would fold. Friendship '98 went ahead with a strong focus on human rights issues and international solidarity and understanding. Participant numbers totalled 16,026 and 68 different countries were represented in the opening ceremonies. Amsterdam offered athletes (all 14,716 of them!) 30 sports to participate in and worked to extend the Cultural Festival considerably. The Outreach Programme was a central focus of Team Stitching and great efforts were made to provide financial assistance to athletes from former communist countries and from developing countries so they could participate in the event. The government assisted this process by ensuring that appropriate visas were granted and, in some cases where coming to the Games would have had political or personal repercussions for the athlete, the ‘sexual’ nature of the event was concealed. This programme provided 238 athletes and cultural participants with travel, accommodation and local tour guides, waived registration fees and provided daily allowances to cover food and leisure activities. A Social Issues programme was a significant addition to these Games; this included a number of political, health-related and academic conferences. The number of women participants rose (42% of total participants) and there were various women-only events scheduled throughout the course of these Games.

For the eight days of celebrations Amsterdam’s small and intimate city centre came alive and the presence of the participants was certainly felt. Friendship Village was established in the city’s main square and large numbers of participants gathered and socialised there between and after their sporting or cultural events for the day. Various venues were clustered in this area and entertainment was provided each evening. Over the course of the event an estimated US $79 million was injected into the local economy (Symons, 2004). When all the medals were won and athletes returned home to tell tales of their fabulous time in Europe’s queer hub, the host organisation was left with an enormous debt of NLG 3.5 million (approx. US $1.92 million).\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{32} There was wide-spread speculation that some of the money was misused and/or embezzled by members of the organising body and that this is why an event that was so heavily endorsed by government monies did not break even.
Gay Games VI: Under New Skies'02

On 13 November 1997 the FGG announced that Sydney had put together the winning bid to host the 2002 Games. The Gay Games were finally heading ‘Downunder’. Sydney beat Dallas, Long Beach, Montréal and Toronto in the bid for the 2002 Games. Team Sydney had unsuccessfully bid for the 1994 Games and again for the 1998 Games. Securing the 2002 Gay Games was thus met with great relief by the Sydney Bid Committee and by the local gay and lesbian community. The Sydney bid was strengthened by the international reputation of the annual Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Festival and the event infrastructure that would be in place by 2002, after the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games.

![Figure 1.2: Front cover, Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Document (Stuart Borrie)](image)

The bid process was an expensive exercise, costing Sydney an estimated AU $75,000. The winning bid package (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Ltd., 1997a, 1997b) includes an impressive 66-page glossy booklet (see Figure 1.2: Front cover, Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Document (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Ltd.) below) and an accompanying ring-bound document that contains detailed venue plans. The main bid document emphasises Sydney’s beauty, friendliness and openness. It also provides detailed information about the structure of Team Sydney, the reputability of its board members, a draft budget (AU $10,310,000), plans for event promotion and media partnerships, evidence of government support (including a letter of endorsement from then NSW Premier Bob Carr) and draft proposals of the sports and
cultural programmes. All of the information in this booklet is interspersed with various images of Sydney’s cityscape, rural Australia and athletes at play.

The Sydney 2002 Gay Games were called Under New Skies ’02 to mark the event’s move to the Southern Hemisphere and also to signal a new face for the Games to mark the second millennium (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Ltd., 1997a). The Sydney Morning Herald stressed the financial benefits the Gay Games would have for the local community with a headline reading: “We win – and it will be worth millions” (Bernoth, 1997). It was estimated that Under New Skies ’02 would inject approximately AU $100 million into the local economy (Fitzsimons, 1997). State government officials also emphasised the financial significance of the event, arguing that these Games would give Sydney the economic boost needed following the tourism slump that was expected to follow the Sydney 2000 Olympics Games. The then Sports Minister, Gabrielle Harrison commented that, “I think when you’re looking at tourism and jobs people will accept these games and support them” (Bernoth, 1997). Harrison framed the government’s decision to support the Games in terms of the positive financial impact they would have on the local community. This is a familiar stance taken by mainstream sponsors and/or government bodies when describing their involvement in queer events; they adopt a ‘business only’ framework and make no mention of the social, cultural or political significance of the event (Sender, 2004). Members of Team Sydney also emphasised the financial rewards rather than the cultural significance of hosting an event of this kind, particularly in the early stages of planning when they were eager to get large sponsors on board. Although a number of large corporations (Qantas Airlines, American Airlines) and widely subscribed to media bodies (gay.com, Satellite Group Ltd.) made early sponsorship arrangements with SGGB, a number of others were too overcommitted to the Sydney 2000 Olympics to make any financial promises for 2002 (Mills, 2003a).

There were, of course, objections to the Games taking place in Sydney. Most of these came from National Party and Christian Democratic Party members of the state Legislative Council (referred to by some political opponents as members of the ratbag fringe), who dubbed these Games the ‘Sad Games’ in objection to the government endorsing an event that ‘promoted homosexual lifestyles’. Heading the campaign was Sydney’s notorious, right-wing cleric-politician Reverend Fred Nile, who pushed for the government to make it mandatory for overseas athletes to be tested for HIV/AIDS before being admitted into Australia to compete (Bernoth, 1997). News media accounts of Nile’s objections quote him saying:
The Carr Government is to be condemned that in the middle of a paedophile scare they actively promoted the Sydney bid and gave thousands of taxpayer dollars to help finance the bid... Sydney has enough social and moral problems without thousands of homosexuals descending on the city. (Bernoth, 1997, p. 4)\(^{33}\)

Despite conservative objections of this kind (which never went further than an in-house rant and a couple of news reports buried in the back pages of local newspapers), the then State Premier, Bob Carr; the Governor of New South Wales, Professor Marie Bashir AC; Lord Mayor of Sydney, Frank Sartor AQ; Mayor of South Sydney, Tony Pooley; and Local MP Clover Moore issued formal messages of support for the Games.

Organisers were working with a budget of approximately AU $10 million. The income for the Games was mainly generated through participant registration costs, party ticket sales and sponsorship. The largest expenditures were administrative costs (e.g. personnel salaries and wages totalled over $1.7 million), the hiring of sporting venues ($598,000) and the opening and closing ceremonies ($1.1 million). As early as December 2000 there were suggestions that the Sydney 2002 Gay Games were in some financial trouble ("Learner Gay Games", 2000). Acting Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Garrie Gibson resigned when Premier Bob Carr rejected Sydney 2002’s request for additional state funding. The Carr government had given Sydney Limited $75,000 for the bid and was providing office space and employment secondments to the value of $50,000. Gibson was replaced by Geoffrey Williams. Despite a change in leadership, complications continued to mount. The Satellite Group, one of the Games’ biggest media sponsors, and Australia’s first public gay and lesbian company, went into receivership that year. Likewise, the American magazine HERO also folded soon after they had signed on as sponsors for Sydney 2002 (Mills, 2002g). Although organisers had a few other sizeable sponsorship deals, most of these were providing value in kind, not dollars. As such, heading into the new millennium, concerns were being raised about the dearth of cash flow available to organisers. These concerns intensified when Mardi Gras was declared bankrupt and there was wide speculation about financial mismanagement by Mardi Gras board members.

By July 2001 local media raised doubts as to whether or not Gay Games organisers could keep the event afloat. The FGG – whom SGGB owed an AU $425,000 licensing fee –

\(^{33}\) Nile’s comment makes reference to the paedophile ‘witch hunts’ that were taking place in Australia around the time of the bid. In 1994 the NSW Legislative Assembly called for a Royal Commission to be set up to crack down on adults having sex with under-age children. Despite evidence that most children sexually abused in Australia are girls, a great deal of the Commission’s efforts were focused on male, homosexual adults having sex with young boys. The campaign was supported in the media by Independent Upper House MP Franca Arena. The campaign escalated into a homophobic witch-hunt in the gay community with a number of prominent gay men implicated in the ‘crack down’ (see Riley, 1997).
expressed concern that Sydney 2002 organisers needed to consider scaling the event down considerably. After the attacks on the World Trade Centre on September 11, 2001 global tourism took a dramatic dive and organisers had to account for the fact that many potential international competitors might elect to give these Games a miss. In August, 2002 Geoffrey Williams resigned and Karen Fletcher was appointed the acting CEO. However, the financial and public relations difficulties the Games were experiencing did not drastically improve under yet another leadership arrangement. In late September, SBS broadcasters pulled the plug on their negotiations with Sydney 2002 to broadcast the Opening Ceremony and produce a nightly show about the Games daily events. SBS spokesperson Ian Phipps explained that Sydney 2002’s enormous delay in providing the station with a contract made it impossible for SBS to sell enough advertising to offset the costs of the program (“No TV deal…”, 2002; “NSW-SBS withdraws…”, 2002; “SBS unplugs Games…”, 2002).

In addition to these difficulties, Australia’s appeal as a safe holiday getaway was in question after the 12 October 2002 terrorist attacks in Bali nightclubs, which were predominantly filled with Australian tourists.\textsuperscript{34} While Sydney 2002 organisers assured overseas visitors the risk of terrorist activity in Australia had not risen and that the Gay Games were working closely with NSW Police to ensure there was no direct threat posed to participants, they also knew that these events would compound existing hesitations to partake in overseas travel. In late October, only weeks away from the Opening Ceremony, news broke that the Sydney 2002 Ltd. was in serious financial jeopardy. A large amount of revenue was tied up in ticket sales, processed by a local ticketing agency, Ticketek. In keeping with local legislation, Ticketek could not release the monies to Sydney 2002 Limited in case the event fell through and ticket buyers were unable to get their money back. The Sydney 2002 executive worked to secure a bank loan of $2 million that would function as a guarantee to Ticketek that it was okay to release fifty percent of the money from ticket sales. Sydney 2002 approached South Sydney Council, asking them to support their loan application. The council refused and at the last minute a number of local gay and lesbian community members came together to personally back the bank loan. Community press publicised the generosity of these community ‘elders’ as a way of encouraging other members of the community to get out and buy tickets and thus do their part in making this community event happen.

---

\textsuperscript{34} The Bali bombings took place on 12 October, 2002 in a tourist district of the island called Kuta. The attack, led by members of Jemaah Islamiyah killed over 200 people (88 of whom were Australians). There was a great deal of speculation around whether or not this attack was targeting Australia because of the government’s backing of the US in the ‘War on Terror’.
Organisers and participants alike heaved a great sigh of relief when the three and a half hour Opening Ceremony ‘kicked off’ at 7 pm on 2 November 2002 in Aussie Stadium to a crowd of over 38,000. The sixth Gay Games, *Under New Skies '02* was held from 2<sup>nd</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> November, 2002, with the event programme organised into ‘on-field’ and ‘off-field’ sections. The on-field programme included the 31 official sports events and the off-field programme was made up of 97 cultural events, 7 conferences and 5 event parties. A total of 12,099 participants were accredited at the Games. There were 11,087 participants from 66 countries accredited in the sporting events, 704 conference participants and over 2,500 artists, musicians and actors involved in the cultural events. The most popular sporting events were swimming (1,387 participants) and the marathon, half-marathon and ten-kilometre road race (1,297 participants) and the most widely acclaimed cultural events were *Blak, Queer ‘n’ Out There*, a showcase of indigenous performers; the Poetry Slam finals and *Foreign Aids*, a one-man play written and performed by Pieter-Dirk Uys that addresses the political links between racism and government responses to HIV/AIDS in South Africa. The Outreach and scholarship programmes were expanded as organisers worked hard to include queer youth, women, Aboriginal Australians and participants from the Pacific region. Although 515 scholarships were offered, only 282 were actually taken up (Borrie, 2002). Although organisers aimed to have an equal number of female and male participants at the Games, the final percentage of women in attendance was only 30.8% (Borrie, 2002).

Many of the sporting events took place at Sydney Olympic Park in Sydney’s mid-western suburb Homebush. In addition, the Botanical Gardens, Centennial Park, Sydney Town Hall, Darling Harbour Convention Centre, Fox Studios Showring and the Moore Park Golf Course were the main inner-city spaces used to host the sporting events, with the remainder scattered across Sydney’s inner suburbs and outer western suburbs.

After eight days of sports and cultural celebrations, the Games culminated with a fairly low-key closing ceremony at Fox Studios called Corroboree. Performing at Closing were Tina Arena and Simon Burke. A standing ovation was given to American Airlines hostess Alice Hogan, whose son Mark Bingham died during the 9-11 terrorist attacks. Bingham had intended to be at the Games to play touch rugby and so his mother made the journey in his honour. Hogan addressed the crowd and helped present the Tom Waddell Award, an honour

---

35 Interestingly, there were actually 12,979 registrations completed (including fees paid) for these Games. In other words, 870 registered athletes never actually came to Sydney (Borrie, 2002).
36 See Appendix C for an overview of the sports and cultural programmes for Sydney 2002 and Chapter Six for maps of various venue locations.
37 ‘Corroboree’ is an aboriginal dance ceremony that uses song and dance to mark the celebrations.
awarded at each of the Games to someone who has shown outstanding dedication to the principles of the Gay Games - participation, inclusion and personal best. Lord Mayor Frank Sartor officially closed the Games and handed the Gay Game flag over to a representative of Équipe/Team Montréal. Although a bit lost in the financial turmoil that surrounded the planning of Sydney 2002, on 25 October 2001, the FGG had announced that Team Montréal had been chosen to host the 2006 Gay Games. Team Montréal used the celebrations at Sydney 2002 as an opportunity to promote the seventh Gay Games that were to be called Rendez-Vous 2006.

On Sunday, November 10, 2002 a headline in the late edition Sun Herald read, “Thanks for having us Sydney, say gays”. In the news piece American Gay Games veteran Jim O’Donnell described his experience at Sydney 2002: “Sydney was very welcoming, but on a more grand scale than, say, Amsterdam, which is a much more intimate place” (West, 2002, p. 31). Both the mainstream and gay and lesbian press proclaimed the Sydney 2002 Gay Games to be a success. Asked how effective he felt the Games had been, Sydney 2002 Co-chair Peter Bailey stated: “we have exceeded the expectations of our overseas visitors and Sydneysiders. ...it’s been incredibly rewarding to see this amazing event come together and to see the smiles of thousands of people who participated in the Games in some way” (West, 2002, p. 31). Kathleen Webster, FGG Co-president described the Sydney 2002 Gay Games as the “best ever”, offering that, “Sydney 2002 has set a new height, it has brought the games to the next level, to another wonderful level” (Moran, 2002). Despite what appeared to be general consensus around the Games’ success, the following month it was announced that Sydney 2002 Gay Games Ltd. was insolvent, its final debt totalling AU $2.5 million, with some 150 creditors owed monies (Jacobsen, 2002). Sydney 2002 Gay Games Ltd. owed $516,000 to NSW government bodies, $425,000 to the FGG for licensing fees, $300,000 to the Australian Taxation Office, $211,000 to Qantas Airlines and the remainder to small

38 There were five official bid city organisations bidding for the 2006 Gay Games: Montréal, Atlanta, Chicago and two teams from Los Angeles. One of the two LA teams was not short-listed for the final presentations which took place at the AGM in Johannesburg, South Africa on October 25, 2001.
39 See Figure A7 ‘Gay Games VII: Rendez-Vous 2006 promotional campaign in 2002’, Appendix A. This promotion was slightly curtailed when, not yet having signed their contract, and having been told by the FGG when they won the bid that their projected numbers of 19,000-24,000 participants would have to be adjusted, Team Montréal arrived in Sydney with pamphlets that projected these numbers. In their 1 November 2002 meeting the FGG Board of Directors voted not to circulate the pamphlets, which they felt contained unrealistic figures.
40 Here and throughout the thesis I refer to the organising board/committee of the 2002 Games as the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board (SGGB), but use Sydney Gay Games Ltd. when referring to the incorporated body responsible for financial and legal matters pertaining to the event.
businesses and venue operators. Eventually Sydney 2002 Gay Games Ltd. went into voluntary administration and subsequently into liquidation ("Debt crisis", 2002).

Co-chair Bev Lange maintained the Sydney Games had been organised on “sound business principles” (Jacobsen, 2002, p. 4) and also stated that Sydney 2002 “set a benchmark for the delivery of the Gay Games in the future” (Mills, 2003d). Although unintentional, Lange’s words would foreshadow an immense amount of turmoil for the future of the Gay Games movement. The financial downfall of Sydney 2002 would have a significant impact on Rendez-Vous 2006 and on the future of the Gay Games movement. While the thesis focuses primarily on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, a brief overview of what transpired for Team Montréal is important for understanding what unfolded for the seventh Gay Games, which was without doubt the result of the string of fall-outs that followed the Sydney 2002 Gay Games.

Gay Games VII?

When the financial loss incurred by Sydney Gay Games Ltd. was announced, the FGG felt strongly that it was time to carefully rethink the Gay Games financial model such that host cities were no longer left with the sort of hefty debts Amsterdam and Sydney had been. Montréal’s original bid budget was CN $20 million, and their estimated number of participants was over 20,000. During the bid, the FGG emphasised the necessity of scaling down these figures. By December 2002 the Federation was putting pressure on Team Montréal to produce a more realistic budget, establish more realistic participant targets and focus on a more modest program of events so to safeguard against financial shortfalls. Team Montréal was yet to sign their event licensing agreement despite having traded under the Gay Games name (primarily securing sponsors and venues and appointing employees) for over a year. However, as both parties would soon discover, finalising the agreement would not be a simple task. Irreconcilable differences emerged. The FGG believed its role as the parent body who had witnessed the mistakes of former host cities was to “break the cycle of financial deficits” (Federation of Gay Games, 2003b, p. 11) by ensuring prudent financial plans were put in place for the 2006 Games. On the other hand, Team Montréal rejected the FGG’s business plan and felt that the level of control exercised by the Federation did not give host organisations the freedom to really make their event a success. For instance, the Federation

---

41 This did not sit well with the Ryde Council, which was owed AU $20,000 by Sydney 2002 Gay Games Ltd. for their rental of the soccer and badminton facilities. The Premier’s Department had, on behalf of the Gay Games, asked various organisations to accept deferred payments. Ryde Council demanded that the state government take responsibility for the Games budget, which it had endorsed.
requires host teams to seek approval for all press releases, sponsorship agreements or employment contracts. Montréal wanted sole control over such matters and felt that having to get an ‘okay’ from the FGG on day-to-day operations prevented swift and professional business dealings. In addition, the FGG uses a formulaic business model that starts with modest projected numbers and builds upward. The FGG wanted Team Montréal to produce a draft budget for a projected 12,000 participants (10,000 sporting participants and 2,000 cultural participants), but Team Montréal felt that they needed to plan for 16,000 participants in order to attract large sponsors and generate enough registration income to break even. The details of the negotiations around these budgetary details were extensive but it is important to point out that what Team Montréal saw as control, the FGG understood to be their consultative obligation, that is, to “assess organization readiness” (Federation of Gay Games, 2003b, p. 8). After innumerable attempts to settle upon a licensing agreement, it became clear that the two groups’ viewpoints of what the Gay Games event should look like could not be reconciled.

On 16 October 2003, in a media interview with Outsports.com, a gay and lesbian sports web portal, Team Montréal expressed freely and publicly many of their concerns about the negotiation process. The following day they circulated a worldwide press release that outlined, as they saw it, the tensions that were mounting between the two organisations. Then again on 3 November 2003 they sent an open letter to gay and lesbian organisations, media outlets and participants who had attended Sydney 2002 that clearly stated what they felt were the unreasonable “demands” (Federation of Gay Games, 2003b, p. 19) of the Federation. Again the letter focused on differing views around participant numbers and budgetary figures. But this time Team Montréal stated that the FGG represents “little more than itself, with only 21 of the 1000 teams around the world being FGG members” (Federation of Gay Games, 2003b, p. 19). They also stated that FGG board members were ‘out of touch’ with the needs of today’s LGBT communities. While the FGG wanted organisers to “get back to basics” (Mills, 2003a, p. 2), Montréal had in mind an enormous cultural event that would take place alongside the city’s pride festival (Divers/Cité Pr.de) and that would be planned closely with the national and provincial tourism commissions. The FGG, which until this point had remained very quiet about the negotiations, released an extensive response to Montréal’s claims, hoping to clear up what they saw as misinformation.

In their open letter, Team Montréal stated their intentions to end their affiliation with the FGG and host their own international gay and lesbian sport and cultural event, which would later be called the Montréal 2006 Outgames: Rendez-Vous 2006. Team Montréal established
an independent sporting organisation called the Gay and Lesbian International Sporting Association (GLISA). Like the Federation of Gay Games, GLISA was to act as a parent body to support the running of a quadrennial sporting festival, with Montréal, of course, to be the first. The Montréal Outgames were scheduled to begin on 29 July 2006 and end on 5 August 2006.

The FGG, although more willing to express regret over the fallout with Montréal, maintained the professional stance that this small hiccup would not put an end to the Games’ 21-year legacy, stating that “the Gay Games event does not belong to any one host city – it belongs to the world” (Federation of Gay Games, 2003b, p. 6). Plans were quickly underway to ensure that Gay Games VII would find itself a new, and perhaps more agreeable host organisation. The FGG invited the four original bid finalists to re-pitch their plans for the 2006 Games and both Chicago and Los Angeles came to the table. On 4 March 2004 Chicago was announced the winner of the bid and quickly began planning for Gay Games VII with only two years to get ready. These Games were scheduled for 15-22 July 2006.

Despite efforts on behalf of Team Montréal and Team Chicago to downplay the rift that had occurred and to focus their energies on putting together successful events, the initial friction between the FGG and members of Team Montréal made a significant crack in the international gay and lesbian sporting community. At the local level debates raged as to whether one event should be supported over the other. Taking place back-to-back, both events were widely praised by those who attended and while both had a great deal of financial backing from government and sponsorship deals, the Chicago Games finished with a small surplus whereas Montréal incurred a deficit greater than CN $5 million (Canada.com, 2006; Carroll, 2006; Lysen, 2006; “Outgames lost”, 2006). While the ‘details’ of the conflict between the 2006 Chicago Gay Games and the Montréal Outgames are not the central concern of this project, they will be returned to in Chapter Seven ‘This should be interesting …’. Here consideration is given to where the international gay and lesbian sporting movement is currently at and opens up some questions for the future of gay and lesbian sporting movements.

It is not the aim of this project to offer a ‘complete’ picture of the Games movement or of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. This project is more concerned with how the historical narratives ‘we all know’ about the Gay Games, the inspirational slogans that dominated Sydney 2002 promotional materials and the critical interventions made by the small amount of academic writing around the Gay Games movement speak to a central concern of the
thesis, which is the governance of both sexed/gendered subjectivities and of (global) citizenship.

Having equipped the reader with some understanding of the overall Gay Games movement and the details that tell us what they are, this introductory chapter now offers a brief explanation as to how I collected the ‘data’ used throughout this project and the theoretical frameworks used to analyse it. I also clarify how various categories of identity – gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer – are deployed throughout this research project. Following this, the chapter comes to a close by providing an overview of the structure of the thesis, developing a sense of how each of the chapters attempts to (re)imagine Sydney 2002.

Questions for a ‘queer’ research project

The arguments and ideas raised throughout the thesis have developed from close readings of photographs, media texts and promotional items from each of the seven Gay Games that have taken place to date (San Francisco ’82 – Chicago ’06). Various promotional items were also collected from the Montréal Outgames. Of course, the principal materials used throughout the thesis are relevant to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, Under New Skies ’02. Appendix E provides a complete list of items collected and analysed for this project. As the list indicates, my ‘data’ set includes a variety of print, electronic and audio-visual materials, dated from 1981-2006.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, this project uses Foucault’s analytics of governmentality to ask new questions about the Gay Games as a global queer tourist event. The analysis draws heavily on queer, feminist and poststructural writings, though I am hesitant in suggesting that any or all of these critical approaches directly establish the project’s ‘method’. As the introductory comments made in this chapter indicate, throughout the thesis theory is approached less as a fixed set of ideas and more so as a set of ‘tools’ that help one respond to the conditions of the present. The idea of theory operating as a set of tools or as a ‘toolbox’ is an important poststructural intervention for it moves away from dogmatic analyses that attempt to uncover the ‘truth’. Theory is used instead to open up or extend discourses and texts and to generate multiple ‘readings’ and/or critical responses to these. Theory does not set out to ‘uncover’, ‘prove’ or ‘establish’; instead, it functions as Foucault (1988g) describes it, viz. to “try to think something other than what one thought before” (p. 256). He elaborates:
I dreamt that the day would come when I would know in advance what I would want to say and all I would have to do would be to say it. It was a symptom of the aging process. I imagined that I had at last reached an age when all one has to do is to unroll what is in one's head. It was at the same time a kind of presumption and a way of giving up. But, for me, to work is to try to think something other than what one thought before. (Foucault, 1988g, pp. 255-56)

For Foucault, critique is not about returning to the same problem again and again from the same critical perspective or with the same tools in hand; instead, 'to work' is to imagine new ways of approaching problems. He maintains that

critique is not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumption, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest. ...Criticism is a matter of flushing out that thought and trying to change it: to show that things are not as self-evident as one believed, to see that what is accepted as self-evident will no longer be accepted as such. Practicing criticism is a matter of making facile gestures difficult. (Foucault, 1988f, pp. 154-55)

Like Foucault, Judith Butler also describes intellectual work as the process of questioning that which is taken for granted: “it means undergoing something painful and difficult: an estrangement from what is most familiar” (Butler, 2003, p. 46). Susanne Gannon and Bronwyn Davies (2006) use Butler’s notion of ‘estrangement’ to make a useful distinction between the idea of poststructural ‘methodologies’ and the usefulness of a poststructuralist perspective in providing a set of approaches or ‘tools’ that guide one’s analysis:

Though poststructuralism does not provide a clear set of practices that might be taken up and ossified as a “method,” it does provide a new set of approaches that might be made use of in analysis to prove the sort of estrangement Butler speaks of and to allow for new thought. In addition, methodologies themselves are made strange as ‘thinking technologies’ that are also, always, subject to critical scrutiny. Within a poststructural research paradigm it becomes difficult to define discrete methods for research. (Gannon & Davies, 2006, p. 98)

Gannon and Davies maintain that while poststructuralism offers a body of approaches and tools with which to make sense of the world, there is also a need to recognise the ways in which poststructuralism itself, as a diverse body of ideas, is naturalised or normalised in intellectual pursuits. Foucault himself stressed the importance of asking how particular bodies of knowledge are constituted over time and through acts of repetition become sedimented (Foucault, 1988g, 1992). Gannon and Davies insist that poststructural analyses should take on the dual task of not only placing the various cultural texts and events intellectuals ‘study’ into an estranged position, but also remaining committed to querying the tools used to undertake this task, such that poststructural theories remain flexible and changeable, responsive to the
changing conditions of the present. It is thus the aim of this project to use Foucault’s work and the work of feminist and queer scholars working in a variety of fields (cultural studies, education, English literature, geography, media studies, social science) as tools for initiating new ways of ‘thinking’ or ‘imagining’ the Gay Games.

**Defining ‘queer’ at the Gay Games**

It should be clarified from the outset how categories of sexual identity will be mobilised throughout this project. It may have been noted already that I often move between the words ‘gay and lesbian’ and ‘queer’ rather loosely. The task of teasing out how each or all these terms should be used ‘appropriately’ throughout the thesis has not been an easy one. That the Gay Games are ‘gay’ and not ‘queer’ seems to me to suggest more than an affection for alliteration. As the ‘historical’ overview indicated, organisers of Sydney 2002 maintained a very identity-based political framework around the event and continue to mobilise a liberalist political agenda (Pronger, 2000). Can one then ‘rightly’ use the term ‘queer’ when speaking about or analysing an event of this kind?

In an effort to acknowledge the importance of individuals’ self-assigned identity categories, I will use gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex, GL/LGBTI or queer when an individual, community or event self-identifies with one (or more) of these labels. While in some cases these categories carry with them exclusive or exclusionary ‘baggage’, it is not the aim of this project to comment on the value, or lack thereof, of these categories. Instead, the focus is on asking how each of these terms is produced, circulated and consumed at an event like the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. That said, in some places I do refer to subjects, objects, events or actions as ‘queer’. For example, I ask how the global queer citizen-subject is assembled and imagined at Sydney 2002. In other places I describe spaces and texts within the Games programme as queer. In doing so, I am not necessarily using ‘queer’ as a category of identity, as an adjective or to reference a specific political movement that counters liberal or liberationist political positions (Warner, 1999). Rather, queer is deployed in these cases as a way of signalling the infinite ways in which identities and sexualities are played out at the Gay Games. Queer indicates that even when a term like ‘gay’ is used to describe an event like the Games, this category does not contain the range of ways in which sexualities are being constituted. In other words, while I acknowledge that by the Gay Games being ‘gay’ and not ‘queer’ the event is located within a particular historical community politic, this does not negate the possibility that there are a multiplicity of bodies, desires, politics and practices in motion across the various spaces of the event. Queer thus characterises the movement or
energy of possibility or excess; it describes the quality of being uncontained, infinite or perpetual, rather than merely describing bodies, events or sexual practices.

I find Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s approach to queer useful to clarify this particular point. She writes: “queer is a continuing motion, movement, motive – recurrent, eddying, troublant” (Sedgwick, 1993, p. xii). Sedgwick maintains that queer is not simply a new term that can be used by more radically minded gays and lesbians. In fact, she insists that gays and lesbians can be queer. Queer operates in opposition to those structures that allow norms and truths to solidify or sediment. To this end, queer operates at times as a set of forces or actions against heteronormative structures of the everyday, whilst at other times it works to trouble the structure of ‘gay and lesbian’ spaces that seek to normalise the conditions within which one can constitute oneself as ‘gay’ or ‘lesbian’ or can claim membership of the gay and lesbian community. It is this capacity of queer to trouble normative structures that this thesis attempts to harness.

In a similar way, Jo Smith (2001) suggests that queer can be understood to be an “active process of becoming” (p. 2) rather than an existential category of identity, like ‘gay and lesbian’. For Smith, queer is a productive assemblage of forces that disrupts the idea of singular or stable categories of identity. Queer also works against the idea that one’s sexuality, race, class, geographical location and so on operate as distinct facets of one’s identity. Although the Games are an event that appeals to a rather demographically homogeneous group of participants, and while the thesis identifies the various practices that shape ‘normative’ models of sexual subjectivity, again, I also acknowledge that at any event of this scale meanings around sexualities and identities cannot be entirely captured or contained; they are constantly being (re)produced, transformed and reworked. Therefore, what constitutes normative ‘queerness’ is never constant, it changes with time and across the various spaces of the event. Finally, it should be clarified that understanding queer as a force of action or movement – ‘a doing’ (Smith, 2001) – as the thesis does, is different from understanding queer as a verb. There is a growing body of work that sets out to ‘queer’ dominant bodies of knowledge, literary or popular texts, social institutions, citizenship, pedagogy, spaces and so on. Many of these works aim to disrupt the heteronormativity of these objects/processes by offering a certain ‘queer perspective’ or reading. I worry that some scholarly efforts to ‘queer’ this or that risk slipping into suggesting that ‘queer’ (theory) carries with it a set of pre-established features or characteristics and that the ‘queering of things’ is a relatively standard practice or action. In some, but certainly not all cases of course, ‘queering’ a person, place or thing gestures towards a linear logic for it implies that
something can exist in some recognisable way as ‘unqueer’ but then be rigorously destabilised such that it becomes distinctively ‘queer’. Queer is about the possibility of transforming and disrupting heteronormativity, not a set of material outcomes or effects that can be held up and labelled ‘non-normative’ and/or ‘queer’.

Project overview

The three key research questions outlined earlier in this introduction are developed across five main chapters (Chapters Two – Six) and a short conclusion (Chapter Seven). While the six chapters develop an overall argument, it is hoped that each chapter will sustain somewhat of a life of its own.

The chapter that follows, **Chapter Two: Normative bodies and the art of governance**, overviews the key theoretical ideas that guide the work of the thesis. It begins by asking how “human beings are made subject” (Foucault, 1982, p. 208) and outlines Foucault’s three processes of objectification. It considers how discourses of sex, gender and sexuality establish the conditions within which one comes to ‘know’ oneself as a viable and intelligible human subject and asks how these discourses are technically assembled in order to uphold social order. The chapter introduces Foucault’s notion of governmentality and asks how sexuality is used to ‘conduct the conduct’ or ‘act on the actions’ of individuals and populations. The chapter concludes by reflecting on the ways in which appropriate models of sex, gender and sexuality are linked to intelligible models of citizenship.

**Chapter Three: Globalisation and the governance of global citizenship**, asks how globalisation acts as a backdrop against which normative models of citizenship are shaped and managed. Following Wendy Larner and William Walters (2002), this chapter approaches globalisation as a *dispositif* (Foucault, 1994) – a multiply-informed assemblage made up of irregular and uneven forces rather than a monolithic and linear set of changes. Globalisation is dislodged from its often stable or fixed position within both public and scholarly discourses and becomes a springboard for asking new questions about emerging patterns of governance and regulation. The chapter suggests that as global citizen-subjects we all learn to imagine ourselves and the ‘global world’ around us by drawing on a range of discourses that are rationalised through neo-liberal discourses of freedom, choice, fluidity, self-knowledge, creativity, style, cosmopolitanism and the minimisation of risk. In rethinking not only what globalisation is but also what it does, a number of important interventions are made into how ‘global’ queer events like the Sydney 2002 Gay Games are analysed and what critical tools scholars use to undertake this task.
Chapter Four: Citizenship, sexuality and ‘politics’ at the Gay Games, brings together the theoretical discussions introduced in Chapters Two and Three. The chapter uses Diane Richardson’s three categories of sexual citizenship as a way of asking ‘how’ the Gay Games are ‘political’. It argues that the Gay Games use the promise of social emancipation and discourses of rights and freedom as a way of selling their event to a particular type of Gay Games participant. Through their participation in this type of global gay and lesbian ‘political’ event, participants are invited to imagine themselves as part of a transnational, cosmopolitan community that is truly changing the world. Likewise, individuals are invited to consume their political, global and sexual identities in various contradictory ways throughout the event. The chapter emphasises the importance of factoring questions of consumption into discussions of sexual citizenship and illustrates how the global queer citizen-subject is defined and governed through various neo-liberal technologies that valorise the idea of the journey towards self-knowledge and validate certain types of ‘tasteful’ sporting participation and consumption.

Chapter Five: Images, image-worlds and the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, highlights the central role that images and various forms of technology played in constructing and governing intelligible models of global citizenship and of queer sexualities at Sydney 2002. The chapter introduces Ron Burnett’s (2004) concept of the image-world. Burnett argues that we can no longer think of images as simulations or representations of the ‘real’ world we live in. For Burnett, images are very much a part of reality: they inform almost every facet of day-to-day living. Chapter Five thus asks how Sydney 2002 might be understood as an image-world, composed of a variety of images and technologies that contributed to the planning and organising of the Games and which affected participants’ experiences at the event. Using a variety of examples, this chapter insists that images and related technologies at Sydney 2002 did more than simply represent what it means to be gay, lesbian, queer, male, female, an athlete, a local, a tourist, and so forth at the Games; in fact, they produced meanings around each of these subject positions. This chapter also establishes that the Sydney 2002 Gay Games image-world is by no means an isolated assemblage of images and technologies. The images and technologies linked to the Games are infinitely connected to other image-worlds that also produce meanings around ‘queer’ sexualities, citizenship and notions of the global.

Chapter Six: Imaging the ‘story we all know’ about the Gay Games, develops the idea of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games as an image-world by providing close readings of image-based texts and ‘moments’ from these Games. The discussion looks specifically at how the light, image and sound spectacle that was the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony produced a
particular ‘story’ about local and global queer sexualities, about national and global 
citizenship and about the Gay Games movement. It argues that participants and spectators 
were invited to imagine themselves as highly adaptable, “freedom-loving” (Rose, 1999, p. 
61), out-and-proud queer subjects with a new sets of choices around old political struggles.

Bringing the various threads of the thesis together, Chapter Seven: ‘This should be 
interesting …’ summarises the thesis’ key arguments, reflects on the challenges facing gay 
and lesbian sporting organisations and community events today and iterates the importance of 
rethinking questions of queer citizenship through the lens of Foucault’s analytics of 
governmentality.
Chapter Two
Normative bodies and the art of governance

Sexuality is not the most intractable element in power relations, but rather one of those endowed with the greatest instrumentality: useful for the greatest number of manoeuvres and capable of serving as a point of support, as a linchpin, for the most varied strategies. (Foucault, 1998, p. 103)

The citation above is taken from *The History of Sexuality, Volume I* (Foucault, 1998). It summarises one of the key points made in the text, and highlights a theoretical shift that guides the work of this thesis. Foucault dislocates sexuality from the natural, pre-given or personal such that it no longer operates as “the most intractable element”, that is, as a mysterious or incomprehensible facet of subjectivity. Sexuality is, conversely, “endowed with the greatest instrumentality”, associated with action, a productive force of doing. It is located within a broader field of techniques that order and manage individuals and/or populations. Sexuality’s capacity to ‘manoeuvre’ suggests its capacity for power as a concept in and of itself, whilst its role as a ‘support’ or ‘linchpin’ points to the ways in which it is often coupled with other dominant governing strategies. In the same volume Foucault unsettles the idea that at the turn of the eighteenth century explicit reference to sex became repressed, silenced or taboo. He insists that rather than being silenced or hidden away, sex became identified as a tool or mechanism of regulation and management. As such, reference to ‘the sexual’ was not repressed or reduced but rather it became a social and political obsession; talked about, thought about and written about more often than ever before. In order to be an effective tool of governance, sex had to proliferate, multiply, diversify, make its way into the minutiæ of day-to-day living. The force engendered in Foucault’s description of sexuality resonates with his analytics of governmentality, that is to say, with his insistence that state power operates less as a uniform or unidirectional force and more so through a diffuse set of technologies that govern the conduct and/or actions of individuals and populations (Foucault, 1991a).

This thesis on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games emerges at the intersection of Foucault’s conceptualisation of sex as a network of disparate and unstable effects and his work focused on questions of government. As mentioned in Chapter One, an overarching aim of the thesis is to understand how normative meanings around sex, gender and global citizenship are technically installed at the level of everyday living. In different ways, Chapters Three to Six explore the shifting mechanisms that order ‘global living’ and alter the ways in which individuals constitute themselves as viable global citizens and intelligible sexual subjects. Consideration is given to the ways in which ‘being global’ and ‘acting globally’ are two of a
broad set of neo-liberal rationalities that order and manage individuals’ lives in new ‘global’ ways. As a transnational gay and lesbian sporting and community event, the Sydney 2002 Gay Games are used to illustrate how particular neo-liberal mentalities of government circulate within and across global queer community events of this kind, naming and regulating what constitutes ‘normal’ sexuality and acceptable models of citizenship. The Games offer an excellent case study of the complex and contradictory ways in which normative meanings around queer sexualities and global citizenship intersect not only with one another but also with a variety of neo-liberal discourses such as freedom, choice, mobility, risk, self-knowledge and cosmopolitanism.

This chapter introduces the various theoretical concepts from which the succeeding chapters take their shape. In particular, it focuses on Foucault’s efforts to link the proliferation of sexual technologies with the governance of (sexual) conduct. In emphasising this relationship, the chapter begins to make a case for rethinking how large-scale queer events like the Gay Games are analysed. Foucault’s line of thinking shifts the questions one asks about events of this kind; rather than focusing on what they are, consideration is given to what they do – what they produce, assume and/or curtail.

It is fair to say that Foucault’s analytics of power, governmentality and sexuality (and the various ways in which these have been taken up by innumerable other scholars) are the primary ‘tools’ guiding the work of the thesis. The introductory comments of Chapter One referenced an interview transcript where Foucault confers with Gilles Deleuze that “a theory has to be used, it has to work. And not just for itself. ... You don’t go back to a theory, you make new ones.” (Deleuze & Foucault, 2004, p. 208). In many ways their dialogue in this interview references a certain ‘labour of love’, a commitment to critical inventiveness, a refusal to unwittingly take up pre-existing concepts without thought or concern for how they have arrived in one’s critical ‘toolbox’. In keeping with the spirit of this conversation, the thesis does not purport to be Foucauldian, that is, it in no way claims to demonstrate a mastery of Foucault’s key arguments. Instead it offers a critical reading of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games that draws on the ideas and modes of analysis developed in Foucault’s works. In other words, it makes Foucault’s theories ‘work’ and not just for the sake of demonstrating a strong command of his work. As Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (2003) point out, Foucault was wary of simple or direct applications of any theoretical perspective including his own. They maintain that what is so appealing about his approach to philosophy is that he spent a great deal of time revising, redirecting and redrafting his own work, viewing what some
might have described as the flaws, holes or inconsistencies in his arguments as opportunities to formulate new lenses through which to view the world.

The chapter is organised into four key theoretical sections. The first section focuses on how “human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 1982, p. 208), a question that Foucault himself described as one of the primary foci of his oeuvre. Here Foucault’s “three processes of objectification” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 7) – scientific classification, dividing practices and processes of subjectivization – are described, with particular attention paid to the ways in which these three overlapping dimensions establish norms or standards against which individuals come to define, order and manage their lives. Readers are provided with a clear understanding of the relationship between being objectified as a subject – defining and making sense of one’s existence – and being governed and/or governing oneself through a network of discursive technologies that order individuals’ daily conduct. This section also illustrates how each of these processes is significant to this analysis of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games that unfolds through the various chapters that follow.

The second theoretical section overviews Foucault’s understanding of the diffuse operations of power and provides a working definition of his notion of government. Like power, government for Foucault is best understood as a diverse set of practices in which individuals partake of in order to ‘conduct the conduct’ of others and of their own lives. By exploring what he himself termed an analytics of governmentality (Foucault, 1991a), this section argues that it is possible to trace particular systems of governmental order that are bound by a body of ideas about how to govern and a vast array of tactics through which these ideas can be practiced. Foucault describes these systems of government as ‘arts of government’ for they entail more than laws and regulations that maintain peace and civility, but also an entire network of ideas and practices that pertain to the questions of how to govern, who should govern, who should be governed and so on. In closing this second section, the discussion turns to neo-liberalism as an example of a contemporary ‘art of government’. Here a working definition of neo-liberalism is offered with some discussion on how it works to manage the actions and conducts of individuals and populations.

The third section of the chapter asks how one assembles oneself as a sexual subject by mobilising the various normative modalities that govern sex, gender and sexuality. Here Foucault’s writings from *The History of Sexuality* are used to reinforce the idea that an individual’s sexuality is not defined and regulated solely by the state. He insists that individuals mobilise a range of technologies with which they manage their own sexual desires and practices.
The ideas introduced in the first three sections are developed in the fourth and final theoretical section of this chapter. Here the works of Judith Butler (1993, 1999, 2004c, 2004d) are introduced. Although they do so in quite different ways, both Foucault and Butler use the body as a discursive palimpsest of sorts that helps make sense of the ways in which the contemporary sexual apparatus functions. Butler’s work illustrates how failing to comply with certain sex/gender norms (inscribed through a set of oversimplified binaries) and/or failing to have an appropriately sexed/gendered body means falling outside that which constitutes acceptable ‘humanness’ (Butler, 2004d). Here her discussion of governmentality and intelligibility illustrates the ways in which normative constructions of western citizenship are rationalised and governed today. It also unsettles the tidy relationships between sovereign power, disciplinary power, governmentality and citizenship, forcing wider critical reflection on the conditions of the present. The closing remarks of this chapter return the reader to Sydney 2002: Under New Skies, such that the Games, and other global queer events of this scale, are ‘read’ as part of the broader network of sexual discourses that establish normative models of contemporary (global) subjectivities and which rely on particularly narrow meanings of citizenship.

Making subjects

In the Afterword to Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics by Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow (1982), Foucault stresses the importance of ‘the subject’ to his overall project:

I would like to say, first of all, what has been the goal of my work during the last twenty years. It has not been to analyze the phenomena of power, nor to elaborate the foundations of such an analysis. My objective, instead, has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects. (Foucault, 1982, p. 208)

Foucault suggests that one can map the various ways in which human beings are ‘made subjects’ across the scope of his work. That is to say, in each of his texts from The Archaeology of Knowledge (2002a) to the History of Sexuality (1990, 1992, 1998) one can trace, but not necessarily in a linear manner, his “attempt to develop an analytic that could make visible the vectors that shape our relation to ourselves” (Rabinow & Rose, 2003, p. 14; italics in original). Foucault himself stresses the importance of understanding how, as

---

42 I use ‘map’ here in the same spirit as Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) who remind their readers that Foucault has been described (by Deleuze) as a ‘map-maker’. To make a map is not necessarily to create mirrors or replicas of certain ontological terrains. Map-making can also describe the practice of uncovering tools or strategies with which to make sense of a terrain of ideas or problematisations.
breathing, thinking human beings, we come to constitute ourselves as certain types of subjects and how we co-opt certain “games of truth” in order to do so (Foucault, 1992, p. 6). Elsewhere he writes:

in order to analyze what is termed “the subject”...it seem[s] appropriate to look for the forms and modalities of the relation to self by which the individual constitutes and recognizes himself qua subject. (Foucault, 1992, p. 6)

Specifically, Foucault describes the “objectification of the subject” (Rabinow, 1984, p. 7) in terms of three interconnected or overlapping movements: objectification through systems of scientific classification, objectification through dividing practices and objectification through processes of subjectivization (Foucault, 1992). It is worth exploring each of these in greater detail as a way of clarifying that in ‘making oneself subject’ individuals co-opt a variety of technologies of self-management and self-regulation such that they become intelligible, ‘normal’ subjects. In the case of Sydney 2002, participants assembled who they were by drawing on a number of rationalities that determine what constitutes normative ‘queerness’ and that inform how to be a normal athlete, cultural participant, tourist, activist and so on.

**Scientific classification**

Foucault considers the ways in which the establishment of knowledge disciplines (savoirs) is linked to the formation of the “thinking, labouring, living subject as an object of knowledge” (Rabinow & Rose, 2003, p. 15). In other words, he asks how certain bodies of (scientific) knowledge gain the authority to determine what are or are not ‘natural’, ‘normal’ or ‘acceptable’ models of humanness. Science was and continues to be afforded the capacity to produce or discover ‘the truth’ about human subjects and the world human beings live in, providing ‘proof’ or ‘evidence’ concerning the mysteries of ‘human nature’. What constitutes the normal or proper subject position is in large part defined and rationalised through the order and linearity of the hard sciences. Scientific rigour is managed by the creation of various disciplinary regimes: the development of specialised meta-languages, the taxonomic and diagrammatic schema that order particular disciplines and the “coherence and demonstrativity” (Foucault, 2002a, p. 197) written into empirical/scientific models. In combination, these processes and practices are thought to minimise, if not eliminate, ‘error’ and provide access to various truths about the natural and/or physical worlds. Scientific ‘truths’ are then used to establish standards and norms that order day-to-day living. Once given science’s stamp of (dis)approval, the subject and the subject’s body (or object, space or
process for that matter) are classified with reference to quantifiable norms and also in relation to other bodies and lives.

A significant part of Foucault’s project is understanding how norms are enacted at the level of the ‘flesh’ and how the body becomes a site upon which categories such as ‘normal’, ‘abnormal’, ‘medical anomaly’, ‘subject-at-risk’ or ‘subject in need of professional assessment’ are inscribed and used to regulate individuals’ conduct or actions. He argues that the need to control and manage the body is reflected in the establishment of a wide range of sciences focused specifically on ‘the body’, including physiology, cell biology, genetics and anatomy (Foucault, 1980a). Foucault maintains that the truth-making mechanism of scientific discourse extends to other bodies of knowledge such as philosophy, anthropology, geography and so on. Scientific knowledge gains (and retains) its authority and status through a vast array of discursive networks and institutional practices. Likewise, institutions are legitimated by scientific findings, statistics, theories and the like. Truths about what it means to be normal or abnormal are established through a disparate array of practices, many of which have been born out of science (e.g. the asylum born in large part out of medical and psychiatric knowledge), while others simply rely on scientific information to justify their own purpose and to reinforce their authority (e.g. drug policies which rely on demography and medical research to justify managerial strategies for reform). Foucault does not subscribe to the idea that knowledge disciplines possess or produce power and then strategically impose it. He is more concerned with the ways in which power relations allow certain discursive fields, in this case various sciences, to be established and then gain social currency or authority (see discussion of biopower later in this chapter).

Foucault’s claim that scientific classification informs how individuals are made subject is important to this project on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games in a number of ways. Throughout the project reference is made to the ways in which ‘non-normative’ sexual/gendered subjectivities and/or contemporary definitions of citizenship are governed by and through various bodies of knowledge, be they linguistic, economic, scientific or social-scientific. In drawing attention to the ways certain bodies of knowledge discursively name and regulate sexed/gendered subjects, the thesis follows Foucault in reconstituting knowledge fields as sites that power moves through and across, and thus as sites of contestation (Halperin, 1995). Foucault (1982) suggests that through the sciences of grammar, linguistics and philology the speaking subject is ‘made’, through studies of economics the productive subject is defined and through the various networks of scientific knowledge the sexual subject is assembled. In a similar vein, examples in the succeeding chapters illustrate how disciplines as varied as
biology, anthropology, the social sciences, economics, feminist studies, gay and lesbian and queer studies generate particular frameworks (even in those disciplines that set out to critique fixed and stable categories such as poststructural, postmodern, feminist or queer theories) that subjects draw upon (and resist) in making sense of who they are as sexual subjects and/or as citizens.

Chapter Three, for instance, focuses on the ways in which globalisation studies constitute the global citizen in particular ways, and Chapter Four considers the ways in which discourses of rights and citizenship, including the field of inquiry now referred to as queer or sexual citizenship studies, establish a set of frameworks that set out in advance who the contemporary sexual subject is or is not. Chapters Four and Six point out that sexual subjectivities are not only constituted throughout the heteronormative mechanisms of certain bodies of knowledge and/or institutional orderings. What it means to be a normative gay and lesbian or queer subject is also constituted through the various strategies and frameworks used to counter heteronormative discourses at events like the Games. In other words, gay and lesbian ‘political’ initiatives such as identity-based rights projects or community events establish practices and structures of inclusion and/or exclusion and risk establishing their own sets of ‘truths’ around sexuality and gender. Likewise, gay and lesbian studies, feminist theory and queer theory risk perpetuating a number of truths around who the sexual subject is or is not.

Following Foucault, the thesis maintains that if one wants to understand how queer individuals or queer communities/collectives come to identify themselves in particular ways, consideration must be given to the ways in which various (and varied) bodies of knowledge and the “truth games” (Foucault, 1992) at play within them influence the construction of ‘selves’. Likewise, consideration must be given to the ways in which experts emerge from within certain bodies of (scientific) knowledge and are then authorised to define and manage the bodies and lives of (queer) citizens.

**Dividing practices**

Foucault’s second mode of objectifying the subject is objectification through dividing practices. Social apparatuses and dominant discourses work to create distinctions and divisions between acceptable and unacceptable models of subjectivity. Critical readings of dividing practices can be traced throughout Foucault’s work, but they are most explicit in his work in *Discipline and Punish* (1995), *Madness and Civilization* (2001) and *Birth of the Clinic* (2003b). For instance, in *Discipline and Punish* (1995) Foucault compares the spatial
partitioning of plague victims to the internment of lepers throughout the nineteenth century. This example illustrates that dividing practices have both ideological and material outcomes. Divisions proliferate at the level of social policy, government legislation and within the social imagination, and they are also materialised through literal separations of peoples or of populations. Dividing practices order groups of people and establish patterns of recognition, ways in which subjects come to identify themselves against who or what they are not. Subjects are thus invested in a range of practices of self-management or self-care that reinforce their appropriate ‘place’. Where the plague was concerned, individuals or groups of individuals were fixed into distinct spaces (or places) for the purposes of maintaining order and restricting the spread of the disease; Foucault (1995) describes these as follows:

strict divisions; not transgressed, but the penetration of regulation into even the smallest details of everyday life through the mediation of the complete hierarchy that assured the capillary function of power; not masks that were put on and taken off, but the assignment to each individual of his ‘true’ name, his ‘true’ place, his ‘true’ body, his ‘true’ disease. (p. 198)

The divisions of people and the management of contagions enlisted a set of truths around who certain subjects were, what their bodies represented (i.e. contagions, illness, impurities) and where, spatially, they belonged. Foucault stresses here that the segmentations established around plague victims were not simply a matter of separating those who had the plague from those who did not, but instead they were about the establishment of discipline and order at the level of the individual bodies. While lepers were simply cast away, that is, divided off from the rest of the population, plague victims were scrutinised, analysed and managed through the establishment of mandatory practices of self-management (again around their bodies, their living quarters and the city space), a form of management that equated with self-division. In their close reading of Foucault’s analysis of the quarantined city, Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) explain that the divisions established during the plague were technical, ordering and managing the population through micro-practices of order and routine. They maintain that this example attests to the fact that power is not held, nor is it exercised over a subjugated population in any simple way. Instead, power operates through devices or mechanisms that are widely dispersed, and often difficult to identify. In his other works, Foucault illustrates how the prison (1995), the clinic/hospital (2003b) and the asylum (2001) were established in the name of dividing ‘normal’ and functional bodies (described as good, healthy, sane) from those that were abnormal or abject (described as bad, ill, insane). For Foucault these practices of division are central to the ‘making’ of subjects and to the establishment of routines and rules of discipline and regulation.
There are innumerable contemporary examples of (global) dividing practices that govern the conduct of individuals and/or populations: the detention of asylum seekers and so-called war criminals; the increasingly privatised, market-driven educational systems around the world that demarcate good or bad education along the lines of class and race; or government legislation that limits the rights and freedoms of some citizens as a means of enforcing certain moral or ideological hegemonies. Mary Louise Rasmussen (2004, 2006) asks how sexual subjectivities are defined through the dividing practices instituted in secondary school settings. She illustrates how divisions, segregations and the logic of binaries underscore school policies and classroom practices around sex, gender and sexuality. She maintains that these institutional divisions are integral to understanding how young people constitute their (sexual) identities, and how they come to impart practices of self-division in their lives outside the classroom or schoolyard.

Rasmussen also troubles the idea that schools or classrooms can be defined as ‘safe spaces’ that protect sexual minorities from homophobia or other forms of social violence. She insists that very often ‘safe space’ policies and practices adhere to essentialised notions of sexual identity, and thus enforce their own dividing practices. In a similar way, Chapters Four and Six of this thesis trouble the idea of a ‘safe’ or ‘inclusive’ queer community space, asking how ideas of safety, inclusivity and security are used at large queer events like the Gay Games to sell the event as ‘alternative’, ‘political’ and/or transformative. These discussions point to the ways in which safe spaces or spaces of ‘total inclusion’ (as was the mantra of the Games) establish their own practices of division that deem some queer bodies acceptable while leaving others excluded and/or alienated. The divisive and exclusionary practices of queer spaces are read as complex operations of power that are underscored by racist and elitist models of global cosmopolitanism.

**Processes of subjectivization**

The third mode of objectifying the subject is through the processes of subjectivization. This facet of subject-making helps to introduce the relationship that Foucault establishes between knowledge, truth and power, and is useful in grasping how his understanding of the subject deviates from that of his predecessors. Foucault stresses the active role of the individual in the processes linked to becoming a subject. His concern for the way “human beings are made subject” is less a question of how various external forces assemble the subject, and more a question of “the way a human being turns him- or herself into a subject” (Foucault, 1982, p. 208). As will be discussed later in this chapter, Foucault approaches power as a set of forces
that are never entirely repressive. Power does not originate in particular bodies or structures, nor does it take on particular forms (such as the state-form). Instead, power is best understood as an operation or series of effects. Rather than acting ‘on’ subjects, power acts through lines of force that move between various apparatuses and discursive techniques (Deleuze, 1988). As such, it cannot be traced back to a source or linked directly to a single cause; instead, power is kinetic, in motion. What this implies is that subjectivities are never formed solely by exterior or imposing forces of power, but are, instead, made through the tactics of state and institutional bodies along with the strategies that individuals themselves employ to manage and make sense of the world around them. Foucault stresses that,

What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. (Foucault, 1980c)

In other words, individuals take an active and even pleasurable role in constructing their lives, rather than passively being assembled by outside influences.

Foucault’s processes of subjectification and his understanding of power have been particularly important in understanding how individuals shape their identities. While some critics reduce Foucault’s thinking (particularly that which stems from his early works) by arguing that what he is doing is simply calling attention to the constructedness of power operations, what he is actually interested in is analysing “the games of truth” (Foucault, 1992, p. 6) that come to constitute ‘real experiences’ and shape ‘real identities’ (Rabinow & Rose, 2003). He asks how subjects come to know who they are and how to govern their conduct and actions such that they are able to uphold or maintain certain subject positions. He clarifies why the subject is central to his analytics:

To sum up, the main objective of these struggles is to attack not so much ‘such and such’ an institution of power, or group, or elite, or class, but rather a technique, a form of power. This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individual subjects. There are two meanings of the word subject: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to. (Foucault, 1982, p. 22; italics in original)

This shift in focus alters the questions asked about global queer community events like the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. Rather than asking how the shifts in queer community politics around the world have changed who queers are, as some scholars tend to do (see, for instance,
Altman, 2001a, 2001b), consideration is given to how these changes bring with them a variety of new rationalities that order the Games as an event at which individuals come to know themselves as queer individuals, international travellers, athletes and so on. Foucault’s approach to power and his understanding of the subject as an active, empowered agent move the analysis of Sydney 2002 away from the idea that sexual minorities are dominated and regulated by new political practices such as globalisation and/or the global economy in simple or absolute ways. His line of thinking opens up a space from which to ask: First, what rationalities or technologies are in place such that an event like the Gay Games ‘makes sense’, that is, such that it is ordered by various norms and truths that set out in advance what one can experience as an athlete, cultural festival participant, conference-goer or community member? And second, how do participants negotiate these various truths and norms and what practices of self-management do they take up in order to constitute themselves as intelligible subjects at this ‘gay and lesbian’ community event?

In combination, Foucault’s three processes of objectification – scientific classification, practices of division and subjectivization – speak to the ways in which individuals come to know themselves as subjects. He speculates:

What are the games of truth by which man proposes to think his own nature when he perceives himself to be mad; when he considers himself to be ill, when he conceives of himself as a living, speaking, labouring being; when he judges and punishes himself as a criminal? What were the games of truth by which human beings came to see themselves as desiring individuals? (Foucault, 1992, pp. 6-7)

It is important to point out that Foucault does not suggest that one makes oneself into a human subject and that subjectivity is then firmly established or set in stone; the processes of ‘making oneself subject’ are ongoing and irregular. In the section that follows, Foucault’s notion of power is outlined in greater detail. Consideration is also given to his theory of governance. For Foucault, government is not limited to the juridical structures that order conduct and establish civil norms, it is also about the various ways individuals’ lives are ordered through everyday practices of management that regulate behaviour without force. As such, questions of government are at the heart of studies of subjectivity for they offer a way of asking: how are the parameters of who the subject is or who the subject can become established by the governing structures that order day-to-day living? How do individual subjects learn to regulate and manage, that is, to govern, their own conduct such that they can become (or avoid becoming) certain types of subjects?
Power and the 'art of governance'

This discussion now turns to the relationship between power and governance. Although Foucault’s approach to power has already been touched on, it is worth elaborating on how he describes, broadly speaking, the relationship(s) between power, the operations of bodies of knowledge and the repetitive and normalising function of truths. Likewise, although the previous section suggested that ‘one becomes a subject’ by mobilising various strategies for ordering and/or managing one’s conduct or actions, this section offers a more detailed overview of Foucault’s analytics of governmentality and his concern for specific ‘arts of government’.

**Power**

Miguel Morey (1992) suggests that, according to the Foucauldian power/knowledge dynamic, “knowledge [savoir] tells us what ‘everyone’ thinks, whilst power invites us to put this into practice” (p. 120). Morey insists that, for Foucault, power is associated with movement and motion, with putting things ‘into practice’; it is understood to act, to produce bodies or systems of knowledge which are, in turn, systematised by sets of truths – facts, theories, theorems, findings and empirical evidence. Power relations produce the real and the real is grounded in networks of norms and truths (Morey, 1992). Again, Foucault does not suggest that bodies of knowledge or particular institutions ‘possess’ power because of their widely acclaimed status as truth-making apparatuses. He maintains that knowledge and knowledge structures are formulated and upheld because of certain power effects (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982). Foucault’s power is not elemental or terminal, it does not originate from somewhere or with someone. Deleuze (1988), speaking about Foucault’s notion of power, clarifies this point:

[power] is less a property than a strategy, and its effects cannot be attributed to an appropriation ‘but to dispositions, manoeuvres, tactics, techniques, functionings’; ‘it is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the “privilege”, acquired and preserved, of the dominant class, but the overall effect of its strategic positions’. (p. 25)

For Foucault, power is not a singular force or structure that reigns or governs over a population; instead, it is defined only through “the points through which it passes” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 25), through the various techniques and technologies that seek to name, order and regulate individuals, populations and spaces in any number of ways (Foucault, 1989a). It is a disparate assemblage of coordinated political effects that order and normalise human beings’ lived experiences (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982).
Of course, Foucault’s approach to power has been widely criticised for failing to account for the agency of the subject (Rabinow & Rose, 2003). If power is diffuse and it is internal to knowledge apparatuses, then how can subjects ever disrupt or overturn power? Likewise, if power is a network of relationships that cannot be traced back to a source or cause, how can one formulate an effective and progressive politics of opposition or transformation? Foucault addresses these concerns indirectly in his descriptions of resistance. He maintains that “to say that one can never be ‘outside’ power does not mean that one is trapped or condemned to defeat no matter what” (Foucault, 1980g, p. 141-2). Since power for Foucault is not a singular, domineering force that exercises power over a weak or inferior object or subject, resistance is likewise multiple, appropriately described as “a centrifugal movement, an inverse energy, a discharge” (Foucault, 1980g, p. 138). In other words, resistance is not necessarily traced through counter forces that act against or in direct opposition to an almighty force of power.

In *Saint Foucault: Towards a gay hagiography*, David Halperin (1995) reminds his readers that, for Foucault power is “positive and productive. It produces possibilities of action, of choice – and, ultimately, it produces the conditions for the exercise of freedom” (p. 17). Resistance, like power, can operate as positive and pleasurable forces of doing. It does not operate outside power, but is internal to power relations. Halperin insists that an effective oppositional politic is therefore one focused on *resistance* rather than liberation. A politics of *resistance* calls attention to the taken-for-granted truths that structure day-to-day living rather than searching endlessly for a way to overturn them. This shift, although subtle, is an important one for this study on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. The succeeding chapters emphasise the complex ways in which power relations act within and around an event of this kind that is at once a social, cultural, political and athletic event. Rather than analysing the Games with the aim of moving outside or beyond the (hetero)normative structures that surround an event like the Gay Games, this project seeks to identify and then unsettle these normative mechanisms that name and regulate the event itself and that limit the range of ways in which subjects can constitute themselves as sexual subjects and/or as global citizens.

**Governmentality**

Foucault’s understanding of power and his concern for how individuals constitute themselves as subjects are closely linked to his analytics of governmentality. Colin Gordon explains (1991), that in Foucault’s various lectures and essays concerning questions of government he was less concerned with authoritative state structures that normalise or ‘govern’ the practices
of everyday living and more concerned with the ways in which these structures “whisper in our ears and advise us how to act and who to be” (Rabinow & Rose, 2003, p. 5). In other words, Foucault traced the uneven operations of power relations that ‘conduct the conduct’ of individuals and normalise the practices of everyday living rather than seeking out an origin or source of the order and/or control. Nikolas Rose (1999) suggests that, unlike other critical approaches, studies of governmentality

... seek to interrogate the problems and problematizations through which ‘being’ has been shaped in a thinkable and manageable form, the sites and locales where these problems formed and the authorities responsible for enunciating upon them, the techniques and devices invented, the modes of authority and subjectification engendered, and the telos of these ambitions and strategies. (p. 22)

Foucault is concerned with the ‘art of government’, that is, with tracing the diffuse mentalities of governmental order with which individuals order and manage their own actions and those of others. He identifies what Colin Gordon refers to as particular “systems of thinking about the nature of the practice of government (who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed)” (Gordon, 1991, p. 3) and argues that a functional art of government is one “capable of making some form of that activity thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and to those upon whom it was practised” (Gordon, 1991, p. 3). In other words, for Foucault, an ‘art of government’ is one that not only functions logically for those administering order, but also for those upon whom practices of order are being enacted.

Foucault’s essay entitled ‘Governmentality’ (Foucault, 1991a), which was part of his 1978-1979 lectures at the Collège de France, is arguably the most oft-referenced of his writings on the topic of government. In this particular essay Foucault considers how, in the sixteenth century, questions of government translated into discussions around the ‘art of government’ - “how to govern oneself, how to be governed, how to govern others, by whom the people will accept being governed, how to become the best possible governor” (Foucault, 1991a, p. 87). To make sense of this emerging concern with how to govern, he offers a close analysis of Machiavelli’s The Prince. This text, widely debated from the sixteenth through to the eighteenth century, outlines a rationality for how it is that a prince remains in control of his populace despite the fragile and “synthetic” nature of the “connection between the prince and

43 Foucault explains that questions concerning ‘how’ to govern emerged alongside two independent, but equally influential processes. The first was the “shattering of structures of feudalism” (Foucault, 1991a, p. 87) and thus the emergence of various colonial states, and the second was the Reformation and Counter-reformation which gave rise to questions of how individuals should be spiritually guided or ‘ruled’ such that they could “achieve eternal salvation” (Foucault, 1991a, p. 88). So the sixteenth century was marked by what Foucault describes as a ‘double movement’. The state was becoming more centralised while at the same time religious ‘rules’ became more widely dispersed. At the apex of these two overlapping trends, questions of how to govern proliferated.
his principality” (Foucault, 1991a, p. 90). A prince’s status as a figure of rule and order was traditionally secured through circumstance such as invasion, colonisation or inheritance. Machiavelli surmises that without the ‘natural’ obtainment of authority a prince must somehow win the esteem of his constituents. As such, he focuses on not what decisions or actions are best for the territory he rules or the people within it, but rather what decisions are the best in terms of retaining his relationship of power with/over his principality. The prince thus focuses on keeping his territory rather than governing it in a manner that reflects the needs of the population. Foucault (1991a) writes:

The objective of the exercise of power is to reinforce, strengthen and protect the principality, but with this last understood to mean not the objective ensemble of its subjects and the territory, but rather the Prince’s relation with what he owns, with the territory he has inherited or acquired, and with his subjects. (p. 90)

Foucault explains that a great number of counter-attacks were waged against Machiavelli’s influential text. He uses some of these criticisms to illustrate how resistance to The Prince led to the emergence of a group of ideas that, broadly speaking, described an ‘art of government’. Foucault explains that these anti- or post-Machiavellian texts brought a number of important ideas around government to the fore. Foremost, these texts made a case for the diffuse operations of government. Many argued that sovereign rule is just one mode or form of government. Governance is not solely about the actions or rules imposed by a sovereign or state figure on his or her constituents. Government, these texts insisted, can be understood as a set of practices which are “multifarious and concern many kinds of people: the head of the family, the superior of a convent, the teacher or tutor of the child or pupil” (Foucault, 1991a, p. 91). In other words, the prince’s actions concerning the people in his territory thus become one of a variety of forms of government at work. In addition, these texts emphasised the ways in which individuals, communities or certain populations govern their own lives and the lives of others at the level of everyday living. These shifts are significant for they account for the type of power relations Foucault describes elsewhere and which have been outlined in this chapter. Foucault (1991a) explains that in governing territory alone, sovereign power is circular – “the end of sovereignty is the exercise of sovereignty” (p. 95), and that is that. Achieving the common good means simply achieving sovereign rule. For the constituents, a sovereign governmental order requires that they follow laws and submit to forces of domination. In contrast, an ‘art of government’ governs to arrive at “a convenient end” (p. 93). As such, rather than imposing laws that cater for the ‘common good’, governing ‘things’ entails a wide range of tactics arranged in a manner that achieves the intended end, whatever that might be. In addition to this, an ‘art of government’ requires that the intended end be met
without violence but with patience and wisdom, imparting on the ‘people’ the knowledge needed to get to the desired result. Power and government operate in the exchanges that take place within various facets of our daily lives, including the ways in which we order and manage our own bodies and lives. An ‘art of government’ thus encompasses the disparate array of mechanisms that will ensure the order and control of individuals and/or certain populations. Foucault explains that an ‘art of government’ details “the right disposition of things, arranged so as to lead to a convenient end” (p. 93). It does not simply establish reasons for state policy of action, it focuses more broadly on how governing structures order day-to-day living:

men and things….men in their relations, their links, their imbrication with those other things which are wealth, resources, means of subsistence, the territory with its specific qualities, climate irrigation, fertility, etc.; men in their relation to that other kind of things customs, habits, ways of acting and thinking, etc.; lastly, men in their relation to that other kind of things, accidents and misfortunes such as famine, epidemics, death, etc. (Foucault, 1991a, p. 93)

Gordon explains that in his 1979 lecture series Foucault provided a rough genealogy of various ‘arts of government’. These included: the theme of the ‘nature of government’ (exemplified in Machiavelli’s text) and the notion of ‘pastoral power’ in antiquity and early Christianity; the idea of ‘reason of state’ and the ‘police state’, both common in early modern Europe; the birth of liberalism in the eighteenth-century; and, finally, neo-liberal thought which took its form in post-war Germany, France and the United States (Gordon, 1991). It is the fourth and final rationality of Foucault’s typology of government that has been extensively taken up in post-Foucauldian responses to modern government.

**Neo-liberalism**

Although in no way a unitary governmental strategy, neo-liberalism, roughly speaking, refers to “new forms of political-economic governance premised on the extension of market relationships” (Larner, 2000, p. 3). It is a mode of government that emphasises the value of an ‘open market’ where all existing constraints on market activity are lifted (Cheshire & Lawrence, 2005). It is also characterised by the government’s disengagement with social welfare programs set up to assist the poor and otherwise socially disenfranchised. Neo-liberal mentalities of ‘rule’ purport to provide a level playing field for ‘all citizens’ and are said to diminish existing inequalities based on class, race, gender, geographical location and so on.

---

44 Foucault (1991a) actually credits Guillaume de La Perrière for this particular quotation and thus for this line of thinking.
Neo-liberalism champions the free and autonomous individual who is in control of her or his own destiny. Economic and social well-being is no longer the responsibility of the state government but that of the individual citizen. Governmental authorities adopt a 'hands-off' approach in the belief that a more effective state is one in which power is decentralised, where order is not the sole responsibility of the state, but rather the mandate of every individual, family or community.

Nikolas Rose (1999) explains that this move towards 'less government' arose after World War II from a fear that existing socialist and/or social welfare states were not representative of the population's needs. Citizens' freedom was under threat from corrupt political parties who were thought to be working in their own best interest rather than that of the people. Liberalism offered a break from these regimes as it purported to stand for the right and freedom of individuals to order their own lives and make their own choices around lifestyle and consumption. The freedom and functionality of the market is the driving force of neo-liberal governmental thought and therefore a series of "institutional and legal forms had to be assembled to free the market" (Rose, 1999, p. 138, italics added) from the monopolising and protectionist rationalities of early governmental forms. Individuals and families were afforded the freedom to shape and manage their own economic and social destinies. With this shift in responsibility, personal enterprise, self-advancement, competition and entrepreneurship became the dominant discourses underwriting government policies and practice (Cheshire & Lawrence, 2005; Gordon, 1991; Larner, 2000; Rose, 1999). Rose explains that an economic imperative underscored the shift in responsibility from the state to 'the people'. Social welfare policies had emptied the pockets and exhausted the person-power of the government and its support infrastructure. By privatising many of these services, the government could retreat to acting as a body that ensures law and order, and the individual citizens could be held responsible for ensuring their personal and 'social' well-being. State structures with a strong social welfare infrastructure were deemed ineffective, inefficient and even controlling. These government structures were accused of disadvantaging those who were 'responsible' for they had to bear the burden of those who were less willing to take responsibility for themselves. Neo-liberalism, in contrast, gave control, freedom and choice back to the people in the name of being 'truly egalitarian' and 'truly democratic'.

In different ways, Chapters Three through Six in this thesis explore the impact of neo-liberal governmental order on normative models of citizenship and on gay and lesbian communities in the western world. However, it must be stated that as an 'art of government' neo-liberalism is not understood to be a singular, all-encompassing force that has uniformly
been imposed on nation-states and their populations. Like any ‘art of government’ that Foucault described, neo-liberalism ‘acts’ in contradictory and irregular ways. The aim herein is not to simply ‘blame’ neo-liberalism for the social or economic breakdown of ‘effective’ gay and lesbian community politics or events. This project simply sets out to identify how neo-liberalism brings with it new modes of personal and collective governance and ask how individuals are invited to constitute themselves as certain types of sexual subjects and citizens within these particular governmental rationalities.

Foucault’s notion of governmentality and his attempts at outlining the operations of neo-liberal governmental forms have been applied in a variety of ways to research within cultural studies (Bennett, 2003; Dimitriadis & McCarthy, 2003; Hay, 2003; King, L., 2003; King, S.J., 2003; McKay, Lawrence, Miller & Rowe, 2001; Miklaucic, 2003; Miller, 1998b; Packer, 2003a, 2003b). There are, however, very few attempts to bring together Foucault’s concern about questions of government with studies of queer sexualities. 45 Although questions of government are not widely taken up in studies of sexuality, Gordon (1991) insists that Foucault’s attempt to sketch the various historical rationalities of government, began in his work in the first volume of The History of Sexuality (Foucault, 1998). It is here, Gordon insists, that Foucault begins to seriously think through the complex power relations attached to being a living human subject. In other words, Foucault’s concern for the ways in which governmental structures order sexual ‘conduct’ made an important critical addition to his work concerning how individuals come to constitute themselves as thinking, breathing, ‘human’ subjects. The next section of this chapter begins to tease out the complex ways in which sexuality can be read as a tool or technique of government.

**Sexuality as governmentality**

By demonstrating the various means through which discourses of sex are produced, Foucault teases out the ways in which power itself morphs, shifts and transforms. Again, Foucault’s focus is less on naming structures and institutions that enact power over subjects and more on the establishment of practices that define, regulate and order individual bodies and lives. One’s sexual embodiment, desires and practices are central to how one’s body is named and regulated. In much of Foucault’s work, but particularly in the three volumes of The History of

---

45 This statement should be qualified. There are a number of feminist scholars concerned with questions of government and, more specifically, with the rationalities of neo-liberalism. For instance, later in this chapter, the work of Lisa King (2003) will be referenced. While King’s focus is on ‘gender’, she stresses that one cannot separate gender from sex or sexuality in any simple way. There are a number of other feminist scholars who critique neo-liberalism (see for instance, Brodie, 1996; Duggan, 2003; Marshall, 1994; O’Connor, Orloff & Shaver, 1999; Probyn, 1997).
Sexuality (1990, 1992, 1998), he demonstrates the ways in which the sexual desires and practices of individuals and certain groups of citizens are scrutinised, surveilled and regulated in order to secure broader social control. Again, a recurring point in these three volumes is that sexual bodies are ordered and managed at the level of the state, through state institutions, but most significantly through the various ways individuals learn to self-regulate, what he calls “techniques of the self” (Foucault, 1988, 1998, 2005), in order to register as intelligible human subjects. These techniques or technologies of self-regulation become the means through which the state upholds order and control over its citizens. Once again, Foucault emphasises that order is secured less through exterior forces and more so through a diffuse network of forces that operate at the level of the individual’s everyday life. In other words, individuals secure their freedom from sovereign rule by ensuring they keep themselves and their family or community in order.

In The Will to Knowledge (Volume I) Foucault traces the way in which sex became a key site for controlling and disciplining populations for the benefit and maintenance of state order and control. He notes that a key shift took place at the end of the eighteenth century that saw the “technologies of sex” shift from being matters of the Christian Church to being issues of importance to the state. He dispels the myth that sexuality became repressed through the establishment of strict social taboos. He maintains that while there was a shift in the emphasis placed on the morality of sexual practices, this shift was one marked by a movement towards the control of sex, knowing everything there was to know about citizens’ sexual habits and desires and ensuring they took close inventory of these themselves. Control was not only placed around the kind of sex people were having but also on the purposes behind their sexual activities. There was a sense that the state was concerned with sex’s productivity, its output. The political economy of populations translated into a state obsession with procreation, birth rates, birth control, monogamy and so forth. Foucault (1998) comments:

It was essential that the state know what was happening with its citizens’ sex, and the use they made of it, but also that each individual be capable of controlling the use he made of it. Between the state and the individual, sex became an issue, and a public issue no less; a whole web of discourses, special knowledges, analyses and injunctions settled upon it. (p. 26)

This level of state vigilance was inextricably linked to population regulation and sex became both an “object of analysis and target of intervention” (Foucault, 1998, p. 26). Foucault notes another important shift, the movement away from governing through doctrine or law to the establishment of patterns of individual surveillance and the establishment of “sex [as] a matter that required the social body as a whole, and virtually all of its individuals, to place
themselves under surveillance” (Foucault, 1998, p. 116). Governing sexuality thus became less about rule and law and more about the distribution and movement of power between state, social apparatuses such as health/medicine and the bodies of individuals. Foucault’s project, most significantly in the third volume of the History of Sexuality: The Care of The Self (1990), analyses the processes of ‘individuation’ that have been integral to the governance of the subject as far back as ancient Greek society. Practices of (sexual) self-scrutiny, what Foucault (1990) calls “the cultivation of the self” (p. 43), were and continue to be played out in efforts to become the model citizen or normative subject.

Some sexual practices or desires were seen to threaten existing structures of order and were therefore regulated to a greater extent. Foucault illustrates how sexuality is constructed through the establishment of normative sex practices, normal desires, and through the classification of acceptable versus pathological sexual bodies. The homosexual and the masturbator (in Volume II) are just two examples that Foucault draws upon to illustrate how the establishment of ‘normal’ and acceptable subjectivities renders other bodies and other sexual practices deviant, abnormal or amoral. Some bodies are deemed normal while others are labelled abnormal or pathological and it is science and medicine which lend credence to and provide evidence for the normality or abnormality of particular bodies. Defining oneself as a sexual subject is bound to the limits of intelligibility, the parameters that dictate what we can and cannot be within the ontological scope available. Truths about the human subject are established from within an epistemological field that determines which bodies of knowledge, classifications, divisions and identities will be popular or normative. Therefore, to be an intelligible (sexual) subject or to have an intelligible body is to fit somewhere within the range of existing sex/gender norms. To fall outside the parameters of intelligibility is to be classified otherwise – as deviant, abnormal, dangerous or a social threat or burden.

**Biopower**

Rabinow and Rose (2003) draw on Foucault’s example of ‘biopower’ to illustrate the relationships between power, knowledge and the government of ‘human’ bodies and sexualities. Biopower is a singular term used to name a variety of practices that order, manage and pathologise the body. Biopower shifts the focus away from *naming* and *defining* the disparate historical and contemporary institutions concerned with the maintenance of the body – psychiatry, medicine, statistics, eugenics, and so on. Instead, biopower focuses on the

---

46 Also see Donnelly, 1992; Gordon, 1991.
ways in which each of these schools of thought is underscored by a common logic that demands order and control at the level of the individual and his or her body—how collectively these sciences *govern*. They all assign power to a host of ‘experts’ or ‘authorities’; they all govern the body through the establishment of a series of strictly defined pathologies; they all uphold the idea that one’s well-being can be directly traced to the level of self-efficacy and self-care one exercises; and they all tend to inform broader social or cultural policies that are concerned with ordering people based on their differences. For instance, most scientific disciplines played a role in the violent project of eugenics by scrutinising, labelling and ordering bodies in a series of racist and xenophobic hierarchies. The scientific ‘evidence’ of these studies continues to underscore state policies around immigration, urban planning and access to and distribution of welfare benefits (Rose, 1999).

Biopower connects the sexual and reproductive practices of the individual subject with state policy and power (Gordon, 1991). It links various social phenomena together through their shared capacities to *govern* and speaks to the ways in which sexual subjectivities are formed through the normative structures that order our day-to-day lives. One can apply this idea of biopower to a hypothetical incident, for example a female patient having a negative feeling after leaving her gynaecologist’s office. Biopower allows one to frame her negative experience against a wider network of power relations, rather than understanding it as a single or isolated event. Through questions of government (which again, are at the heart of biopower), consideration is given to the ways that this strand of medicine is imbued with particular privileges and powers that have long pathologised women’s bodies. One might also consider the ways in which women’s sexual/reproductive anatomy has been viewed as abject, impure, mysterious and dangerous within the broader scope of medical practice. One could look at the violent culture of medical experimentation that has developed around women’s bodies, especially women’s reproductive organs, in the name of science, or one could compare this particular branch of medicine to others to ask how medical science has come to hold the ‘answers’ to all matters of the body. (Braidotti, 1994; Haraway, 1990; Harding, 1986, 1991; Sawicki, 1991; Treichler, Cartwright & Penley, 1998)

This example of the governance of women’s gynaecology is an interesting one given the focus placed on the relationships between gender, sexuality and sport in this thesis. For centuries a long list of biological mythologies has been circulated to justify women’s exclusion from various sporting activities (Hargreaves, 1994).\(^{47}\) When the number of women

\(^{47}\) In fact, in some sports, such as track and field and tennis, gender-based standard differences are only beginning to change (e.g. women’s steeple chase will make its first appearance at the 2008 Olympic Games).
competing in international sporting competitions began to grow, there was concern that biological ‘men’ would try to register in women’s sporting events in order to compete (and win) in a less competitive field. It was believed that fairness in sporting competition could be achieved by screening all female competitors to weed out any ‘gender impostors’.

Mandatory gender verification of female athletes at international sporting events began in the late 1960s. Early ‘sex-tests’ took the form of pre-competition physical inspections and/or gynaecologic examinations (Dickinson, Genel, Robinowitz, Turner & Woods, 2002). In early cases, female athletes were marched into a room naked where a group of gynaecologists would inspect the women’s external genitalia to confirm they were ‘normal’ and the athlete, therefore, legitimately female. These early inspections were superseded by ‘more accurate’ pelvic examinations that involved probing the internal sex organs of the athletes (Cole, 2000).

The International Olympic Committee (IOC) instituted mandatory gender verification at the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City using the Barr-body chromosomal test (also referred to as the sex-chromatin test), a much less invasive diagnostic test that involved taking a buccal (oral) cell smear sample. In place at Olympic competitions until 1992, the Barr-body test was deemed more ‘accurate’ and ‘reliable’ in revealing the ‘truth’ about female athletes’ ‘true sex’ (Cole, 2000; Dickinson et al., 2002). However, this new sex-test posed serious problems for athletes who had been diagnosed ‘female’ by physical examinations but presented as gender variant or genetically ‘male’ with this new diagnostic technique. Medical practitioners also noted that these tests identified only some gender variations (i.e. those that showed the presence of the Y (male) autosome) whilst leaving others undetected. But more importantly, they argued, the IOC (or any other international sporting body for that matter) had no “hard proof” that being gender variant actually gave an athlete an unfair advantage. In response, the IOC replaced the Barr-body test with PCR-based techniques48 in 1992 believing, again, that they were refining the techniques with which gender was ‘verified’. Dickenson et al. (2002) suggest that the IOC’s decision in 1992 “replaced one diagnostic test with another but did not alleviate the problems” (p. 6).

48 The Barr-body test analyses the buccal cells for the presence of a ‘Barr body’, found only in cells with two X autosomes. A ‘normal’ female karyotype is 46-XX. When a Barr-body is not present an athlete is deemed not female. However, there are some athletes that live as ‘women’ and/or have classifiably ‘female’ rather than ‘male’ external genitalia yet are not ‘verified’ as acceptable female competitors. Athletes presenting 45-X (Turner’s Syndrome) or 46-XY (mixed gonadal dysgenesis or androgen sensitivity) do not have a Barr Body and therefore do not qualify as female. On the other hand, there are some athletes who have partially or fully developed penises that test female because they have the karyotype 47-XXY (Klinefelter’s) or 46-XX and thus one Barr-body. These examples challenge the idea that a two-sex/gender system can possibly organise the complex range of genotypes or bodily phenotypes that exist. The PCR test stands for Polymerase Chain Reaction. This tests for the presence of the Y chromosome. But again, this technique tests an individual’s chromosomal patterns and this does not necessarily translate his or her ‘true sex’ in a straightforward manner.
Cheryl Cole makes an important connection between the changing technologies for sex-testing in sport and the meanings attached to notions of accuracy and truth; she points out that truth about one’s sex shifted from being measured through the visual to being measured by complex tests thought to capture one’s ‘essence’ via a sample of one’s genetic makeup. She makes an important link between the refinement of scientific procedures and the new standards this scientific ‘progress’ brought to definitions of the ‘normal’ or ‘acceptable’ or ‘true’ female body. The body’s internal domain, that which can only be ‘read’ and known by experts and their ‘procedures’, became the mysterious space that housed the ‘truth’ about an individual’s sex (and therefore appropriate gender). Moreover, athletes categorised as ‘gender variant’ were labelled something ‘other’ than ‘normal’ and had to undergo immense professional and public scrutiny when such ‘truths’ were ‘uncovered’.

Chapter Four of the thesis touches on the complex relationships established between sex, gender and sport. In particular, it looks at the *Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI Gender Policy* (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board [SGGB], 2002h) and asks how this policy attempts to negotiate the slippery terrain between mainstream sport’s regulation of gender difference and the Game’s mantra of ‘inclusion for all regardless of sex, gender or sexual orientation...’ (SGGB, 2002f). The Gender Policy (see Appendix H) outlines many of the same criteria for gender verification as the IOC has in its recent ban of blanket sex-testing (1999) and its subsequent adoption of a policy (2004) that allows transgender athletes to compete at the Olympic games under certain conditions.49

As Rabinow and Rose (2003) point out, Biopower is a useful tool for understanding that governance takes place through a scattered and uneven set of power relations. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Foucault’s focus on governance is not solely concerned with the structures or policies of the state. He argues that the state’s control is upheld less through sovereign power and more through the repetition of practices that structure, order and discipline individuals and populations. While governance does take place at the level of the state, it also occurs through the various institutions that manufacture “truth-effects” (Rabinow & Rose, 2003, p. 16). Techniques of self-surveillance and self-discipline are established in such a way that the onus of state order falls on the shoulders of individuals or communities. Governance is established through heterogeneous techniques that govern the ‘conduct of one’s conduct’ or ‘the action of one’s actions’. Judith Butler (2004c) explains:

---

49 The IOC demands that ‘transathletes’ (Carlson, 2005) have undergone full surgical reassignment at least two years prior to competing and have had uninterrupted hormonal therapy since then.
the tactics characteristic of governmentality operate diffusely, to dispose and order populations, and to produce and reproduce subjects, their practices and beliefs, in relation to specific policy aims. (p. 52)

As Butler points out, tactics of governance “operate diffusely”; they are exercised at the level of our everyday practices and through the entrenchment of normative bodies of knowledge that establish, in strict terms, what it means to be ‘normal’ and to have a normal body. Butler’s work demonstrates how, more specifically, the ordering of sex and gender in strict, binary terms is inextricably linked to regulating the range of possible sexual and/or gendered subjectivities. Butler argues that social norms not only contribute to the regulatory practices that order subjects, they also produce the very subjects they govern (Butler, 1993). She draws on Foucault’s notion of productive power to illustrate how the institutionalised norms that uphold the sex/gender binary and which define, classify and manage subjects are the same norms that produce the subject who will then enter into a lifetime of regulatory practices where sex and gender are concerned (Butler, 1993, 1999). It is to the question of how binary approaches to understanding sex and gender govern the ‘making of subjects’ that the discussion now turns.

**Sex, gender and the governance of human intelligibility**

Questions of intelligibility are central to Judith Butler’s early work in *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity* (1999) and *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex”* (1993), and also to her more recent work in *Undoing Gender* (2004d) and *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (2004c). Butler’s work is important to this chapter’s discussion for it extends Foucault’s project of asking how gender, sex and sexuality are part of a wider field of mechanisms that govern individuals’ conduct and/or actions. It is also particularly salient because it focuses on important questions relating to how the body becomes a key site for the management and ordering of sex and gender norms. Rather than offer a comprehensive overview of her ideas, this discussion uses some of the central ideas in each of the four texts listed above to rethink how one might analyse an event like Sydney 2002 with a new set of critical tools.

‘Troubling’ sex/gender binaries

In *Gender Trouble* (1999) Butler unsettles the idea that gender is something individuals ‘are’ as a result of their biological sex. She argues that gender is not merely the cultural inscription
of one’s biology, but instead a term that describes the collective practices through which sex is produced and normalised as ‘natural’ within the realm of the social. In her words:

Gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which ‘sexed nature’ or ‘a natural sex’ is produced and established as ‘prediscursive’, prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts. (Butler, 1999, p. 11)

In making this leap, Butler not only redefines gender but also sex, for the one is always already the other. Gender is no longer the social outcome of ‘natural sex’, it is the productive force behind sex as we know it. Likewise, gender cannot be assumed to be a concept distinct from sex, for sex is internal to gender. In her disruption of this binary, Butler argues that there is a need to rethink the category ‘woman’ as the subject of feminist studies. She queries both the narrow definitions attached to the category ‘woman’ as the subject of feminist studies. She argues that an effective (feminist) politic is one that critiques how the subject and the subject’s identity are defined and regulated by the normative social structures of everyday living. She writes:

The question of “the subject” is crucial for politics, and for feminist politics in particular, because juridical subjects are invariably produced through certain exclusionary practices that do not “show” once the juridical structure of politics has been established. In other words, the political construction of the subject proceeds with certain legitimating and exclusionary aims, and these political operations are effectively concealed and naturalized by a political analysis that takes juridical structures as their foundation. Juridical power inevitably “produces” what it claims merely to represent; hence, politics must be concerned with this dual function of power: the juridical and the productive ... It is not enough to inquire into how women might become more fully represented in language and politics. Feminist critique ought also to understand how the category of “women”, the subject of feminism, is produced and restrained by the very structures of power through which emancipation is sought. (Butler, 1999, p. 5)

Making a case for a more effective feminist politics, Butler maintains that understanding how the category ‘woman’ is produced and governed within various juridical structures (i.e. as subjects define themselves through various social apparatuses that dictate laws, customs, social mores, etc.) is “crucial” to an effective feminist politics and/or feminist critique. She insists that identifying how women are represented by social structures is a different and less effective political project and one that focuses primarily on the “language and politics” of these configurations. This latter approach points to the ways in which juridical structures impede, exclude, objectify or misrepresent women and focus on making sure that women are counted as equal and vested citizens. In contrast, the former political stance, which asks how
the category ‘woman’ is produced and governed from within various social mechanisms, challenges the very structures feminists themselves mobilise to impart ‘change’ or ‘progress’. In adopting this focus, this political stance ‘troubles’ the category ‘woman’ itself such that it might extend outside the confines of these normative structures.

In *Gender Trouble* Butler also introduces the idea that the relationship between gender and sex is normalised and naturalised through the performative. Her theory of performativity has been significant in reshaping the debates in both feminist and queer studies over the past fifteen years (Salih, 2002). As such it has also been one of the more controversial (Butler, 2004a). Butler’s notion of the performative is inextricably linked to her argument that gender is not what one ‘is’ by default of the sex one is assigned at birth, but is instead a discursive category used to reinstate sex as natural, biological and prediscursive. To this end gender is imbued with an active quality, a capacity to ‘do’ or to ‘become’. Butler explains that gender, as a discursive and/or linguistic production, acts to bring into being the normative conditions of gender itself. In other words, one comes to know what one’s gender ‘is’ (woman or man), and know how to ‘be’ this gender (masculine or feminine), through the various socio-political and economic spaces and structures within which gender is ‘done’ again and again. She maintains that throughout an individual’s life the gender he or she knows him or herself to be is continuously being reinvented through the performative interpellations of gender itself.

Therefore, one of the central aims of *Gender Trouble* is to offer a genealogy of sorts that outlines these discursive practices of becoming gendered and to query the normative devices that facilitate and/or impede certain gendered performances over others. Concerning these norms, she explains elsewhere:

> the performance of a gender is ... compelled by norms that I do not choose. I work within the norms that constitute me. I do something with them. Those norms limit and condition at the same time. What I can do is, to a certain extent, conditioned by what is available for me to do within the culture and by what other practices are and by what practices are legitimating. (Butler, 2004a, p. 345)

Butler insists that if one is to call attention to the artificiality of the sex/gender relationship, if only momentarily, then one moves towards providing an opening for new expressions of gender to emerge, for new performances to arise. To this end she asserts that given sex and
gender are in fact repetitions of particular performances, then it is possible to ‘perform’ one’s identity in ways that disrupt the widely upheld binaries between sex and gender.\footnote{This is not to suggest that one simply wakes up and says, ‘I will perform, in a theatrical sense, my gender in a new and counter-hegemonic way’. Butler’s notion of performativity is more about the possibility of change and/or disruption, about the instability and changeability of gender and sexuality as performative constructs.}

The subtle shifts in Butler’s approach to understanding sex and gender are vital to this project’s ‘(re)imagination’ of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. Each of the succeeding chapters aims to unsettle taken-for-granted categories that organise events like the Gay Games and have come to structure certain strands of gay and lesbian community politics. In doing so, one of the key arguments guiding this project is that the promotional and media cultures surrounding Sydney 2002 did more than merely represent the Gay Games history or Sydney’s gay and lesbian community— in fact, they produced them. The promotion, organisation of space, administration, sponsorships, cultural events, sporting events, ceremonies and parties contributed to the production of meanings around what it means to be queer, a citizen, an athlete, straight, old, young, Australian, a tourist, indigenous, political, global, cosmopolitan and so on.

**Whose bodies matter?**

In *Bodies that Matter*, Butler uses Foucault’s discussion of the relationship between knowledge, power and sex to argue that sex is “a cultural norm which governs the materialization of bodies” \footnote{In her critical reader on Judith Butler, Sara Salih (2002), points out that Butler has critiqued the absence of ‘concrete bodies in complex historical situations’ in Foucault’s work. So, while throughout this section I make links between the work of Butler and Foucault, it is important to point out that in many ways their work is quite different. Salih suggests that *Bodies that Matter* was one part of Butler’s attempts to create a genealogy of bodies “that does not reduce culture to the imposition of the law upon the body”, a focus she read in Foucault’s work (Salih, 2002, p. 40). Butler draws on a number of psychoanalytical tools that Foucault himself is critical of.} (1993, p. 3). For Butler, the materiality of the body cannot be separated from the strict governance of sex and sexuality at the level of everyday living. In the introduction to this text she states:

> Sex not only functions as a norm, it is part of a regulatory practice that produces the bodies it governs, that is, whose regulatory force is made clear as a kind of productive power, the power to produce – demarcate, circulate, differentiate, the bodies it controls. (Butler, 1993, p. 1)

Like Foucault, Butler understands power as a set of active and productive forces that operate in diffuse and irregular ways. Power acts through a series of relations or effects rather than as a singular force that emanates from a singular cause. Again she argues that sex (i.e. whether
one is ‘born’ female or male) does not just regulate subjects, it produces and constructs how the subject comes to know him or herself and determines the limits of who the subject can become. She also maintains that there is no body that pre-exists the social. It is through sex/gender norms that one’s body is materialised, in other words, how it becomes living, breathing and, of course, governable matter. Similarly, it is through the same normative functions of sex and gender that some bodies register as normal, acceptable or intelligible. That is to say, they come to matter, to count, to be speakable, definable entities. Butler makes this point eloquently when she states: “Sex becomes one of the terms through which ‘one’ becomes viable at all, and ‘sex’ qualifies a body as liveable within that domain of cultural intelligibility” (1993, p. 2).

In Undoing Gender (2004d) Butler extends her discussion of intelligibility by suggesting that when one fails to register within the parameters of what constitutes acceptable gender, sex or sexuality, one also fails to be counted as an acceptable human subject. The conditions through which one qualifies as ‘human’ are constantly being reconstituted, by the social and economic policies of the state, state-related institutions such as the church, science, medicine, the family and through the day-to-day interactions that organise our daily lives. The limits of human intelligibility are strictly linked to the norms that define and govern sex and gender. One’s sex, gender and/or sexuality are so intimately bound to the processes of making and governing the human subject (and thus central to biopower) that failing to fit within the appropriate gender/sex order is to disqualify as a human subject.

Butler (2004d) stresses that the “grid of human intelligibility” is not only established by “laws that govern our intelligibility, but ways of knowing, modes of truth, that forcibly define intelligibility” (p. 57). The various institutional practices that order our daily interactions constantly (re-)establish “ways of knowing” and “modes of truth” about gender, sex and what should constitute ‘normal’ desires or acceptable sexual practices. It is through the practices and principles of modern medicine, statistics, psychiatry, science, etc. that sex/gender differences are labelled acceptable or unacceptable, normal or abnormal. These bodies of knowledge constantly reinscribe what it means to be male or female, a man or a woman, a girl or a boy, transgendered, homosexual and so fort1. Butler, like Foucault, reminds her reader that while many of the normative practices that determine who will or will not count as intelligible fall within the dictate of the law, they also often exceed the limits of the law. That is to say, being ‘by law’ a viable human subject does not guarantee equal access to rights and protections, nor does it guarantee that one will register as a viable human subject within the spaces that structure day-to-day living. As Chapter Four points out, the expansion of rights to
those on the margins of national citizenries (in the case of Chapter Four, gay and lesbian constituencies) does not necessarily eradicate the ways in which national ‘others’ are described in absolute binary terms and strictly policed at the level of everyday existence. Of course, that is not to say that norms do not change over time. Butler herself reminds us that norms are fluid entities that shift and are shaped over time and space. The important point here is that the grid of intelligibility that determines normal or abnormal sex, gender and sexuality also establishes who does and does not constitute the human subject. To be human is to be sexed/gendered, but in very particular ways. Furthermore, the parameters of human intelligibility are established and policed through diffuse techniques and tactics that govern and order bodies and lives.

**Unintelligible bodies, ‘non-human’ lives**

Butler’s work often returns her reader to the question of how narrow sets of ‘truths’ associated with sex and gender get translated at the level of the body. The material body becomes a medicalised entity, a space across which various “truth machines” (Dean, 1996, p. 209) traverse. That is to say, sex and gender are defined through rigid and prescriptive binaries that are always already tied to certain morphological or performative characteristics or features: male–female, boy–girl, penis–vagina, man–woman, XX–XY. For example, to be male, a boy, a man, or to have XX sex autosomes is to be recognisable as such through a set of pre-determined primary or secondary sex characteristics (penis, facial hair, deep voice) or social behaviours (income earner, macho, emotionally vacant). Butler explains that to have the wrong body, a body that falls outside the normative laws that govern gender, sex or sexuality, is to fail to have a human body. Humanness is thus always bound to normative models of sex and gender that register at the level of the flesh. As such, non-normative, and thus non-human, sexed/gendered bodies bring with them a great deal of anxiety, especially for those ‘experts’ naming and managing them. ‘Non-normative’ bodies are pathologised, scrutinised, surveilled, managed and/or placed under professional ‘care’.⁵²

Butler explores the ways in which transgender and intersex bodies are ‘managed’ by science, medicine, the media and within the institution of the family. Both of these bodies in their own ways unsettle the tidy binaries that order sex and gender. She emphasises the pain and violence one suffers at the hands of science and medicine when one is in, or has, ‘the

⁵² This is not to suggest that ‘non-normative’ subjects experience a life filled with doom and gloom. A great deal of important research illustrates the ways in which those on the margins of normative sex-gender embodiments construct alternative spaces that counter and in some cases challenge dominant sex-gender norms. See for instance, Halberstam, 1998; Matzner, 2001; Pattatuci-Aragón, 2006.
wrong body’, that is, when one’s body fails to register as adequately normative, as human (either to oneself or to others). This is perhaps most clearly articulated in her readings of the David Reimer case (Butler, 2001, 2004d). Reimer was born Bruce Reimer on August 22, 1965 (Colapinto, 2000).53 He was one of two twin boys born to Ron and Janet Reimer of Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. At seven months both boys developed phimosis, a condition in which the foreskin closes over the end of the penis making urination difficult and painful. Although a serious condition, phimosis is easily remedied through a standard circumcision. During Bruce’s operation, the acting surgeon did not use the medical equipment correctly and, as a result, Bruce’s penis was severely burned and partially severed. Doctors strongly advised Ron and Janet Reimer to have their son’s penis removed and argued that living with ‘deformed’ male genitals would greatly limit his chances at having a ‘normal’ life or a ‘fulfilling’ sex life. Bruce thus became Brenda and began a life punctuated by a series of emotionally and physically invasive ‘medical procedures’. At 14 years of age Brenda was told that she had been born a biological male and throughout her teenage years underwent the process of reclaiming her ‘original sex’ (Colapinto, 2000). In the process of reclaiming ‘her’ male identity, ‘Brenda Reimer’ changed ‘her’ name to David Reimer. Tragically, after struggling for over twenty years with depression, David ended his life in 2004.

In her reading of this case, Butler considers how Reimer’s body and his ‘gender’ were managed through the manufacturing and dissemination of ‘scientific’ and populist truths around sex and gender. In her engagement with his life story and the controversy that surrounded it, Butler refuses to analyse Reimer’s life, his body and his parents’ decisions along traditional lines of thought that seek to explain ‘what happened’. Instead she attempts to ‘do justice’ to his life by framing his experiences against wider social norms that limit what humans can and cannot become, what we can and cannot desire. In doing so she highlights the ways in which questions of governance significantly refocus studies of sex, gender and sexuality. She stresses that the decision to ‘make Bruce into a girl’ cannot be separated from the pervasiveness of sex and gender norms and the ways in which sex-gender binaries are policed at all costs. That his body (at various points throughout his life living as either ‘a boy’ and as ‘a girl’) failed to register as a normal male or female body meant that throughout his life he remained on the margins of what constitutes a ‘normal’ human subject position. Again, Butler draws a link between normative sexed/gendered bodies and the limits of human

53 This chapter’s discussion of Reimer is only intended to offer a sketch of his life and to summarise Butler’s reading of the medical and media debates that surrounded his life and death. The aim is not to sensationalise Reimer’s life or his suffering or to suggest his life represents a universal story of intersexuality. David Reimer ended his life in 2004.
intelligibility. She argues that David's body was not only 'other' to the normative male (or female) body, it was 'other' than human. She contends that the violent forms of governance enacted on his body, and other intersex bodies like his, never actually count as acts of violence to 'human' bodies. Instead, they leave "a mark that is no mark" (Butler, 2004d, p. 25), a scar that is as invisible as the normative regulatory practices that inflict it.

What Butler points out in her attempt to 'do justice' to Reimer's life story is that the ordering of sex and gender is governed, and often violently, at the level of the body and that this ordering, this governance, takes place in diffuse and irregular ways. For the thesis, and its concern with questions of sexual identity and citizenship, Butler’s reading of Reimer’s body allows one to think through how the parameters of intelligibility are directly linked to broader practices of governance and the establishment of normative ‘brands’ of (sexed/gendered) subjectivity.

**Governance, intelligibility and citizenship**

In *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (2004c), Butler builds on these discussions around the governance of bodies and the establishment of intelligible models of humanity, this time questioning the qualifying conditions of western citizenship. Her earlier questions around the establishment of normative subjectivities and who is or is not an intelligible human subject are extended against the broader contemporary backdrop that challenges our understanding of the relationships between sovereign authority, societies of discipline or control and governmentalities. This work is useful in moving this chapter's discussion towards questions of 'global living' and in asking how notions of sexuality and citizenship are conjoined at global queer events like the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. Butler speaks to the new regulatory patterns that govern the lives of contemporary citizens in many western countries around the world.

Drawing on contemporary examples, Butler argues that while Foucault's model of governmentality stresses a movement away from sovereign state power, in favour of a more capillary or network model of government, this does not negate the possibility that sovereignty, as such, still exists. While it might appear that Butler is abandoning her earlier project of describing power as diffuse and unevenly dispersed (Butler, 1993), it is important to point out that Foucault himself cautioned against conceiving of power in chronological terms (Butler 2004c; Rose, 1999). Foucault’s formulation of an analytics of governmentality was a response to the shifting conditions that he examined across time. Likewise, Butler is working to critically unpack how contemporary regulatory regimes and governmental strategies order and
manage individuals and certain populations. Nikolas Rose (1999) maintains that understanding that power acts in various and varied ways is seminal to the project of governmental thought:

...in the power regimes that began to take shape in the liberal societies of the nineteenth century, the thesmatics of sovereignty, of discipline and of bio-power are all relocated within the field of governmentality. Each is reorganized in the context of the general problematics of government, which concerns the best way to exercise powers over conduct individually and en masse so as to secure the good of each and of all. It is not a question of a succession of forms, but the ways in which the discovery of new problems for government – and the invention of new forms of government – embraces, recodes, reshapes those that pre-exist them. (p. 23-24)

Butler refuses to approach questions of how individuals are governed by mobilising a simple or evolving chronology that sees sovereign power entirely replaced by more web-like strategies of population management. She uses the detainment policies of the United States government and the imprisonment of ‘war criminals’ at Guantanamo Bay to rethink how the re-emergence of sovereign power today serves to limit the rights of freedoms of ‘indefinitely detained’ prisoners and thus their status as human subjects. To register as non-human is to be refused the basic rights of citizenship and to be other than human is to be denied public sympathy. Non-human citizens are not only denied the political freedoms and rights of the so-called good human citizen, they are denied social empathy. She maintains that while governmentality may depend on the devitalisation of sovereignty in its original form, “this does not foreclose the possibility that it might emerge as a reanimated anachronism within the political field unmoored from its traditional anchors.” (Butler, 2004c, p. 53). This is perhaps most clearly articulated in the introductory preface to Precarious Life where she writes:

Governmentality designates a model for conceptualizing power in its diffuse and multivalent operations, focusing on the management of populations, and operating through state and non-state institutions and discourses. In the current war, prison officials of governmentality wield sovereign power, understood here as a lawless and unaccountable operation of power, once legal rule is effectively suspended and military codes take its place. (Butler, 2004c, p. xv)

For Butler, the judiciary power afforded to the President of the United States to make decisions about the right of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay to a trial, and the power given to detainment centre officials to assess the innocence, guilt or level of threat posed by particular detainees, suggests that “the historical time that we thought was past turns out to structure the contemporary field” (Butler, 2004c, p. 54). The idea of history folding back onto itself is a provocation to think in less linear terms, not only about the relationship between govern-
mentality and sovereignty, but also about the ways in which normative models of subjectivity are discursively formed and materialised in our midst.

Butler’s early work around the normative sex/gender body and her more recent work around both intelligibility and the governance of contemporary citizens offer three particular points that guide the focus of the thesis. First, she makes the point that one cannot ask questions about the construction and regulation of certain subject positions without considering how sex, gender and sexuality are produced and governed. Second, she illustrates how the parameters of human intelligibility define the limits of who a subject can and cannot be, what gender they can claim, and what body they can or cannot have. Finally, she argues that if one is to critically respond to the forms of government that order contemporary living, one must allow his or her theoretical tools – in this case one’s theories of what studies of governmentality should do – to be equally as flexible and responsive to the conditions of the present.

Conclusion

This chapter introduced a number of key concepts that frame the remainder of this project’s analysis. In particular, it emphasised the importance of questions concerning the subject to Foucault’s work and outlined his three processes of objectifying the subject, that is, the three key processes through which the subject comes to understand him- or herself as an intelligible human subject. Questions of the subject are central to this analysis of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. To begin with, Foucault’s approach to the subject allows one to think through how it is that in various cultural contexts or at certain events, individuals come to constitute themselves as certain types of subjects and what social structures contribute to the processes of taking up certain subject positions. Foucault’s work encourages scholars to trace the various truth-making apparatuses that normalise some subject positions over others. In the case of the Gay Games one can ask how individuals constitute themselves as ‘gay’, ‘lesbian’, ‘transgender’, ‘straight’, ‘queer’ and so on by drawing on the various discourses that name, rank and regulate each of these categories. It provides a space from which to ask how one comes to take up the idea of ‘being an athlete’ (or non-athlete as the case may be), ‘being a traveller’, ‘being a national citizen’ or ‘being part of a global community’. In addition, Foucault’s work allows one to consider the Gay Games as part of a broad assemblage of popular cultural events that produce normative truths around what gender, sexuality, citizenship, sport, culture and tourism mean. While arguably a space that disrupts some of the heteronormative underpinnings of sport, the Gay Games also re-inscribe certain ‘truths’
whilst inventing new ones. Foucault’s work allows one to consider how the Games, as an assemblage of practices and processes, link up or break away from other assemblages in ways that produce and regulate normative meanings around sex and gender but also, again, around sport, nation and citizenship.

The chapter also reviewed Foucault’s model of power and his analytics of governmentality. In understanding power less as a substance and more as an assemblage of relations, one moves away from understanding sexual minorities as victims of homophobic or heteronormative regimes. While Foucault acknowledges that structures of dominance do exist, he maintains that there is no simple or linear relationship between the dominator / dominated. Power for Foucault is always unevenly distributed and resistance always takes place from within power rather than in being able to move outside of it. As such, this project moves away from the argument that gay and lesbian athletes are ‘oppressed’ by the structures inherent in mainstream sporting cultures. Instead, it traces the complex relationships whereby individuals constitute themselves as sexual minorities within tourist and sporting spaces like the Games.

Foucault’s notion of governmentality is also central to this project on Sydney 2002 as it offers a way of tracing the diffuse power effects that ordered and governed the conduct and shaped many of the affective responses participants had at the Games. This project is particularly concerned with the ways in which neo-liberalism governs through a variety of everyday practices of order and management. Rather than disqualify or dismiss the Gay Games as apolitical or ineffective, the aim of the succeeding chapters is to ask new questions about how various neo-liberal governmental mentalities conjoin with discourses of global consumerism and cosmopolitanism at global queer tourist events like the Games.

Another key point made in this chapter was established by outlining Judith Butler’s efforts to trouble the tidy binaries that bind sex and gender. Butler’s notion of performativity and her discussion of what constitutes an intelligible human subject illustrate, again, how the conditions within which one ‘makes themselves subject’ are always located within the realm of the social. What Butler does in her work is to point out how this artificial ‘grid of human intelligibility’ is materialised through the, often violent, exclusion of those subjects who do not fall within the bounds of what constitutes acceptable humanness. Her work opens up a space to query the Gay Games’ focus on inclusion, safety and community and ask who is excluded from large gay and lesbian events of this kind. Furthermore, her work demands that studies of citizenship take into account the changing conditions of the present, so as to acknowledge that a range of new governmental mechanisms are emerging (some of which,
she explains, are better described as having returned), many of which work to tighten the conditions around who will and will not count as suitably human.

While the aim of this chapter was to introduce a number of theoretical concepts that have salience throughout the thesis in its entirety, it provides particular support for the discussions in the succeeding chapter, Chapter Three: Globalisation and the governance of normative citizenship. This thesis is not just a case study of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, but a broader engagement with questions about the relationships between citizenship and sexuality. It is committed to tracing those rationalities of governance that order global queer events today. How the global governs individuals and populations by showing concern for the ‘conduct of conduct’ is the primary focus of Chapter Three.
Chapter Three
Globalisation and the governance of global citizenship

As detailed in Chapter One, the central aim of this project is to understand how normative meanings around both sexualities and citizenship are produced and governed at global queer events like the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. As such, Chapter Two addressed the questions of how one comes to ‘know’ oneself as a certain type of subject and how this self-knowledge is governed by a series of norms that determine what will or will not count as a viable way of being ‘human’. Judith Butler’s work (1993, 1999, 2004c, 2004d) was used to ask how sexual subjectivities are assembled through the various technologies that govern ‘normal’ sexual desires and appropriately gendered bodies. Butler maintains that to have a body that falls outside the normative sex/gender order is to have a body that not only fails to qualify as appropriately gendered or sexed, but that also fails to register as suitably human. This is an important point given the thesis’ emphasis on the governance of gay and lesbian or queer sexualities. Butler provides an important link between so-called ‘normal’ or ‘natural’ models of sex and gender and the violent forms of regulation imposed on bodies and lives that do not comply with these norms. She also signals an important connection between the various ways in which normative models of humanity are governed and the ways in which these norms circulate within discourses of (national) citizenship.

Building on the ideas established in Chapter Two, this chapter focuses on the problem of global governance. The overarching aim of the chapter is to illustrate how globalisation is refigured when it is conceptualised as an assemblage or network of practices that govern. When globalisation is reconfigured as an assemblage, it shifts from being a linear, evolving or inevitable process (the view espoused by many dominant approaches to globalisation) to being a complex and contradictory set of movements that establish new modes of regulation and control over the conduct of the individual citizen-subject and his or her body. This chapter asks how the technologies and tactics of contemporary global living demand that individuals organise and manage themselves differently, such that they become model ‘global citizens’ or viable members of ‘global communities’. It argues that both academic and popularised discourses of globalisation rely on the idea that the changes associated with contemporary global living are entirely new and that the world has never experienced change of this volume or kind before (Appadurai, 1996; Grossberg, 1996; Perry & Maurer, 2003; Thrift, 2005). The idea that the world has never experienced such rapid economic, social or political growth before brings with it a demand that individuals rethink who they are as global...
subjects. The chapter takes up Arjun Appadurai’s idea of the “imagination as social practice” (1996, p. 31) in order to ask how normative models of global citizenship demand that individuals imagine themselves and their global world in new ways. It argues that the expansive geographical reach associated with the global, and the rapidity of change associated with global flows, offer individuals the promise of new opportunities, of remaking and reinventing themselves – they can always imagine being somewhere else, having something else, or becoming someone else. This chapter critiques the new role assigned to the imagination and argues that the imaginary operates as part of a wider (neo-liberal) project of governance that situates the global citizen in the role of urban cosmopolite and entrepreneur of the self.

Appadurai’s (1996, 1999) account of the global and his engagement with the imaginative are also taken up to illustrate how globalisation studies, as a body of knowledge, govern the way scholars think about the global and how they critically locate the global citizen within their research. Viewing globalisation as an assemblage or a network of forces means that it encompasses more than just the shifts in how people, ideas and capital are distributed around the globe, it also includes the multitude of ways in which globalisation is taken up within political discourse, popular culture and the bodies of academic writing that have come to constitute ‘globalisation studies’. This chapter is committed to rethinking the theoretical frameworks scholars working in a variety of disciplines deploy in order to ‘understand’ new global phenomena. It argues that too often theoretical responses to the global carry with them a stock of global ‘answers’ that presuppose various global ‘problems’. It argues that discourses of the global and of global citizenry have not simply evolved as a response to the various changes in contemporary living (although often this is the way they are described). The ways individuals are constructed as global citizens and the ways in which discourses of ‘the global’ are mobilised within scholarly critiques of global events are shaped by the ontological limitations governing globalisation studies themselves.54 Wendy Larner and William Walters (2002) argue that all too often “the story we all know” (p. 1) about globalisation gets uncritically taken up in scholarly pursuits to analyse new global moments or events. As such, what globalisation is (or is not!), and what it means to be an acceptable, productive global citizen become ‘fixed’ and attached to stable sets of truths.

54 While an entirely separate discussion and one that a thesis of this nature does not provide room for, it is important to note that many of the fixed ways in which globalisation studies set up their field of knowledge fail to mobilise the frameworks that many nomadic, diasporic or exiled peoples use to make sense of their own lives, their own terrors, joys and sites of resistance to global governing forces.
Larner and Walters' (2002) notion of globalisation as governmentality guides the work of this chapter as does their understanding of globalisation as a dispositif. They borrow the term dispositif from Foucault, who conceptualises power as a series of forces moving in irregular directions through, around and across various social apparatuses, sometimes detached, at other times overlapping (see Chapter Two). Consideration of globalisation as a dispositif moves away from a singular, uniform or unified understanding of global governance and calls attention to the innumerable and irregular ways in which individuals are governed in this so-called global age. Likewise, viewing globalisation as a dispositif leads one to the question of how globalisation scholarship – the endless journal articles, conferences, books and so on – has come to map out a field of knowledge that is then applied to various transnational events or phenomena as they emerge. But beyond either of these, understanding globalisation as a complex social apparatus demands a rethinking of how global subjectivities are 'made'. The figuration of the dispositif or apparatus acknowledges that the ways in which individual subjects imagine and therefore govern themselves as appropriate global subjects are inflected differently in different spaces and are dependent upon the arrangement of forces and practices at any one particular moment in time. Just as there is no singular global force, the processes through which one makes oneself into a global citizen-subject are ongoing and unstable processes of becoming (Deleuze, 1992).

The theoretical work of this chapter is done with the aim of offering a renewed way of critiquing global queer events like the Gay Games. Viewing the global in less linear terms forces one to rethink what constitutes an effective critical response to an event like Sydney 2002 and/or of the Gay Games movement more generally. The Games are a self-professed ‘global’ event and yet one rarely stops to think about the implications of naming and framing an event in these terms. Rather than describing the global nature of the event, the thesis aims to illustrate the ways in which certain truths around what it means to be global and what it means to be gay, lesbian or queer are produced, circulated and consumed side-by-side. When globalisation is understood as an assemblage of regulatory mechanisms, analyses of large transnational events like the Games focus less on describing what happens at these events. Instead, discussion turns to the ways in which the conduct of participants/athletes/visitors is regulated and managed by the various truth-producing mechanisms operating within and

55 Likewise, within the academy, globalisation has become a key theoretical lens for our research in cultural and media studies, international studies, postcolonial studies, social geography, education and gender/queer studies. Many disciplines have devoted journal editions, conferences and entire units of study to the topic of globalisation. See, amongst others: Altman, 2001a; Binnie, 2004; Halberstam, 2005a; Larner & Walters, 2002, 2004; Mason, 1998; Miller, Lawrence, McKay & Rowe, 2001; Morris, 2000; Puar, 2000a, 2000b.
around these types of events, many of which call upon participants to self-monitor and self-manage themselves as political, cultural and athletic subjects and as consumers.

**Globalisation as governmentality**

For Wendy Lamer and William Walters (2002, 2004), the wedding of studies of globalisation with theories of governmentality alters one’s understanding of governmentality as a critical analytics and challenges traditional conceptualisations of the global. This chapter thus begins by outlining some of Larner and Walter’s key arguments for bringing these two bodies of work together and, in doing so, asks how studies of ‘global’ events like the Gay Games benefit from being ‘read’ alongside questions of global governance. In bringing these two bodies of work together, Foucault’s conceptualisation of the *dispositif* is also introduced. For Larner and Walters asking how the global governs requires that the global be configured less as a linear, inevitable process and more as an assemblage of irregular and unpredictable discourses and effects.

**Globalising governmentality studies**

Often governmentality studies are concerned with the distribution and structuring of power at the level of the local or national (Lamer & Walters, 2002; Rose, 1999). This is no surprise given Foucault’s emphasis on *state* governance and those practices internal to the state such as the economy of the family. Larner and Walters (2004) argue that there is a need to ask how mechanisms of order and regulation have become globalised, that is, how many of the governing structures that order contemporary living are no longer contained within the state, but, instead, take on a more ‘global’ character.

As Chapter Two suggested, one of Foucault’s intentions in conceptualising power through governmentality was to develop a way of highlighting “histories of the present” (Barry, Osborne & Rose, 1996, p. 2). Through the framework of governmentality and other genealogical readings of power, Foucault moves away from the expectation that history should tell a story of the past. ‘Histories of the present’ provide insight into the non-linear and irregular *emergences* of the present (Colebrook, 2002). According to Wendy Brown (2001), Foucault’s history of the present is central to grasping what it is about Foucault’s approach to power that is so unique. His project is about “following the lines of fragility in the present” in order to render “that-which-is” as “that-which-might-not-be” (Brown, 2001, p. 112). Transformation takes place in the fracturing of the idea that the present is bound to the past.
and/or future in a teleological manner. The past is rendered multiple and irregular while the promise offered by the future is ruptured. In moving away from understanding the present as a stable truth or reality to envisioning it as a fractured or dislocated event, one begins to think differently about the construction of the social and about the very processes through which individuals become intelligible subjects (Lamer & Walters, 2002; also see Morey, 1992). Human beings are not “made subject” (Foucault, 1982, p. 208) through processes of evolution that have a clear beginning and an end point; instead, subjects are constantly being ‘made’ from within the erratic and unpredictable conditions of the present.

Given Foucault’s commitment to exposing “that-which-is” as “that-which-might-not-be” (Brown, 2001, p. 112), approaching globalisation through an analytics of governmentality seems a timely critical intervention. If one is to adequately understand how individual subjects are governed and/or the practices through which they self-govern today, then it is important to look outside of state-based or state-informed models of governance. After all, contemporary living is ordered through the language of the global; daily, citizens are reminded in some way or another that their lives are ordered in an increasingly global manner. Individuals are instructed to act, think and move globally at work, in the classroom and even within the private sphere or during their leisure time. Whether doing online business for/with someone in another country, attending a rugby match that is a part of the Tri-Nations series, or standing in a queue to have travel or immigration documents stamped, there is little doubt that individuals are called upon to define themselves against a transnational or global backdrop.

Analysing an event like the Sydney 2002 Gay Games also requires a more ‘global’ lens. At Sydney 2002 participants were encouraged to define themselves beyond their local queer communities as productive and cooperative global gay and lesbian athletes and activists. Throughout the thesis a number of examples will be offered in order to reinforce this point. However, for the time being it is enough to say that the geographical reach of the Gay Games movement (having taken place in seven cities in four countries to date) and the frequent references to queer world-making within the Sydney 2002 promotional materials, suggest that participants are invited to narrate their lives as sexual minorities (Rubin, 1997) beyond their own ‘local’ microcosm. Participating in an event of this kind requires participation in a number of transnational political economies, including the global queer tourism industry, the global sporting industry, the global media industry and global politics or rights movements.

---

56 The tri-nations series is a rugby tournament between South Africa, New Zealand and Australia.
Extending governmentality outside the state is an important and timely project and one that Larner and Walters argue is also important in rethinking other dominant ideologies such as neo-liberalism and neo-colonialism, that are often thought to be ideologies of the past or ‘issues’ particular to the national sphere. In their conceptualisation of global governmentality Larner and Walters are careful to clarify that the way the global governs cannot be separated in a neat or tidy manner from the other dominant ideologies that have long structured peoples and nations. It is therefore an important function of this chapter, and indeed of the entire thesis, to highlight how both neo-liberalism and neo-colonialism are part of a broader network of global patterns of governance that are often overlooked in critical accounts of globalisation.

Governance and globalisation studies

Globalisation studies are also enriched and extended when considered alongside theories of governmentality. Larner and Walters (2002) suggest that too often critical work around globalisation sets out to “capture the substance of [global] change along one or several axes” (p. 1). Later in this chapter, some theories of globalisation are outlined as a way of demonstrating how theorising the global often involves seeking out the essence or eternal structures of globalisation in a commitment to a certain “epistemological realism” (Larner & Walters, 2002, p. 1). They ask what globalisation is rather than considering what it does or how it acts. Conversely, Larner and Walters’ focus is on the mentalities of the global, how globalisation acts to organise, discipline, normalise, expand and shrink at the level of ‘the local’ or the individual subject. Their focus marks a shift away from questions concerned with the why of power and allows one to think about the how of power. Less concern is given to understanding why certain spaces or people are affected by new waves of global change. Instead, they ask how these ‘waves’ are produced as ‘new’ and ‘evolving’ conditions of the present and how individuals define and organise themselves as global subjects from within these ‘novel’ configurations. In a similar vein, Richard Perry and Bill Maurer (2003), in the introduction to their edited collection entitled Globalization under construction: Governmentality, law and identity, point out that through the lens of governmentality, globalisation can be addressed as “an ensemble of quite specific governmental ‘hows’... as a disparate array of practices and their effects” (p. xi).

Accordingly, this chapter focuses on questions that relate to the hows of global living: how does globalisation act as a diffuse set of techniques that govern who or what citizen-subjects can or cannot become? How do individual subjects learn to manage and order their own bodies and lives such that they adhere to normative models of fashionable, productive and
civil global citizenship? In focusing on how global mentalities shape meanings around citizenship this project is calling for less attention to be paid to the substance of globalisation and for consideration to be given to the surface of global living, what Nikolas Rose (1999) calls “an empiricism of the surface” (p. 57).

As the previous chapters pointed out, attention to the surface or the outside of problematics is an important theoretical shift guiding this thesis. Much of Foucault’s work is about working on the outside of normative thinking in order to disrupt the linearity and ‘blind faith’ one maintains around the norms and habits that structure one’s day-to-day life. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (2003) argue that Foucault’s notion of governance is about opening up “new options for thought and new possibilities for action” (p. 4). This idea of ‘action in thought’ can be read throughout Foucault’s work on governmentality and in his related efforts to unsettle the way we understand the relationship between power, knowledge and subjectivity, much of which was overviewed in Chapter Two. Miguel Morey (1992) suggests that the gesture towards placing himself on the outside of not only normative discourses but also normative models of critique distinguishes Foucault’s work from that of his predecessors:

The critique which Foucault carries out against the prestige of the norm and of the normal takes the form of a discourse outside norms, as a working process by means of which one places oneself outside the normal. In short, it takes the form of a strategy. This means that Foucault has to place himself in a relationship of exteriority regarding both the norms of analysis proper to the areas which he is studying and the general norms controlling forms of ‘academic discourse’. Instead of a picture of thought guided by the idea of con-sensus, Foucault tries to provoke dis-sensus to exercise his right to take up a position elsewhere. (Morey, 1992, pp. 120-1)

Like Morey, Gilles Deleuze (1988) insists that what makes Foucault’s work so important is its non-static sensibilities that will always “remain mobile, skimming along in a kind of diagonal line that allows him to read what could not be apprehended before” (p. 1). The (diagonal) movements of rupture and disruption – of dis-sensus – are central to Foucault’s work on governmentality and are useful to this chapter in thinking through how the global governs. More specifically, it allows one to consider how globalisation studies, or any other body of scholarly work for that matter, establish the conditions under which subjects and objects are named.

Of course, the mobility written into Foucault’s work and his call to work on the outside of dominant modes of thinking are both important to studies of global gay and lesbian events like the Gay Games. This approach to thinking calls into question not only the ways in which global queer sexualities are constituted through various (global) “truth-machines” at events like the Games, but also how the theories we use to make sense of emerging patterns of global
queer living are bound to stable forms of knowledge. When the tenets of a given body of knowledge are taken-for-granted, when they are left to settle, the critiques that emerge are mere transcriptions of pre-arranged narratives. A singular and personalised narrative is told by a stable subject in response to a set of prearranged questions. In the case of research around the Gay Games movement, personal experience and critiques of the event’s content are used to understand what the games are and to evaluate their political and cultural relevance or effectiveness. In contrast, diagnostic critiques that maintain Foucault’s emphasis on the surface respond to the superficiality or changing nature of the Games. Rather than suggesting that stable narratives allow one to interpret the world around them, diagnostic analyses allow the conditions of the present to dictate what research questions get asked. In diagnostic readings, less concern is given to what can be said or told about a given subject, object or event; these types of critiques are more concerned with “identifying the differences in what is said, how it is said, and what allows it to be said and to have an effectivity” (Rose, 1999, p. 57). As mentioned in Chapter One’s introductory comments, very little of the scholarship around the Gay Games offers a critical, diagnostic reading of the event. However, those studies that do (Miller, 2001a; Probyn, 2000; Stevenson et al., 2005) tend to spend less time describing the Gay Games and more time asking what they do, that is, how they uphold or challenge normative discourses around gender and sexuality. In different ways these critical responses to the Gay Games demand new questions be asked concerning the production, governance and consumption of normative models of sex and gender and of national or global citizenship at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games.

Larner and Walters (2002) offer a diagnostic or ‘surface’ reading of the global and argue that while reactions to globalisation are plentiful, globalisation theories are anchored to a relatively narrow set of ontological starting points. They argue that much of the current thinking around globalisation tends to be somewhat repetitive, offering a rather narrow set of responses to both the macro- and micro-level changes that are taking place around the world. Very complex economic, cultural and ideological shifts are captured by much less diverse sets of theoretical approaches. They point to the ways in which the term globalisation essentialises, singularises and ontologises irregular and contradictory sets of transnational conditions that eventually come to constitute “the [globalisation] story we all know” (Larner & Walters, 2002, p. 1).

Following Larner and Walters, one can say that globalisation studies have become somewhat fixed in their approach to understanding the transnational flows that are so integral to day-to-day living. Meaghan Morris (2000) suggests that the idea of a ‘global culture’ is,
a critic’s dream: a discourse genre marked by maximal generalisation and minimal empirical evidence, in which we can burble or scold about all sorts of big, powerful, world-changing developments we need know very little about. (p. 18)

Like Morris, Larner and Walters’ (2002) concern is with the ways in which the bodies of knowledge used to make sense of globalisation (the large body of writings roughly grouped together as globalisation studies) translate into modes of being that produce the grounds upon which objects (e.g. the nation, the local, the global, capital) and subjects (e.g. the global citizen, the national citizen, and, as this project argues, the global queer citizen-subject) are produced and governed. They problematise the practice of collapsing diverse sets of problems and processes into a singular term or concept. The questions they ask about globalisation and about the kinds of disciplinary baggage we bring to ‘the global’ are in keeping with Foucault’s work in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (2002a). Almost four decades ago he addressed the tendency of scholarship to allow certain bodies of knowledge to become stable, fixed and absolute:

> We must question those ready-made syntheses, those groupings that we normally accept before any examination, those links whose validity is recognised from the outset; we must oust those forms and obscure forces by which we usually link the discourse of one man with that of another; they must be driven out from the darkness in which they reign. (Foucault, 2002a, p. 24)

Here Foucault offers an important methodological reminder, urging the critical scholar to interrupt (or in his words, following Nietzsche, *irrupt*) the tendency to construct concepts in absolute or fixed terms – “ready-made syntheses” (Foucault, 2002a, p. 24). Elsewhere, Foucault identifies complex and heterogeneous apparatuses which he calls dispositifs, social apparatuses that “cut reality in a different way” (Rabinow & Rose, 2003, p. 9). 57 Larner and Walters (2002) borrow this idea of the dispositif to develop their critique of existing theories of globalisation and to make a case for introducing questions of governance into studies of ‘global living’.

---

57 While some scholars apply Foucault’s notion of the assemblage or the dispositif to their works, an actual textual reference that indicates when Foucault first used these terms is difficult to trace. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (2003) suggest that while the concept of an assemblage is used in various places throughout his work before 1975, it was in an (unspecified) interview in 1975, following the publication of *Surveiller et Punir*, that he first used the term dispositif.
What is a dispositif?

Foucault approaches concepts, terms or institutions such as sexuality, capitalism, the prison, the hospital and madness as overlapping and conflicting assemblages (Lamer & Walters, 2002; Rabinow & Rose, 2003). In his words, a dispositif or apparatus is:

a resolutely heterogeneous grouping composing discourses, institutions, architectural arrangements, policy decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophic, moral and philanthropic propositions; in sum, the said and un-said, these are elements of an apparatus. The apparatus itself is the network that can be established between these elements. (Foucault, 1994, p. 298)

The dispositif becomes a useful tool for studies of governmentality because it allows relations of power within a given socio-political terrain to be viewed as diffuse and uneven. One no longer goes searching for the essence or substance of a social structure or event (in a way that symptomatic readings, psychoanalysis or semiotics might for instance) in order to understand what it is. Instead one seeks to understand what it does, how it operates as “a machinic contraption whose purpose in this case is control and management of certain characteristics of a population” (Rabinow and Rose, 2003, p. 10).

Lamer and Walters develop their idea of globalisation as governmentality by arguing that globalisation can be viewed as a dispositif. In doing so they pose a new set of questions around the global: What are the conditions within which globalisation is named? Why and how has a singular term come to represent a very diverse set of processes and practices? How do global frameworks and global norms govern how we read, think and write about transnational movements and formations? And, finally, how might the world be imagined otherwise? For Lamer and Walters the concept of the global dispositif changes the questions asked of globalisation, and how individuals ‘know’ themselves as global subjects. Viewing globalisation as a dispositif turns a singular term like globalisation into a web-like network of mechanisms and effects that are never entirely tangible. Rather than seeing globalisation as a finite or linear set of processes it becomes a vast assemblage of competing and contradictory forces that organise and manage populations. All of the work one does in globalisation studies is thus a part of the globalisation apparatus. How one critically speaks or writes about globalisation contributes to the defining, ordering and regulation of the parameters around what is ‘knowable’ about the global. As Lamer and Walters (2002) explain, the dispositif demands that researchers interrogate the processes and practices of naming and theorising, questioning “the conditions of truth and practice under which [globalisation] acquires a certain positivity” (p. 6). Viewing globalisation as a site of the dispositif allows one to see how globalisation studies ontologise; how it constructs global subjects within narrow, often
national or state-centred discourses. In short, viewing globalisation as a dispositif disrupts ‘the story we all know’ about the ‘global’, ‘globalisation’ and, most useful perhaps to the thesis, about global subjectivities. In Larner and Walters’ (2002) words:

We suggest a shift from a concern with the substance of globalization, to an account of it in terms of its dispositif – the ceaseless work of conferences, books, speeches, commissions, the creation of research centres and everything else which fixes it, makes it speak, or speaks in its name, gives it a presence, a visibility, a durability. It is through these ‘curves of visibility’ and ‘curves of enunciation’, but also ‘lines of force’ and ‘lines of subjectification’ that globalization comes into existence. (p. 6)

In their description of the dispositif, Larner and Walters evoke a set of Deleuzian concepts: curves of visibility, curves of enunciation and lines of subjectification. In his 1992 essay entitled “What is a dispositif?”, Deleuze outlines the important contribution Foucault’s work has made to understanding that power operates less through the dictates of a sovereign power and more so through the diffuse mechanisms of governmentality. He suggests the dispositif is composed of lines, each having a different nature. And the lines in the apparatus do not outline or surround systems which are each homogeneous in their own right, object, subject, language, and so on, but follow directions, trace balances which are always off balance, now drawing together and then distancing themselves from one another. (Deleuze, 1992, p. 159)

Lerner and Walters draw heavily on Deleuze’s reading of the dispositif. He argues that each dispositif is composed of various and varied curves and/or lines of force. The linkages made between various lines of force moving through a social apparatus (dispositif) are never linear, traceable connections, nor are they simply compositional elements, substance, content. Instead, they are forces that make the dispositif function like a machine – they “run through it and pull at it, from North to South, from East to West, or diagonally” (Deleuze, 1992, p. 159). Deleuze describes curves of visibility and curves of enunciation as the lines of flight within a given social apparatus that make us “see and speak”. Here Deleuze acknowledges the regulatory function of social apparatuses; they establish ways of knowing and definitive sets of truths that in turn limit what is seeable or sayable, and of course what we desire to see or say.

Deleuze maintains that the seeable and/or sayable within a dispositif often depend upon the apparatus itself for its existence. So in the same way that Butler argues that gendered bodies are not only governed by sex/gender norms, but produced within them, Foucault maintains that normative subject positions sometimes lose their normative status outside the apparatus within which they acquire their power. Take the example used in Chapter Two about the woman who has an uncomfortable visit at her gynaecologist’s. In this hypothetical situation,
the ‘doctor’ is a single line of force within the expansive medical apparatus, or medical dispositif. The doctor is rendered intelligible through the innumerable other lines of force that make up this dispositif – patient, clinic, illness, medical school, pathology, hospital and so on. Each of these reinforce who the doctor is or is not and without these the ‘doctor’ occupies a different, and arguably less significant, subject position. This is not to suggest that ‘the doctor’ is a constant or fixed entity either, nor is it a term that remains unchanged as long as all other lines of force are in place. Deleuze reminds his reader that according to Foucault’s understanding of the dispositif, lines of force “act as go-betweens between seeing and saying things, constantly waging battle between them ... and [pass] through every area in the apparatus”. (Deleuze, 1992, p. 160). He stresses that lines of visibility and lines of enunciation can make objects disappear as quickly and as randomly as they produce them.

According to Deleuze’s reading, there is another set of forces that make up Foucault’s theoretical frame: lines of subjectification. Here Deleuze stresses that for Foucault understanding the ways in which “human beings are made subjects” (Foucault, 1982, p. 208) is one of the key ways of understanding broader shifts in contemporary living. Deleuze emphasises that for Foucault the self is not a pre-existing ‘thing’ that is discovered, revealed or unravelled. The self is always produced at the points where other lines of force meet up, within the parameters of what constitutes an intelligible subject position. In Deleuze’s estimation, lines of subjectification are productions, events, endless forces of becoming that push and prod at the boundaries of what constitutes acceptable humanness.

But how does the notion of the dispositif contribute to research around global queer events like the Gay Games? Moreover, how does viewing the global as a dispositif or assemblage, as Larner and Walters propose, shift how one critiques an event of this kind? To begin with, the concept or idea of the dispositif allows one to ask this question: What happens when the Gay Games movement becomes the Gay Games dispositif? This shift disrupts the ‘story we all know about the Games’ that was outlined in Chapter One. Sydney 2002 is no longer tied to the previous five Games in a simple or linear way. The Gay Games become a network of various lines of force that have not necessarily been constant or unidirectional over the course of time or across the geographies they have traversed. Global capital and the innumerable ruptures associated with it become compositional lines of action within the Gay Games dispositif. This moves away from a view of the global as a uniform and omnipotent force that has singularly transformed gay and lesbian or queer politics around the world and shaped the
face of the Games over the past ten years. Viewing the Games as a dispositif composed of an ever-changing and uneven network of forces thus opens up a critical space within which one can acknowledge that the Sydney 2002 Gay Games are not an object that is temporally or spatially bound. The Games are freed from the expectation that they will have a finite set of effects (or affects for that matter) that organisers and participants can anticipate.

A very important task throughout the thesis is to illustrate that gay and lesbian events and the images that circulate within and around them are not constant or stable objects but are constantly changing assemblages of forces that respond to the conditions of the present. Again, there is a need to move away from descriptive accounts of the Games that set out to stabilise or locate each of the events in fixed and absolute terms; it is only then that new critiques emerge. Take Sydney 2002 as an example: It is common to say that this event began on November 2, 2002 and culminated on November 9, 2002. It is also very common for Sydney 2002 to be described as a single part of a larger movement that began with Tom Waddell’s early 1980s vision of a sporting celebration of Olympic proportions (the historical overview in Chapter One no doubt reinscribed this idea). When approaching the Gay Games as a dispositif, one queries the linearity used to describe the relationships between the 1982 Games and the 2002 Games. Why are the points of connection always linear and straightforward? How might their relationship be imagined otherwise? Rather than outlining a progress narrative to explain the relationship between the two events, the chapters that follow map the irregular and disjointed lines where these two events connect. Likewise one could argue that it is futile to claim a calendar starting date or origin of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. If one considers the innumerable exchanges that took place well before November 2, 2002, then the idea of the event’s ‘beginning’ is troubled. How can one say that the event started on November 2, 2002 when so much of the programme of the 2002 Gay Games came from the previous bids Sydney had made? When the online spaces were up and running four years prior to the actual opening ceremonies and offered promotions, online registration and

---

58 As mentioned later in this chapter, readings of globalisation within gay and lesbian or queer studies tend to, first, collapse the diverse sets of processes and practices of the global under the single category of global capital. Second, responses to globalisation and sexualities tend to either uncritically praise the global for the transnational and anti-national linkages it allows queers to organise around the global or to hold the global responsible for all of the problems and shortcomings currently faced by gay and lesbian communities. This latter line of thinking tends to associate queer politics and queer theory with the global and see grassroots gay and lesbian activism as authentically local or national.

59 There are two simple examples that emphasise the non-linear relationship between the 1982 and 2002 Games and problematise the notion of progress. The first is the recent release of a Gay Games documentary entitled Take the Flame (Seeter, 2006) This DVD illustrates how many of the social injustices that early organisers struggled against are still on the agendas of Games organisers today. The second example was introduced in footnote 27 (Chapter One, p. 17). I explained that organisers of the San Francisco Games in 1986 and of the Chicago Games in 2006 both had to get a waiver to allow participants who were HIV+ or who were living with AIDS to travel to the United States.
so on? When athletes from around the world were anticipating and preparing for the Games years in advance? Better yet, perhaps it is more useful to ask how hosting the 2000 Olympics put Sydney, and indeed Australia, back on the world map as a holiday destination for fun, sun and sport and allowed Team Sydney to secure the bid. These are just a few examples to illustrate the futility of trying to chase origins or to insist that the effects of an event can all be accounted for. In the same way, one could argue that the event’s end point is not as straightforward as one might think. One could argue that the event continues each time someone pulls out their photos to reminisce about their experiences at Sydney 2002; when they receive emails months later to buy the commemorative DVD, or years later to attend the next Games; when someone dons a Sydney 2002 t-shirt in an otherwise heteronormative space; or when someone sits down to offer an ‘alternative reading’ of Sydney 2002 in the form of a doctoral thesis. There is a need to challenge the idea that events are contained by clear starting and ending points just as there is a need to ask why it is that one seeks to understand the practices and processes of the everyday with reliable and well-rehearsed methodologies and epistemologies.

For Larner and Walters, it is this breaking of rules and assumptions we bring to thinking about transnational events or moments that is at the heart of their efforts to understand globalisation as a dispositif. Of course, this is clearly another very important contribution that the concept of the dispositif offers to this project on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. Rather than simply replicating and/or uncritically applying existing theories of the global, the thesis calls into question the theoretical tools it uses just as much as it problematises the ‘global’ data it makes use of. The discussion now turns to existing theories of the global and considers how viewing globalisation as a dispositif and introducing questions of governance into existing studies of the global, shift ‘the story we all know’ about globalisation as an omnipotent and unidirectional set of forces.

**Globalisation studies and the ‘story we all know’**

Larner and Walters position globalisation as an assemblage or dispositif of techniques and technologies that govern and thus call into question traditional approaches to studying the global. They insist that globalisation studies are often tied to a narrow set of spatial and temporal metaphors that envision the world as either being dissolved into a single space or expanded in infinite directions. These two approaches to ‘the global’ commonly characterise it within a homogeneous/heterogeneous binary (Appadurai, 1996; Grossberg, 1996; Mittelman, 2004). Theories of homogeneity personify the global as a force that takes over,
imposes upon, Americanises, Westernises, (neo-)colonises or imperialises the national and/or local. Distinctive national characteristics and the state’s autonomy (in terms of cultural, political or economic autonomy) are threatened by large economic giants (most notably multinational corporations (MNCs), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank), and the countries that are significant political, economic, military and cultural forces (American, British, western countries).

Marshall McLuhan and Bruce Power’s ‘global village’ epitomises this critical position as it envisions local cultures becoming assimilated into a transnational cultural monolith (McLuhan & Powers, 1989). The notion of a global village implies that a world once organised as geographically, economically, culturally and politically distinct nation-states is slowly seeing the demise of its regulated territorial borders. By the early 1990s a significant volume of work spoke to this threat of rapid economic, political and cultural uniformity. The rising power of multinational corporations, the large-scale migration of people from the Third World to the First World (particularly to the United States, the United Kingdom and many parts of Europe) have become symbols of globalisation’s homogenising impact and sites upon which academics and non-academics alike could anchor their fears and anxieties (Altman, 2001a).

Within gay and lesbian studies of the global, some scholars fear that an American model of community politics is becoming the norm in countries around the world. Everything from the notion of pride to the establishment of gay ghettos and the tradition of street parades is read as an ‘import’ that fails to recognise the specificities of the diverse local contexts within which they are produced (Altman, 2001a; Manalansan IV, 1995). For instance, Australian gay studies scholar Dennis Altman argues that ‘queer’ politics and queer theory are little more than elitist American products that gay and lesbian communities around the world have bought into.

Theories of a solidifying and homogenising world have been critiqued both within and outside of gay and lesbian and queer studies. It is beyond the scope of this discussion to tease out these criticisms in their entirety. However, a brief engagement with some of these criticisms is useful in thinking through how globalisation studies limit the possibilities for who global subjects can become. Perhaps the most significant oversight of theories of global homogeneity is their failure to account for the ways in which power remains unevenly distributed. Viewing the global as a singular and unidirectional force and positioning the nation-state as being under attack fail to recognise that in many cases the borders and divisions between nations have deepened over the past three decades, with citizens clinging to
nationalist and patriotic discourses in times of greater mobility, instability and change. Meaghan Morris (2000) argues that theories of wide-spread cultural imperialism “minimise the importance of everything that has changed the world since the early 1970s” (p. 19). She also maintains that a universalising logic does not necessitate a universalising impact. That is to say, while some large-scale global forces or movements might appear to threaten smaller, more localised enterprises, cultural traditions or practices, there are almost always some ‘positives’ that come from transnational exchanges; globalisation is never uni-directional. Morris uses the example of the growth of multiplex theatres to reinforce her point. Morris argues that while the introduction of these globally franchised theatres have brought with them a series of unfavourable effects, namely that they have reduced the number of smaller, local cinemas and replaced ‘local’ or national cinema with Hollywood flicks, in some cases, she insists, the introduction of large multiplex cinemas has had a positive impact on local film industries. In some instances these venues allowed smaller, local, alternative productions to be screened for the first time in larger venues and thus gave a wider range of people access to these types of productions. Like Morris, Arjun Appadurai (1996) argues that the decline of national sovereignty and the threats posed by living in a seemingly borderless world are in no way fixed or universal processes of change, nor can they be understood in solely negative terms. For some communities and/or individuals there is much promise that comes from living in a world with fewer borders and regulations around travel and mobility.

In a similar way, scholars concerned with the globalisation of sexualities are quick to point out that while some facets of American and/or European gay and lesbian or queer culture have been replicated in cities around the world, this does not mean that they will manifest themselves as exact replicas in each locale (Berry & Martin, 2003; Binnie, 2004). To begin with, this view suggests that there is a singular or uniform way of being gay, lesbian and queer within the American or Anglo-European context. This perspective also refuses to acknowledge the innumerable ways in which gay and lesbian ghettos, festivals, marches or fashions take on their own style according to the local language, culture and geographies of a particular place.60

60 One example to support this is the ways in which Lucy Lawless and her character Xena have been taken up as queer icons in different ways by different queer communities around the world. In her work on Xena fan culture, Carolyn Skelton (2003) traces the various ways that lesbian fans in New Zealand and Australia rework the relationships between Xena and Gabrielle such that their lesbian desires come to the fore. The same television serial is taken up in the work of Walter Alesci (2002) who stresses the importance of Xena to gay male fans in Latin America. He explores ‘Xenaverse’, an online space where content of various episodes are re-scripted by gay fans such that new and ‘happier’ endings are offered.
In contrast to theories of homogeneity, theories of heterogeneity describe the intensifying pastiche that marks global living. Living in a global world means living in a world where everything is so multiply coded, endlessly diverse and irregular that one can no longer claim to belong to a fixed place or to have a clear sense of identity. From this critical perspective the spatial and temporal effects of globalisation do not necessarily thrive on the erasure of difference and the swallowing up of borders as suggested by theories of homogeneity, but, instead, globalisation is seen as a set of practices that multiply and intensify cultural differences, modes of production, geographic territories and ways of communicating. Whereas McLuhan (and he is certainly not alone in his views) suggests that difference is erased by theblanketing force of the global, the shrinking of the world into a single space, theories of heterogeneity maintain that difference is lost to the speed and intensity through which objects, events and ideologies are (re)produced. Theories of this kind construct a world whose order is so various that it is difficult to maintain clarity around the notions of culture or identity. Thus even scholars attempting to theorise those on the periphery of the dominant global core tend to anchor their arguments in this notion of absolute deterritorialisation (not in the Deleuzian sense) that suggests that local identities (usually understood as national identities) can no longer be understood as bounded constructs, but rather are merely mediations within a rapidly changing and borderless world. Images and ideas are so overlapping and various that to speak of ‘culture’ as something distinct or tangible, or of ‘nations’ as somehow contained within geographical boundaries or borders is meaningless (Altman, 2001a). Like theories of homogeneity, theories of heterogeneity position the global as a mighty and uniform force that disrupts existing forms of stability and control – nothing is sacred or safe from the grips of global capital.

In both gay and lesbian activist circles and within gay and lesbian studies there has been a substantial backlash against queer theory. It is believed that queer theory represents not only an American-centric body of work but also a trendy response to the disordered and fragmented nature of contemporary living. Altman (1992, 2001a) certainly maintains this view and fears that the efforts of early liberationists are lost to fluid, postmodern readings of global sexualities. Rather than responding to the ‘real’, material threats posed by globalisation, queer politics and queer theory are themselves products of the global. The fluidity underpinning both queer theory and queer politics and their shared refusal of identity categories are viewed as qualities that are bought and sold globally. They are held up as additional examples of how the reach of American cultural artefacts and/or of global capital fragment and consume gay and lesbian culture and politics.
The power afforded to the global, and the mourning of lost identities, be they cultural, national or sub-cultural, is problematic for it reinscribes each of these as a contained or stable entity. In particular, it positions the nation as a fixed and entirely tangible structure and undermines minoritarian critiques of the nation as a social and political entity whose regulatory practices exclude those who do not adhere to certain norms. Suggesting that nation-states and identities are lost entities infers that both of these somehow existed before globalisation in a pure and essential manner. This upholds a linear nostalgia for ‘the way things used to be’ and the global becomes somehow unearthly or spaceless, or as Larner and Walters (2002) describe it:

the idea is that as economic activity becomes more digital, production more fluid, communication more instantaneous, and people more mobile this gives rise to a conceptualization of a world characterized by connectivity and flows. The assumption is that social, economic, political activity is less bounded, located outside physical or geographic spaces, that with globalization it somehow escapes territory. (p. 4; italics in original)

Lerner and Walters demonstrate the ways in which theories of rapid global connectivity and flow imply that social, economic and political activity transcend the world we live in. Globalisation is thus extra-territorial, omnipotent, acting as a master narrative and a puppeteer of the social, the economic and the political.

Whether one is describing globalisation as a process of homogenisation or heterogenisation, the repetition of this dichotomy positions globalisation in a predatory role, linking the inevitable repercussion of global living (especially those associated directly with global capital) with the inability of minoritarian cultures to produce an effective counter-hegemonic polity. Theories of globalisation that see the world as “run away” (Giddens, 2002) and those that argue it is being “crystallised[ed]... into a single space” (Robertson, 1992) construct narrow meanings around ‘the local’ and ‘the global’ and adhere to a centre-periphery model of world order. It is therefore important that scholars think critically about how they, theoretically speaking, approach the range of changes characterised as globalisation. Greater attention needs to be paid to the theoretical tools used to analyse new global events or movements as they occur.

Taking a different approach to understanding globalisation, Arjun Appadurai focuses on the irregularities and flows of global living. The next section overviews his theory of global – scapes which attempts to capture the fluidity and contradictions that mark global living. The notion of flow (as defined through the idea of –scapes) is Appadurai’s response to earlier work that envisioned the global within strict dialogical terms. However, as the discussion that
follows points out, the notion of flows and fluidity might also be read as part of a wider set of neo-liberal techniques that govern how global subjects constitute themselves as global citizen-subjects.

**Imagining the global otherwise**

As the previous section illustrated, globalisation has been defined and applied in infinite directions, interpolating existing theoretical and empirical frameworks and, at the same time, acting as a backdrop against which one can understand new movements of cultures, images, information, peoples and capital as they emerge. Issues of ‘the global’ are equally as widespread in public and popular domains. Although not the primary focus of this discussion, it is important to point out that ‘globalisation’ has become the rallying call for a number of causes, ranging from the eradication of world poverty, to the elimination of the polio virus, to pro- and anti-genetic engineering campaigns, and to the more recent rhetoric around the war against terrorism (Klein, 2002). Arjun Appadurai (1996) argues that the number and variety of reactions to the term globalisation are indicative of the ways in which it features as a source of anxiety for various people around the world. When one speaks or writes about globalisation one is engaging with a concept that is articulated in multiple directions, for a variety of reasons and is emotionally underscored by a variety of symbolic and material implications, all of which, in the words of Appadurai (1996), have left globalisation “marked by a new role for the imagination of social life” (p. 31).

It is worth resting for a moment on Appadurai’s use of the imagination and the imagined in relation to the shifts and changes in ‘global living’. He argues that, “the image, the imagined, the imaginary – these are all terms that direct us to something critical and new in global cultural processes: the imagination as a social practice” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 31; italics added). He acknowledges that the transnational movements that mark contemporary living are by no means new phenomena – many other periods over the past two centuries have experienced equally as significant changes in the production, circulation and distribution of capital, peoples and goods. While he makes this point clear, he does insist that electronic mediation and the mass migration of peoples “create a new force field for social relations globally” (Appadurai, 1999, p. 230). Moreover, Appadurai argues that in this current phase of

61 At the time of editing this chapter, over three years after its first draft, the ‘war on terror’ continues, if not through the same amount of direct military force than through widely disseminated beliefs that the ‘Western’ world must be on guard against global terrorism. See discussion of risk below and the introductory analysis in Chapter Five.
global living there is a new role assigned to the imagination and that this change should inspire new theoretical approaches to the global:

The imagination has become an organized field of social practices, a form of work (in the sense of both labor and culturally organized practice), and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (individuals) and globally defined fields of possibility. This unleashing of the imagination links the play of pastiche (in some settings) to the terror and coercion of states and their competitors. The imagination is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and the key component of the new global order. (Appadurai, 1996, p. 31)

Appadurai extends Benedict Anderson’s notion of “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1983) to suggest that it is now more appropriate to say that we live in “imagined worlds” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 33). Imagined worlds are composed of various irregular flows that are never uni-directional and never wholly tangible. Appadurai (1996) insists that the components of these imagined global worlds are

perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors: nation-states, multinationals, diasporic communities, as well as subnational groupings and movements (whether religious, political, or economic), and even intimate face-to-face groups, such as villages, neighborhoods, and families. (p. 33)

He also stresses that imagined worlds act as sites for resisting dominant ruling forces. He contends that people can utilize their positionality within a given imagined world to, “contest and sometimes even subvert the imagined worlds of the official mind and of the entrepreneurial mentality that surround them” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 33; italics added). As the ‘official mind’ and the ‘entrepreneurial mentality’ imagine normative models of global citizenship, individuals and communities can imagine their (global) worlds otherwise – in opposition to these dominant forces of power. The imagination thus becomes a tactic for resisting and/or surviving the messiness of global living.

The terrain of ‘imagined worlds’

Appadurai puts forth a framework to describe the landscape of these imagined worlds that involves five overlapping -scapes. He moves away from over-simplified analyses of globalisation as a monolithic force that is ‘sometimes good and sometimes bad’ as he attempts to analyse the complex relationships that mark the symbolic and material flow of people, ideas, images and cultures in various directions around the world. The simultaneity of openings and closures, surpluses and deficits, consumers and producers articulated in Appadurai’s conceptualisation of -scapes counter earlier approaches that understand
globalisation in binary terms. The global is no longer positioned as an all-encompassing external power for in his estimate, viewing globalisation as a unidirectional entity fails to account for the pace at which various ideas or trends introduced from particular metropolises are immediately culturally contextualised – what he calls “indigenized” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 32) by minoritarian cultural groups.

Appadurai’s (1996) five -scapes embody the “fundamental disjunctures between economy, culture, and politics that ... have only begun to [be] theorised” (p. 31): ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes and ideoscapes. The head noun -scape describes fluid landscapes that speak to a broad set of global trends as far-reaching as financial or capital flows, to styles and fashions that circulate worldwide. Accordingly, ethnoscapes encompass the various people that constitute the shifting global terrain including tourists, immigrants, guest workers and all other nomadic subjects that appear to “affect the politics of (and between) nations to a hitherto unprecedented degree” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 32). Appadurai does not dismiss people’s attachment to the notion of home or birthplace, nor does he discount the significance of filial forms. However, he maintains that a greater volume of individuals are forced to move, choose to move or dream of moving away from or to somewhere and that this movement of bodies and lives, this human traffic, disrupts fixed or stable constructions of place. Technoscapes are equally as fluid, representing the high speed with which technologies move across various virtual and actual boundaries. Technoscapes move in complicated and multidirectional patterns. They do not only hasten the trafficking of information, they change humans’ relationships with machines and open up new pathways (not necessarily positive or negative) of communication. Appadurai’s -scapes also acknowledge the ways in which the distribution of technology is closely linked to the flow of capital and of people. Therefore, he introduces the term financescapes to describe the interconnectedness and rapid distribution of currency markets, national stock markets, the World Bank, multi-nationals and the anti-corporatisation movements worldwide. Finally, his theory of -scapes encompasses the disjunctures of what he calls mediascapes and ideoscapes. The former refers to the broad range and enormous volumes of information that is distributed worldwide and the images and language of representation attached to this information as it circulates. The latter captures the link between various images and the ideologies of the state and/or social movements explicitly aimed at challenging or participating in state power.

Appadurai’s model of -scapes, which makes use of metaphors of networks, disjunctures, fluidity and flow, and his focus on the imagination open up a number of important questions for the thesis with its focus on global queer citizenship at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. To
begin with, much like the notion of the *dispositif*, his framework of the global allows one to respond to the Games as an assemblage of overlapping and irregular flows that move capital, bodies, media information and ideologies around the world in rapid and irregular ways. Sydney 2002 cannot be viewed as a singular event that demonstrates the homogenising impact of American gay culture on other queer communities around the world. Likewise, Appadurai’s approach to the global discounts the argument that large, commercially-driven community events multiply difference and encourage consumptive practices to the point where it is impossible to have an effective or cohesive community politic. Appadurai’s – *scapes*, which position the global as a network of forces that overlap and disconnect in irregular and unpredictable ways, allows one to approach Sydney 2002 on much more complex grounds. It acknowledges that while the Games are an American-born, international queer mega-event that has slowly made its way around the world, this does not foreclose the range of ways in which local and regional ‘host’ communities make the Games into something other than an entirely American-centric event.

Appadurai’s work is also useful in moving outside binary responses to the global living and in discounting traditional analyses of global queer events like the Gay Games. As previously mentioned, the Games are promoted and sold as a global ‘political’ event that brings about changes of global proportions. While ‘diversity’ is used frequently in the Sydney 2002 promotional materials, emphasis is also placed on participants’ shared commitment to extending basic human rights and freedoms to gays and lesbians in all areas of the world, eliminating homophobia in mainstream sport and providing individuals with an opportunity to achieve their personal best in the company of other queer athletes, artists and activists from around the world (See Chapter Four). As such, one can build an analysis of the Games by starting with these ‘political’ aims and accepting that everyone knows what it means to attend a ‘global event’, to contribute to the ‘global queer tourism industry’ or to be a member of a ‘global queer community’. However, as mentioned before in this chapter, this project pulls apart declarations of this kind that speak to the Games’ ‘globalness’ and reassembles them to tell a ‘global’ story different in kind from the ‘story we all know’ about global living and/or the Gay Games movement.

**The problems of global -scapes**

Lawrence Grossberg (1996), while acknowledging how seminal Appadurai’s work has been in inserting questions of culture into globalisation studies, is cautious of his theory of global – *scapes* and wary of his formulation of imagined worlds. Grossberg argues that while –*scapes*
are arguably more fluid than previous models of global living, they are still modular in form. Although Appadurai explains that each -scape shifts and changes over time, Grossberg queries the need to name and frame this irregularity in such absolute terms. What, he asks, gets accounted for within new theories of the global and what gets elided? In other words, how did Appadurai (1996) arrive at these five particular -scapes when what he is describing is a “rhizomic” (p. 29) assemblage of endlessly shifting processes and forces? Grossberg also argues that the relationship between ‘the global’ and ‘the local’ remain under-theorised in Appadurai’s work. He maintains that Appadurai focuses on reworking the content of ‘the global’ and providing a revised model of the global that is simply more deterritorialised, rhizomatic and chaotic. In doing so Appadurai repositions the local as a place of resistance, while the ‘global’ remains a large and omnipotent space that continuously impacts upon the actions of local lives – albeit a less-locatable and more fractured one. Grossberg argues that what needs to be theorised is less the content of the global (or local) and more the changing relationships between the global and the local. Although Appadurai assigns more power to local communities, he does not, according to Grossberg, consider that perhaps it is the forces that move between these two trajectories - the global and the local - that need to be rethought.

Appadurai’s suggestion that the imagination has become ‘an organized field of social practices’ through which individuals and/or communities oppose and/or survive the conditions of global living also sits uneasily with Grossberg. Of most concern to him is that Appadurai’s notion of ‘imagined worlds’ relies heavily on Anderson’s idea of the nation as an ‘imagined community’. Grossberg problematises Anderson’s idea that the nation is an entirely social and cultural fabrication built on the commonalities of its citizen-constituents. To this end he asks: “Why is the nation not a real community, always built on the basis of imagined commonalities? Or is there even another possibility for understanding such communities?” (Grossberg, 1996, p. 174; italics added). Grossberg’s question implies that there is more than one way of understanding the relationships between the national community and the realm of the ‘imaginary’. He suggests that it might be more productive to rethink the nation as a real entity, that is, as the material outcome and/or effects of imagined commonalities between various groups of people. In making this shift, customs, nostalgia, memories and longings for place fold into an imaginary set of commonalities that with time and a great deal of investment shape nations in real, material ways and inform normative definitions around citizenship and nationhood. The nation thus becomes less a fictive template upon which cultures write themselves, and instead becomes the material outcomes of imagined identities, histories, geographies and so on.

93
The shift that Grossberg makes in his critique of Appadurai’s work is a subtle but important one, and one that opens up a space in the thesis to rethink how concepts such as the ‘global’, ‘the national’, ‘the local’ and ‘citizenship’ circulate at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. To begin with, Grossberg continues a line of thought that was introduced earlier in this chapter in the work of Larner and Walters. Grossberg singles out a need to interrogate the critical tools scholars use to make sense of globalisation. He argues that too often the global is married to a series of presuppositions that determine in advance what the global is, where the global is or when the global acts. Appadurai’s ‘alternative’ morphology of the global demonstrates that the demands for order and structure engendered in most dominant modes of thought are difficult if not impossible to escape. Grossberg insists that it is not enough to simply formulate new theories that describe the global in more chaotic and irregular terms. In his estimate, there is a need to make theories themselves chaotic and irregular enough that they are able to respond to the shifting dynamics that have come to be named ‘globalisation’. He argues that new questions need to be generated around those concepts and constructs of the everyday that are the most familiar – nation, culture, place, space, local, global and so on. To this end, Grossberg’s work is in keeping with Foucault’s insistence that the invention of new theoretical perspectives is a creative act of politics and refocuses the aim of this project, which is to find new ways of asking questions about global queer events and globally disseminated norms around queer subjectivities. As Foucault (1989a) explains so eloquently:

Political analysis and critique, for the most part, have to be invented – but so do strategies that will allow both modifying these relations of force and coordinating them in such a way that this modification will be possible and register in reality. That is to say that the problem is not really defining a political “position” (which brings us back to a choice on a chessboard that is already set up), but to imagine and to bring out new schemas of politicisation. If “to politicise” means going back to standard choices, to pre-existing organizations, all these relations of force and these mechanisms of power that analysis mobilizes, then it’s not worth it. The great techniques of power (which respond to multinational economies or bureaucratic states) must be opposed by new forms of politicization. (p. 211)

An important part of Grossberg’s project then is to invent or imagine new terms with which to theorise global living. He positions the imagination less as a faculty with which individuals and communities resist the flow of globalisation, and more so as the act of thinking otherwise. He is wary of theories that reinstate the authority of the global by theorising it on its own

62 Of course by devoting so much time and space to the ‘global dimensions’ of Sydney 2002, this project also contributes to the naming and framing of the globalisation apparatus. However, the aim of this chapter, and indeed of the thesis in its entirety, is not to suggest that studies of the global should cease just because they reinvent ways of knowing or seeing the world. Following Larner and Walters (2002), this project simply attempts to be as reflexive as possible around the use of the global, acknowledging the ways in which the tools used to understand globalisation are invested in the globalisation machine and are always in need of reinvention.
terms. To speak of global superpowers or local forces of resistance as stable assemblages that are in linear relationships with one another is to reinstate the power and force of the globalisation machine. He opts to ‘disarticulate’ the relationship between the global and the local, troubling instead “the different ways they have been, are being and can be, brought into relationships” (Grossberg, 1996, p. 176). Grossberg’s critique of Appadurai opens up a place where one can begin to make a shift towards asking how global living is ordered through various mechanisms and technologies that observe, monitor, manage and regulate the conduct or behaviour of individuals and populations. His approach shifts studies of the global from concern for the macro distribution of power and instead outlines the micro operations of power that are not bound to simple dichotomies such as local/global or place/space, but are captured in the junctures in between trajectories of these kinds.

Where the thesis is concerned, Grossberg’s critical reading of Appadurai raises the question of how one might reconfigure the notion of globalisation such that it opens up a new space from which to analyse large global (queer) sporting and/or tourist events. It is the aim of the rest of this chapter to rework Appadurai’s idea of the ‘image, the imagined and the imagination’ by returning to Larner and Walter’s (2002, 2004) contention that theories of globalisation are best reworked through an analytics of governmentality. What, it asks, happens to Appadurai’s notion of the imagination when Grossberg’s criticisms are taken into account and the imagination is framed against questions of government?

**Governmentality and the global imagination**

Examples from the succeeding chapters reinforce Appadurai’s point that images and image-based technologies play a new role in mediating everyday living, significantly changing the *kinds* of relationships individuals build with others, with the spaces around them and with themselves. This thesis also accepts his argument that images and the imagination are amongst a range of tools that individuals draw on to resist state forces or other networks of government.63 These ideas are reinforced throughout the thesis, particularly in Chapters Five and Six, where the various images circulating in and around Sydney 2002 are analysed alongside normative models of global queer citizenship. This chapter emphasises the novel ways in which images, image-based technologies, new-media technologies and information technologies contribute to the ‘making’ of global citizens and of queer subjectivities. In

---

63 Susanne Gannon and Sue Saltmarsh (2007) illustrate this in their work around detained refugees in the Australian context. Gannon and Saltmarsh offer a number of examples of how creative writing has opened a space for detainees to counter the violence and isolation of the systemic views of people living in detention.
particular it focuses on the ways in which they inform normative meanings around urban queerness at global queer tourist events like the Gay Games. In Chapter Five, Ron Burnett’s (2004) notion of the *image-world* is introduced. Burnett argues that images are no longer simple representations of real life, but that they are very much a part of everyday ‘realities’. The ‘worlds’ of both Burnett and Appadurai are arguably responses to the changing role that images and new-media technologies play within the global context. This said, there are a few important differences between Appadurai’s ‘imagined-worlds’ and Burnett’s *image-worlds*. The differences between these two figurations are terribly important in establishing how the thesis deviates from Appadurai’s line of argument and how it takes on board Grossberg’s hesitations around the idea of (global) imagined worlds.

As Chapter Five elaborates, Burnett argues that the ‘real’ and the imagined no longer exist in strict polarities, that the imagined is, in fact, very much a part of the ‘real’. Images and new technologies are vital to how humans exist and how they define and govern themselves as human subjects. They contribute to every facet of daily life, informing how one eats (online recipes), works (emails), sleeps (dreams, reveries), builds and maintains relationships (online dating), ‘makes a family’ (IVF), travels (automatic check-in services, retinal scanning), keeps in touch (video phones, online telephone services) and creates memories (JPEGS, facebook.com, myspace.com). For Burnett, images and the imagination are two of many facets of everyday living that contribute to the *production* of an individual’s reality. Offering a slightly different perspective, Appadurai seems to assign a more labour-intensive role to images and the imagination. In his formulation of imagined worlds, ‘images, the imagined and the imagination’ *labour* in new ways, acting as “a crucible for the everyday work of survival and reproduction” and “a faculty which allows people to consider migration, to resist state violence, to seek social redress, and to design new forms of civic association and collaboration, often across national boundaries” (Appadurai, 1999, p. 132). Rather than being an internal or elemental facet of the real, the imaginary is always reacting to or recovering from the real. It operates as a distinct faculty that shapes human beings’ understanding of the real, and this move in Appadurai’s work seems an odd choice given that his model of the global argues for disorganised lines of global force and ‘rhizomic’ connections between these varied forces. While clearly the imagination *does* act as a key way through which people survive and manage the innumerable upheavals and terrors of global living, it is not made clear in Appadurai’s work how this is *new*. Hasn’t the imagination always been a way of responding to and *surviving* change in other phases of modernity? Surely the imagination did a great deal of labour as people adjusted to early colonisation, to the advent of the telephone
or the television, to the introduction of the computer or to the various technologies of warfare that have come before this ‘global age’?

In Appadurai’s imagined worlds it seems as though the imagination operates as both the space of dominant ‘imagined’ ideologies and as the ‘faculty’ through which individuals resist or subvert the impositions of global living, if sometimes only fleetingly or momentarily. The imagination engenders the hope and potentiality of becoming otherwise or of inhabiting an elsewhere. It is both that which imposes sanctions on citizens and communities and that which opens up a space for new ways of constituting one’s identity:

This analysis of the role of the imagination as a popular, social, collective fact in the era of globalization recognizes its split character. On the one hand, it is in and through the imagination that modern citizens are disciplined and controlled, by states, markets and other powerful interests. But it is also the faculty through which collective patterns of dissent and new designs for collective life emerge. (Appadurai, 1999, p. 231)

In Appadurai’s description of the push and pull of the global imaginary there is a sense that resistance or survival within the global requires new forms of labour, the ability to imagine outside or against the boundaries of the dominant social imaginary. Whether intentional or not, there seems to be a dichotomy created between the real and the imaginary where the imagination becomes both a space for political reconstitution and the impetus or force behind creative practices of resistance.

This thesis takes a slightly different position, arguing that while there may be a new role assigned to images and image-based technologies in human beings’ lives, this does not directly translate to the imagination becoming a more significant form of labour, nor a more useful tool for cultural dissidence or survival. It focuses on locating discourses of the imagination within broader sets of neo-liberal imperatives that both produce and govern normative and desirable models of global subjectivities (and in other places throughout the thesis models of queer subjectivities). It argues that the imagination, in particular the promise for personal and political agency and the transformation it engenders, is a modality of governance that reinforces a neo-liberal, market-driven logic that sees the global citizen-subject as an entrepreneur and manager of the self, and of others. The imagination functions as a mechanism of order and regulation that demands that global subjects constantly imagine themselves in various new ways (or in ‘old ways’ couched in ‘the new’). As such, individuals ‘make use’ of their imagination, and of the various image-based technologies within and across the global landscape in order to constitute themselves as intelligible global subjects and normative citizen-subjects.
So while for Appadurai the imagination seems to offer the space ‘in between’ that which one is called upon to be and that which one becomes through processes of resistance, in this thesis the imagination is understood to be a tool or technology of (global) governance and a site for regulating the conduct and actions of so-called ‘global citizens’. The imagination becomes a vehicle through which one attempts to locate the elsewhere, the beyond, the otherwise of global living through various practices of self-regulation. Although never explicitly stated, Appadurai seems to designate the imagination as a biological or psychological faculty of some sort such that drawing upon the imagination is about making use of some natural or psycho-social dimension of the self. In this project the imagination is not biological or psychological, rather it is technical.

Various points throughout the remainder of the thesis illustrate the ways in which becoming a global citizen-subject entails not only constituting oneself as adequately global (fast paced, fluid, flexible, knowledgeable and technologically literate) but also as sufficiently in control of the dictates or demands of global living (grounded, driven, certain of one’s truth, creative and intuitive). Individuals are expected to give way to the forces and flows of global living, while at the same time demonstrating their capacity to manage and minimise risk within these spaces by taking advantage of global opportunities and getting to know their global selves. In order to register as an acceptable and/or desirable global citizen, individuals draw upon a range of skills and technologies that allow them to negotiate these contradictory, yet nevertheless co-emergent demands. As a way of clarifying this argument, the following discussion offers a more detailed engagement with the specific mentalities that individual citizen-subjects and communities negotiate as they attempt to imagine themselves as global citizen-subjects. More specifically, this section identifies five discursive couplings or groupings that, within the current neo-liberal governmental climate, are used as technologies for ordering the actions and conduct of contemporary citizens and/or populations. In different ways each grouping invites individuals to celebrate an open market economy and to take responsibility for their personal health and social well-being.

‘Be global, think globally’: Managing the global imaginary

Nigel Thrift (2005) argues that, “the kind of subject positions that are deemed worthy of managers and workers are increasingly similar to the kinds of subject positions that define the worth of the citizenry” (p. 93). Thrift speaks to the ways in which entrepreneurial language now permeates both state policy and the everyday exchanges of individual citizens. As state policy becomes increasingly corporatised and underscored by neo-liberal visions of an
entrepreneurial society, so too do various other socio-cultural institutions such as education and health that have a more direct (but not necessarily uniform) impact on the day-to-day lives of individuals. Likewise, media (television, radio, film) and various cultural or recreation activities (sport, museums, galleries, movie theatres, book stores) have become increasingly privatised and thus subject to corporate models of rationalisation and censorship.

Individual citizens are placed in a position of agency in as far as their destiny is thought to be less a ‘state matter’ and more so something within their own control. Global subjects become what Thrift (2005) refers to as, “mineral resource[s] with attitude. Self-willed subject[s] whose industry will boost the powers of the state to compete economically, and will also produce a more dynamic citizenry” (p. 98). Being productive and resourceful is what makes individuals successful and viable community members within neo-liberal government. As such, citizens take on the task of being ‘creative’, ‘entrepreneurial’ and ‘businesslike’ and deploy a range of strategies for self-management in order to remain in control of the changing pace of contemporary living. Of course this is the model of government – ‘government at a distance’ – that Foucault speaks to in his seminal essay, ‘Governmentality’ (Foucault, 1991). Chapter Two explained that as certain traditional structures of sovereign government (e.g. the prince) became less useful in the ordering of economic and political life, governments needed to find ways of securing order and control ‘at a distance’. As such responsibility for population management moved away from the ruling hand of a sovereign authority, it became the responsibility of individual citizens who were expected to take up various mechanisms of self-management “that lie outside the purview of the state” (Hay, 2003, p. 166).

As mentioned previously, contemporary citizens are expected to, on the one hand, acknowledge and embrace the rapid set of changes associated with global living and yet, at the same time, adopt a number of strategies of self-management that allow them to be both ‘in control’ of their ‘local’ welfare, but also atop the challenges of living in the bigger and faster global world. To this end, the global citizen-subject enters into a managerial position in relation to him- or herself, applying diverse managerial strategies to take care of the more mundane facets of day-to-day living. Again it is Thrift (2005) who is able to capture how this tension is played out at the level of the everyday:

a partially coherent set of practices...is starting to be produced by the cultural circuit of capital, a kind of instrumental phenomenology which can produce subjects that disclose the world as uncertain and risky but also able to be stabilized (in profitable ways) by the application of particular kinds of intense agency that are creative, entrepreneurial and businesslike. (p. 98)
Where then does the imagination come into play in management of these contradictory expectations? How is one’s capacity to imagine new ways of being part of the new discourse of citizen-as-entrepreneur that Thrift describes? The various subsections below consider the ways in which the imagination is one of a range of tools individuals and certain populations draw upon in order to ‘conduct the conduct’ of their global lives and constitute themselves as viable subjects amidst the schismatic demands normalised around ‘global living’. Each of the five short sub-sections below speak to the ways in which ‘the imagination’ is inherent in the neo-liberal project of making individuals and/or populations responsible for their own economic and social well-being. For each discursive field, an overview is offered that points out how each of these is used by individuals in their attempt to imagine themselves as intelligible global subjects.

Global freedom, global choice

According to Vicki Bell (1996), Foucault and Nietzsche shared a suspicion of liberalism and saw the liberal citizen “as a package for freedom” (Bell, V., 1996, p. 81). Like Bell, Nikolas Rose (1999) describes freedom as an outcome of human technologies; it is “material, technical, practical, governmental” (p. 63). Rose sketches a brief genealogy of ‘freedom’, detailing the ways in which discourses of freedom facilitate neo-liberal governmental order. He asks how freedom becomes ‘technical’, how it acts on the actions of individuals such that they order and manage their lives in novel ways. He is concerned with

freedom as it has been articulated into norms and principles for organizing our experience of our world and ourselves; freedom as it is realized in certain ways of exercising power over others; freedom as it has been articulated into certain rationales for practising in relation to ourselves (p. 65)

Rose thus calls attention to the ways in which discourses of freedom establish a variety of norms and truths that inform the ways in which individuals constitute themselves as human subjects and as citizens. He focuses on constructedness of (neo-)liberal notions of freedom which rest on the idea that freedom is something natural, something that has evolved from societies becoming increasingly civilised. Rose asks how neo-liberal models of freedom carry with them an array of mechanisms that act on the actions of ‘free subjects’.

The (neo-)liberal project defines government and freedom in opposition to one another. Freedom is that which ensures limited government and which promises personal and collective liberty, rights and choice. What is ironic about (neo-)liberalism’s promise to ‘give’ freedom and to detach it from state control is that freedom is in fact at the heart of (neo-)
liberalism. The act of giving freedom ‘back’ to the people is in fact what makes (neo-)liberal governmental projects effective and lasting. In promising freedom, (neo-) liberalism actually achieves a system in which citizens are neatly ordered and managed and in which those who are ‘not-free’ become free only through rigorous practices and procedures that require various ways of working on the self. Rose (1999) explains:

The achievement of the liberal arts of government was to begin to govern through making people free. People were to be ‘freed’ in the realms of the market, civil society, the family: they were placed outside the legitimate scope of political authorities, subject only to the limits of the law. Yet the ‘freeing’ of these zones was accompanied by the invention of a whole series of attempts to shape and manage conduct within them in desirable ways. On the one hand, the ‘public’ activities of free citizens were to be regulated by codes of civility, reason and orderliness. On the other hand, the private conduct of free citizens was to be civilized by equipping them with languages and techniques of self-understanding and self-mastery. Freedom thus becomes inextricably linked to a norm of civility; from this moment on, even when freedom is practised as calculated resistance to civility, its exercise entails extrapolating, parodying or inverting its valuations. (p. 69)

Freedom is not a natural or organic facet of social order. Instead, it is a mechanism of organisation and management, an “artefact of government” (Rose, 1999, p. 63) that is, as Rose notes above, “inextricably linked to a norm of civility” (p. 69). Freedom is always conditional and carries with it a variety of expectations concerning an individual’s conduct and action.

For Rose, the belief that one is free and that one lives in a ‘free market’ society is bound to the idea of choice. Individuals are given ‘total control’ of their economic and social destinies and thus can choose their immediate lifestyle outcomes and shape their future and their destinies. Increased choice is thus primarily defined by a greater number of consumer choices. Harnessing these new possibilities is thus the right and obligation of each and every individual. Underpinning this idea of course is the belief that (neo-)liberalism evacuates the inequalities of class, race, gender, geographic location and so on by providing an equal and level ground for all citizens. One’s ability or failure to achieve one’s economic and social comforts is directly linked to making the correct choices and to the amount of self-efficacy and entrepreneurial spirit individuals are capable of mustering up.

Neo-liberal ideas of ‘being free’ and ‘having choices’ are attached to a horizon of possibilities of ‘beginning anew’, ‘going elsewhere’, ‘imagining otherwise’. Subjects are shaped from within these possibilities as individuals possessing the will and knowledge to project and steer themselves through the ups and downs of the present and to secure a promising future. Happiness and security are a guarantee for the “freedom-loving authentic
individual” (Rose, 1999, p. 61) who takes ownership of opportunities in the present that will open up the scope and/or secure possibilities in the future.

In many ways the idea of being a free agent is at the heart of ‘being global’ and/or of ‘thinking globally’. The changes associated with global living are thought to bring about new modes and mediums for individual and collective freedom and choice. The increased availability of consumer goods and the increased range of and access to various technologies and forms of media are thought to equate with greater freedom and choice around consumption, information, entertainment and so on. Consumers cannot only access a more diverse range of consumable items, they can do so at more affordable prices, in much greater quantities, at much greater speeds and through much more convenient modes of purchase. These new freedoms and choices are framed as opportunities and any of the downfalls of the broadening of market opportunities are seen to be the result and/or responsibility of the individual rather than of decisions by governments. For instance, the loss of jobs some industries have experienced are seen to be a simple product of the times. Those who find this change difficult and struggle to recover from it are deemed inadequately adaptable and flexible. Often the only solace is offered in opportunities to ‘better themselves’ and broaden their skill sets through training incentives and entrepreneurial schemes.

How then do discourses of freedom and choice inform the ways in which individuals imagine themselves as global subjects? How do freedom and choice get mobilised in discussions of global living and global citizenship and how are these married to the discourses around one’s capacity to imagine one’s life, one’s freedom, one’s opportunities? Also, how are images, various forms of ‘global’ technology and the skills required to use them, bound to discourses of freedom, choice and to imagining one’s self otherwise? These questions will be explored in various ways in the succeeding chapters. However, for the purposes of this discussion it should be emphasised that as citizens we are continuously invited to imagine greater levels of freedom in our relationships with others, at work, through travel, in our leisure time and in our practices of consumption. It is not that we are simply exercising greater freedom in these areas in our lives, we come to imagine that a greater degree of freedom and choice is always just beyond our reach.

**Going with the global flow?**

Within neo-liberal rationalities of government, individuals are framed by discourses of mobility, fluidity and flow, all of which are closely linked to discourses of freedom and choice. When an individual is able to ‘go with the flow’, he or she is capable of withstanding
Minimising global risk 'at home'

As the discussion above intimated, while global subject-citizens must imagine themselves as increasingly networked, flexible and mobile, they must also put in place a variety of measures that reduce the risks that ‘globalisation’ presents to the quality of their ‘local’ existence. Neo-liberal mentalities of government do not only offer the promise of freedom, they also foster the need to manage and minimise risk (Rose, 1999). One’s freedom is always closely bound to one’s capacity to foresee, reduce or control risk. On a daily basis citizens in western countries around the world are inundated with mediated messages that warn of new global threats. Everything from global warming to global terrorism to global epidemics pose new types of risks that, while macro-managed by global networks much bigger than an individual citizen, must also be micro-managed by the diligent, prudent and imaginative citizen-subject.

An entire micro-economy has emerged to minimise personal risk. Private insurance is perhaps the most obvious risk-reducing product on the market. Rose explains that with the introduction of liberalism in the twentieth century the idea of insuring oneself and one’s family as an act of solidarity, that is, to better the overall security of the national community, faded. The autonomous and individualistic subject of liberal government was to only worry about the safety and security of his/her own family. National security schemes are deemed ineffective and said to actually foster insecurity and more risk. Privatised insurance gratifies those who take their personal security seriously and they no longer have to ‘carry’ the burden of those less committed to the security cause. Responsibility for life-long financial and medical security is given over to individuals who must act prudently to secure whatever their personal life entails. In addition to various forms of private insurance – house, house contents, car, health, pet, life – there is a vast range of products that contribute to risk reduction. Everything from car alarms to weight-reduction programmes and to stress reducing vitamins and self-help books become ways of purchasing personal safety and reducing everyday risks. Even fines for watering our garden during water restrictions in Australia, flu shot programs between seasons and Neighbourhood Watch programmes are peripherally linked to the political economy of risk management. Individuals are provided with a number of consumer options with which they can minimise the risk posed to them, their family and their belongings. It should also be noted that many of the ‘risks’ associated with living in a global world are underpinned by racist and xenophobic discourses that see ‘difference’ as a central threat to personal (and thus national) security.
Getting to 'know' the global self

As discussed in Chapter Two, Foucault's work in the third volume of The History of Sexuality (1990) focuses on care and knowledge of the self as political rationalities used to govern individuals and populations (Hay, 2003). Personal care is equated with personal management and self-control. In order to control one's self, an individual must first know him- or herself. As Foucault (1990) explains, "a whole art of self-knowledge developed" in ancient Greek societies "with precise recipes, specific forms of examination, and codified exercises" (p. 58). The aim of knowing oneself and the idea that one must undergo a variety of practices or tests in order to achieve this knowledge conjoin with the economic rationality of neo-liberalism in modern governmental styles. Neo-liberalism relies on the idea of the self-determined, self-controlled citizen-subject who is responsible for the procurement of knowledge about him- or herself. Neo-liberal mentalities of government link self-knowledge with utility – the more one knows oneself, the more adaptable and responsible one is.

Rose (1999) explains that self-knowledge is tied to the idea of 'lifelong learning', a discourse that underpins modern governmental mentalities and thus informs how individuals constitute themselves as subjects. In charge of determining the outcomes of their future, individuals embark on a lifetime of self-discovery or self-imagining. In other words, individuals are directed to continuously learn about themselves and who they are in the world. Individuals not only set out to acquire consumer items (and insurance to protect these acquisitions) but to capitalise on themselves – to make the most of themselves. Knowing and harnessing one’s personal capital requires a commitment to ongoing work on the self. Almost every facet of one’s personal life – family, relationships, shopping, work, leisure time, food, exercise, sex, health, education, travel, home decoration (the list is endless) – is framed by an economy of personal preoccupation. What one does for and to the self in each of these facets of everyday living determines both one’s immediate experiences and establishes patterns or options for one’s future relationships with or to the self. When one is getting a stress-releasing facial, attending group therapy sessions, responsibly reading food labels, seeing a grief counsellor, attending a yoga or meditation class, reading a list of tips on 'how to be a better lover', taking a mental-health day, attending dog-training, toilet-training or personal-training information sessions, or doing a self-assessment test in a parenting magazine, one is entering into the circuits of an economy that emphasises the importance of capitalising on the self and taking responsibility for knowing and thus bettering one’s personal welfare. For instance, where the workplace is concerned, employers now value employees who are willing to work on themselves. The ideal employee is one who is well-rounded, has 'life skills and
experience’, who knows her or his strengths and weaknesses and is willing to partake in specialised and ongoing training courses that expand her or his personal repertoire of skills. Goal-setting, team-building, group dynamics and five-year personal plans are now the buzzwords in both our working and personal lives.

While globalisation is often accused of multiplying and blurring one’s sense of self, living in an increasingly ‘borderless’ world also provides a range of opportunities for getting to know oneself and for imagining the possibilities of what one can ‘become’. The journey towards self-discovery (which is, again, lifelong!) becomes not only more demanding but also more doable. A variety of technologies of consumption feed on the need for ‘global’ self-discovery. Of course, the World Wide Web is perhaps the best example of this since web portals use advertising revenue to offer online services and communication spaces that keep people globally connected. Likewise, global tourism depends on peoples’ collective anxiety to be seen as ‘worldly’ or ‘cultured’ and to ‘see and experience it all’. With increased value placed on flexibility and mobility and with increased access to places that were once deemed remote or extravagant, travel is sold as a way of getting to know yourself and to gain perspective on what it is you really want out of life. Just as the road trip is bound to the idea of self-discovery where the adventures on the road definitely shape who you are (see Chapter Five’s reading of Stephen Elliot’s film, Priscilla), a week of trekking down the Amazon River or up Mount Kilimanjaro at the age of 18, with a backpack and three of your closest mates is now sold as a viable way of gaining a clearer sense of one’s self. Notions of exploration, discovery, challenge and adventure all contribute to the idea that ‘seeing the world’ means discovering more about yourself than the places you are visiting. All of these self-discovery opportunities are imagined through the economy of travel books, online travel deals and slide-show memories from those who have dared to harness these opportunities. In other words, access to images of places and people from elsewhere allow individuals to imagine themselves elsewhere also.

Like the tourism industry, globally popularised television programmes and self-help literature are dedicated to practices of acquiring self-knowledge and self-awareness. In the case of television, any number of personal problems are divulged in front of millions of viewers with the aim of gaining greater insight into one’s self-destructive patterns or as a way of harnessing one’s inner truth or strength. Reality television, for instance, is premised on the idea that those ‘at home’ get to watch, first hand, the processes through which others work out who they are in competitive and trying situations (e.g. The Biggest Loser, Queer Eye for the Straight Guy). Self-help wisdom fills the shelves of bookstores around the globe, sustaining a
number of related consumptive practices including a variety of approaches to counselling and therapy, stress, anger and other ‘management’ workshops, spiritual practices, life coaching, fitness training and alternative health practices such as Reiki, acupuncture, naturopathy and so on. Heidi Marie Rimke (2000), in her analysis of the discursive terrain of self-help manuals and books suggests that,

The idea of knowing oneself entails a kind of self-fashioning based upon expert convictions of what is ‘best’ to know. ...In the process of ‘discovering who one really is’, the techniques do the work of self-inventions. ...Rather than discovering their ‘real selves’, self-helpers create and constitute their identities by the very practices and techniques prescribed for knowing and uncovering. (p. 70)

Rimke points out that although the various technologies one uses to ‘find’ oneself appear to facilitate a natural process of self-discovery, these various pre-determined avenues constitute in advance what one can or will come to know about oneself, and usually what steps are needed to get there. In the case of self-help books, individuals are helping themselves by slotting themselves into a rather formulaic, step-by-step journey towards ‘help’. As such, the ‘helped subject’ in fact presumes the subject in need of help and the processes of self-journeying themselves. Furthermore, to benefit from self-help one must already be in the process of helping oneself, that is to say, one must already constitute oneself through the discourse of transformation.

Taking control of one’s health and fitness has also become an avenue for working on and getting to know oneself. Working on the body is thought to contribute to an overall clearer sense of the self and to contribute to one’s productivity and longevity. When one does not ‘know’ one’s body or is not ‘in’ one’s body, one is viewed as lacking motivation and self-efficacy. Through specific practices of self-scrutiny and consumption, individuals take ownership and responsibility for their health and well-being in a political climate where governments no longer take responsibility for these things.

Obtaining peak health and fitness is bound to an enormous range of consumptive practices (Heywood & Dworkin, 2003). Individuals are invited to make a series of responsible consumer choices that help them imagine better health and a better body. This can include everything from diet pills to protein supplements, fitness magazines, specialised workout gear, gym memberships, massages, personal trainers, low-fat foods, energy drinks, fitness videos and electronic scales. The fitness and health industries have given rise to a very elite and cosmopolitan set of consumer practices that are inextricably linked to unrealistic standards of (western) beauty and to the notion of an ideal athletic physique. Individuals who partake in these consumer practices are the ideal neo-liberal subjects, active and responsible
citizens who are taking charge of their own lives rather than passively waiting to be taken care of by others, namely by the government. Through proper exercise and health choices individuals constitute themselves as responsible citizens and reinstate their commitment to gaining knowledge around themselves. Samantha King (2003) studies the ways in which government cutbacks in health funding and research is bound to discourses of volunteerism and the idea that individual citizens are capable and responsible for ensuring these funding and support gaps are filled. She focuses specifically on the rise in fundraisers and ‘thons’ (walk-a, run-a, swim-a, skate-a, bike-a, roll-a) that marry an individual citizen’s responsibility for upholding social welfare with her or his responsibility for personal health, and with the idea that physical exercise is a way of working on the self.

Creativity, style and global cosmopolitanism

In each of the previous discourses outlined in this section of the chapter, what has emerged is a clear sense of the ways in which neo-liberal governmental order with its emphasis on the open market and autonomous and rational individual subject, introduces a variety of new ways of consuming or buying freedom, flexibility, mobility, self-understanding and so on. Within this political framework, individuals are constituted simultaneously as citizens and as consumers. Consumption is both a celebrated form of freedom, a choice and a duty of citizens.

This final section considers the ways in which the freedom, choice and duty to consume are linked to discourses of cosmopolitanism. At a very basic level, being ‘cosmopolitan’ means being open and able to interact with a variety of world cultures (Hannerz, 1990); it describes a group of people who have “become seemingly more diverse, more international, more worldly” (Latham, 2006, p. 92). Being cosmopolitan is often associated with global travel, or, at the very least, living in a city where ‘mixing’ with a range of people from different cultural backgrounds is part of everyday experiences.

For the purposes of this discussion, however, cosmopolitanism refers to more than a set of qualities or skills mobilised by a class of ‘global citizens’ who choose to live in urban centres and/or have access to global travel. Here, it also encompasses a political economy from within which an entire set of cultural and consumer practices define and govern what it means to be a cosmopolite (Beck, 2004; Latham, 2006). In other words, it is not enough to simply name and describe the qualities or characteristics of the cosmopolitan citizen. Consideration must also be given to the discursive and material (though these are by no means independent of one
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This final section considers the ways in which the freedom, choice and duty to consume are linked to discourses of cosmopolitanism. At a very basic level, being ‘cosmopolitan’ means being open and able to interact with a variety of world cultures (Hannerz, 1990); it describes a group of people who have “become seemingly more diverse, more international, more worldly” (Latham, 2006, p. 92). Being cosmopolitan is often associated with global travel, or, at the very least, living in a city where ‘mixing’ with a range of people from different cultural backgrounds is part of everyday experiences.

For the purposes of this discussion, however, cosmopolitanism refers to more than a set of qualities or skills mobilised by a class of ‘global citizens’ who choose to live in urban centres and/or have access to global travel. Here, it also encompasses a political economy from within which an entire set of cultural and consumer practices define and govern what it means to be a cosmopolite (Beck, 2004; Latham, 2006). In other words, it is not enough to simply name and describe the qualities or characteristics of the cosmopolitan citizen. Consideration must also be given to the discursive and material (though these are by no means independent of one
another) processes and practices against which one comes to name or describe oneself as cosmopolitan.

In their introduction to the edited collection, *Cosmopolitan urbanism*, Jon Binnie, Julian Holloway, Steve Millington and Craig Young argue that ‘being a cosmopolitan citizen’ is a “classed phenomenon” (Binnie et al., 2006a) linked to various tenets of cultural citizenship:

[cosmopolitanism] is bound up with notions of knowledge, cultural capital and education: being worldly, being able to navigate between and within different cultures, requires confidence, skill and money….a cosmopolitan disposition is most often associated with transnational elites that have risen to power and visibility in the neo-liberal era. (pp. 8-9)

In making this link between cosmopolitanism and class, Binnie et al. argue that to be a cosmopolitan subject is to have and/or to have access to certain bodies of knowledge, particular socio-cultural norms, particular experiences of urban living, specific types of consumption, a certain level of education and so on. From within the changing conditions of global living there emerges a type of an urban ‘creative class’ (Binnie et al., 2006a; Halberstam, 2005a) and being part of this grouping is about having certain life-style interests and experiences.

Interestingly, neo-liberalism thrives on the idea of a select, creative class, and entrepreneurialism emphasises the importance of finding creative and innovative ways of coping with the changing conditions and contexts of contemporary living. In the global context, the ability to creatively integrate a range of cultural practices into the way urban spaces are organised, business is done and human socialisation is played out, contributes to the neo-liberal agenda of ‘making’ individuals more resourceful, flexible, mobile and fluid.

Ulrich Beck (2004) takes this analysis one step further, suggesting that the idea of a cosmopolitan citizen or class, feeds an economy of excess that depends on the fetishisation and consumption of the Other. He writes:

Cosmopolitanism has itself become a commodity; the glitter of cultural difference fetches a good price. Images of an in-between world, of the black body, exotic beauty, exotic music, exotic food and so on, are globally cannibalised, re-staged and consumed as produces for mass markets (pp. 150-151)

For Beck, the desire to be more cosmopolitan, to acquire the quality of ‘being worldly’ is about making a number of consumer choices – travelling to certain ‘exotic’ places, watching certain anthropological television documentaries, eating in certain ‘ethnic’ suburbs – that
overlook the operations of power and give majoritarian cultures cause and permission to consume the minoritarian Other.

Conclusion

This chapter began by asking how theories of globalisation might be productively wed with governmentality studies. Drawing on the works of Wendy Larner and William Walters (2002, 2004), it argued that globalisation is less a singular process that “impinges upon subjects and more a site in the production of particular kinds of subjectivity and experience: ‘be global’, ‘think globally” (Larner & Walters, 2002, p. 16). In their analysis of globalisation as governmentality, Larner and Walters make use of Foucault’s notion of the dispositif (Foucault, 1994). The dispositif is a multiple and irregular assemblage of objects, peoples, spaces and discourses that are never entirely stable or permanent. As such, understanding the global as a vast and disordered assemblage accounts for the contradictions that mark global living, but also for the various theoretical and technical mechanisms with which the globalisation ‘story we all know’ gets taken up as truth. Foucault’s notion of governmentality and his formulation of the dispositif are important critical interventions for this analysis of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. Together these formulations shift the focus away from seeing the ‘globalisation of queer culture’ as a uniform and unidirectional set of changes and demand that scholars remain critical of the tools used to analyse the movement of ‘all things queer’ around the world. Where the Gay Games are concerned, questions of governance unsettle the idea that the Gay Games movement is one marked by progress or evolution. Instead, each Gay Games event can be viewed as an assemblage (or dispositif) that links up with, but also breaks away from, the other six Games. Likewise, one can locate ‘what happened’ at Sydney 2002 against broader contemporary socio-political and economic conditions.

This chapter outlined two popular ways of theorising the global, theories of homogeneity and theories of heterogeneity, and pointed to some of the limitations of these theoretical approaches. Here Arjun Appadurai’s theory of -scapes was introduced alongside his contention that, “images, the imagined and the imaginary ... direct us to something critical and new in global cultural processes: the imagination as a social practice” (Appadurai, 1999, p. 31). Although a much more fluid understanding of global living, Appadurai’s work poses a series of concerns for Lawrence Grossberg (1996), some of which were outlined in this chapter. Grossberg maintains that it is not enough to rearrange the contents of the global by reordering it within a less fixed theoretical mode. He also problematises Appadurai’s use of the imagination and his idea of imagined worlds. Grossberg insists that there is a need to
question why or how we have come to understand the changing conditions of the nation-state as ‘imaginary’. He suggests that perhaps the nation-state is the real effect of imagined solidarities and traditions that are lived out on a day-to-day basis.

Grossberg’s criticisms are provocations to think otherwise about the global and about the way in which we order the ‘globalisation story we all know’. As such, this chapter returned to the notion of globalisation as governmentality and to Appadurai’s ideas around the imagination and asked: what happens when one rethinks the relationship between globalisation and the imagination through the lens of governmentality? The chapter then outlined the role of the imagination in governing global citizens. The final section of the chapter overviewed five discursive groupings that mobilise the imagination as a resource for becoming an acceptable and/or intelligible global citizen-subject. What emerged was a clear sense of the ways in which neo-liberal governmental order with its emphasis on the open market and the autonomous and rational individual subject invites individuals to imagine a variety of new ways of consuming.

The succeeding chapter, Chapter Four, draws on the theoretical tenets introduced in Chapters Two and Three to ask how notions of (queer) sexualities, citizenship, rights and politics have been mobilised throughout the Gay Games movement. Drawing on a wide range of examples, this chapter argues that many of the neo-liberal discourses outlined in the final section of this chapter underpin what it means to be a ‘gay and/or lesbian’ and/or a ‘sexual citizen’ at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games: Under New Skies. It argues that while organisers promised political and personal emancipation at the Games, they adopted an assimilationist public profile that avoided direct reference to sexual difference and celebrated, instead, community visibility, collective pride, individual participation and personal growth. Moreover, the ‘political’ platform at the Games invited participants to view themselves as particular types of cosmopolitan citizen-consumers who are self-assured, ‘out and proud’, globally networked, mobile and adaptable citizen-subjects.
Chapter Four
Citizenship, sexuality and ‘politics’ at the Gay Games

Today and this week, we see ourselves as we really are: active, productive, creative and healthy... Let the Games Begin!

-Tom Waddell, Opening Ceremony address, Triumph in ’86, San Francisco

At a time when there is so much fear and danger, anger and destruction, this event represents an alternative vision struggling for the soul of humanity. This is the competitive idea for all of us: Acceptance, diversity, inclusiveness, participation, tolerance and joy. Ours is a world of love, questing to find the common links that bind all people. We are here, because whatever our sexuality we know that the days of exclusion are numbered.

-Michael Kirby, Opening Ceremony address, Under New Skies ’02, Sydney, Australia

We are your children. We are your neighbours. We are your brothers and sisters, fathers and mothers, teachers and citizens, and yes, indeed, we are your athletes and artists.

-Martina Navratilova, in Take the flame! Gay Games: Grace, grit & glory (Secter, 2006)

Notions of citizenship are infused with public images, official definitions, informal customary practice, nostalgic longings, accrued historical memory and material culture, comforting mythologies of reinvention, and lessons learned from past rejections.


This chapter is guided by a simple question: How were the Sydney 2002 Gay Games political? Although one might argue that it is more productive to first ask the question ‘were the Sydney 2002 Gay Games political?’; the work of Chapters Two and Three established that questioning the ‘hows’ of power allows one to map “the disparate array of practices” (Maurer & Perry, 2003) that govern normative models of subjectivity and/or citizenship. As such, this chapter is less concerned with measuring or evaluating the political effectiveness of the Games and more with how the Gay Games, a global queer sport and cultural festival, becomes intelligible as a ‘political’ event and how individual participants are invited to constitute themselves as sexual subjects and as citizens within this ‘political’ landscape.

The ‘political vision’ mandated by the Federation of Gay Games (FGG) and instituted by the various host teams at each of the Games is riddled with contradictions. For instance, on their main information pamphlet and on their homepage, the FGG claims the “Games can and will change the world” (Federation of Gay Games, 1997). At the same time, each of the Games is bound to the founding principles of ‘participation, inclusion, and personal best’ and has notoriously disassociated itself from any form of ‘radical’ queer politics. In the case of

---
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Sydney 2002, organisers positioned these Games as part of a broader struggle for human rights. In a press release issued to mark the 100-day countdown to the opening ceremonies, a Sydney Gay Games Board (SGGB) spokesperson made the event’s political aims clear:

Sydney 2002 Gay Games is also a rigorously political and intellectual event with a real commitment to advancing the human rights of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people around the world. (SGGB, 2002c, p. 1)

This fairly serious and arguably rather ambitious political agenda, however, is very different to the vision set out in the vast majority of the promotional and media materials for Sydney 2002. A clean-cut, de-sexualised, politically neutral and ‘inoffensive’ image of the queer community, and of the Games, is offered on the event’s webpage and on all of the major promotional brochures and official programme guides. Increasing gay and lesbian visibility, building friendships, gaining individual self-awareness and having fun seem to be the driving forces behind the event and these materials make no claim to a broader political focus.

What then is one to make of the Federation’s claim that the Games are ‘changing the world’? Are participants ‘advancing human rights’ by their very presence at this global sport and cultural event? How do global tourist events like the Gay Games operate as a new form of politics, replacing more radical lobbying efforts? How are ‘politics’ and ‘change’ defined or measured by event organisers or the FGG? How or when is the gesture towards being political an appealing feature of the Games promotional campaign, and when does it become the event’s Achilles heel, a weakness or impediment? How does one determine whether or not large global queer events like the Gay Games are changing the world or not or whether they are being adequately political? Is change necessarily the outcome of effective politics? If so, how is change measured? Why is one so concerned to measure a gay and lesbian community event’s political effectiveness? What does one look for when evaluating or (dis)qualifying an event’s political aims? How, as queer activists or scholars, have we come to know what being political looks like? Sounds like? Feels like?

It is the task of this chapter to address these questions and to begin to make sense of the contradictory political discourses operating within the Sydney 2002 promotional and media cultures. While some scholars are interested in asking whether or not these contradictions make the Games an effective or ineffective community event (Lenskyj, 2002a; Pronger, 2000; Waitt, 1999, 2005, 2006), this chapter is simply concerned with understanding the conditions within which these contradictions are produced and played out. It focuses on mapping the contradictions within the Sydney 2002 promotional and media cultures. While some scholars are interested in asking whether or not these contradictions make the Games an effective or ineffective community event (Lenskyj, 2002a; Pronger, 2000; Waitt, 1999, 2005, 2006), this chapter is simply concerned with understanding the conditions within which these contradictions are produced and played out. It focuses on mapping the contradictions within the Sydney 2002 promotional and media cultures. While some scholars are interested in asking whether or not these contradictions make the Games an effective or ineffective community event (Lenskyj, 2002a; Pronger, 2000; Waitt, 1999, 2005, 2006), this chapter is simply concerned with understanding the conditions within which these contradictions are produced and played out. It focuses on mapping the contradictions within the Sydney 2002 promotional and media cultures. While some scholars are interested in asking whether or not these contradictions make the Games an effective or ineffective community event (Lenskyj, 2002a; Pronger, 2000; Waitt, 1999, 2005, 2006), this chapter is simply concerned with understanding the conditions within which these contradictions are produced and played out. It focuses on mapping the
contradictory discourses framing the politics of the Games and then asking how individuals are constituted as sexual subjects and as citizens within (and outside of) these particular political configurations.

The chapter is organised into four key sections. The first section provides an overview of feminist and queer approaches to citizenship studies. Although this vast body of work is born out of a variety of scholarly disciplines including sociology, political studies, feminist studies and social geography (Bell, 1995; Bell & Binnie, 2000; Berlant, 1997; Cooper, 1994, 1995; Duggan, 1995; Evans, 1993; Hubbard, 2001; Isin & Wood, 1999; Lister, 2002; Phelan, 2000; Plummer, 2003; Richardson, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2004; Sullivan, 2000; Weeks, 1998), they share a common commitment to inserting questions around sex, gender and sexuality into existing debates around citizenship and rights.

Diane Richardson's (2000b) three categories of sexual citizenship – practice-based rights, identity-based rights and relationship-based rights – are used to direct the focus of the three succeeding sections. While these sections only touch on the vast amounts of research generated around each of these categories of rights claims, the distinctions are useful in highlighting how notions of sexuality, citizenship and appeals for gay and lesbian rights come together in irresolvable ways at the Gay Games. Although the Games claim to be advancing the rights of individual queer citizens and their communities, as this chapter shows none of the rights claims outlined by Richardson are easily integrated into the event's program. Drawing on the theoretical discussions introduced in the previous chapters, this chapter suggests that the contradictions implicit in the Gay Games promotional materials say more about the conflation of consumer practices with civic responsibilities than they do about an effective or ineffective gay and lesbian political effort. As such, there is a need to rethink how we evaluate or analyse the 'politics' of queer community events like the Games.

Citizenship, gender and sexuality

Feminist and queer writings have shifted discussions of citizenship toward issues of difference in an effort to complicate the notion of 'the citizen' (Bell & Binnie, 2000). Nira Yuval-Davis (1993) argues that the idea of citizenship is grounded in liberal, democratic discourse where a community of citizens is defined not only by who belongs, but also by who does not belong. The terms for inclusion within a national citizenry are always determined with reference to the conditions of exclusion. Once an effective citizenry is established, its member citizens tend to guard the boundaries of who will and will not be afforded citizen
rights with great care, ensuring that the benefits they secure are in no way compromised (Isin & Wood, 1999; Janoski & Gran, 2002; Phelan, 2001; Yuval-Davis, 1993).

Iris Marion Young (1990, 1997) suggests that many of the groups that have historically been denied equal citizenship status are groups traditionally associated with the body or with feeling, and are figured as too irrational and/or fickle to participate in the rational and non-organic functions of the state and its citizenry. Women, people of colour, homosexuals and children have, at different points in time, been deemed too emotional and untrustworthy to perform the ‘public’ duties of the rational-minded (white, heterosexual male) citizen.

For centuries, ‘citizen’ has been a term associated with men’s logical nature and with the practical duties and responsibilities of upholding the order and productivity of the nation-state. The political/public sphere was designated a masculine space and women were positioned on its margins (Cox, 2000; Lentin, 1997; Lister, 2002; McClintock, 1997; Pettman, 1996; Young, 1990). Rather than being part of the national body politic, women were often metaphorised within the national imaginary, their ‘natural’ feminine qualities likened to the land and their roles within the family limited to those of reproducer, nurturer and caregiver. Men’s defence of national territory was therefore also about defending the feminine features of the nation – women, children and the motherland (Lentin, 1997). Capitalism reinforced the exclusive association of women with the private sphere and of men with the public by commodifying motherhood and aligning the domestic sphere with discourses of productivity, duty and responsibility. Jana Sawicki (1991) argues that capitalism was “indispensable to patriarchal power insofar as it provided instruments for the insertion of women’s bodies into the machinery of reproduction” (p. 68). Women’s role as a machine-like child-bearer and domestic labourer became a national imperative. Women’s role within the domestic/private sphere was not only of benefit to her immediate family, but was vital to the growth, strength and productivity of the nation-state. As such, ‘public life’ and ‘the market’ remained almost exclusively male spaces that required not only a rational and reliable disposition but also an ‘education’, another luxury afforded more commonly to boys and men (Cox, 2000; Miller, 1993; Pettman, 1996).

The nuclear family has long been held up as a model kinship arrangement and one that supports and upholds the well-being of the nation-state. Still today ‘family-values’ are heralded the cornerstone of national culture. Protecting and defending the nation is cloaked in rhetoric around nurturing and upholding ‘family values’. Of course, the defence and

66 It should be noted that the idea of a country being the ‘motherland’ is far from universal. There are also strongly patriarchal societies in which the country is referred to as ‘fatherland’, Germany, for instance, is one.
protection of the family is not the nation’s commitment to ensuring that one’s chosen kinship arrangement is sustainable. The notion of ‘the family’ remains bound to a fairly monolithic heterosexual kinship arrangement that sees men positioned at the head of the family and links women and children to the domestic sphere.

Alexandra Chasin (2000) situates the cultural and symbolic importance of the heterosexual family to the nation-state within broader questions of economics. Tracing the shifting role that the family has played in the formation of the national imaginary, she explains that the sexual division of labour within the family unit coincided with production and consumption being transferred from within the home to taking place outside the home. Men were sent into industrial production jobs whilst women did unpaid work within the domestic sphere. While capitalism reinforced the dynamics of the male-female family unit within the home, it also provided space for unattached individuals to survive outside a familial arrangement. An increase in the number of jobs and the growth of a free-labour market facilitated this space. Chasin draws on the work of American scholar John D’Emilio (1983), who illustrates how this shift coupled with the growth of urban centres actually made room for same-sex relationships to survive outside of the heterosexual family unit and unsettled the idea that heterosexuality was the only viable kinship arrangement. In Chasin’s (2000) estimate, “it seems that capitalism...made possible both gay identity and the beginning of what we might call gay community by the early twentieth century” (p. 11). With the decline in the family unit’s economic function, and the possibility for non-heterosexual kinship arrangements opening up, Chasin (2000) maintains that, “something less expressly economic had to justify the social need for the family” (p. 11). The family thus reasserted itself as the fundamental cultural unit. The market no longer relied on the family unit to act as the primary site of exchange, but it did require a guaranteed labour force to sustain an active economy. As such, rather than functioning solely as producers and consumers of goods, the family became a procreative and reproductive unit, contributing to the rationality of the economy by ensuring that adequate numbers of workers were being ‘made’. The heterosexual order of the family thus remained bound to the national citizenry and all other kinship arrangements remained less natural and less civil. In other words, while the relationship between the nation and ‘the family’ had changed, they continued to depend on one another in order to sustain their hegemonic function. Of course, within today’s neo-liberal political landscape, the normative family unit’s role as a reproductive unit is also bound to endless practices of consumption. Everything from suburban housing developments, to kitchen appliances, to home theatre units to suburban utility vehicles (SUVs) are designed and marketed with the lifestyle demands of a middle-class, procreative, heterosexual family unit in mind.
The Australian nation as family

The importance of the family to the national citizenry is sustained by contemporary national discourses that mobilise metaphors of the nation as a cohesive family unit (Nicoll, 2001). Fiona Nicoll (2001) explores the importance of the nation-as-family metaphor to the Australian national imagination. Nicoll argues that the individualism of the Lone Digger who embodied the fate and future of the nation was eventually replaced by the metaphor of Australia as host-nation or national family. She uses the example of the Whitlam administration, which in the 1970s introduced multiculturalism as a move away from the assimilationist and mono-cultural dictates of earlier immigration policies. Nicoll argues that while multiculturalism appeared to be inclusive, inviting various racial and ethnic minorities into an ‘inclusive’ national fold, assimilationist and neo-colonial rhetoric never died, they were just masked by messages of unity and an invitation to ‘adapt’ to the (white, Anglo-Saxon) ‘Australian way’. Individuals and/or individual families were encouraged to see themselves as one small part of the larger, ‘national family’ unit. As far as the government was concerned, there was no need to expect all Australians to look the same or share the same ‘history’ – such policies were passé, perhaps even blatantly racist. Multiculturalism and the idea of ‘nation-as-family’ worked to ensure that despite the diversity of its family members “all [Australians] were committed to the good of all” (in Nicoll, 2001, p. 133). The ‘good of all’ and the idea of a unified national family thus replaced hard-nosed policies of assimilation. In 1995 this political stance was echoed by the Labor Prime Minister Paul Keating who stated that “we are not homogenising the culture; we are homogenising the values” (in Nicoll, 2001, p. 123). The emphasis is thus on all Australians adhering to the same principles of conduct and order, to be governable and to govern themselves for the sake of the common good.  

Family is defined intra-governmentally; it functions as a mechanism for the regulation of national character, and national policies are in place to always ensure that families take up their responsibility in becoming (or producing) good citizens. As Nicoll points out, the nation-as-family metaphor is an uncomfortably ironic choice for a nation whose history includes the assimilation policies that led to the stolen generation where Indigenous children with any trace of a European bloodline were taken from their families and communities and placed in

67 We have witnessed the re-emergence of a similar rhetoric most recently in Australia with Prime Minister, John Howard’s demand that all children learn Australian values in schools. His government have also begun the task of developing a ‘citizenship test’ for individuals applying for permanent Australian citizenship. In both cases, Australian values are bound to Judeo-Christian values and seem to be sharply defined against what have been coined ‘un-Australian’ cultural practices, most commonly defined as unassimilated, separatist and/or fundamentalist. Again, the move towards unified national values is not something that Australia alone is grappling with; many other countries are entering into similar cultural/political discussions.
foster care with the aim of civilising Indigenous people. Of course, what it means to be civilised is defined within a set of assumptions about whiteness as the ‘normal’ colour/skin/body and as Ghassan Hage (1998) contends, this association remains central in establishing a field of governmental power that privileges whiteness over all forms of non-whiteness.

The movement that Nicoll traces from the Digger individualism to the collective metaphor of the national family demonstrates a shift in where responsibility lies. The fate and safety of the nation shifts from the institutionalised, masculine and authoritative body of the Digger to the collective laps of communities and individual citizens. Civic duty is thus tied to the idea that if one protects and upholds the values of one’s nation then individual protection and security are more likely to be guaranteed. The formation of a singular, united national family is equated with a guarantee of personal and national security and as Chapter Three made clear, security in the current neo-liberal, global climate is bound to insular, xenophobic readings of ‘the other’ as a threat, contagion and/or danger.

The idea that every ‘citizen’ has a duty to protect the values of the nation is mobilised today in a variety of everyday encounters. For the purposes of maintaining this argument’s continuity, one can use the example of Australia’s recent national anti-terrorist strategies that call upon individuals to be on the lookout for outsiders or threats to the nation. The national government’s 2004 poster and television ad campaign featured in Figure 4.1 below encourages ‘good citizens’ to act as national watch-dogs, protecting Australia from terrorism.

---

68 Of course, a similar analysis could be applied to a number of nation-states where indigenous peoples have suffered under a number of genocidal governmental policies and practices.

69 As the discussions later in this chapter and in the remaining chapters illustrate, discourses that link family and nation are often used in LGBTI appeals for rights.
Figure 4.1: ‘Help Protect Australia from Terrorism’, Bus Shelter Advertisement (Kate Hansen)

The poster shows a map of Australia with its periphery composed of small images that seem to offer ideas of where to be on the lookout and what to be on the lookout for: an image of an airport baggage carousel, abandoned baggage at a train station, hands exchanging goods, Australian passports. The caption at the top of the advertisement reads: “Help Protect Australia From Terrorism”; in the centre of the map of images in smaller font it reads: “Every piece of information helps”. ‘Information’ here becomes material proof that citizens are, in fact, fulfilling their national duty and contributing to the national community. This poster and its call for citizens to be on alert is similar to the posters in Australia’s Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs\textsuperscript{71} that simply advise we “Dob’em in” and offers a ‘dob-in hotline’ for, again, good citizens to ring if they suspect someone is illegally residing on Australian soil. In both cases, individuals play an integral role in protecting themselves, their neighbourhood and the overall security and well-being of the nation.

\textsuperscript{70} For another example from this advertising campaign, see Figure A8, Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{71} This was the current name for the government department concerned with issues around citizenship and immigration at the time of these campaigns were initiated. It is now called the Department of Immigration and Citizenship.
These examples illustrate one of the key shifts that Foucault identifies in his work on governmentality (and more particular in his work around the police state), for they outline the state’s attempt to institute “government of all and of each” (in Gordon, 1991, p. 3). As Chapter Two pointed out, the state emphasises individualism as a way of enforcing a totalising art of order and/or management, or as Colin Gordon (1991) puts it, the state “strives towards the prudential by cultivating the pastoral” (p. 10). In other words, the government works towards a carefully balanced and well-managed society by positioning itself as a guide or ‘herder’ of the populace rather than an imposing or authoritative governmental body. Individuals are asked to take on the role of managing themselves and their family and in exchange the state is less imposing or authoritative, or so it comes to seem. Families are positioned as economic cogs, functional units in the well-oiled national machine, and become managerial units responsible for the regulation of a nation of ordered and decorous citizens.

**Unintelligible families and lives**

Since families operate as building-blocks of the nation, if/when an individual or his or her family do not register as ‘normal’, he or she can find him or herself disqualified from the rights, privileges and protection of the national citizenry and/or excluded from the broader national imaginary. If one follows the argument that national citizenries are defined not only by who is included but also by who is excluded (Isin & Turner, 2002; Yuval-Davis, 1993), then non-heterosexual subjects (and their relationships/family) certainly fall outside most western citizenries. David Bell and Jon Binnie (2000) maintain that, “all citizenship is sexual citizenship, in that the foundational tenets of being a citizen are all inflected by sexuality” (p. 10). Likewise, Diane Richardson (1998, 2004) argues that citizenship is always already heterosexual. Regardless of the model with which citizenship is being defined (i.e. social, political, economic, cultural), the ‘normal’ citizen is usually presumed to be male and heterosexual. Heterosexuality is normalised within citizenship discourse to the point of its invisibility, leaving most sexual minorities on the margins of their national culture. Sexual minorities register a weakness in the fabric of the nation-state. Lesbian women threaten singular models of femininity and call into question women’s primary role as child-bearers (Dunne, 2000; Ryan-Flood, 2002). Gay or homosexual men undermine dominant forms of national masculinity (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 1996; McKay et al., 2000; Messner, 1992, 1994; Messner & Sabo, 1994; Miller, 2001a; Miller et al., 2001; Nicoll, 2001; Richardson, 2002).

---

72 Here I use Gayle Rubin’s (1997) notion of sexual minorities as a way of encompassing single women and men, and those in unconventional or non-monogamous relationships who are also disadvantaged within normative frameworks of citizenship.
Likewise, individuals who are transgender or intersex interrupt the tidy ordering of sex/gender, male/female binaries that order everyday living (Bornstein, 2006; Boyd, 2006; Butler, 2001, 2004d; Kessler, 2000). Finally, because family is defined as a procreative unit that sustains national populations, same-sex families that choose to remain childless are disqualified as ‘real families’. At the same time, same-sex couples who do elect to have children, challenge the procreative function of the family and the ‘essential’ naturalness of male-female relationships and are thus vilified as immoral, unnatural and dysfunctional.

A growing body of scholarly work has engaged with the idea of sexual or queer citizenship, asking how gays, lesbians and other sexual minorities are forced to manage their place on the outside of the national culture. Much of this work addresses either the American context (Berlant, 1997; Cooper, 1995; Duggan, 1995; Phelan, 2001) or the British one (Bell & Binnie, 2000, 2004; Binnie, 2004; Evans, 1993; Isin & Wood, 1999; Plummer, 2003; Richardson, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2004; Weeks, 1998). The discussion that follows sifts through this large body of work to ask specific questions that relate to the key aims of this chapter and brings the focus back to the topic of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. The introductory comments of this chapter established that the Gay Games often make ambitious claims about their political impact and yet, at the same time, put together a very light-hearted and highly stylised set of promotional materials and event programmes that emphasise participation, visibility, friendship, goodwill and fun and avoid commenting on current affairs or controversial political debates. The aim of this next section, therefore, is to begin to make sense of these contradictions, not so much to evaluate or judge these contradictory moves by Games organisers, but to locate or situate this type of rhetorical schism within a broader set of questions about sexuality and citizenship. Remembering Grossberg’s (1996) suggestion (quoted in Chapter Three) that rather than rework the substance of a problem, scholars should consider reinventing the critical perspective from which they work, this section does not set out to solve the contradictory political climate of the Games, but does aim to put contradictions in relation to new assemblages (dispositifs) of practices and forces such that a different critical perspective is gained. It is not enough for queer scholars to ‘judge’ events like the Games and cast them aside as ‘apolitical’ or ‘ineffective’. Instead, new questions and new problematics need to be formulated around the Gay Games such that one can ask how queer community politics have come to be consecrated through the staging of large tourist events like the Gay Games. In addition, a renewed critical perspective means stepping outside existing ontological frameworks that order gay and lesbian or queer studies to consider how it is that the various qualifiers one uses to rank or evaluate gay and lesbian or queer political life — effective/ineffective, authentic/gentrified, grassroots/commodified — have come to function...
as such stable and easily identifiable categorials. It is with the aim of moving towards a new way of understanding *how* the Gay Games are political that the discussion moves forward and focuses more specifically on understanding how the notion of *sexual citizenship* is conjoined with various political claims for rights.

**The ‘politics’ of sexual citizenship**

Diane Richardson (1998) points out that although the fight for certain sexual rights has been an important feature of the gay liberation, lesbian/feminist and queer movements, it was not until the 1990s that sexual rights were theorised alongside the notion of citizenship. Richardson maintains that there are two distinct approaches to understanding the relationship between sexuality and citizenship. Some scholars work to make sense of the broad mechanisms through which sexuality and citizenship are produced and circulated as two separate but overlapping spheres. In contrast, a second body of scholarship focuses on *sexual citizenship*, a concept that whilst never very clearly defined, tends to focus on issues of rights, more particularly the ways in which laws and public policies discriminate on the basis of an individual’s sexuality. It is this latter approach, with its focus on gay and lesbian rights-based appeals, that has received the greatest attention from gay, lesbian and queer scholars. 73

Richardson is certainly correct in arguing that these two strands of critical thinking have, thus far, organised discussions that bring gay and lesbian or queer studies and citizenship studies together. However, it seems important to this project, given the contradictory ways in which ‘politics’, ‘rights’, ‘sexuality’ and ‘citizenship’ have been defined at each of the Gay Games, to begin the task of dissolving these types of artificial distinctions. Rather than seeing these two critical approaches as isolated perspectives, the discussions in this chapter bring them together. As mentioned above, the objective of this chapter is to ask *how* the Gay Games are political. In other words, it is concerned with asking what discourses are mobilised in order to present each of the Gay Games as a ‘political’ event. As such, the three subsections below ask how political appeals for rights and arguments for extending definitions of citizenship for sexual minorities are in fact always influenced by the various discourses that organise the broader governmental sphere within which these claims are made.

73 There are, of course, exceptions. There are some scholars whose work focuses less on rights-based debates and more on trying to understand how norms and truths around sexuality are produced alongside the regulatory values and practices of the national citizenry. Most notable perhaps are Berlant (1997) and Duggan (2003). Furthermore, there is a long list of others who address both of these (Bell & Binnie, 2000; Plummer, 2003; Phelan, 2001; Richardson, 2004; Warner, 1999). A number of these works will be used later in this chapter to formulate a different response to the relationship(s) between sexuality and citizenship.
Richardson's three categories of sexual citizenship – practice-based sexual rights, identity-based claims and relationship-based claims (2000b) – are used to guide the analysis of this chapter. Under each category of claims, consideration is given to the ways in which appeals for rights, the language of equality and references to citizenship are co-opted by organisers and/or sponsors as promotional or advertising slogans for the Gay Games and used to uphold very singular models of queer sexuality and of citizenship. The ambiguous political messages that proliferate within the Gay Games promotional materials illustrate four important points: First, that since the 1980s, when the Games first began, not only has what it means to be gay, lesbian or queer changed, but so too have the rationalities of national governments against which individuals define themselves as certain types of citizen-subjects. Second, that there is a limited range of intelligible ways of being sexual and/or being political about one’s sexuality at events like the Gay Games and that these limitations are determined to a large extent by the economic imperatives of the event. Third, if one is to begin to think through the complex relationships between sexuality and citizenship one must consider the ways in which both of these terms are bound to the discourses of global entrepreneurialism and to practices of consumption. If one is to ask who gays and lesbians are as citizens or to contemplate the limits of their civil rights and duties as sexual citizens, one must also consider who gays/lesbians/queers are as consumers, for as Chapter Three pointed out, the linkage between citizenship and consumerism is almost entirely in-dissolvable (Miller & Rose, 1997; Rose, 1999; Thrift, 2005). The fourth and final point this chapter makes is that there is a need to rethink how the notion of sexual citizenship should function within scholarly analyses of global tourist-driven events like the Gay Games.

Category 1: Practice-based sexual rights

The first category of sexual citizenship is what Richardson (2000b) calls practice-based sexual rights. These refer to civil liberties claims that deal with the right to participate in intimate and/or sexual activities and the right to enjoy a range of pleasures autonomously. Examples of practice-based sexual rights include: the right of women and sexual minorities to sexual and reproductive choice; the right of individuals to choose the type of relationship and/or sex they wish to engage in; the decriminalisation of anal sex between men; and, the right of People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWAs) to the same rights as other citizens (Lister, 2002). Each of these examples emphasises the rights of individuals to have their sexual practices taken seriously and the right to practice sex on their own terms, without fear of legal or social persecution. In practice-based rights, citizenship is equated with autonomy, privacy
and the guarantee of security – security around an individual’s legal right to make sexual choices and to security or protection from violence or discrimination once their choices have been made. In other words, the state is expected to protect both the individual and the range of choices available to them.

Citizenship claims that demand privacy are complicated and contradictory claims given the long-held association of the private sphere with non-citizenship matters. As mentioned above, the public sphere has traditionally been deemed a masculine and ‘civilised’ political domain. In contrast, the private sphere is associated with femininity and domesticity and matters pertaining to the private are often deemed non-state matters. As such, when queer constituents fight for the right to sexual privacy, in a sense they are reinscribing the sexual as a non-state and non-public matter (Butler, 2004b; Pearson, 2004; Warner, 1999). The heteronormativity of the public sphere remains unfettered and uninterrupted and although in making these types of claims, the domestic sphere and the sexual activities that take place within this domain are less exclusively ‘straight’ and/or procreative, queer sexualities remain privatised or ‘closeted’. Homosexuality, and the politics of visibility that were central to the gay and lesbian liberation movement of the 1960s and ’70s, are cast back into the private sphere where what queers ‘do between the sheets’ remains a non-state, non-public, matter.74 Queer activists and scholars have questioned the effectiveness of this political strategy, arguing that rights legislation that makes queer lifestyles legitimate in ‘private’ refuses to acknowledge the systematic discrimination that is in place around issues of sexuality and gender (Berlant, 1997; Warner, 1999). Another obstacle that arises in marrying practice-based rights claims with appeals for privacy is that sometimes violence and discrimination within the realm of the private or domestic get overlooked because they are deemed personal, non-state matters (e.g. sex workers experiencing violence in domestic settings).75

Practice-based sexual rights have rarely featured on the agendas of Gay Games organisers. Despite the fact that a woman’s right to reproductive choice, sodomy laws and discrimination against individuals based on their HIV status have been widely debated topics since the early 1980s when the Gay Games movement began, the SFAA and successive host organising bodies have never really positioned the Games as a political conduit for these legal and social

74 In Canada in 1967 the then Prime Minister, Pierre Trudeau, proclaimed that “the state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation”, advocating the right of Canadian citizens to do whatever they want to do sexually within the confines of the private sphere. For a discussion of the significance of Trudeau’s comments and the ways in which they inscribed a set of meanings around the private/public divide, see Pearson, 2004.

75 In saying this, one must take into account the argument that Lauren Berlant (1997) makes in The Queen of America goes to Washington State. Berlant argues that the state governs citizens through the privatisation of citizenship and citizenship becomes sanctified through private practices within the family unit.
debates. In fact, as the discussion that follows points out, the Games movement tends to de-emphasise sexual practice as a way of countering negative and/or pathological stereotypes of gays and lesbians. By showing the rest of the world that most gays and lesbians are not political or sexual radicals, the Gay Games prefer to make change through participants’ visibility, that is, they aim to “change social attitudes and have fun at the same time” (Secter, 2006). Although the Games maintain they are ‘political’, the politics of the movement does not seem to entail addressing practice-based rights or even really addressing areas where one’s sexual choices are the cause of homophobic discrimination, exclusion or violence. This discussion thus takes a closer look at the ways in which the Gay Games movement has elected to downplay the sexuality and/or sexual practices of participants and to detach the struggles of queer participants from the sexual choices they make. Certain patterns of interest emerge when one scratches the surface of the ‘political’ platform of the Games. For instance, it can be said the possibility of ‘being political’ at the Gay Games is bound to a very narrow set of practices and to normative definitions around what it means to be queer and what it means to be a citizen. Furthermore, the range of ways one can ‘be political’ at the Games are presupposed by the imperatives of a neo-liberal, market-driven governmental sphere that permeates almost every facet of the event, particularly its sponsorship campaigns. Individuals are invited to constitute themselves as viable members of a global community, as subjects of agency who are taking responsibility for their personal, social and political well-being and as valued consumers with a range of consumptive options and choices.

**Troubling ‘normal’ at the Games**

As Chapter One stated, Waddell and other SFAA organisers stressed the importance of desexualising the public image of the Games in order to counter stereotypes of gays and lesbians as sexual and social deviants. The sexual practices of participants were deemed irrelevant and/or incompatible to the SFAA’s efforts to have the event taken seriously by mainstream sporting bodies, sponsors and the media. Waddell’s efforts to deter those on the margins of an already marginal gay and lesbian community from attending *Celebration ’82* (e.g. drag queen and leather communities; see Chapter One), suggests that early organisers were worried that outsiders would see the event as just another incident of the queer

---

76 As discussed in Chapter One, organisers of both the New York City Games and the Chicago Games lobbied federal governments to waive the tough US visa requirements for people who are HIV+ so that international athletes could compete in the Gay Games regardless of their status.
community “flamboyantly lusting for attention” (Waddell & Schaap, 1996, p. 145). Waddell wanted to prove that the gay and lesbian community was more ‘diverse’ than the majority of media representations suggested. In doing so, Waddell emphasised the ‘decency’ and ‘civility’ of gay and lesbian athletes and worked to clear up any misconceptions of gays and lesbians as social misfits. As such, the public image of the early Games de-emphasised the sexually and politically confrontational history of the gay and lesbian movement and adopted an ethos of civic wholesomeness. Ironically however, what Waddell and fellow SFAA members deemed a ‘decent’ and/or ‘appropriate’ way of being gay or lesbian was in fact very narrowly defined. As such, a rather monolithic model of ‘normal’ same-sex desire proliferated in many of the early Gay Games promotional materials.

Since its formative days, sweeping claims about the political reach of the Games such as the Games “can change the world” (Federation of Gay Games, 1997) and extend “human rights and social justice” (SGGB, 2002b) have been fused with the language of visibility and assimilation. The ‘political vision’ for the Games established by Waddell and the SFAA focused on restoring participants’ self-esteem and replacing negative representations of the gay and lesbian community with images of healthy, happy and upstanding athletes and citizens (Probyn, 2000; Symons, 2004; Waddell & Schaap, 1996). Waddell believed the Gay Games were an opportunity for gays and lesbians to experience a sense of individual pride and to come together with other gay and lesbian athletes from around the world. They aimed to provide an alternative sporting space that countered the homophobia inherent in mainstream sport and allowed the (straight) community at large to see that gays and lesbians could be strong athletes and “vested citizens” (Waddell, 1986 in Secter, 2006). In his welcoming address at Celebration ‘82, Waddell proclaimed, “We will learn many things about ourselves this week and we will educate an untold number of others” (Waddell, 1982, p. 8). Elsewhere he states:

In celebrating our togetherness in such a fashion, we choose cooperation rather than confrontation to establish our visibility and identity. In turn we create visual examples of how we hold ourselves and this serves to educate those who need to know us better. (Waddell, 1984, p. 1)

This vision of participant-as-educator is underscored by the idea that change takes place when members of the minorititarian group show the majority (through increased visibility) just how unique and useful to the national culture they really are. Change is achieved by creating a ‘safe’, ‘inclusive’ sporting space where individuals can (re)discover their sense of self-worth

77 Tom is quoted in his semi-autobiography as saying “To too many people, gay rights was ‘you can’t stop me from getting a blow job on Castro Street’” (Waddell & Schaap, 1996, p. 146).
and achieve their 'personal best'. In addition, social and political transformation are reached when gays and lesbians prove that they are, on the one hand, non-threatening, everyday people and, on the other hand, a creative, unique and productive group of citizens. This is achieved by mobilising the discourse that gays and lesbians are 'just like everybody else' alongside the idea that the queer community is one that transcends the hatred and discrimination of everyday life in original ways. While gays and lesbians aim to fit in, they also celebrate their community as one that is uniquely loving, proud, accepting and inclusive. In both discourses, the sexual practices of gays and lesbians are deemed irrelevant, non-public matters and in some cases impediments to the community's 'political cause'.

This was, and continues to be, the dominant political focus of the Gay Games movement. Each of the Games is described as part of a broader movement that is “safeguarding the Gay Games’ founding principles of inclusion, participation and personal best” (McAdam, 2002, p. 10). These types of efforts to desexualise the image of the gay and lesbian community and to adopt a more gentrified and civilised public image of same-sex relationships have received both support and criticism from within and outside of gay and lesbian/queer activist and scholarly circles. American commentator Andrew Sullivan’s (1996) book Virtually Normal: An argument about homosexuality is representative of a growing body of conservative responses to questions of citizenship rights and responsibilities. Sullivan’s overall aim is to de-politicise gay and lesbian culture. He believes that the time has come when gays and lesbians should enjoy their place as equal and ‘normal’ American citizens. He says:

Our battle, after all, is not for political victory but for personal integrity. In the same way that many of us had to leave our families in order to join them again, so now as citizens, we have to embrace politics if only ultimately to be free of it...[P]olitics cannot do the work of life. Even culture cannot do the work of life. Only life can do the work of life. (cited in Bell & Binnie, 2000, p. 45)

Sullivan argues that it is time the queer community move on and let life “do the work of life”. Political struggle is not marked by the obtainment of rights (though Sullivan is a strong advocate of same-sex marriage), but by the achievement of “personal integrity”. Gays and lesbians will be politically and personally victorious when, individually, they can find a way

---

78 Other oft-referenced American texts with this gay conservative bend include Bruce Bawer's A Place at the Table: the gay individual in American society (1993), Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen's (1989) After the Ball: how America will conquer its fear and hatred of gays in the '90s. All of these authors are part of the Independent Gay Forum, a select community of writers, academics, attorneys and public intellectuals who define themselves as neither 'conservative' nor 'progressive'. They argue that gays and lesbians should play an equal role in American pluralism. They are politically self-defined as libertarians, limited-government conservatives, moderates and classical liberals.

79 Although a well-known gay Republican in the US, Sullivan was actually born and raised in the United Kingdom and is not an American citizen.
to return to their families and assimilate into the national fold. Sullivan suggests that gays and lesbians need to accept and embrace the role they play in America’s melting pot. Of course, his political commentary on the future direction of gay and lesbian politics has been met with criticism both within academic and activist circles. In their critical reading of his work, David Bell and John Binnie (2000) overview the list of ‘things’ that Sullivan ranks as contributions that ‘non-heterosexual citizens’ make to society: style, irony, childlessness, commitment, cultural and entrepreneurial regeneration and rebelliousness. Bell and Binnie argue that Sullivan’s response is a typical neo-conservative solution to the second-class status of gays and lesbians; any radical or transformative community politics is frowned upon and gays and lesbians are advised to work on their public relations front. Of course, Sullivan’s comments are also bound to the type of discourses that allow neo-liberal mentalities of government to hold. Sullivan suggests that gays and lesbians have certain qualities or attributes to offer the national culture (stylishness, entrepreneurship) and that they should lead productive and quality individual lives rather than focusing on collective political appeals and/or relying on the government for greater levels of social integration. It is worth holding on to this idea of Sullivan’s as the rest of the chapter proceeds, for it is this type of language that underpins the Games motto, ‘participation, inclusion and personal best’, and it is this type of language that is frequently being mobilised in justifying the shifts in contemporary gay and lesbian/queer community politics. It is not the aim of this discussion to re-inscribe or justify ideas like Sullivan’s, nor is the aim to argue that these attitudes are ‘wrong’. What the discussion does set out to do, however, is to situate Sullivan’s comments within a broader field of discourses that constitute individual queer subjects as normative sexual subjects and as autonomous, self-directed, economically-minded citizens.

Like Bell and Binnie, Michael Warner (1999) is very wary of arguments like Sullivan’s and contends that this type of political position has “an extremely powerful influence” (p. 53) on (American) gay and lesbian community politics. He maintains that what Sullivan advocates is the desire to be normal and that this is a very compelling political position given that “nearly everyone, it seems, wants to be normal” (Warner, 1999, p. 53). Warner believes that the radical, countercultural spirit of the gay and lesbian liberation movement in the 1970s and queer movements of the late 1980s and early ‘90s has been lost to the community’s efforts to “divorce homosexuality first from sex and then from politics” (Warner, 1999, p. 60). He maintains that the queer subject’s desire to be normal is understandable; queer bodies and lifestyles have been subject to vast amounts of social vilification and institutional pathology. However, for Warner, arguing that queers are ‘normal’ is “a false alternative” (p. 59) and one that fails to problematise the link between the norms that govern sex and gender
and the powerful production of sexual shame. A more productive political campaign, he argues, is one that asks ‘whose norms?’ He advocates for a community politic that questions how and why certain norms around sexuality and citizenship are produced and governed alongside discourses of sexual shame.

*The economy of ‘normal’*

Chasin (2000) is also troubled by the normative political practices of contemporary gay and lesbian cultures. In her monograph *Selling out: The gay and lesbian movement goes to market* (2000) she outlines the role that mainstream corporations have played in shaping the contemporary gay and lesbian movement in the United States:

> It is...impossible to understand the history of gay and lesbian political life in this country without considering the ways that identity and identity politics function in the marketplace. The way that gay men and lesbians in the United States come to understand themselves as “gay”, and as “American”, has everything to do with understandings of the relationship between citizenship and consumption. In turn, citizenship and consumption are only intelligible in relation to ideas about nation, sexuality, market, race, class, gender, and the public and private spheres. (Chasin, 2000, pp. 2-3)

Chasin’s work makes important links between sexuality, citizenship and consumption (and race, gender, class and locatedness) as she attempts to understand how, since the 1970s, the gay and lesbian movement has waged its battles to a large extent within the marketplace. She explains that by the early 1990s there was significant growth in the number of representations of gays and lesbians within the mainstream social imaginary. Gay men, and to a lesser extent lesbian women, were being named an untapped niche of consumers with greater amounts of leisure time and with higher dual income earning capacities than their heterosexual counterparts. The ‘pink economy’ emerged as a way of referencing the earning and spending capacities of this demographic. A popularised meta-language – pink dollar, pink pound, disposable income, DINKS (Double Income No Kids) – described gays and lesbians as a very monolithic group of consumers.

---

80 Again, this mainly applies to gay men’s dual-income earning levels. As Danae Clark (1993) points out, many lesbian couples have much lower dual incomes because of existing gender hierarchies in many fields and the disproportionate number of women in lower-income earning professions (e.g. social work, childcare, teaching, nursing, domestic labour). Katherine Sender (2004) points out that while lesbians were certainly a much less attractive market to mainstream marketers, bisexual and transgender people are almost entirely absent in queer advertisements. She explains that although there have been efforts to reclaim the ‘gay market’ as a GLBT market, she believes that this is really an attempt to appease a wider slice of the queer population rather than a serious attempt to include their consumer or lifestyle needs seriously into their marketing campaigns.
Identifying the gay and lesbian community as an ‘untapped’ group of consumers meant that innumerable corporations became interested in advertising in gay and lesbian publications or at queer community events. While mainstream companies tried to align themselves with the queer community by linking their product to the community’s history and cultural practices, they were also careful not to ‘taint’ their company’s image by associating it with the ‘negative’ facets of gay living, namely casual or kinky sex practices, radical (queer) politics and HIV/AIDS. Gay men and, again, to a much lesser extent, lesbian women featured as ‘normal’, respectable citizens and responsible consumers in various mainstream advertising campaigns. Of course the ‘normalness’ offered in these campaigns was less about presenting an ‘average’ lifestyle and more about inscribing an ideal model of queer consumer-citizenship. A sanitised and civilised model of gay consumerism emerged in various mainstream ad campaigns; he was white, able-bodied, wealthy, well-groomed, beautiful, fit, living in the city, and in a ‘normal’ (i.e. pseudo-heterosexual or homonormative (Duggan, 2003)) relationship. Furthermore, he was almost always represented in ‘everyday’ spaces commonly occupied by heterosexual couples, such as urban commercial districts, shopping precincts or the domestic sphere. Both the queer buyer/consumer and the mainstream advertiser (often presumed to be straight) were thought to benefit from the emergence of a ‘pink’ economy. Having been almost entirely excluded from public discourse in any affirmative way up until the late 1980s or early 1990s, gays and lesbians were offered a ‘normal’ depiction of queer living. To a large extent what was being sold (and, one could argue, continues to be sold) was a long-denied sense of belonging. At the same time, sponsors tapped into an oft-overlooked niche of buyers and could do so fairly discretely by using ‘tasteful’, non-controversial texts that were inoffensive to their straight, mainstream buyers.

Chasin (2000) argues that queer press and ‘community’ events have become increasingly reliant on advertising endorsements from mainstream corporations. As a result, these ventures have been forced to adopt a clean-cut, desexualised, non-radical and widely consumable public image in order to secure advertising/sponsorship endorsements. She maintains that the increasingly dependent relationships queer communities have established with corporate sponsors, media conglomerates and government bodies have resulted in what she calls “identity-based consumption” (Chasin, 2000, p. 24). Gay and lesbian/queer communities are now organised around various consumptive rituals which have rendered radical community political efforts obsolete. Rather than partaking in serious political projects, sexual minorities are invited to purchase their ‘difference’ and their political lives in the form of various ‘gay commodities’ and/or gimmicks that are manufactured and sold by self-professed, ‘gay-
friendly' organisations. She argues that the relationship between community supporters/sponsors and the queer consumer is inimical to any 'serious' political campaign for it results in "consumption [being] held out as the route to political and social enfranchisement" (Chasin, 2000, p. 101). Moreover, she warns that "private identity-based consumption might to some extent seem like an adequate substitute for public activism among consumers who otherwise support progressive social change" (Chasin, 2000, p. 43; italics added), but that the only change in the quality of the lives of gays and lesbians is measured in their capacity to access new forms of buying power. In her estimate, the trend towards replacing political protests and lobbying efforts with expensive 'community' dance parties, pride festivals and the purchasing of various forms of queer paraphernalia (e.g. rainbow stickers, pink triangles, camp aesthetics) marks a desire to assimilate with heterosexual, mainstream consumer practices. Likewise, shopping at designated queer stores (usually marked by the colourful rainbow sticker in the shop window) or buying property in 'gay ghettos' have come to symbolise a new generation of queer politics and have, again, effectively invalidated the need for other types of political action.

Chasin is not alone in her attempt to understand the now well-established relationship between mainstream sponsors and the gay and lesbian community. A growing body of scholars considers the ways in which the changing global marketplace has informed local community politics, the construction of queer spaces and/or the content and reception of queer popular cultural texts (see, for instance, Brady, 2003; Clarke, 1993; D’Emilio, 1983; Evans, 1993; Gluckman & Reed, 1997; Hennessy, 1994; Hjorth, 2003; Manalansan IV, 1995; Pellegrini, 2002; Sender, 2003, 2004; Simpson, 1996a, 1996b; Strub, 1997).

Katherine Sender’s analysis of queer advertising campaigns in Business, Not Politics (2004) makes interesting links to Chasin’s work and is useful in rethinking the ‘political’ climate of the Gay Games movement. Like Chasin, Sender asks how contemporary gay and lesbian/queer community life (in the United States) has been imagined through the relationships created between queer organisations and mainstream advertisers and/or event sponsors. However, her work moves beyond simply critiquing the relationship gay and

---

81 Chasin points out that many companies that get involved with queer events do not even offer equal benefits for same-sex couples. Furthermore, Katherine Sender (2003) explains that the work the market does to court the gay and/or lesbian consumer is almost always rationalised through market-speak and is seldom about companies adopting more politically or ethically sound business practices.

82 See Figures A9, A10, A11 and A12 in Appendix A for examples of how these types of consumer goods were used at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games. Figure A9 shows the inside of a brochure for Sydney 2002 paraphernalia. Figure A10 is an advertisement for Gay Games clothing collectables. Figure A11 is a picture of the Gay Games souvenir cart that sold various types of event merchandise to participants. This cart was stationed at the Sydney Olympic village at Homebush. Finally, Figure A12 is a photograph taken of a house in an inner-city suburb in Sydney that was making use of rainbow paraphernalia to mark the arrival of the 2002 Gay Games in Sydney.
lesbian organisations have with the mainstream marketplace. Instead, she asks how meanings around identity, community and politics are formed within the limits of these newly formed ‘partnerships’. She writes:

The gay community, on a national scale at least, is not a preexisting [sic] entity that marketers simply need to appeal to, but is a construction, an imagined community formed not only through political activism but through an increasingly sophisticated, commercially supported, national media. Marketing has thus been instrumental in the very formation of groups, including politically inflected groups. (Sender, 2004, p. 5)

Sender insists that gay advertising/marketing does not simply represent GLBT people as though this community existed as a natural or ‘pre-existing entity’. Instead, she explores the ways in which the gay market produces meanings around gayness, community, politics and so forth. In other words, Sender moves beyond an analysis like Chasin’s that laments the way, politically speaking, things ‘used to be’. Following Sender, this analysis of the Gay Games considers the ways in which the political aims of the Gay Games movement have produced (and continue to produce) notions of gayness and/or queerness and how they have mobilised the notions of civil rights and citizenship. The next sub-section offers a brief overview of how the call by early organisers of the Games to be ‘normal’ and ‘civil’ was reinforced by the growing interest by mainstream sponsors in the Gay Games.

The price of ‘normative politics’ at the Games

Market imperatives have long driven the public image of the Gay Games. Chapter One mentioned Max Harrold’s (1994) comment that the growth in sponsorship at Unity ’94 in New York City was a sign that Corporate America had, at last, discovered the Games. It was at the 1994 Games that larger corporate sponsors began to recognise the Gay Games as an important international gay and lesbian gathering and thus aimed to align their product with participants’ ‘sensibilities’. Take the American bottled water supplier Calistoga for example. They advertised in the official program for Unity ’94 with the slogan: ‘We don’t label people. Just bottles’ (Miller, 2001a). Similarly, Figure 4.2 features an advertisement for Miller Beer, another major sponsor of the 1994 Games. Here the Games commitment to inclusion and fair play is conjoined with discourses of gay pride and the company’s product and brand name.\[83\]

---

\[83\] Figure A13 (Appendix A) shows an advertisement for Sydney 2002 that aligns the notion of pride with one of the event’s major sponsors, Qantas Airlines.
Max Harrold’s comment that the New York Games marked Corporate America’s commitment to the gay and lesbian community fails to mention that while *Unity ’94* secured a number of sizeable sponsorship deals, the political protests and commemorative celebrations of *Stonewall 25* (see Chapter One) received next to no corporate funding. Sean Strub (1997) suggests that the political nature of *Stonewall 25* was much less appealing to ‘Corporate
America' than the clean-cut, conservative public image adopted by *Unity '94*. In other words, mainstream sponsors were not interested in *all* gays and lesbians, just the civically and economically responsible types that would be at the Gay Games.

The practice of promoting the Games with a very clean-cut and upstanding version of gay and lesbian sexuality was not limited to *Unity '94*. In planning for *Friendship '98* in Amsterdam, the host team (Team Stichting) hired marketing consultants ProServ Incorporated to conduct a market analysis and offer a set of recommendations to their marketing department. Amongst their recommendations, ProServ made specific proposals with regard to the 'political' and 'sexual' nature of the 1998 Games:

> [...] The Games must be marketed as the largest (non-AIDS related) gay and lesbian event vehicle [...] The Games’ marketers must guarantee a high quality, above the fray, non-political, non-sexual, non-militant celebration. [...] (ProServ Incorporated, 1995, p. 30)

According to ProServ, in order to secure financial partnerships, events like the Games must consider the needs of their sponsors and must market themselves as an appealing community of consumers. Organisers are encouraged to de-sexualise and de-politicise the event and also to promote the Games as a non-AIDS related celebration. 'Sexual', 'political' and 'AIDS-related' become flimsy adjectives that the community can simply choose to disengage with. Securing financial support becomes more important than establishing an event ethos that reflects the practice or space-specific needs of the community. What these examples illustrate is that when asking *how* the Gay Games are political, the question of politics cannot be divorced from the demands of the marketplace or the political economy driving the Gay Games apparatus.

Interestingly, less time was spent *de-sexualising* the public face of Sydney 2002. The market plan for Sydney '02 made no reference to the regulation of the event's sexual or political climate or its public image. Chapters Five and Six illustrate how, under the direction of Ignatius Jones, the Opening Ceremonies of the Gay Games were a fascinating mixture of rather clean-cut depictions of 'queerness' and more confronting representations of community life that incorporated those who have traditionally been excluded from events of this kind. For instance, both the leather community and drag queen performers had a strong presence in

---

84 The disassociation of the Games with HIV/AIDS as a disease or syndrome is longstanding. During the 1986 Games in San Francisco, when the number of diagnoses of and deaths from AIDS was at a high point, the topic of AIDS was cautiously inserted into the event programme, cushioned with discourses of health and self-efficacy. For instance, in a news-related piece in the lead-up to the 1986 Games, Waddell suggests that the Gay Games are not about AIDS, but about health (in Waddell & Schaap, 1996). This type of rhetoric circulated widely at these early Games.
these ceremonies. However, when it came to the promotional and media materials, SGGB did not go to any great lengths to counter the discourses expressed by ProServ at Friendship '98. Apart from the odd side-ways reference to sexuality, the promotional climate at Sydney 2002 remained rather politically neutral and certainly sexually modest.\(^{85}\) Not only did most of the official brochures, posters and booklets present a very wealthy and fresh-faced image of gay life in Sydney, so too did the promotional campaigns run by most of the media partners (for a list of media partners, see Appendix F). There was no sense that the Games were trying to subvert the heteronormativity of mainstream culture by inserting direct references to queer sexuality or (sexual) practice-based rights into their publicity or media campaigns.\(^{86}\) Sport and culture were used to emphasise the wholesomeness of the Gay Games athlete, but also the civility and utility of his or her body.

What is interesting in the case of Sydney 2002 is that while SGGB offered rather clean-cut poster boys and girls throughout their promotional materials (see Appendix D for covers of all promotional items), and while they made no references whatsoever to the event’s political aims in any of their major publications, corporate sponsors welcomed the opportunity to do the controversial ‘political’ work organisers (and their media partners) seemed to avoid. Throughout the Sydney 2002 promotional materials, sponsors made reference to same-sex (male) desire and, though to a lesser extent, to the political struggles of the queer community.\(^{87}\) Of course, this sexuality was always attached to a very white, attractive body and was almost always ‘located’ in urban settings. Perhaps the best example of this comparison is found in the Official Guide to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival (SGGB, 2002a) where the sexual content of the images on the front cover (Figure 4.3) is quite different to that captured in the full-page advertisement for Aussie Bodies\(^ {88}\) that features on the back cover of the publication (Figure 4.4). The subsection below provides a close reading

\(^{85}\) The only explicit reference to sexuality on the Games homepage is an advertisement for the event’s home hosting programme, established to offer visiting athletes free accommodation with local Sydney ‘hosts’. The ad read: ‘Get a participant in your bed! It’s an idea worth thinking about, an idea that could become a reality for 4000 Sydney households.’ This information was located on the official Gay Games homepage at www.sydney2002.org.au/housing/home.asp.

\(^{86}\) The gesture towards sexual modesty is one that has been a topic of discussion for Sydneysiders for the past decade. Bridget Haire maintains that Sydney’s Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Festivals “have been quite specific about policing the types of ‘sexual excess’ that are admissible under the Mardi Gras umbrella” (Haire, 2001, p. 107). Additional works that speak to the increasingly commercialised nature of Sydney’s GLBTI community and to the ways in which Mardi Gras and Australia’s (gay and lesbian) tourism industry are now intimately bound to one another include Best (2005), Markwell (2002) and Waitt & Markwell (2006).

\(^{87}\) The advertising team for Beck’s Bier in Australia took their commentary on gay community politics one step further by placing a full page advertisement in the Sydney Star Observer (2002) special photographic edition that read: “No half-arsed attempt to appeal to the gay community. Just Beck’s Real Bier”.

\(^{88}\) Aussie Bodies is an Australian-owned company that sells nutritional supplements.
of these two texts and asks to what extent ‘queer sexual practices’ were permitted within the Sydney 2002 promotional and media materials.

**Sexuality - a matter of taste**

The cultural festival guide is a 39-page booklet that provided Sydney 2002 participants with a list of the various theatre, dance performance, visual arts and musical events they could attend. Each event is introduced with an image, a synopsis of the work and details about the event’s venue and ticket price. Official welcomes are offered by the Sydney 2002 Co-chairs, Bev Lange and Peter Bailey, and the Cultural Programme Director, Tom Cullen. None of these welcoming statements offers a political rationale for the Games but they do describe the Cultural Programme as a reflection of the Games motto ‘participation, inclusion, and personal best’. Although some of the programme items reflected on the homophobic discrimination that sexual minorities and people living with HIV/AIDS must endure (e.g. Pieter-Dirk Uys’s *Foreign Aids*; Tim Bishop’s *His Spirit Flies*; the visual art works of Garrie Maguire; and the public reading events *Not Fit to Print* and *Home*), SGGB spokespersons simply pointed out that the diverse range of items in the cultural programme offered cultural participants an opportunity to “strive for their personal best alongside their sporting brothers and sisters” (SGGB, 2002a, p. 5).

---

89 While the official *Cultural Festival* guide, it also overviews the Conference and Party programmes.
Figure 4.3: Front cover, *Official Guide to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival* (SGGB)
As Figure 4.3 illustrates, the programme cover is designed in shades of rusty orange, copper and black. The central image on the cover is of a woman with long, blonde hair, wearing an elegant, fitted sequined gown. The woman’s body is petite and her pose confident, considered, yet not strained; her slight, feminine hips are resting against a bed of material that matches her dress. Her breasts, waistline and buttock are accentuated by both the type of dress she is wearing and by the distribution of light across the image. Her face is pushing away from the camera, fading into the background and the viewer cannot see her eyes. As such, there is no point of contact or exchange between the woman in the image and the viewer. The graceful upward extension of her left arm directs viewers’ eyes towards the programme title that is printed in fine, white font in the upper left-hand corner of the cover, along with the festival’s dates. The title and dates float on a bed of stars, printed in various tones of orange, with pink undertones. These stars reference the Games theme *Under New Skies*, and are used in many of the event’s promotional items.\(^{90}\) Directly below the title, in the bottom right-hand corner of the cover, the event’s Southern Cross emblem is placed atop the folds of sequined material with the montage of stars decorated in bright fuchsia pink. The 2002 javelin logo is placed in the left-hand corner and bears the traditional FGG logo of three interconnected rings.\(^{91}\) The *Official Guide to the Cultural Festival* offers a rather conventional image of femininity and of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games as a whole.

In contrast, the image on the back cover of the same booklet, shown in Figure 4.4, features a full-page advertisement for Aussie Bodies, one of the major sponsors for Sydney 2002. Viewers are invited into the contradictory space of the men’s locker room, a hyper-masculine domain riddled with “homophobic and sexist banter” (Messner & Sabo, 1994, p. 48) but at the same time a space that “feed[s] the homoerotic imagination and provide[s] homoerotic contact” (Pronger, 1990, p. 195). In this particular locker room a young, topless male athlete reclines on a slate grey bench with an Aussie Bodies Protein Revival drink box in his hand. The focal point of the image is constructed through a series of intersecting diagonals that meet at the athlete’s muscular torso and groin. Where the female body in Figure 4.3 was turned away from the viewer, drawing his or her line of vision towards the image’s periphery, the male body in this image invites, even demands, the viewer’s gaze.

---

\(^{90}\) See for instance, Figures D1-D6, D9, D11-D13 in Appendix D.

\(^{91}\) The Sydney 2002 logo was designed in June 1999 and included the Javelin, the Gay Games VI Banner and the Southern Cross Emblem (Barnes, 2002b).
Figure 4.4: Aussie Bodies advertisement, back cover of the *Official Guide to Sydney 2002 Cultural Festival* (SGGB)
The grey and white tones of the image are interrupted by the deep black of the athlete’s Adidas leggings and by the bright blue and orange casing of the Aussie Bodies product. The leather-laced ball he is leaning on and the glaze of moisture on his skin suggest he is seeking his ‘revival’ after a game of American gridiron football. Viewers are left to wonder whether this is a local boy learning a new game or a preview of the calibre of Gay Games visitors local participants can anticipate. With straw just meeting his slightly pursed lips, the athlete stares into the camera with the same intensity and intention as the ad’s main slogan “Looking for a Pickup?” reads and his eyes suggest. Below in the smaller print the image states: “Protein Revival delivers instant, sustained energy without the comedown of a sugar or caffeine high. It’s the one pickup that won’t let you down.” The ad seems to suggest that this nutritional supplement is like a well-kept male athlete. Offering “instant sustained energy without the comedown”, this supplement and men of this kind are quality pickups “that won’t let you down”, and here coming down seems to be signified by more than just a state of unhappiness.

In the context of the Gay Games Cultural Programme, this advertisement serves two key functions: First, it reinstates the sexual context of the event which was, perhaps out of necessity, extracted by Sydney organisers. Second, it inserts homosexual desire into a traditionally hyper-masculine domain – sport. The athlete’s striking masculinity coupled with his suggestion or offer of sex confirms Messner and Sabo’s (1994) point that:

...since homosexual behaviours – or even covert expressions of desire – violate locker-room norms, most gay men develop an ironic strategy of identity construction: while superficially conforming to the heterosexist masculine culture, they view this culture through their hidden knowledge of the highly charged eroticism of the locker room. (p. 50)

Although there is a great deal more that could be said about this image in terms of its depiction of the hyper-masculine, sexually charged gay male athletic body, for the time being this advertisement is useful in exploring why it is that while participants and organisers at Sydney 2002 adopted an assimilationist political stance and ‘normalised’ their public image, some sponsors elected to identify their products with what they see as the edgy and sexually charged facets of contemporary queer living. The sexualised, gay masculine image offered by sponsors is an interesting contrast to the feminised image on the front cover that in no way references the sexuality of participants at the Games. It would seem that Gay Games organisers worked to desexualise their image in order to secure sponsors, and then sponsors packaged and sold queer sexuality back to the community alongside their own products and/or brand names. In SGGB’s promotional materials sexuality seemed to operate as a ‘non-issue’. While it was not dutifully policed as it was in previous Games, it was not at the fore of
the event’s public image either. Once in the hand of sponsors, however, queer sexuality shifted to the realm of the public. While Sydney organisers were not prepared to make explicit references to same-sex sexual practices, let alone to same-sex practice-based rights, advertisers played freely with a series of sexual innuendos.92

This comparison is made even more complex by the fact that the woman featured on the cultural programme guide is in fact a male-to-female transsexual (Mills, 2002b). The viewer is given no indication that this body is different from any other female body; the model is not even listed in the cover credits. Of course, one could argue that this image disrupts the rules of gender representation as it refutes the idea that there is an essential or singular female body and challenges the idea that transgendered or transsexual bodies should share a common outward aesthetic. The image also acts as an example of how individuals and communities adopt strategies and tactics with which to ‘make do’ (Fiske, 1989) within an economically rationalised and hyper-mediated cultural life. The transgender/transsexual body, which is commonly deemed inappropriate, incomplete or irregular within the normative sex/gender order (Bornstein, 1994, 2006; Butler, 1993, 1999; Califia, 2006; Feinberg, 2006; Halberstam, 1998), is inserted into this public document and manages to ‘pass’ as a ‘normal’ female body. In passing as ‘female’, this body disrupts the stability of the binaries male/female, man/woman and masculine/feminine that order everyday living. One could also argue that this image functions much like what Toby Miller (2001a) describes as “encrypted ad” or as “vague ads”, “designed to make queers feel special for being ‘in the know’ while not offending straights who are unable to read the codes” (p. 54). The woman in the image is a well-known local performer and thus might have been recognisable to some Sydneysiders. Perhaps organisers inserted her body on the cover of this text as a way of preserving the diversity of the local community while doing so within a format that did not offend conservative outsiders, mainstream media partners or event sponsors. While all of these readings put a positive spin on the ambiguity of this body’s sex and/or (trans)gender, it is also important to consider how this body is stripped of its difference and to point out that it finds its place in a festival guide that is all-in-all sexually and politically conservative.

92 For additional sponsorship advertisements like this one that reference participants’ sexuality, see Figures A14–A19 in Appendix A. These images illustrate that when advertisements referenced sexuality they were almost always aimed at men. Figure A20 is the only ad that appeared in the *Official Guide to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival* (SGGB, 2002a) that was directed at women. However, rather than using sexual references in the ad, Aussie Bodies focused instead on women’s concern for attaining the ‘ideal’ female athletic physique. Even in *Lesbians on the Loose*, Australia’s lesbian publication, there were no ads aimed at Gay Games participants that referenced lesbian sexuality. The ads that were published at the time of the Games were generic travel advertisements that showed women holidaying together and having fun. They made no references to lesbian sexuality.
Certainly one could argue that promotions like the Aussie Bodies advertisement were ‘safe’ within the confines of the Sydney 2002 promotional climate as they were likely received by a primarily queer readership. In other words, one could argue that Aussie Bodies could afford to ‘dirty’ their brand within this publication without the risk of alienating or offending their straight consumers. But something else seems to be operating here, something that returns this discussion to both the work of Katherine Sender (2004) and to the various discourses that Chapter Three identified as distinguishing features of an emergent model of global citizenship.

Having conducted a series of interviews with mainstream advertising agencies and gay media agents, Sender tries to make sense of when and where the line between sexy and sleazy gay sexual content is drawn. She explains that in some cases “sexual content is not banished [from gay ads]...but [is] contained by aesthetic tastefulness” (Sender, 2004, p. 201) and that this idea of tastefulness is central to understanding how the normative gay consumer-subject is produced. She outlines a model that some marketers and/or gay magazine editors use in defining “tasteful [gay] sexiness” (Sender, 2004, p. 213). A set of arbitrary criteria is mobilised to distinguish between acceptable queer sexiness (most commonly sex between two men) and pornographic sleaze. These include: the aesthetic quality of the text (artistic versus pornographic presentation), the discretion of the erotic/sexual content of the text (implicit, homosocial content versus explicit references to homosex), the necessity of the sexual content within the text (sexual information versus sexual gratuitousness), and the context of the sexual moment or encounter imagined in the text (a playful reference to intimacy between two ‘respectable’ subjects versus kinky, commercially facilitated sexual exchanges between virtual strangers or multiple partners).

Considered against Sender’s topography of sexual taste, what might one say about the sexual content of the Aussie Bodies advertisement shown in Figure 4.4? In terms of its aesthetic quality, this advertisement, while sexually provocative is professional and artistically presented. The sassy offer of ‘a pickup that won’t let you down’ is made ‘tasteful’ by the fresh-faced, classically handsome male model used in the ad, and by the professional quality of the photograph, layout and glossy, high quality finish of the ad. To this end, the ad can be read as ‘designerly’ or artistic, rather than aesthetically crass or offensive. One could also argue that this text qualifies as ‘erotic’ rather than sleazy or pornographic for it playfully calls attention to the homoerotic underbelly of male sporting domains. While the advertisement gestures towards the possibility of a casual sexual encounter (i.e. he is looking for a pickup rather than a relationship), the offer remains implicit and private rather than
raunchy and explicit and thus passes as clever, sexy and tasteful rather than indiscreet or distasteful. The sexual content of the text passes because it is contained within a format that renders it tasteful.

As Chapter Three suggested, the ideas of taste and style are associated with a set of aesthetic qualities thought to define a new type of urban cosmopolitan living. As such, selling ‘tasteful’ gay or queer sexuality means also selling a normative model of queer cosmopolitan living. Aussie Bodies are not only selling participants ‘back’ their sexuality (via their protein revival box drink), they are also offering buyers important messages about what it means to be a normative gay male subject, an athlete and, arguably, a Sydney 2002 Gay Games participant. The athlete in this advertisement is afforded some sexual playfulness because of the particular brand of ‘tastefulness’ he exemplifies: white, able-bodied, slim, fit and well-toned, well-groomed and embodying a rather traditional style of sporting masculinity. These ‘qualities’ of course are earned through various rituals and economies of self-work: sport and fitness, proper nutrition, travel and tourism. This advertisement (and the ‘tasteful’ sexuality it allows for) not only inscribes a very particular, homonormative (Duggan, 2003) ideal for queer living, it also validates various practices of self-management and self-regulation, all of which are bound to very particular cosmopolitan consumer practices.

**Category 2: Identity-based claims**

Richardson’s second category of sexual rights claims is identity-based rights. These are often associated with the emergence of the gay and lesbian liberation movement in the 1960s and ’70s (Chasin, 2000; Lister, 2002). Identity-based claims primarily focus on the right to public recognition. Where practice-based appeals focus on sexual minorities’ right to choice and privacy around sexual matters, identity-based claims maintain that sexual minorities should be allowed greater public recognition and political freedom. Identity-based claims are thus about the right to self-definition and self-expression and the right to exercise both of these without fear of public persecution or discrimination. Individuals and groups making identity-based claims can often demand greater representation in public life and in the media. Over the past three or four decades debates concerning the recognition of homosexuals in the church; the protection of queer teachers in schools; the right to be gay or lesbian in the military (see brief discussion of gays in the US military in the introduction to Chapter 5); and the inclusion of ‘sexuality’ within anti-discrimination policies and legislation have all been ‘hot topics’ that fall within this category of rights claims.
Identity-based claims tend to define citizenship as the right to occupy certain cultural spaces (Lister, 2002). They demand access to a greater number of public domains and argue for the right to positive media representation. Citizenship is thus equated with being permitted to enjoy the national culture in the same ways that ‘everyone else can’. In some cases, identity-based claims attempt to redefine what is meant by ‘culture’ and expand the parameters of the national imagination. However, more often than not, these claims uphold a very narrow definition of culture and of the nation. Like practice-based claims, they tend to focus on the idea that if gays and lesbians can demonstrate that they are committed to the national culture in much the same way as their straight counterparts, then they should be granted equal rights and access to public life.

Jan Pakulski (1997) argues that identity-based claims are “the most interesting illustrative case” of the battle for “cultural citizenship” (p. 81). Toby Miller (2002) defines cultural citizenship as “the maintenance and development of cultural lineage via education, custom, language, and religion, and the positive acknowledgement of difference in and by the mainstream” (p. 231). For Miller, one’s status as a ‘citizen’ is not only bound to legal rights and social responsibilities, but also to the various cultural practices that are regulated through civic responsibilities and national values. Identity-based appeals by sexual minorities are never solely about the attainment of equal political freedoms or socio-economic benefits such as partnership rights, the right to adopt and so forth, they are also about the desire of sexual minorities to have their sexual choices (re)affirmed in everyday cultural spaces. The work of American queer scholar Shane Phelan (2001) takes up this point that citizenship extends beyond questions of rights and responsibilities. In her mind “legal rights without cultural and political support are simply the facade of rights” (p. 147). In other words, Phelan believes that to be a fully vested citizen is to be publicly and politically affirmed and positively represented within the national culture. She argues that until the state is willing to defend and celebrate the lives and choices of sexual minorities, they will remain little more than ‘sexual strangers’. In other words, gaining rights does not always mean gaining respect, protection from violence or access to various cultural institutions.

There have been a number of identity-based rights issues taken up at each of the Gay Games. In the case of Sydney 2002, the eight conferences in the Global Rights conference programme were said to “provide the intellectual base for the celebrations, and stimulate debate and discussion around a wide-range of topics including health and sexuality, lesbian and gay trade unionists, social issues, hate violence, first cultures, human rights and queer studies” (SGGB, 2002c, p. 36). Despite the conference programme’s focus on various
identity-based rights concerns, it is hard to imagine how these forums provided an ‘intellectual or political base’ for Sydney 2002 as the conferences were kept very separate from the sporting and cultural events. In comparison, the rights-based conference at the recent Montréal Outgames in July, 2006, played a central role in the broader event format. The conference was used as a forum to draft the ‘Declaration of Montréal’ (see Appendix G), which was read to all delegates and signed by Outgames officials at the Montréal Opening Ceremony. The declaration was then presented to the United Nations as an appeal to have the Lesbian and Gay Rights movement added to the list of official UN rights movements (Wockner, 2006). Of course, the inclusion of the declaration in the Opening Ceremony does not necessarily mean that this event had a more ‘authentic’ set of political objectives. What it does illustrate, however, is that the political focus of the Outgames framed the overall event programme in a much more central way than the political aims of the Sydney Gay Games did. The section below explores the ways in which the sporting events at the Gay Games which have always been so central to the event’s overall programme, are heralded as a site of personal and political change.

*Levelling the playing field?*

Making sport into a more egalitarian cultural space was a founding objective of the Federation of Gay Games and since the first Games in 1982 there has been a great deal of emphasis placed on the event’s capacity to reclaim sport as a less competitive and less heteronormative cultural space. The Games have long been positioned as an event that not only allows gay and lesbian athletes to enjoy the ‘highs’ of competitive sport, but also one that disrupts elitist and exclusive structures of sport itself. Participation in sport at the Games affirms and empowers those participants who, in their past, were either excluded from sport in their childhood or were constantly preoccupied with being ‘found out’ as gay or lesbian in their sporting lives (Secter, 2006). The sporting programme at the Games is described as inclusive of all races, religions, classes, genders and sexualities and aims to include all athletes regardless of their HIV status. Sport is thus tied to discourses of total inclusion, safety, liberation, self-transformation and personal goal setting.

Sydney organisers also hoped for total sporting inclusion. This aim was perhaps best encapsulated in the words of Stuart Borrie, Sports Director at Sydney 2002, who in the official guide to the Games stated:
Hosting the Gay Games provides positive and uplifting experiences for lesbians and gay men in sport. The Games give us a tremendous sense of belonging on the field of play and provide us with strong connections between our sporting and social worlds – a connection that does not always fit comfortably in the context of the broader sports community. (McAdam, 2002, p. 22)

Borrie describes sport as a space of belonging for queer subjects and thus interrupts the long held associations of sport with exclusive forms of heterosexual masculinity. Participating in the sporting programme at the Games is framed as an alternative athletic experience, one that empowers gays and lesbians through discourses of personal pride and the dissolution of fear. At the Games, participants can also enjoy the connection between “[their] sporting and social worlds” (McAdam, 2002, p. 22), a sense of personal harmony that is hard to achieve in mainstream sporting contexts.

Within the Gay Games promotional materials sport is also described as a cultural space where the stereotype that all ‘gay men are sissies’ can be challenged and/or dispelled. Men in particular are able to reclaim their gendered identities and be taken ‘seriously’ as athletes and citizens. As stated by Corey Czok, a young Aboriginal Outreach scholarship recipient at Sydney 2002, sport is a space where queers can “throw out the stereotypes – we’re not sissies, we don’t all look the same and we’re not all pretty! (McAdam, 2002, p. 25). Czok’s words, which were published as one of a series of athlete profiles in the Official Guide, were so inspiring, and his message so pertinent that Justice Michael Kirby quoted Czok in his opening ceremony keynote address (see detailed analysis of Kirby’s speech in Chapter Six). Kirby suggested that the spirit of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games is ‘put best’ by Czok’s comments, and then added:

Now you may think that his last comment should be disputed because real beauty lies in the fact that we are here united, not in negatives of hate and exclusion, so common, but in the positives of love and inclusion. (Justice Michael Kirby in Heil, 2002a, also see Appendix B for Kirby’s speech transcribed in full)

The Games are often described in these terms, as a space where the global queer community can teach the rest of the world about acceptance, tolerance and inclusion. The event’s overall programme, but in particular the sporting events, are thought to build character and demonstrate the virtuous and ‘civilised’ nature of the queer community.

As mentioned previously in this chapter, for Tom Waddell, an international sporting competition of this kind would help “dispel any arbitrary notions of our character” (Waddell, 1982, p. 8). The Games are not just about showing the world that queers can play sport, they are also about demonstrating that the athletes at the Games are upstanding citizens who are
deserving of recognition and respect. Waddell’s sentiments are reinforced by Borrie (1999) in his reflections on the significance of the sporting events to Sydney 2002’s overall programme:

Being visible as lesbian and gay athletes provides positive role models for others. This serves to educate the broader sports community just as much as it does our own. It helps to emphasise sameness, not difference. In the eight days of sporting competition we will be helping to break down the stereotypes about who we are on the field of play. (p. 22)

He insists that the Games ‘emphasise sameness, not difference’ and demonstrate to other members of the gay and lesbian community and to the mainstream heterosexual community (some of whom will partake in the Games events but continue to be narrated as a homogenous majoritarian force) that gay and lesbian athletes are, on the one hand, creating a unique and alternative sporting experience, and on the other hand, are just like everybody else. Sport is thus held up as an equalising, normalising and civilising mechanism and the Gay Games provide queer athletes with opportunities to ‘be normal’ sporting participants.

Brian Pronger (2000) argues that the Gay Games are an opportunity to disrupt the exclusive, homophobic and masculinist values of mainstream sporting cultures and a chance to “contribute to the critique and transformation of oppressions that are perpetuated by conservative political cultures more generally” (Pronger, 2000, p. 227). However, in his estimate, the Games trade opportunities to impart serious political change for opportunities to gain credibility in the mainstream sporting and political arenas – to be normal! He maintains that many smaller gay and lesbian sporting organisations have also adopted policies of inclusion and togetherness as a way of making sport into a non-exclusionary and/or ‘equal’ space. However, in doing so important differences between queer politics and the mainstream political culture get erased. Queer athletes assimilate into sporting spaces rather than transforming them. Pronger argues that equating inclusion and visibility with social or political change compromises the transformative potential an event of this scale and reach can have. He writes:

It is fair to say that virtually all lesbian and gay community sports organizations do not discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation and, like the Gay Games, welcome all who support their inclusive and ‘gay-positive’ culture. Gay sports culture is the very model of liberal, inclusive lesbian and gay politics and aspirations.... One of the reasons it is such a popular form is that it expresses the dominant gay liberal philosophy: Lesbians and gays are just like anybody else: We shop, we eat, we have families, we play sports. The only real difference is that we have sex with people of the same gender. Lesbians and gay men are essentially ‘normal’ human beings. Although our sexuality and experience of marginality makes us especially sensitive to issues of inclusion, in the final analysis, we are the same: Gay community sports prove our normality. (Pronger, 2000, p. 232)
For Pronger, the inclusiveness of the Games is also a way of adopting a non-confrontational and inoffensive public image. Inclusion is not only used to ensure a vast range of people attend the Games, it is also used as a way of normalising the face of the Games movement and as a way of showing the 'rest of the world' that gay and lesbian athletes are just like straight athletes. As the previous section in this chapter outlined, many gay and lesbian community events normalise their public image by downplaying sexual or relationship-based differences between 'queer' and 'straight' people. As suggested above, this type of political approach makes an interesting double movement: on the one hand it highlights the ordinariness of gays and lesbians – 'we are just like everyone else' – and yet, on the other hand, it emphasises the extraordinariness of the community – 'see how vital and upstanding our community is and how we contribute to making the world a much better place'.

Here again is an example of the tensions at the heart of the Games: They claim they are transforming traditional sporting cultures and transforming individual lives through sport and yet they adopt a very normative approach to the issue of gays and lesbians in sport, aiming to 'fit in' and be assimilated rather than to change the structures that make sport an inherently homophobic and masculinist, elitist, classist cultural space. More importantly perhaps, the Games promise total inclusion and purport to offer a safe sporting space for all people regardless of class, gender, sexual orientation, religion, race or HIV status. This chapter has already demonstrated how organisers’ reliance on mainstream sponsors has made the Games inaccessible to some community members who have less disposable time and/or income to take part in the event. The discussion that follows builds on this critique and suggests that while a vital part of the Gay Games political platform is its promise of total inclusion and the dissolution of the competitive and exclusionary conditions of mainstream sport, this is perhaps its most flawed political promise. In making this argument it offers a close reading of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI Gender Policy (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board, 2002h), a document that addressed issues concerning the participation of transgender and intersex athletes in the Games' sporting events.93 Although a step forward in addressing the specific needs of trans-athletes in sport, the very need for this policy illustrates that the Games are more committed to qualifying as a serious sporting competition than they are challenging the cultural 'rules and games' that limit the range of intelligible ways of doing sex/gender.

---

93 According to Caroline Symons (2004), the 1994 New York City Gay Games were the first games to officially allow transgender athletes to take part in the sporting and cultural events. The Amsterdam Games were the first to issue a formal gender policy. However, it was much less comprehensive than Sydney’s.
Diagnosing gender – whose Games are they?

The Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board (SGGB) addressed specific identity-based issues in the *Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI Gender Policy* (see Appendix H). To formulate this seven-page document, members of SGGB consulted with a variety of internal committees and community organisations, including the Gender Centre in Sydney, Australian Intersex Support, the Sydney 2002 Women’s Advisory Group, the Sydney 2002 National Indigenous Advisory Committee, the AIDS Council of NSW, the Sydney 2002 Pacific Islands Working Group (Moana Pacifika), the Sydney 2002 Asia Committee and the Federation of Gay Games.

The purpose of the policy was, foremost, to formally outline how “the Gay Games principles of Inclusion, Participation and Personal Best [would] be upheld in relation to Gender” (SGGB, 2002h, p. 4). It aimed to provide an inclusive and harassment-free community environment built on the principles of ‘diversity’ and ‘equality’. It stated that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people are diverse in terms of their race, cultural and religious beliefs, age, socio-economic status and geographical locatedness, and that these differences result in unequal levels of access to an event like the Gay Games. Therefore, creating an ‘equitable space’ at Sydney 2002 meant doing more than simply recognising the barriers faced by various members of the LGBTI community. It also meant ensuring “fairness, impartiality, even-handedness” (SGGB, 2002h, p. 4) in all areas of the event’s programme. While the policy acknowledged that “achieving equity is a long term process” (SGGB, 2002h, p. 5), it also stated that one of its key aims was to ensure that “Sydney 2002 [was doing] all it [could] do to enable inclusive participation reflecting the wide diversity of backgrounds and situations” (SGGB, 2002h, p. 4). While the policy’s pledge to provide a harassment-free and equitable environment at the Games was clearly well intended, how would this promise translate into a set of policies or guidelines pertaining specifically to issues of gender?

In the policy gender was defined as a social construct and it acknowledged that one’s chosen or self-assigned gender may not always coincide with one’s biological or assigned sex. Specifically, it provided a framework for the inclusion of Gay Games participants who identify as transgender, intersex or with a specific ethno-local and Indigenous transgender identity (i.e. Hijra – South Asian; Sistergirls – Indigenous Australian; Waria – Indonesian; Kathoey – Thai; Faafafine – Samoan). It stated that one of its primary aims was to,
As Chapter One outlined, every athlete who participated in any of the sports or cultural events at Sydney 2002 had to go through a standard accreditation procedure. Sporting participants were required to have the name and gender they registered with verified by a Games official before they were given their official ‘passport’ to compete. 94 According to the policy, there are two key reasons why gender verification was deemed necessary to the staging of the sporting events. The first is that the Gay Games are given official competition status by a variety of sporting bodies which adhere strictly to same-sex competition guidelines. If an athlete at one of the Gay Games was to set a world record, in order to have it officially registered and recognised by relevant sporting bodies, the Gay Games would have to be officially sanctioned by these bodies and thus show that they followed all of their policies and practices. The second reason offered for mandatory gender verification at Sydney 2002 was that competing with others of the ‘same sex’ was thought to create a level and equal competitive field. As such, ensuring that everyone in a given competition was of the same sex was thought to ensure ‘fair play’. The policy thus laid out a procedure for how to accredit those athletes whose gender on their official identification was different from the gender they wished to compete as. The policy stated:

Where a person’s identity documents record their gender to be other than that under which the person wishes to participate, they will be accredited for participation under their chosen or self-identified gender on the following two conditions: A letter from a medical practitioner is provided stating that the participant has been actively involved in hormone treatment for a minimum of two full years; and/or proof of the participant living as the chosen or self-identified gender for a minimum of two years. (SGGB, 2002h, p. 7)

94 See Sydney 2002 participant passport featured in Figure A21, Appendix A. Interestingly, an athlete’s nationality is not checked during the accreditation procedure. So while the Games break the rules of traditional sport in allowing people to compete for a country whose passport they do not carry, they adhere to traditional male-female rules around gendered competition. For instance, I used my New Zealand mailing address to register for Sydney 2002. I was therefore registered and competed as part of Team NZ. However, at this time I had only been living there for one year and I was carrying a Canadian passport. When I presented my Canadian passport at the accreditation desk nothing at all was said about this discrepancy. Furthermore, I was allowed to ‘march’ with my friends from Team Canada at the opening despite being ‘officially’ registered as a NZ competitor. Another interesting point that should be made is that the idea of a Gay Games ‘passport’ not only references the practice of issuing national passports to demarcate and regulate who is and who is not officially part of the national citizenry, it also bears a similarity to the IOC’s early practice of issuing a ‘femininity card’ when women successfully passed their Barr-body gender verification test (Kirby & Huebner, 2002).
The policy also explained that if the ‘safety’ of another sporting participant (the insinuation here is that this refers to all ‘biological’ female athletes) was at risk because of a transgender or intersex athlete’s disproportionate strength or size, officials could exercise ‘discretion’ and refuse these athletes the right to participate, even when they had satisfied the accreditation requirements.

Chapter Two briefly touched on the recent policy issued by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) that mandates the inclusion of post-operative transgender athletes in Olympic competitions. The IOC stipulates that transgender athletes must be at least two years post-operative (complete surgical transition is necessary) and must have had ongoing and uninterrupted hormone therapy since then. At Sydney 2002 athletes simply had to provide evidence that they have either been ‘actively involved’ in hormone treatment for a minimum of two years, and/or provide ‘proof’ that they had been living as their chosen or self-identified gender for at least two years (SGGB, 2002h, p. 7). Athletes who self-identified as a gender other than that which they were biologically assigned, could participate at Sydney 2002 without having had gender transitional surgery. Clearly the SGGB was attempting to recognise those individuals who chose not to undergo sex transition surgery, those who could not afford the procedures, and those living in ethno-indigenous cultures less organised by sex/gender binaries. While clearly Sydney 2002’s gender policy offered a greater breadth of ‘gender variant’ athletes the opportunity to participate in an international sporting competition than the IOC’s policy does, wouldn’t one expect this of an event that purports to create an equitable community space and a dramatically different sporting experience?

As emphasised earlier, since its inception, a primary mandate of the Gay Games movement has been to create an ‘inclusive’ space that recreates the spirit of Olympia (Waddell, 1982, 1984), whilst providing an entirely different sporting environment for its athletes. An ethos of ‘participation for all’ has been said to replace the need for qualifying standards, global unity and pride have been promoted over nationalistic rivalries, and striving for one’s personal best has been said to be more important than competing to win at all costs. So why then must the Gay Games insist on being an ‘officially sanctioned event’ and thus necessitate the drafting of policies that make stipulations and conditions around who can compete as which gender? How inclusive is it to make athletes ‘prove’ their gender? How equitable is it to scrutinise the ‘time-line’ of a transgender person’s transitioning process? Does asking individuals for whom existing in a certain body requires regular moments of self-legitimisation to justify their gender at a queer community event in some ways qualify as a form of harassment? Why should the physical safety of athletes who qualify as ‘normal’ men or women be more
important than the psychological or spiritual safety and well-being of those athletes who have, in some cases, lived their entire life within a particular self-chosen gender identity? Are there other ways to organise sporting competitions at these Games? Through weight or height categories? By ability levels and/or qualifying times? After all, anyone who has been to one of the Gay Games will attest to the wide range of ability levels within a single event. Most importantly perhaps, can the Gay Games really claim that part of the event’s political appeal is that it is ‘inclusive of all people regardless of sex, gender, race…’ when it organises its sporting competition using traditional gender categories? Perhaps a more accurate representation of its ‘political reach’ is encapsulated in its promise that, “every sport and cultural event is open to women and men of all abilities, backgrounds and sexualities” (SGGB, 2002b), where the categories ‘women’ and ‘men’ are still rather narrowly defined.

Perhaps the real problem lies in any political platform that purports to offer ‘total inclusion’, ‘equity’ or ‘fairness’ and promises to create a space that is ‘safe’ and ‘harassment-free’. These political mandates are built on the assumption that a level playing ground is possible, and as this example and the previous examples in this chapter have illustrated, a level playing ground is an unachievable political outcome. The Gay Games are no more removed from the discursive orderings of contemporary culture than any other event. As such, the aim of offering a utopian space of total inclusion and acceptance can function as little more than a hollow sales slogan directed at a rather homogenous audience who will find themselves completely accepted and included at the Gay Games. After all, the majority of the ‘global’ delegates at Sydney 2002 were white, middle-class gay men from developed countries for whom a ‘tasteful’ and ‘normative’ depiction of queer living was an obtainable ideal.

These criticisms are not intended to dismiss the possibility that Sydney 2002, or any of the previous Gay Games for that matter, had some direct or indirect social or ‘political’ impact on the lives of individuals or on their communities. As stated previously in this chapter, evaluating the political effectiveness of the Gay Games is not a central aim of this chapter. Instead, these discussions speak to how the Gay Games are political, that is, how the event discursively shapes its political campaign and how these political ideals shape the experiences and conduct of individuals at the event. The Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI Gender Policy (SGGB, 2002h), highlights the central role that notions of inclusion, safety and acceptance play in framing the event’s rather traditional liberal political scope. More importantly perhaps, this policy demonstrates how, where sex and gender are concerned, the idealistic promise of
total inclusion is limited to those who fit neatly within the traditional sex/gender order whilst those who do not are asked to formalise and legitimise their sex/gender ‘variance’.

Category 3: Relationship-based rights

Diane Richardson’s third and final category of sexual citizenship encompasses relationship-based rights. This category includes claims such as equal age of consent laws for young men and women, and for heterosexual and homosexual young men; the right to choose sexual partners regardless of age, race or gender; and the right of same-sex couples to marry and/or have their partnerships and family units officially recognised and protected by the state. Relationship-based claims are grounded in a politics of recognition, defining citizenship as a set of privileges that everyone should have equal access to regardless of their gender and/or sexual identity. Through relationship-based claims individuals work to extend the terms and conditions of relationships, inserting their lives into normative relationship models. Since both heterosexual partnerships and the family are entrenched in national traditions, relationship-based claims by gays and lesbians are met with great hostility and resistance. As mentioned above, the conditions for belonging to a national citizenry or to a majoritarian group within the nation-state are monitored and upheld not only through rules of inclusion, but also through rigid and unrelenting practices of exclusion.

Over the past three decades, one of the most widely debated relationship-based claims has been the right of same-sex couples to have a civil marriage (Bell & Binnie, 2000). Framed in liberal terms, the right to marry someone you love is viewed as a basic human right and one that carries with it a series of cultural and economic benefits (Wolfson, 2004). Within this framework marriage should be accessible to all citizens regardless of their gender and/or sexuality. To date, six countries have legalised civil marriage: the Netherlands (2001), Belgium (2003), Spain (2005), Canada (2005) and South Africa (2006), along with the state of Massachusetts (2004) in the United States. In comparison, civil unions are legalised in many countries; they afford registered same-sex couples the same rights as married, heterosexual couples but retain civil marriage as a cultural institution accessible only to opposite-sexed couples. 95 Neither the United States nor Australia has legalised civil marriage or civil unions. However, in both countries, some states have provisions for same-sex

95 Countries with registered civil unions include: Andorra, Czech Republic, Columbia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greenland, Iceland, the United Kingdom, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, and Switzerland. The following countries allow civil unions in some regions or states: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Italy, Mexico and the United States. Some countries provide equal rights to cohabitating same-sex couples, but do not necessarily have a way of registering these partnerships with the state in a formal way: Austria, Croatia, Hungary and Israel.
partners' recognition under civil law. In Australia, for instance, Tasmania (TAS) has created a civil registry where same-sex couples (and arguably opposite-sex couples who do not want to marry) can register their relationship and thus qualify for many of the same legal benefits that married, opposite-sexed couples enjoy.

In 2006 the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) passed civil union legislation, making it the first state to legalise civil unions. This legislation was passed within a national climate that had, in the past two years, grown increasingly hostile to the idea of widening the definition of what marriage is and opening up these terms to include same-sex couples. Prime Minister John Howard’s amendments to the Federal Marriage Law in 2004, and his promise that marriage would remain the cultural and religious cornerstone of the nation, reserved for heterosexual couples alone, had been a significant setback for pro-gay marriage activists. It was no surprise then that Howard was quick to react to the ACT’s decision, making it clear that he did not agree with the underpinning principle of the legislation, i.e. that same-sex couples are deserving of the same rights as opposite-sex couples. Defending his stance he stated:

The fundamental difficulty I have with the ACT legislation is the clause which says that a civil union is different from marriage but has the same entitlements ... That is the equivalent of saying to somebody who’s passed the HSC [Higher School Certificate] and wants to get into a particular course, saying to them, well, you haven’t got the requisite tertiary score but we are going to let you into the course anyway. It’s a little bit hypocritical. (Farouque, 2006, p. 1)

The Howard government disallowed the ACT legislation in the federal parliament by mobilising the ACT Self-Government Act (Section 35). This particular Act gives the federal government ‘special power’ in regard to the country’s two territories. In defence of his decision, Howard offered the following:

We are not anti-homosexual people, or gay and lesbian people. It is not a question of discriminating against them. It is a question of preserving as an institution in our society marriage as having a special character. (Farouque, 2006, p. 3)

Howard’s likening of same-sex relationship rights to a student’s Higher School Certificate (HSC) results in the first quotation above illustrates how marriage is not just a civil right, but also a way of ordering the socio-cultural sphere of the nation-state. Apart from the sheer absurdity of this analogy, these comments point to the role that Howard takes up as public

---

96 In Australia these include: New South Wales, Western Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, Australian Capital Territory. In the United States, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine, New Jersey, Vermont, and the US territory of Washington D.C. have some legislated recognition for same-sex couples.

97 Australia’s second territory is the Northern Territory.
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pedagogue – dressing up moral rationalities in discourses of cultural nostalgia and the preservation of values. He not only refuses to imagine that same-sex couples can have the required relationship ‘scores’ to gain ‘admittance’ to the institution of marriage – that they could be in committed, sexually gratifying and loving relationships – he also singularises the diverse ways that heterosexual couples function both within and outside the institution of marriage. Howard defends his refusal to see same-sex relationships as on a par with heterosexual relationships, claiming that his government is not homophobic and does not discriminate. He then goes one step further, arguing that it would be “a little bit hypocritical” to allow same-sex couples to gain the same rights as married couples when they simply do not have the same relationship qualifications or requisites. Howard insists that his government’s decision to override the ACT’s legislation on civil unions had little to do with homosexual relationships at all, but was a move to preserve the ‘special character’ of heterosexual relationships. Preservation thus becomes a formidable and courageous act of policing the boundaries of inclusion and does not register as an act of discrimination or exclusion.

Equality or normality?

Debates around how to politically manoeuvre governmental and public resistance to redefining marriage have varied within both activist and scholarly circles (but of course, these two circles are not always entirely separate). While some groups or individuals unapologetically lobby for the right to marry, others believe that the gay and lesbian community should focus its energies on “starving” (Butler, 2004b, p. 273) civil marriage of its legal and cultural significance. Although a diverse set of arguments, it is possible to offer a rough sketch of these standpoints along a continuum of sorts, running from those responses that are entirely in favour of same-sex marriages to those which are entirely opposed to this political move. Those in favour of same-sex recognition often adopt a strategic essentialist approach. They argue that gay and lesbian relationships are essentially the ‘same’ as heterosexual relationships; the only difference between the two is the gender of the two partners. American liberal-reformist Morris Kaplan argues that the right of same-sex couples to marry is central to an effective politics of recognition. The union of marriage brings with it so many other legislative and social rights and privileges that not being able to marry as a same-sex couple means being classified as second-class citizens. Full citizenship rests on obtaining equal rights with heterosexuals in all domains governed by the law, both federal and state and the state’s inclusion of same-sex couples into the institution of marriage avows the
seriousness and commitment of non-heterosexual relationships. As Maurice Kaplan (1997) explains:

Lesbian and gay marriages, domestic partnerships, and the reconceiving of family institutions as modes of intimate association among free and equal citizens all are efforts to appropriate, extend and transform the available possibilities. (p. 222)

For Kaplan, the right of same-sex couples to marry is about ‘extending’ the parameters of traditional relationship models and reconfiguring the relationships between intimacy and the state. Marriage is viewed as a great democratising force (Butler, 2004b) that allows gays and lesbians to move from second-class to fully vested citizens. In some cases, gay marriage is said to challenge the hegemonic function of the state and to erode the long-held relationships between the state and normative models of relationships and family. It is also argued that same-sex marriages force opposite-sex couples to reflect on the power and privilege bound to the institution of marriage and to thus operate within their marriages in new ways (Pearson, 2005).

While some scholars/activists associate gay marriage with the transformation of ‘possibilities’, others argue that it limits the ways in which relationships and intimacies can be acted out. For Michael Warner, regardless of how diverse and ‘progressive’ married couples can be, the gay marriage debate itself has had a normalising impact on queer culture as queers have had to mobilise conservative language and frameworks in order to be heard. He also argues that marriage reinstates ‘monogamous coupledom’ as the normative structure for relationships and further denaturalises the choice to remain unmarried. If gay marriages are legalised, homosexual couples and a greater number of heterosexuals will feel pressured to have their relationships naturalised and sanctified through state formalities. Appeals for the right to marry close down opportunities for queers to dismantle the heteronormative structures that order and police sexuality. Warner fears that marriage re-privatises queer sexualities that have only ‘come out’ publicly in the past five decades. Binding queer sexualities to the private, personal and ‘unseen’ is to re-criminalise and re-shame all ‘other’ forms of sexuality and to keep queer relationships out of public spaces. Although the aim of gay marriage is to expand the field of rights and to make rights more universal, it serves to deepen the chasm between legitimate and illegitimate relationships (Butler, 2004b; Warner, 1999).

Like Warner, Judith Butler (2004b) expresses hesitations around the fight for same-sex marriage, arguing that these marriages run the risk of reinforcing the state’s role as a democratising body and its paternalist sense of ownership around the institution of marriage itself. She elaborates on this view:
The successful bid to gain access to marriage effectively strengthens marital status as a state-sanctioned condition for the exercise of certain kinds of rights and entitlements; it strengthens the hand of the state in the regulation of human sexual behaviour; and it emboldens the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate forms of partnership and kinship. Moreover, it seeks to reprivatize sexuality, removing it from the public sphere and from the market, domains where its politicization has been very intense. (Butler, 2004b, p. 273)

Butler argues that to marry is not only to identify with the heterosexual ‘norm’, but also with the state and its capacity to define and govern relationships and sexuality. She maintains that the only way forward is to “relieve marriage of its place as the precondition of legal entitlements of various kinds” (Butler, 2004b, p. 274), resisting the idea that state-sanctioned alliances are somehow deserving of greater social, economic and political clout. She maintains that gays and lesbians should harness the performative capacity of refusing to marry. In doing so, sexuality and sexual relationships can be imagined beyond the terms of marriage. In the act of refusing to marry, couples ‘whither’ and ‘starve’ marriage of its status as a normative cultural apparatus:

As increasing numbers of children are born outside marriage, as increasing numbers of households fail to replicate the family norm, as extended kinship systems develop to care for the young, the ill and the aging, the social basis for the state turns out to be more complicated and less unitary than the discourse on the family permits. And the hope would be, from the point of view of performativity, that the discourse would eventually reveal its limited descriptive reach, avowed only as one practice among many that organize human sexual life. (Butler, 2004b, p. 274)

Rather than making room for same-sex couples within an existing citizenship structure, Butler suggests that the performative act of refusing to marry deprives the institution of marriage of its normative function and a multitude of new relationship possibilities open up. Given the range of ‘political’ positions on the issue of ‘gay marriage’, how, if at all, has the Gay Games movement responded to these debates?

*Here comes the bribe?*

Since the Games inception, host organising boards have made very few efforts to intervene in the debates around same-sex marriage. In the case of Sydney 2002, there were no official commentary or event forums around the issue. Perhaps the absence of any serious debate around gay marriage can be attributed to the fact that Australia’s stance on this issue was
hardly one of the event’s selling features. In comparison, both the Amsterdam Gay Games and the first Outgames held in Montréal used their countries’ progressive same-sex marriage laws as a key draw card for the event. At the 1998 Games there was a public ‘marriage’ held in Friendship Village, which as Chapter One explained, was the central hub for participants at these Games. More recently at Rendez-Vous 2006 in Montréal, Canada’s recently amended marriage laws were used as a marketing tool to attract international participants to the event. Équipe Montréal/Team Montréal promoted their event by offering participants an opportunity to ‘get hitched’ while at the Games. With 93 days left before the opening ceremonies, the Outgames media team circulated a notice to participants that read:

Hello <participant’s name> The first World Outgames is looking for all gay and lesbian couples planning on marrying in Montréal during the 1st World Outgames. Couples who wish to be contacted will have the chance to be interviewed by a CBC journalist and the possibility to have their wedding stories told. (“Outgames Montréal 2006”, 2006)

Media agents and local gay and lesbian tourism providers sent out a clear message that “gay marriage is legal in Canada, so athletes [would] be able to compete and take wedding vows” (“26 Jul – 5 August”; 2006, italics in original). Two cornerstones of mainstream national culture – sport and marriage – were brought together at these games as a way of promoting both the event and the city of Montréal as progressive, ‘gay-friendly’ spaces.

Montréal Gazette reporter Anne Sutherland stated that, “there could be a run on rainbow-coloured confetti as the 1st World Outgames in Montréal marks the perfect opportunity for gay couples from around the world to take advantage of Québec’s same-sex marriage laws” (Sutherland, 2006). Although perhaps nothing more than a throwaway comment, it is an interesting one given this chapter’s emphasis on the relationships between discourses of

98 In the Sydney 2002 promotional materials, couples were validated primarily through their role as consumers. For example, local tourist attractions and holiday packages advertised in the official Sydney 2002 promotional materials were often aimed at participants travelling together as couples. Advertisements for holiday getaways to rural Australia were almost always directed at couples (both men and women) rather than lone travellers. In contrast, urban nightlife and Sydney’s main inner-city attractions were geared towards single (and perhaps by default available) participants, and more often than not single male participants. So while couples were validated by some of the marketing campaigns of the event, discussions around same-sex marriage were absent in the events programme. It should also be noted that while many advertisers appealed to Gay Games participants in relationships, very little consideration was given to families or single participants with children. The Rainbow Families picnic was one event that offered a space for children to take part in the Gay Games, but otherwise the event was not particularly ‘family-friendly’ in the sense that many of the events charged exorbitant entrance fees and there were limited or no childcare options at most facilities. Furthermore, children of participants were not given transportation passes.

99 In 1998 only registered partnerships were available to same-sex couples in The Netherlands. In the archival footage of the ceremony in Sector’s (2006) documentary, Take the Flame!, the occasion is referred to as a ‘public marriage’ by documentary narrator Greg Louganis. Amongst the couples making a public commitment were Sara Lewinstein (Tom Waddell’s ex-wife and the mother of their child) and her partner Sandy Ghilarducci. For more details on Waddell’s life as a ‘gay married man’, see Waddell & Schaap, 1996.
citizenship and rights, the global economy and the emergence of elitist brands of cosmopolitan queerness. How, one might ask, have legislative changes around gay marriage in some countries not only broadened the existing economy around marriage, but also been mobilised by global gay and lesbian tourism industries to promote certain places as politically and socially appealing holiday destinations?

Advertisements aimed at Outgames couples promoted the opportunity to get married alongside a range of luxury ceremonial and holiday items. For instance, in Sutherland’s article she profiles three gay male couples, one couple from Adelaide, Australia, who were actively involved in the lobby for gay rights in Australia. This couple used the Outgames as an opportunity to seal their commitment in a fun and formal way. They emphasised the ease involved in organising their ‘wedding’ thanks to clear instructions provided by a Canadian Magistrate and the growing number of online services available to help couples organise their ceremony from a distance. Sutherland writes:

The $234 fee for the wedding licence was charged to a credit card ... they have rented formal wear over the Internet and plan to ask two members of Team Adelaide, the local gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered sports group, to be witnesses. (Sutherland, 2006)

While this Australian couple were keeping their marriage rather low-key, Canadian born architect Christian McHogue and his American partner James McAnally, who is a practising dentist, planned to get married at the Games and then return home to McHogue’s family home in Rosemère, a south-western town in the province of Québec after the Games (and the wedding) to “cook paella for friends and family”. Getting married with a little bit of cosmopolitan style includes, in this particular case, a return to the family fold for home cooked Spanish cuisine.

A new economy has emerged in those countries or states where same-sex marriages are legalised. Gay wedding planners now provide a wide range of wedding services that cater to the ‘special needs’ of gay and lesbian couples. Getting married certainly became part of Rendez-Vous 2006’s repertoire of social events. A variety of ‘deals’ were offered so that a wedding at these games would be both easy and memorable. Weddings were also organised by city (Toronto, Montréal or Vancouver) so that participants could combine their overall travel experience in Canada with their plans to be married. In an Outgames promotional publication it read:

100 Outbyview.com, for instance, is a Canadian tourism site for gays and lesbians who specialise in organising overseas visitors weddings.
Those visitors to the Outgames wanting to tie the knot will find it easy to access needed information and a venue. In fact, Rendez-Vous Square will be the place to be! Equipped with a wedding chapel, couples so inclined will be able to choose between a sacred union or a full-fledge [sic] civil wedding! Imagine getting married as you and your spouse run back and forth from one competition to the next. (Leclerc, 2005, p. 5)

The option of marrying while at the Games was also used to sell the Outgames as a more appealing sports and cultural festival than the Chicago 2006 Gay Games (scheduled the week before Rendez-Vous '06) and to differentiate between Canada and the United States as ‘suitable’ host nations for these international queer community events.\(^\text{101}\) The city of Montréal, the province of Québec and Canada as the ‘host nation’ were all celebrated as cosmopolitan and egalitarian spaces. The event’s website, for instance, described Canada as, “an open society, leading the way for rights and freedoms” (“1\(^{\text{st}}\) world Outgames”, 2006). They also emphasised the leadership of Québec’s provincial government in Canada’s fight for same-sex marriages.\(^\text{102}\) The site offered a timeline of rights achievements that began in 1999 when the provincial government of Québec voted unanimously to adopt Bill 32, which would officially recognise same-sex partners as having equal rights to opposite-sex partners (a decision supported by three quarters of the Québec population) and culminated with the national legislative changes that came through in 2005. It also notes that Québec was, in fact, the first jurisdiction in Canada to provide same-sex marriage in 2003 (Leclerc, 2005, p. 5).

Given this chapter’s focus thus far, what is particularly interesting is how some countries use their progressive same-sex marriage legislation as a promotional tool to encourage gay and lesbian tourism. In a similar way, some organisers of gay and lesbian events use these changes to substantiate their event’s political reach. In both cases, the ‘host countries’ are depicted as uniformly safe and inclusive queer spaces. What is also particularly interesting is that despite Australia’s declining position as a ‘leader’ in gay and lesbian rights, during the 2006 Gay Games Sydney was still positioned as the gay and lesbian destination in the Southern hemisphere.

\(^{101}\) This was also the case with Canada’s immigration policies for people living with HIV or AIDS. Montréal was the only city vying for Gay Games VI whose host country issued visitors visas regardless of their HIV/AIDS status. A press release dated 7 February 2006, when Team Chicago was lobbying state and national governments for putting a waiver in place to grant HIV + people US visas to take part in Gay Games VII, proclaimed, “Canada is open at any time to HIV positive people” using politics as a strategic selling point for gay global tourism” (Equipe Montréal, 2006).

\(^{102}\) Québec, Ontario and British Columbia were the first three provinces in Canada to legalise gay marriage.
Conclusion: Making ‘cents’ of rights and citizenship at the Games

The central question guiding this chapter was: how are the Gay Games political? Organisers at each stage of the Gay Games movement have positioned these international sport and cultural events as political and personally transformative. At the same time, the desire to make the Gay Games a ‘normal’ sporting event that demonstrates the civility of Gay Games participants begs the question of how transformative the event ever really can be. The chapter began by considering the ways in which gender, sexuality and the notion of ‘family’ are bound to discourses of citizenship and to citizenship rights. Guided by Diane Richardson’s three categories of sexual citizenship – practice-based rights, identity-based rights and relationship-based rights – the main body of the chapter asked how notions of citizenship and rights were taken up at various points throughout the Gay Games ‘history’ (this included a short discussion on the Montréal Outgames in 2006) in order to construct the event’s ‘political’ profile. In each case, what became evident was that the relationship the Gay Games movement has built with corporate and mainstream sporting bodies has meant that many of the events’ ‘political’ aims are in place to satisfy the demands of these external bodies and/or to sell the event as a transformative community experience.

In its focus on practice-based claims, the chapter offered a close reading of the ways in which efforts to normalise the face of the Gay Games movement are bound to their increasingly co-dependent relationship with mainstream corporations/sponsors. It argued that each of the Gay Games have actively avoided any discussion around practice-based rights, and, in fact, have gone to great lengths to desexualise the public image of the movement. A close reading of some of the promotional and advertising texts from Sydney 2002 showed that while the SGGB offered very ‘normal’ and ‘clean-cut’ representations of the event and its participants, sponsors allowed some references to sexuality (in particular gay male sexuality) into their ad campaigns. Katherine Sender’s (2004) notion of taste was used to suggest that while advertisers usually avoid linking their product to overt sexuality, the playful, homosocial and non-commercial nature of the sexual content in these ads coupled with their professional layouts and high-quality finishes make them suitably ‘tasteful’ and thus consumable expressions of gay cosmopolitan sexuality.

The chapter then asked how identity-based rights have been taken up by various Gay Games host organisations. One of the guiding mantras of the Gay Games movement has been to transform the institution of sport such that gay and lesbian athletes (and, more recently, they have taken minor steps to include bisexual, transgender and intersex athletes) feel more confident and comfortable being ‘out and proud’ within a sporting context. This section of the
chapter used the *Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI Gender Policy* to argue that while the Gay Games aim to create an inclusive and harassment-free community space, asking transgender athletes to verify their chosen or self-identified gender means that not everyone can compete at the Gay Games ‘just as they are’. While these stipulations are in place to legitimise the sporting results (and thus the athletes) at the Games, only some athletes are unconditionally ‘included’ and ‘safe’ at these events. The events’ promises of personal and collective emancipation, which are mobilised through discourses of inclusion and safety, are political impossibilities. As such, this chapter suggested that perhaps these promises function to attract those participants who are already included and safe in contemporary gay and lesbian culture(s) and to reinforce their comfort and status within these cultural/community spaces.

The final section of this chapter explored the ways in which relationship-based claims made by sexual minorities have been used by Gay Games organisers and, more recently, by Outgames organisers to promote their events’ political reach. It suggested that cities like Amsterdam and Montréal, which can boast progressive national legislation around gay and lesbian rights issues, use state legislation to promote their event and their city as particularly welcoming of queer tourists. This discussion focused specifically on recent changes to same-sex marriage legislation in Canada and illustrated how Équipe Montréal worked to position the province of Québec and the country of Canada as much more suitable hosts than their less progressive neighbour, the United States (which was hosting the Chicago 2002 Gay Games).

The next two chapters look carefully at the role that images and their related technologies play in producing and governing the ‘story we all know’ about the Gay Games movement, but also, more broadly, about local and global sexualities and citizenship. Drawing on a variety of texts and images from the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, Chapter Five argues that Sydney 2002 is best understood as an *image-world* (Burnett, 2004) – an assemblage of various images, texts and related technologies that is never constant or fixed (even now, after the event is well over) and which connects infinitely with other *image-worlds*. While the chapter focuses primarily on Sydney 2002, the discussion in fact begins with Judith Butler’s (1997a) work on homosexuality in the US military and with a very different set of images, the violent photographs taken of the Abu Ghraib prisoners by US soldiers and then widely disseminated via various new media technologies (email, Internet, digital broadcasting technologies). Although at first glance these images might seem an odd starting place for a discussion of citizenship, sexuality and the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, these particular images elucidate the chapter’s key arguments and illustrate how images do not merely reflect or represent a single or ‘real’ moment in time, they make infinite connections with other times, and spaces, and are
constantly being assigned new meanings and contexts and thus becoming something other than they were before.
Chapter Five
Images, *image-worlds* and the Sydney 2002 Gay Games

In *Excitable Speech* (1997a) Judith Butler considers the ways in which language can act as an injurious force. Butler argues that human beings are constituted through language and therefore language acquires a particular power to insult (perhaps even assault) us. The mode of an injurious speech act, and the context within which it is made, determine the extent of its damage. Butler is not only interested in the ways speech acts *injure* subjects under attack, but also in the faultlines of language, where injurious speech becomes the impetus for resistance to linguistic violence and for the reconstitution of the meanings attached to particular slurs or insults. Of particular relevance to this thesis is Butler’s chapter entitled “Contagious Word: Paranoia and ‘Homosexuality’ in the Military”. Here she unpacks the linkage between the utterance ‘I am a homosexual’ and the notions of ‘conduct’ and ‘act’ within the United States military context. She explains that the utterance, the act of saying ‘I am a homosexual’, is inextricably linked to the homosexual sex act, sex that when *named* binds the speaking subject to ‘inappropriate conduct’. Butler establishes a key link between claiming or outing oneself as a homosexual subject within the US military and the regulation of this speech act within an institution that sanctions a very particular form of American citizenship. The restrictions placed around naming and/or proc:aiming oneself a homosexual within this context speak to other “retractable zones of citizenship” (Butler, 1997a, p. 105) that now dominate many western countries around the world (e.g. in immigration policies). Moreover, they suggest that full citizenship is limited to those that fit within the parameters of a strictly defined national imagination.

Butler’s discussion of homosexuality and the military can be read against a fairly recent article entitled “Weapons of mass homophobia” in *The Advocate*, an American national gay and lesbian news magazine produced in Los Angeles. In the article, author Patrick Moore (2004) reflects on the violent images from Abu Ghraib that began to circulate within the public domain in June 2004. The images offered graphic ‘evidence’ of the torture that some American troops were inflicting on Iraqi prisoners held in detention. The images became ‘public’ when, after being emailed home by troops, they made their way into the hands of the media. Moore explains that in many of the images the modes of torture and intimidation are sexual. Prisoners were either forced to simulate sexual acts or, in some cases, forced to perform sexual acts – most of which were homosexual sex acts (anal sex, anal penetration using various objects or oral sex between men). Moore’s critique is, to say the least, western-
centric and while he attempts to unpack the significance of using homosexual sex acts to intimidate and denigrate non-western, non-Christian ‘Others’, any salience his argument might have gets lost to a set of gross generalisations about Muslim traditions and Iraqi culture. Moore somehow loses sight of what the images say about violence or the techniques of contemporary warfare as he works to protect and reclaim the essence of homosexuality, as though it were a singular or simple category of identity. For instance, Moore is concerned that images of this kind are damaging to gays and lesbians ‘back home’ and argues that “seeing our sexuality utilized as an extreme form of torture is a mortifying experience. For the closeted gay men and lesbians serving in the military, it must evoke complete terror” (Moore, 2004, p. 25).103 There is no mention of why or how the self-identifying utterances of homosexual men along with homosexual sex acts themselves are deemed so vile and toxic that they are used as charges of violence against the Other, and as objects – weapons – used by one nation or culture to assert dominance over another. The horrific images of torture not only illustrate the ways in which homosexual sex is the most humiliating thing one can force a detained or captive ‘non-citizen-subject’ to partake in (which is one of the central arguments that Moore makes), but also that homosexual sex threatens and undermines most dominant forms of national masculinity. The photos are reminders of Ronit Lentin’s (1997) contention that in times of war, defeat is often reinforced with a second act of violence, of making the army’s men into defiled subjects – into women or homosexual men. The images thus force the question of how homosexuality becomes a concept against which citizenship is defined and strictly policed.

For the purposes of this thesis on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, these images point to the ways in which sexuality functions as an apparatus that governs conduct, but also as a mechanism used to violently name, regulate and humiliate those bodies and lives deemed uncivil, non-human, or Other.104 Like Butler’s work in Excitable Speech (and certainly in her later work in Precarious Life (2004c); see Chapter Two), these images press viewers to understand military and state regulation of gays and lesbians against broader agendas to normalise and purify the (US and Iraqi in this case) national imaginary. Furthermore, they force the viewer to consider the materiality of the images themselves. How do the properties

103 New York activist Bill Dobbs makes a similar argument about the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Program’s response to the USS Enterprise warhead that read “Hijack this, fags”. Dobbs argues that local activists were more concerned with the unconstitutional use of ‘fag’ than they were with the significance of coupling homophobic violence with international warfare. He maintains that this type of ‘gay tunnel vision’ fails to address broader issues of violence. For a discussion of this incident, see Duggan, 2003.

104 Again, while this example illustrates how sexuality and homophobia function to violate the body of the Other, there are a number of horrific examples that point to the violence done against women and their children (e.g. rape of the enemy’s women) at times of war in order to assert power over the ‘enemy’ or to claim victory/defeat (Lentin, 1997).
of these images allow them to circulate so widely? As digital images, how do they actively produce meanings around sexuality, citizenship, violence and democracy?

Like the utterance “I am a homosexual” that, as Butler insists, defines the speaker as the vile, illicit and contagious Other, these images act as ‘visual statements’ that extend the circuit of violence and hatred towards the ‘uncivil’, non-western subject while, at the same time, upholding the association of homosexual sex with government condoned acts of violence, intimidation and degradation by one human being to another. The photos are marked by a visual utterance that says, ‘we will make you into that which we abhor, that which we silence; we will remind you that you are a contagion to our nation’. They confirm Ron Burnett’s (2004) point that “humans speak with words and images. Language and image are inextricably bound together. …” (p. 53; italics added). Here, at the junction where language and image meet, homosexual sex acts are understood to be non-permissible, un-utterable acts within the US military context and yet at the same time are read as powerful and tactical acts of humiliation, torture and defeat used by US military soldiers.

These images embody something language cannot, a surplus or excess that language cannot contain. Again, they were taken as digital photographs and as such they function in a way that is quite distinct from analogue technologies. As this chapter will explore in greater detail, digital images in their malleability and transportability contain the subject matter within the frame differently. Many of these images were taken by the troops on their digital cameras and sent ‘home’ as souvenirs of sorts, alongside other tourist photos from outside the prison confines (Butler, 2005). That these images are digital, captured on digital cameras, is central to understanding their capacity to ‘act’ violently. That they were taken by American troops and emailed home to family and friends before they leaked into the hands of the media also says something profound about the digitised and mechanised nature of this war. The temporal and spatial specificity of the violent acts contained in each photo’s frame were altered again and again into new forms of violence – a digi-violence one could say – with each successive movement of the photographic image across cyberspace. One could also ask how the digital camera forces significant cultural and historical moments into simple tourist snapshots, or what it means that violence can now be pixelated, altered digitally and sent around the globe electronically.

105 Similarly, Butler argued in a public lecture entitled “Giving an account of oneself” (Butler, 2005) that the images from Abu Ghraib are useful examples of how the photographic frame contains subjects in particular ways. She was not so much concerned with the material properties of the images themselves, but rather with the relationships between photographer, image frame and the subjects being photographed. This lecture was given on 18 June, 2005, after this chapter was first drafted.
Susan Sontag (1978, 2003) suggests that wartime photography always bears a trace of the dominant ideologies of the time. She explains that the dearth of ‘war images’ circulating within the (US) public domain during and following the Korean War indicates that there was no ideological ‘room’ in the US national culture at that time for images that forced citizens to come to terms with the ecocidal and genocidal nature of that war. Sontag explains that just over a decade later, the wide circulation of Nick Ut’s photograph (1972) of Kim Phuc, the young girl fleeing her South Vietnamese village after it had been sprayed with napalm during an American air raid, was indication that American citizens were having a different response to their country’s involvement in this (Vietnam) war. In making this comparison Sontag insists that the manner in which images are produced and circulated around these two wars reflects the public’s political and moral understanding of the conflicts. In her view, while images cannot create morality they can reinforce existing ideologies and norms. What then do Sontag’s reflections say about the Abu Ghraib images of violence, torture, intimidation and humiliation? How does the content of the photographic frames and the way in which they were disseminated speak to the dominant ideologies around the war in Iraq and within America post-September 11, 2001? How does the manner in which these images became public influence how they are interpreted or understood? Moreover, what do the images’ format and the mediums through which they became public (or not, in the case of those that the media decided not to show; see Butler, 2005) say about the relationships between discourses of violence, detention, homosexuality, nationalism and citizenship today, not only in America, but also in a number of other western nations?

This chapter argues that there is a need to think through the ways in which images and their related technologies are involved in the diffuse strategies that govern the actions (in particular the sexual actions) of individual citizens and/or certain populations. While this chapter in no way intends to take as its central focus the images discussed above or the responses they generated within or outside of America, this example and the questions it brings to the surface, demonstrate that images act in new ways to order our day-to-day lives and actively produce meanings around ‘nation’, ‘identity’ and ‘citizenship’. The images from Abu Ghraib also serve as reminders that the relationships between images and language, between humans and images and between images and new forms of digital and information technologies are complex and ever-changing.

106 Ut, a Vietnamese photographer, won the Pulitzer Prize and World Press Prize for this photograph in 1973. It was really by chance that he managed to capture this image as he had been photographing the village all day when the raids began. Ut took Phuc to the hospital and saved her life. The photo made its way to America when Ut’s (Vietnamese) editors decided that Americans needed to see what was really happening in Vietnam (“Picture power”, 2005).
Thus far, this thesis has outlined the ways in which the various neo-liberal rationalities construct and naturalise both the introspective, self-managed individual queer subject and the globally networked queer community made up of respectable consumer-citizens. Chapter Three outlined Arjun Appadurai’s contention that in an age when information and peoples move around the globe at greater speeds and volumes, “images, the imagined and the imagination” (Appadurai, 1996, p. 31) operate in new ways that order everyday living and act as powerful tools of resistance. He mobilises the imagination as a new form of (local) labour that aids in the negotiation of global living. Following Appadurai’s line of thinking, Chapter Three explored the ways in which the imagination is bound to the entrepreneurial spirit of freedom, reinvention, innovation, flexibility, creativity and cosmopolitanism and how it becomes a resource for ‘making things happen’ and for working on oneself. It asked how the imagination is bound to labour-intensive practices of management and regulation and how individuals ‘make themselves subjects’ by drawing on these laborious modes of (self) work. Chapter Four teased out the ways in which the ‘politics’ of the Gay Games movement is riddled with contradictions because of the event’s commitment to a politics of inclusion and its simultaneous reliance on large corporate sponsors and its desire to attract upwardly mobile gay and lesbian participants. This chapter, along with Chapter Six, extends these discussions by asking what role images play in producing, ordering and managing the experiences and conduct of participants at Sydney 2002. Together they ask how images and their related technologies were used at the Games to encourage participants to imagine themselves as certain types of sexual subjects and as global consumer-citizens.

This chapter begins with the simple question: What is an image? Ron Burnett’s (2004) work in How Images Think is used to tease out the relationship between a photograph and an image and to introduce Burnett’s notion of an image-world. He insists that images do not simply represent the world around us; they produce and govern our everyday experiences. Rather than understanding images as strictly bound and independent objects, Burnett suggests that an image-world is a vast network that encompasses images, various forms of technology and the language and discourses used to make sense of both of these.

Having established a new way of understanding the role images play in ordering contemporary living, the remainder of the chapter considers how the Sydney 2002 Gay Games might be viewed as an image-world. It illustrates the ways in which the images and technologies that constitute the Gay Games image-world(s) are by no means contained in a fixed or tidy manner. The images and technologies used to ‘make’ the Games what they were can be linked to a variety of other images and events that fall outside the parameters of this
eight-day celebration. The Sydney 2002 Gay Games *image-world* finds points of connections with other popular queer image texts (both past and present), sport iconography, the ‘history’ of the Gay Games movement, and styles and symbols of local (Sydney) and national (Australian) cultures.

### ‘Thinking’ the image

Photography has never been a constant or fixed artistic discipline. As the example of the photos from Abu Ghraib illustrated in the opening discussion of this chapter, contemporary photography and the photographic formats used to ‘capture’ images are very different now from what they were even a decade ago. Chapter Six provides examples of how the Gay Games movement has changed significantly as a result of various technological innovations in photography, printing, design, advertising and film-making and also through the growth of new-media technologies such as email and the Internet. A great deal of work has gone into thinking through what a photograph is, the role the photographer plays in constructing the photo’s frame and the role of the lens in capturing or creating particular features (e.g. light, texture, depth) of the photo. Roland Barthes’ early work remains seminal to scholarship in visual culture, art history, film studies and media studies. For Barthes (1981) the photograph is an object created by a photographer. The photographic image carries meaning that tells the viewer about the world and about particular times and places. Images are a direct reflection of the places we inhabit as human beings and how we live our lives. Barthes maintains the photographer is able to capture time standing still into a manageable and collectable format.

Susan Sontag (1978) suggests that, “to collect photographs is to collect the world” (p. 40). She differentiates between the interpretive nature of written texts and/or of paintings and the more realistic nature of the photo. The photo is less a statement about the world and more a small fragment, or ‘miniature’ of the world itself, objects that let us “hold the world in our heads” (Sontag, 1978, p. 40). While Sontag’s description of the relationship between the photograph and the world goes beyond simply seeing the photograph as an object that offers human beings some insight into the ‘real’ contours of the world, her description, like Barthes’, still creates a clear distinction between what is captured in the (miniature/micro) photographic frame and that which the photo represents, the (larger/macro) ‘real’ world. The event being photographed remains distinct from the contents of the photographic frame.

In his most recent book, *How Images Think* (2004), Ron Burnett suggests that these types of distinctions are no longer adequate for describing the relationships between photography and the world around us (past, present or future, although he makes the point that these cannot
be named or defined in simple or linear terms). For Burnett, photographs become images the minute they are viewed or consumed and images are how human beings organise, understand and interpret the world around them. They are not simply miniature moments or memories of ‘real time’; instead, they are a very real part of everyday experiences. Photographic images, like all the countless other images and related technologies, are not simply around us in the sense that, as human beings, we can detach or stand outside or beside them; we think in images, eat in images, have sex with/in images and dream in images. Photographs are thus part of an expansive flow of images that are not simply human creations, but objects that produce and govern daily experiences, shape interactions and structure spaces which establish the limits of human intelligibility.

He also points out that the shift from analogue to digital demonstrates the blurry and uncertain line between image, machine and an event that is happening in ‘real time’. Where analogue photos recorded fluctuating light waves by focusing these fluctuations on film, digital photography focuses these light fluctuations onto a semi-conductor, translating these movements into electronic information. Digital cameras contain small computers that translate this ‘information’ into a pixelated image. The experience of the photographer in framing and ‘capturing’ the person, object or event is different from both automatic and manual analogue technologies (Burnett, 2004). Digital technologies such as scanners allow users to convert what was originally a photograph developed from an analogue camera into a pixelated image that can be altered, enhanced, preserved and stored using computer software. Computer software programmes like Adobe Photoshop® allow users to alter the resolution, size (in terms of its dimensions or the amount of memory it takes up), colour gradient, colour range, pixel ratio, brightness, contrast or texture of a photo. One can crop, rotate, enlarge, blur, restore, sharpen, pixelate, liquefy, distort or duplicate existing photo images. Likewise, one can create or assemble new images by bringing together components of existing images. In comparison, images captured on celluloid can only be chemically (through the process of development) or mechanically (cropping, brushing, etc.) altered.

Digital images are also stored differently; they can exist as jpeg or Tiff files that take up a certain number of bytes on a hard drive. Digital images are stored on mobile phones, websites, iPods and other mp3 players, and in computer files; they are not stored as negatives or tucked away in photo albums on the shelf like photographs taken on analogue cameras tend to be. Digital technologies beg the question of what the original image was and what constitutes the time the image was taken or made. Old images become new using computer programs’ restoration features. Digital images can borrow fragments of the past (black and
white, antique motifs) or adopt futuristic motifs (liquefaction, distortion). They are now more highly compressible, alterable and less fixed entities than they were when completely produced with analogue technologies. The possibility for multiple alterations not only transforms what the image is, but also what it ‘says’ about the particular moment captured in the frame.

Burnett introduces the notion of an image-world\textsuperscript{107} to develop his understanding of the complex, changing relationships human beings form with various images and technologies. As the subsections below explore in greater detail, he argues that questions around the construction of identities and/or of human experience of the world, must take into account the role images play.

**Image-worlds**

For Burnett, image-worlds are not simply reflections or representations of society as it is, but are productive forces that shape all facets of socio-cultural living and inform “the way[s] in which humans visualize themselves and how they communicate the results” (Burnett, 2004, p. 9). In other words, images and related technologies are integral tools in the complex processes of subjectivization, the ways in which, in Foucault’s words, “human beings are made subject” (Foucault, 1982, p. 208, see Chapter Two). Images and image-worlds are therefore productive forces at an event like the Gay Games; they do not merely function as representations of global gay and lesbian (sporting) communities, they produce them.

*Image-worlds* encompass more than just photographic technologies; they include all forms of technology that rely upon or interact with images including various forms of news media (radio, television, pod-casts), interactive new media technologies (internet, video games, i-pods), information technologies (computers, computer software, databases, medical screening devices), and communication technologies (mobile phones, fax machines, email systems, peer-to-peer communication systems). Furthermore, image-worlds do not stop at what is seeable. Burnett argues that images cannot be experienced in isolation from sound, language, smell, taste or touch. Most image experiences rely on more than one sensorial response in order to be effective/affective. There are a number of examples that illustrate this point. A rather simple one is the online greeting card (or e-card) that allows users to send, by email, a virtual (and visual) greeting complete with music and/or voice recordings. The

\textsuperscript{107} Burnett is not the first to speak of the *image-world*. For Sontag (1978, 2003) the *image-world* is that which is feared to be replacing ‘reality’.
traditional greeting card experience of opening and plucking a card from a sealed envelope is replaced by an animated, onscreen experience. Another example that illustrates the rich dimensions of images and *image-worlds* is the range of devices referred to as virtual reality (VR) technologies. The aim of these technologies is to give the individual/player an experience of total immersion by simulating as many of the dimensions of ‘real life’ as possible. This involves a complete morphological experience that incorporates touch, sound, vision and, in some cases, smell (Burnett, 2004).

Burnett’s conceptualisation of an *image-world* also includes the various mediums or apparatuses capable of altering what an image is and how it functions as a visual text and/or as a form of information or communication. Images, and the forms of technology that synthesise, fragment, alter and disseminate them, interact with the discursive contexts within which images are viewed. Again, there are endless examples of such devices: the digital camera used to take photographs; computer programs such as Adobe Photoshop® that allow ‘users’ to alter and manipulate the form, size and content of an image; email interfaces and the servers that allow images to be sent from one virtual space to another; iPods; peer-to-peer file sharing networks, interactive, computerised photo booths; telephones with built-in cameras; webcams; websites and USB memory sticks.

An *image-world* also abandons the idea that language is an isolated or the sole dimension of human interactions, forcing an acknowledgement of the multi-sensorial ways in which individuals come to understand who they are and the world(s) around them. Individuals’ interactions with images, and the texts, sounds and discourses linked with them, are not simply simulations of ‘real life’, they are the translation of material conditions of the present. Again, to understand contemporary living is to understand the role that images play. Therefore to understand an event like the Sydney 2002 Gay Games is to ask how images function as sites of communication and mediation throughout the event, rather than analysing them simply as texts upon which discursive meanings or messages are written and/or read. In other words, images are not simply the products of human *imagination* or creation, they are understood to be in a continuous circuit of communication with human subjects; they are active, interactive, creative and productive. Burnett explains:

Immersion in the *image-world* is simply part of what it means to be human and is perhaps the best example of how pivotal to human activity and self-definition image-scenes have become in the twenty-first century. (Burnett, 2004, p. 43)

Burnett assigns a productive quality to images, arguing that they do not merely *represent* human beings and the world they live in; instead, they are instrumental in processes of subject
formation and the government of the everyday conduct of individuals. The repetition of images across time and space normalises and naturalises the idea that what we ‘see’ in/through images is merely a window to the ‘real’ world. Again, Burnett’s notion of an image-world suggests that images are not tools that mediate the ‘real’, but are, instead, very much part of our everyday ‘real’ experiences. Images are integral forces in constituting social norms and governing the nature of an individual’s day-to-day activities and are central to how individuals constitute themselves as certain types of subjects.

Images and image-worlds at the Games?

There are a number of ways in which Burnett’s work is useful in formulating a new reading of the Gay Games. First, Burnett approaches the relationship between human beings and images as much more active and reciprocal than those critical responses that either ignore or are suspicious of images and related technologies. The previous chapters in this thesis stressed the productive capacities of various politico-juridical structures and policies at the Games that claim to merely describe and/or represent the subjects and objects around them (see in particular Chapters Two and Four). Emphasis was placed on how certain subject positions (woman, man, queer, gay) are produced by these governing structures. In a similar way, Burnett’s work opens up a space from which to consider the productive role that images and image-based technologies play in constituting normative subject positions at Sydney 2002.

His work inspires new ways of approaching studies of queer image texts and global queer events like the Gay Games. Images of queer bodies and lives in all of their variety and contexts, shift from being understood as simple representations or purveyors of meanings and instead become integral parts of everyday living that produce the normative subjects they claim to merely represent. Furthermore, Burnett’s formulation of the image-world provides a space from which to consider the promotional and media materials of an event like Sydney 2002 as integral features of the overall event. As intimated in previous chapters, this project moves away from those studies that attempt to describe what the Gay Games are by recounting organisers’ and participants’ experiences of the event. Although this type of critical work is vital in developing a broader understanding of the Gay Games, this thesis is less focused on ‘telling the stories’ of those involved in the event and more interested in mapping the discursive terrain within/upon which stories about the Games are formulated and/or told.

Viewing Sydney 2002 as an image-world (or series of image-worlds) is also in keeping with the idea that these Games can be viewed as a global assemblage, apparatus or dispositif.
As Chapter Three pointed out, it is useful to approach transnational events like the Gay Games as an assemblage of competing objects, forces and actions that are never constant or stable. Adapting this type of framework moves the Games outside narratives of singularity, progress or linearity (as described in Chapter One). 'Going to the Games' is in no way a singular experience that everyone in attendance was a part of in the same way despite organisers' and participants' efforts to describe it as such. Images are one of many tools or mechanisms that shape individuals' experience of and response to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, or any of the previous Games for that matter. Everything from what events they attended or participated in, to what they wore, or what kind of accommodation they stayed in was influenced by images in one way or another. Likewise, individuals' affective responses to the competition and celebrations and how they came to identify and/or articulate their identity as an athlete, a conference-goer, an activist, a citizen, a singer, a traveller, a local, a volunteer and so on were produced within the Gay Games image-world.

In all their multiplicity, images were used to maintain a sense of celebration, unity, uniformity and order at Sydney 2002. Participants' interactions with almost every facet of the 'event' required immediate or peripheral interactions with images and technologies. Registering for the Games required getting onto the official Sydney 2002 Internet site. Choosing an event to participate in meant selecting from a variety of drop-down menus and proceeding through an online payment procedure. Making plans to come to Sydney would have required a variety of image-based tools: online booking agencies, brochures from tourism outlets, and/or the Lonely Planet guide books (or website) with their glossy photos and designerly layouts. Getting to Sydney from interstate locations or from overseas required getting to an airport, checking in using paper tickets, e-tickets or express, automated checkout services, all of which use language, symbols and images to represent travel information in a recognisable format. Getting on a plane meant following digital signs through busy airports. Flying depends upon sophisticated onboard communication and information technologies. Passengers on board are offered in-flight entertainment services in the form of personal media consoles containing in-flight news programs, films and television serials. Once in Sydney participants would have taken a taxi, bus or rental car, and following Sydney's green and white road signs, would have made their way to their accommodation. If staying in a hotel or hostel, it is likely they would have been given a stack of flyers and brochures of things to do and see in their area.108 If they were lucky, they would have been given a map, a scaled

108 Figure A22 offers an example of the type of promotional/information packages some hotels put together for the Games. This figure shows the front cover of a multi-page brochure given to guests at the Park Lodge Hotel, which is a gay-friendly hotel located very close to the Opening Ceremony venue in Moore Park.
representation of the area\textsuperscript{109}, in order to make their way to Sydney’s Town Hall where the official Gay Games accreditation process took place. To get accredited and thus participate in the Games, individuals would have been asked to produce their passport, visual evidence of citizenship. They would have had their photo taken by a digital camera, and then this photo would have been inserted into the official ID/accreditation tag (see Figure A21, Appendix A). Worn around the neck, this image-based ID would become participants’ ticket into various free events and a way of recognising other participants around the city. Images and technologies would continue to inform every move they made at the Games, shaping their experiences in large and small ways. For example, participants would interact with the spectacular sound and light shows at the Opening Ceremony (see discussion of Opening Ceremony in Chapter Six), the electronic recording and scoring devices used at the various sporting events,\textsuperscript{110} the signs and symbols used to direct visitors to the Sydney Olympic Village, the Gay Games Hub in Hyde Park, Oxford Street and so on,\textsuperscript{111} and the photos they took at the event and then used in a variety of ways – perhaps they emailed them home, stored them as electronic files in their computer’s image library, displayed them on personal websites, used them as screen-savers or simply had them professionally developed and then arranged them in a photo album.

Each of the examples above speaks to the ways in which Sydney 2002 can be read as an image-world composed of a vast array of images, image-based technologies, new-media technologies and information technologies too numerous and changeable to be contained. They also illustrate the central role that images play in shaping tourist events, gay and lesbian/queer community/cultural events and global sporting competitions more broadly. In a sense what this thesis has been doing thus far is uncovering various segments of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games image-world. The various images analysed in the previous chapters are all

\begin{itemize}
\item See Figures A23-A26 for maps used by Gay Games organisers to map the official spaces and places of the Gay Games onto Sydney’s inner-city and suburban spaces. David McInnes (2001) suggests that maps function as diagrammatic and/or graphic technologies that ‘imagine’ space in certain ways. He analyses the Sydney City Rail Network and argues that this information tool represents the city centre as the ‘heart’ of Sydney whilst the suburbs are represented as mere extensions, or ‘arteries’ of the core. Likewise, the maps used to show Gay Games visitors how to get to event venues used symbols and images to make certain spaces part of the Sydney Gay Games experience whilst designating others unimportant. Furthermore, the inner city is produced using brighter colours, a more extensive legend and appealing images of participants and famous Sydney landmarks than the map of Sydney’s suburbs.
\item Figure A27, Appendix A, is a picture of the large screen used at the Olympic Pool to advertise events and to show participants’ scores.
\item Figures A28 & A29, Appendix A, are photographs of the digital welcome signs used at the Sydney Olympic Park. Figures A30 & A31, offer two examples of how images were used in and around the Gay Games inner-city Hub, and Figure A32 is a photograph of the Gay Games information shop on Oxford Street. Most of this office was moved to the Hub during the Games, but this space still offered some information and an Internet service. In each case, the signage around/within these places and spaces played a central role in demarcating it an official Sydney 2002 area.
\end{itemize}
part of a broad assemblage of images and technologies that are in constant interaction with the written texts, bodies and spaces of the Games. Of course, Burnett insists that an image-world is never a self-contained or independent set of images and image-related technologies. The Gay Games image-world is thus comprised of infinite images that connect with an infinite number of other assemblages or image-worlds. To describe the Gay Games as an image-world is not to envision a neatly defined and clearly bound assemblage or network of images and technologies. The Gay Games image-world is better understood as a dense entanglement or network of objects and effects that intersect and overlap with one another in disordered and irregular ways. Whilst some images were created specifically for Under New Skies ‘02, others were reproductions from one or more of the previous five Games, while still others referenced other queer cultural events and/or familiar sporting or cultural motifs or styles. The section that follows explores the ‘contents’ of the Sydney 2002 image-world(s) in more detail. What becomes apparent is that this assemblage of ‘queer’ images and technologies encompasses and overlaps with a variety of other image-worlds that, in similar ways, produce and govern meanings around what it means to be an individual gay and lesbian or queer subject, an Australian citizen and a global tourist.

**Tracing the ‘contents’ of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games image-worlds**

Figure 5.1 below is a useful starting point for illustrating the untidy and uncontained operations of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games image-world. It is one of an endless stream of image-based texts that make up the Sydney 2002 image-world(s), and the broader Gay Games image-world(s). Like all of the images circulating within and around the Gay Games, the photograph featured in Figure 5.1 makes scattered connections with an infinite number of other images, image-related technologies, sounds, language texts and so on, all directly or indirectly linked to Sydney 2002. This photograph is also particularly salient in highlighting the important role that images play in producing and governing meanings attached to certain spaces, in this case, Sydney’s inner city.
Figure 5.1: Southern Stars Drag Troupe atop the Harbour Bridge to mark the two-week countdown for Sydney 2002 (The Sydney Morning Herald (October, 19-20, 2002), Photographer: Robert Pearce)\textsuperscript{112}

The image is an aerial photograph that featured in The Sydney Morning Herald (SMH) two weeks before the Gay Games Opening Ceremony took place. It manages to capture four distinguishing features of the local metropolitan area: The steel-grey structure of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, the glistening waters of the Sydney Harbour, the striking, fan-ribbed roof shells of the Sydney Opera House, and ten wig-wearing drag queens, clad in bridge-climbing attire no less!\textsuperscript{113} The photograph is thus linked to the innumerable other tourist images and technologies associated with the Sydney Harbour foreshore, the Harbour Bridge and the Opera House. This includes everything from glossy tourism booklets and postcards; the city’s New Year’s Eve fireworks displays that take place atop (and around) the Harbour Bridge; the Opera House webpage, show tickets and the performances themselves; the Harbour Bridge e-

\textsuperscript{112} In many ways the photo as it appears above is direct evidence of Burnett’s point that images and technology are brought together in innumerable new ways. This image was scanned using my Canon LiDE 500F scanner and then cropped and resized in Adobe Photoshop®.

\textsuperscript{113} Since Bridgeclimb began offering 3.5 hour trips to the ‘summit’ of the Sydney Harbour Bridge in 1998, the grey coveralls featured in this image and the distant body specks ‘in climb’ have become well-known, everyday features of the bridge. Bridgeclimb advertised to gay and lesbian travellers during the Games and these ads feature in Figures A33 and A34 in Appendix A; these images can also be said to be part of the Games image-world.
Tag toll technology that electronically records drivers’ use of the bridge; and, the personal snap-shots millions of tourists take every year in front of these local landmarks. In the same way, the photograph in Figure 5.1 is linked to other images of drag queen iconography used at the Games, but also to the untold images, music scores and performance technologies that have made ‘queening’ such an important part of Sydney’s queer community. In other words, the Sydney 2002 image-world connects with a multiplicity of images and technologies that ‘originated’ outside the Games and reinforces Ron Burnett’s point that image-worlds are never contained or bound objects, but instead are vast and layered assemblages of images, sounds, technologies and discourses that are constantly being altered, recycled and re-imagined.

As mentioned in Chapter One, despite plans by Games organisers to secure mainstream media partners, Sydney 2002 did not receive a huge amount of mainstream print media coverage and only minimal television coverage on non-commercial channels. Sydney’s daily broad sheet, The Sydney Morning Herald (SMH), provided some coverage of the event but these news pieces were usually tucked away amidst a great deal of other news and commercial advertisements. In the period from October 31 – November 10, there were 22 articles in the SMH that referenced the Gay Games. Most of these, like the image above, featured either drag queens or male athletes/participants in Sydney’s best-known tourist spaces or socialising in inner-city venues.¹¹⁴

It is only in the recent past that drag queens have ‘come out’ as one of the Sydney queer community’s mainstream poster girls. Unlike the image of the well-groomed, middle-class gay male, which is another frequently disseminated image of queerness (Brady, 2003; Burns, 2003; Chasin, 2001; Miller, 2001a, 2005; Sender, 2003, 2004), drag queens maintain a much more ambivalent relationship with their mainstream audience/consumer. In many ways the photograph above (Figure 5.1) embodies this historical ambivalence and therefore plays an interesting function within the Gay Games image-world. On the one hand, the image attempts to assimilate or normalise drag culture by associating it with national icons like the Sydney Harbour, the Sydney Harbour Bridge, the Opera House, and the exclusive economies linked to each (real estate, opera, tourism, boating). On the other hand, however, this image disrupts or undoes the tidy associations of national culture with normative sex/gender performances through the use of gender parody and camp sensibilities.

¹¹⁴ See for example, Figures A35-A37, Appendix A.
In *Gender Trouble* (1999), Judith Butler argues that drag performance calls attention to both the ways in which gender is discursively produced and the ways in which gender norms are sanctified at the level of the body. Drag’s playful reworking of normative sex/gender rules, more specifically its capacity to trouble what constitutes an intelligibly ‘female’ or ‘male’ body, calls attention to the productive and performative ways in which gender norms are defined and governed. It other words, drag does not simply parody male/female gender roles, it parodies the *performative* ways in which gender roles are normalised and naturalised.

According to Clive Faro and Gary Wotherspoon (2000), drag queens have always maintained a very elusive relationship with their audience, even within Sydney’s queer community itself. Although today a cornerstone of urban queer living in Australia, the “radical and disruptive metaphors” (Faro & Wotherspoon, 2000, p. 262) embodied in drag performance have long pushed the boundaries of what constitutes an acceptable or unacceptable gender ‘bend’ or parody for queers. When drag performance was first introduced to the Sydney scene in the 1960s (Harris & Witte, 2006) there were mixed reactions from within the gay and lesbian community concerning the appropriateness of this style of performance. Some radical lesbian feminists felt that drag was an affront to women’s efforts to be taken seriously. Some women felt that the performers were mocking women’s feminine attributes and/or suggesting that womanhood is something one can easily put on and take off. They felt that drag trivialised the gendered nature of society and was thus part of a wider spectrum of misogynistic responses to women’s struggle for equality (Faro & Wotherspoon, 2000). Likewise, some gay men were (and some certainly continue to be) resistant to drag for they felt it type-cast gay men as feminine and flamboyant. How, they asked, could the community be taken seriously when men were running around in wigs and stiletto heels?

Stephen Elliot’s film *The Adventures of Priscilla Queen of the Desert* (1994) played out some of these tensions on screen and is also largely responsible for inserting drag performance into the mainstream Australian imagination. One cannot talk about drag queens in Australia (or, as this discussion will suggest, at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games) without considering the ways in which *Priscilla* transformed the place of drag within both queer and mainstream circles. As such, the subsections below explore the various ways in which this filmic portrayal of Sydney’s drag queen culture finds points of intersection with the Sydney 2002 Gay Games *image-world*. They offer a short discussion of the film’s key themes and show how many of these are at play within the promotional and media cultures of Sydney 2002. But beyond this, these sections argue that, like Sydney 2002, *Priscilla* is not a fixed or
finished assemblage of images, language and discourse. Like other image-worlds, this film is forever becoming something other than it was before, both because it has the potential to be read by different audiences in different ways and because changing technologies allow ‘snippets’ from this film to be made into something other than they were before.

Imaging Priscilla, imagining queer Australia

Described by Faro and Wotherspoon (2000) as a story about “three seriously frocked-up queens. …taking Oxford Street subculture into outback Australia” (p. 287), Priscilla not only won an American Academy Award (for best costume design), it also received world-wide acclaim and put Sydney on the map in global Hollywood. In many ways Priscilla is a classic film of the road movie genre (Rayner, 2000) where the experiences and personal growth gained ‘on the road’ become far more monumental than either the starting or terminal points of the characters’ journeys. In this sense it is a useful text for thinking through what role film and other image texts play in reproducing discourses of the autonomous, neo-liberal subject who is responsible for finding his or her own personal truth, a theme guiding the direction of the analysis in this thesis. But there are also other important questions that can be asked of this film, questions that push this chapter’s discussion towards the idea that as a (moving) image text or indeed as an image-world, Priscilla finds innumerable points of intersection with the photograph in Figure 5.1 above and with the broader Sydney 2002 Gay Games image-world. For instance, one might consider what it is about Priscilla that allowed it to achieve such international success and such positive reception from mainstream audiences. What struggles around identity and place were played out in this film, and what made these struggles so consumable to both local and global audiences? How does the photograph in Figure 5.1 above challenge and/or reinforce these particular themes or struggles? How is a particular type of ‘local’ queerness produced in Elliott’s film? How was the legacy of Priscilla and drag queen culture more generally used by Sydney 2002 organisers in order to create a tourist-friendly ‘image’ of queer life in Sydney (and beyond)? Does the use of drag queens and other drag imagery at the Games produce a similar set of meanings around queerness? Around Australia’s gay and lesbian/queer community?

The still from Priscilla featured in Figure 5.2 offers an interesting starting point for addressing each of these questions and for illustrating the various ways in which Elliott’s film finds various points of connection with the Sydney 2002 image-world. In many ways this particular still captures a key turning point in the film. The viewer has followed the three main characters, Tick Belrose (a.k.a. Mitzi Del Bra, played by Hugo Weaving), Bernadette
Passenger (a bereaved transsexual, played by Terence Stamp) and Adam Whitely (a.k.a. Felicia Jollygoodfellow, played by Guy Pierce) on their collective voyage from Sydney to Alice Springs and on their individual journeys toward self-discovery. Before optimistically boarding their newly purchased, but mechanically suspect bus that would quickly become their “micro-habitat, vehicular home” (Biber, 2001, p. 40), Adam explains that the aim of his outback adventure is, “to travel to the centre of Australia, climb King’s Canyon – as a queen – in a full-length Gaultier sequin, heels and a tiara”, to which Bernadette sarcastically replies, “Great. That’s just what this country needs. A cock in a frock on a rock”. The comic and often egocentric struggles of the drag trio’s adventures come to a cathartic break when they finally arrive in Alice Springs and each character comes to terms with a particular part of themselves that the rush of city life had allowed them to leave unaddressed. For Tick/Mitzi this means coming to terms with his conflicting roles as a parent, a gay man and drag performer. Before the trio reach their destination Tick confesses that he has an ex-wife (Marion, played by Sarah Chadwick) and when they finally arrive in Alice they discover that he also has a son (Benji, played by Mark Holmes). Tick’s realisation that his son ‘knows what he is’ and accepts ‘who he is’ provides him with an opening to imagine himself as both an acceptable father and an intelligible queer subject.
The scene depicted in Figure 5.2 collapses the humour, tension and drama of the film into a cinematographically rich sequence of shots and begins to bring the three characters’ journeys to an end. In a gesture of ‘coming to terms’ with themselves and with the ‘reality’ of rural life in Australia, the trio tart themselves up in striking costumes designed in bright whites, yellows, teals and fuchsias and begin to scrabble up Kings Canyon (‘I had a dream’, Adam states as they start their ascension\(^{115}\)). Giuseppe Verdi’s *E Strano! Ah fors E Lui* plays as the camera follows the three on their climb. Close-up shots of brown boots on red soil cut to feather hats and sun-scorched make-up and when the trio has finally reached the summit the viewer is offered a series of magnificent aerial shots (photographed from a helicopter) that uncover the expanse of the canyon and reveal the magnitude of this part of the country (represented as the centre in this film). Red oxides fade to rich siennas and bleed to yellow ochres and as the camera settles on the sun-baked but still glamorous faces of the three main characters, they offer a reflection:

Adam: Well, we did it...

Bernadette: It never ends, does it? All that space...

Adam: So, what now?

Tick: I think I want to go home.

Adam: Me too.

Bernadette: Well then, let’s finish the shows and go home.

The scene ends with another aerial shot that pans away from the three characters, leaving them small, colourful specks amidst “all that space...”. The viewer can’t help but be struck by the incongruence of these bodies in this place – urban queer figures in a remote and deserted expanse. At the same time, however, there is a symmetry and connection between the landscape Elliot captures in this series of aerial shots and these three ambiguously gendered bodies. The raw, weathered, yet spectacular costumes they are wearing and the excessiveness of their glamour and glitz somehow seems at ‘home’ in the breathtaking desert vista (three cocks in frocks on a rock). A juxtaposition similar to this one is at work in the Gay Games promotion image (see Figure 5.1 above), which captures the Southern Star Drag Troupe atop

\(^{115}\) This is an interesting line Elliot uses to begin the emotional and physical closure of this film. Whether intentional or not, this reminds the viewer of Martin Luther King’s famous civil rights speech that began with “I have a dream”. In Chapter 6, thought will be given to the ways in which the struggle of queer subjects is often conflated with other minority struggles.
the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The excessiveness and/or camp quality of these local bodies ‘matches’ the size and grandeur of the Sydney Harbour, the Sydney Opera House and the Harbour Bridge and yet their gender performance also disrupts these tourist spaces’ enduring link to traditional definitions of nationhood.

Both the Gay Games photograph (Figure 5.1) and the filmic moment captured in Figure 5.2 reinforce the idea that queer bodies, queer travel and indeed queer living are most at home (at least within the Australian context) in the city. Tick’s desire to ‘go home’ after a journey to ‘somewhere else’ reinscribes the ‘coming out’ narrative where gays and lesbians leave their place of personal/sexual struggle (often connoted as small town living) only to return to it once they have reconciled who they truly are (often done in the city). Coming home is thus about coming home to oneself and to one’s familial ties. Chapter Four referenced American commentator Andrew Sullivan’s plea for gays and lesbians to abandon their political fight to find their place at ‘home’ in their families and in American society. To some extent Tick’s desire to ‘go home’ gestures towards the same type of homonormative (Duggan, 2003), nationalistic return that Sullivan advocates, except that the three main characters must leave the confines of the city to find a deeper sense of who they are as queer subjects, only to return to their rightful place in the queer metropolis. To this end, Elliott established a false dichotomy between rural and urban living in Australia; real economic and cultural possibility exist in the city, especially if you are queer, while the expansive ‘outback’ offers momentary possibilities for spiritual enlightenment (Biber, 2001). Although Elliott opens up the possibility for queers to ‘survive’, perhaps even thrive in rural Australia (for example, Bernadette decides to stay in Alice with country gentleman Bob, played by Bill Hunter), ultimately the characters’ trip to Australia’s ‘remote centre’ is punctuated by the desire to return to a place where being queer is that much easier. Non-urban Australia functions as a singular ‘place’ and “serves as a metaphor: of exclusion, of peril, of difference, and is accessorised with a collection of mutated creatures that are perfect plunder for a drag venue” (Biber, 2001). The features of this ‘place’ that were, throughout the film, exclusionary, debilitating or impossible become satirised and conquered by the end of the film.

Drawing on the work of Allan Thomas (1996), Katherine Biber (2001) points out that the trio’s climb to the top of Kings Canyon functions as a rather masculinist moment of conquest. The Australian landscape is not only viewed (by both the trio and the camera/audience) in a very touristic and voyeuristic manner, it is, in a sense, recolonised by these bodies, who make it into their own personal space of transformation and thus evacuate it of its cultural and spiritual significance. Biber (2001) also suggests that the urban is reclaimed as an acceptable
space for queer living at the expense of various ‘raced’ bodies. In particular, she argues that
the character of Bob’s ‘mail order’ bride from the Philippines and the Aboriginal community
‘discovered’ in the ‘outback’ when the trio’s van breaks down, are simplistic and stereotypic
representations of non-white Australia. Biber also notes that the Aboriginal community is the
only community that accepts the performers without hesitation, suggesting that there is a
shared affinity between the two marginalised groups. The trio incorporate members of the
community into their living ‘by the camp fire’ performance and are warmly received. This
scene, of course, functions in stark contrast to their performances in small, white Australian
towns, where they are met with great resistance, even violence.

The photograph in Figure 5.1, like many of the promotional images for the Sydney 2002
Gay Games, links queer living to an exclusive and glamorous type of cosmopolitan urban
living. Sydney functions as a queer ‘host’ for displaced queers from all corners of the world to
come home to.

Priscilla Queen of the Desert goes to the Games

There are a number of other ways in which the Sydney 2002 image-world intersects with the
film Priscilla and with the broader history of drag culture in Sydney. Sydney’s drag
community was a significant feature of the opening celebrations for Under New Skies and of
the event’s broader cultural festival. In the Opening Ceremony, many of Sydney’s most
seasoned queens joined the impressive line-up of local and international performers (see
Chapter One). Local favourite Portia Turbo (who, incidentally, had a cameo performance in
Priscilla) led the crowd in a full-stadium Mexican wave, the Southern Cross Drag Troupe
(featured above) assisted Australian television sitcom favourites Kath and Kim (Gina Riley
and Jane Turner) in the world’s biggest pom-pom stunt; a special tribute was paid to one of
Sydney’s oldest camp/drag venues called the Purple Onion (see description of tribute later in

116 The Mexican wave is a coordinated crowd stunt where one section of a stadium rises to their feet and throws
their hands in the air. As they are bringing their hands down and sitting down, the people next to them are just
beginning to rise. This continues around the entire set of stands, having a ripple effect. The largest recorded
wave was at the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games where a crowd of 110,000 people took part.
117 This stunt was performed by placing pink and white pom-poms on each of the chairs in the stadium. When
the audience were asked to wave the pom-poms in the air, it became clear that the pink pom-poms held up
created large pink triangles amidst the sea of white pom-poms. This ‘stunt’ on its own makes infinite
connections to other image-worlds. In some ways this crowd choreography was reminiscent of the large
ornamental that Busby Berkeley created in his Hollywood musicals. But perhaps in a more sinister manner, it
should be noted that this practice of creating images out of objects and humongous numbers of participants
(often in a stadium, parade ground or open square) to offer political/ideological ‘messages’ was engaged in by
the Nazis, the Soviet Union, China (PRC) and North Korea. Finally, Peter Roubal (2003) writes about the ways
in which mass gymnastics were used at large, official events in Communist countries in Eastern Europe. This
involved thousands of young gymnasts parading in tight formations dressed in matching costumes.
Chapter Six); and a large number of queens featured in the closing number – ‘Fabulous’ – dressed in matching pink frocks and high heels.\textsuperscript{118}

The queens’ active role in the Opening Ceremony was not without controversy. On 8 November 2002, \textit{The Sydney Morning Herald} reported that, “in years to come they’ll be calling it Drag-gate – the scandal that rocked the Sydney 2002 Gay Games when a bunch of men wearing wigs and make-up offended one or two very powerful Gay Games officials” (Hornery & Wyld, 2002, p. 20). It was reported that former Federation president Gene Dermody had left the Opening midway through the programme because he was offended by the drag queens in the show. Those associated with the planning of the Opening Ceremony were quick to defend the queens’ involvement. Director of the Opening Ceremony, Ignatius Jones, calling on the Games’ tradition of inclusion, stated plainly that,

some of [the Federation members] are kind of like Log-Cabin Republicans – they think gay people have to be just like straight people, but I think they’re in opposition to the principles of the Gay Games which are inclusion, participation and personal best. I couldn’t even imagine putting on a Gay Games opening ceremony in Sydney without a drag queen – they practically pioneered Oxford Street. (Hornery & Wyld, 2002, p. 20)

Jones was not the only one to publicly comment on the incident. On 11 November 2002 Dermody himself sent a letter to the \textit{Herald’s} editor in defence of his early departure:

Regardless of my own personal take on the opening ceremonies of the Gay Games (and I have seen all six now), the implication that I “walked out” was a bit of a stretch (\textit{Spike}, November 8). For the record, yes, I am one of the older Federation of Gay Games members; yes, I am a former Federation president; yes, I am a (gasp) Log Cabin Republican who is a Bush supporter and yes, I am NOT a devotee of ‘drag’. However, I have always believed that a diversity of visions in the quest of common goals is the superior strategy. (“Letters”, 2002, p. 14)

Dermody clarifies in his letter that he was not leaving the ceremonies because he was offended by the queens (although he does admit he is not a big fan), but rather because he and the team of athletes he was travelling with needed to get back to their accommodation for some sleep. He explains that they had arrived late in Sydney that afternoon and had gone straight from the airport to the accreditation centre at Sydney’s Town Hall and then to the

\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Priscilla’s} role in inserting drag queen performance into mainstream national spaces was also demonstrated during the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games when 200 drag queens in \textit{Priscilla} costumes entered the Sydney Olympic Stadium as part of the Closing Ceremony’s tribute to Australian film icons. Of course, objections to the queens’ participation in the ceremonies were abundant with talkback radio stations inundated with irate sports fans ready to sell their tickets in protest (Williams, 2000). Both the Sydney 2000 Opening and Closing ceremonies were under the creative direction of Ric Birch and his second-hand man, Ignatius Jones, who was, as mentioned previously in this thesis, also the creative director for the Sydney 2002 Gay Games’ Opening Ceremony.
Opening Ceremony. Since they had to compete the following morning, Dermody believed it was best to leave the ceremony early for a decent night’s sleep. Whatever his reason for leaving, the accusations made against Dermody and his defence are interesting in terms of thinking through how drag continues to provoke discussion around what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable modes of gender performance, even at an international gay and lesbian/queer community event. It also acts as another example of the central role that drag performance plays in producing Sydney as a city with a very particular local queer identity. Drag queens were an integral part of the Sydney 2002 image-world and provided visitors with a ‘picture’ of Sydney’s local culture and queer history.

Drag performances were also showcased in various ways throughout the cultural events at the Games. For example, Queer Screen, a local community organisation, screened Priscilla alongside Ana Kokkinos’ international feature film Head On as part of the cultural festival of the Games, again illustrating the connection between the film and the Sydney 2002 image-world. Figure 5.3 below shows the QFilms advertisement for Priscilla that was printed in the Official Guide to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival (SGGB, 2002a).

Figure 5.3: QFilms advertisement in the Official Guide to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival (SGGB)

For example, drag was central to Oceanmania, a carnivalesque pool party where each team performs acts in and out of the water; Wild Sex, an alternative tour of Sydney Taronga Zoo that identifies the ‘homosexual’ mating patterns of certain Australian zoo animals; Foreign Aids, Pieter-Dirk’s one-man theatrical perspective on AIDS in South Africa; the musical theatre presentation ‘Elegies for angels, punks and raging queens’; the theatre piece ‘Pink ladies and steak’; and Dred Gerestant’s drag king performance.
The image from the film itself is composed of two film stills that are frequently used in *Priscilla* promotional posters, DVD covers and so on. The first film still (in the foreground) is of Tick (Hugo Weaving) practising a drag routine in the hot desert sun after their bus (Priscilla) has its first mechanical mishap, and the second still (in the background) captures the notorious bus Priscilla making its way along red-soil roads as Adam’s enormous silver, kite-like, taffeta scarf, flies high atop the moving vehicle. These oft-used promotional images are formatted into another image-based text, the *Official Guide to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival’s* (SGGB, 2002a) design template. The guide’s glossy format and design frame the image with the colours and symbols of the event. Bright orange pages that fade from left to right, Sydney 2002 logos and the Gay Games motto – participation, inclusion and personal best – bind Elliot’s classic to the legacy of the event and its international history. Bold black text details the screening dates, times and venues for the film and promotes it as “a celebration of camp, Australian-style”. Drag kings and queens are offered a special invitation, urging them to ‘come in drag’ to celebrate a “night of glamour, kitsch, and fun!” In its association with the event’s promotional campaign, *Priscilla* becomes a different film text and/or film event and in doing so illustrates the changeability of images and texts, both over time and using emerging technologies. More importantly though, the key themes operating within this film are taken up as part of Sydney 2002 organiser’s efforts to offer participants and visitors a glimpse of ‘Australian’ gay and lesbian ‘culture’.

**(re)Imagining Priscilla**

The changeability of Priscilla as an *image-world* is illustrated again through Figure 5.4, which shows the dust jacket (front and back) of the 10th Anniversary Special Edition *Priscilla* DVD. The cover utilises the same images featured in the QFilms advertisement (Figure 5.3) and yet these images take on a different ‘life’ in this context.120 The back cover explains that the feature film has been given a “mighty makeover”, using a variety of new technologies:

Ten years on, and the comedy that helped change the way we think, the way we feel and, most important, the way we dress has gone and given herself a mighty makeover...Here’s “Priscilla” as you’ve never seen her before in this fabulous 10th Anniversary DVD celebration [sic]

---

120 Of course it should be noted that the red and brown pigments of the outback soil in Figure 5.3 have become subtler shades of orange and brown in this second example. Likewise, the blacks and reds Weaving was pictured standing on have turned a brighter (and queerer?) shade of pink. See Figure A38, Appendix A, for an image of the inside cover of this DVD Special Edition dust jacket. Figure A39 shows the advertisement for the musical Priscilla. This is another example of how an image text or *image-world* is not a stable text with fixed properties or meanings. Instead, they are alterable and “flexible” texts (Fiske, 1989), open to a variety of readings or interpretations.
A range of special features are offered to the viewer including a sneak peak at deleted scenes, a behind the scenes tour of the filming of *Priscilla* (cleverly subtitled, ‘*Priscilla* (referring here to both the film and the bus) with her pants down’), the 1994 *Priscilla* featurette, various theatrical trailers, and cast and crew biographies. In his spoken tour of the film, Elliott moves through each scene pinpointing the challenges faced by the cast and crew and highlighting places in the film that reference a particular feature or quality of Sydney’s local drag scene. The decade-old film is given a touch-up using a variety of new image-related technologies. Familiar images and moments in the film are slowed down and undone with ‘behind the scenes’ sneak peaks of how each scene was captured by cameras and how the scenes were joined together through careful editing to create the ‘original’ feature film. Watching *Priscilla* on this DVD is a different viewing experience. In many ways the ‘special features’ of this anniversary edition extend the parameters of the film text and alter viewers’ experiences of the narrative and the characters in it (Smith, in press).

Figure 5.4: Front and back covers, *Adventures of Priscilla Queen of the Desert*, 10th Anniversary Collector’s Edition DVD (PolyGram)

---

121 For instance, Elliot explains that the over-sized silver-scarf that Felicia (Pierce) dons while performing atop the moving bus (featured in both Figures 5.3 and 5.4 above) is a replica of a stage prop used by drag queens at the Imperial Hotel in Sydney, one of Sydney’s notorious venues of drag performance in the city. It should be noted that some of Elliot’s claims are not necessarily in keeping with gay and lesbian historians’ account of drag history in Sydney (e.g. Faro & Wotherspoon, 2000 or Harris & Witte, 2006).
The introduction of digital technologies to motion picture making has altered the material properties of the film as well as the effects/affects of the viewing experience (Smith, in press). The opening discussion of this chapter used the highly disturbing and widely circulated photographs from Abu Ghraib to introduce a similar argument. These images were digital images taken by American troops and emailed home as markers of their ‘time in Iraq’. These images were used in this chapter to illustrate, for one, the violent and uneasy manner in which sexuality is bound to discourses of citizenship and nationality; and for another, to force the question of how violence of this kind is materialised by the technologies or apparatuses that capture and disseminate them. In other words, these images beg the question of how the material properties of an image affect their capacity to ‘act’ on the processes and practices of everyday living, producing sexual subjectivities in particular ways. Although a dramatically different body of images, the Special Edition of Elliot’s decade-old Priscilla presses a similar question: How do DVD formats alter the ways in which viewers engage with a film text (Smith, in press) and the film’s capacity to produce the world around us? How do these changing formats (re)produce the relationship between queer sexualities and Australian nation culture? Again, the capacity of a film (or any image text/event for that matter) to become a different text over time challenges the idea that images are stable and/or permanent objects. In bringing the various threads introduced in this chapter together, the section below asks how images and image-based technologies have changed how ‘the story we all know’ about the Gay Games movement is imaged or ‘told’.

**Changing technologies, (re)imagining the Gay Games**

Like the film Priscilla that was originally released on video but has recently been given ‘a 10-year makeover’, the image-world(s) of Sydney 2002 has been significantly altered by the development of more sophisticated technologies, in particular digital photography, digital film, light and sound technologies, graphic design software, and the Internet. There are a number of examples that illustrate how significant these changes have been to the promotional efforts of the Games in the past decade. Earlier in this chapter a variety of examples were listed to show how images and related technologies shaped participants’ overall experience of Sydney 2002. Everything from participant registration to the accreditation process to the sporting competitions and cultural events themselves relied on images and technologies in order to provide participants with enjoyable, professional and safe encounters at the Games.
Images and technologies have also altered the ways in which the broader Gay Games movement is understood. The introduction of the Internet, for instance, has allowed the Federation of Gay Games (FGG) and individual host organisations to promote upcoming Games and other Federation events to a broader international audience. The central Gay Games website (www.gaygames.com) has allowed the first seven Gay Games (and the 8th Gay Games scheduled for Cologne, Germany in 2010) to be ‘imagined’ as a singular, linear global movement. The ‘story we all know’ about the Gay Games is described online as a unified, progressive global movement and is ‘told’ using various archival images and small amounts of written text. For instance, the Gay Games I: Challenge ‘82 page tells visitors that it was at these Games that the Gay Games ‘legacy began’. Most striking on this page is the short video commemorating the life and death of event founder, Dr. Tom Waddell. The video describes Waddell as the founding father of the Gay Games movement and incorporates original audio voice-over of Waddell reading segments of the diary he penned for his daughter Jessica in the year before his death. New technologies not only allow the Gay Games ‘history’ to be recovered, recorded and retold in new ways, they also (re)produce meanings about the Gay Games as a contemporary ‘global’ gay and lesbian event and about the ‘future’ of the Gay Games. In other words, presenting each of the Games as a micro-milestone within a macro-movement that is ‘changing the world’ through social inclusion and sporting participation and personal best, the contemporary face of the Gay Games and of future Games are presupposed by an evolving story of growth and/or progress.

In viewing archival materials from the first Gay Games alongside the promotional materials from Sydney 2002, it is clear that the twenty years of ‘advancements’ in technology have significantly altered the types of images that make up the image-world of each of the Games. However, these examples need not simply reinforce a progress narrative of the Gay Games movement or of image technologies themselves. Instead, one might focus on the ways in which images and technologies have contributed to the professionalisation of the Gay Games and how they have significantly transformed the ‘information’ that participants, sponsors and the media receive about this global queer event in advance of the event itself. Furthermore, one might ask how the ‘new’ public face of the Gay Games, with its use of images and technologies, is used to reinvent the Gay Games ‘past’ and to produce a narrative of linear political and social progress (take for example, the video of Waddell mentioned above).

Figures 5.5 and Figure 5.6 are digitally scanned images of the front covers of the 1982 and 2002 Gay Games respectively. The limited colours and simple fonts and graphics used on the
1982 programme cover were most likely put together mechanically by cropping and pasting images and stencils onto a master document. More advanced copying technologies would have given the final product its uniform and well-polished finish. These guides were printed and distributed in hard copy at the event itself. Inside, the Guide contains sporting programmes, lists of teams in attendance, letters from various members of the SFAA Board and advertisements adopting a similar design layout and quality.

Figure 5.5: Official programme guide for Gay Games I: Challenge '82 (Australian Lesbian and Gay Archives)
In contrast, the cover for the Sydney 2002 Games guide uses a variety of very detailed digital images, logos and fonts, assembled first using computer software. This programme guide was released in the lead-up to the event and participants were notified by email and on the main event homepage of its release date. It offers a much more aesthetically rich assemblage of images, logos and fonts.
images, colours and written text. Many of the images used on the Sydney 2002 cover would have already been familiar to participants for they borrow from many of the other brochures and posters that made up the event’s extensive promotional campaign. As such, the cover is in keeping with the event’s attempt to ‘brand’ these Games as a significant moment within Gay Games history, and as a monumental event for the local (both Sydney and Australian) and regional communities (South Pacific/Asian-Pacific). The sheer size of the Guide (75 pages) suggests that these Games are an event not to be missed. Likewise, its glossy, professional finish, the well-toned, athletic physiques of the models used in the images and the snippets of ‘local culture’ (i.e. the only two Indigenous photos used in the entire promotional campaign), provide prospective participants with a sense that these Games will have something for everyone, and that this ‘something’ will undoubtedly be stylish and professional, but ‘inclusive’.

The inside of the magazine offers articles on each of the major parts of the Games programme (culture, sport, ceremonies, Outreach, volunteer), travel tips for the Sydney area, highly stylised advertisements from various sponsors, and a schedule of events. The guide also features a four-page spread of the history of the Federation of Gay Games and the Gay Games movement. This article is organised by a number of subheadings and sections that provide readers with a “brief look back” at the Games (McAdam, 2002, p. 8), a description of “the Federation today” (McAdam, 2002, p. 9), an overview of the Tom Waddell Award and a history of recipients122, and lists of FGG Board Members, affiliated organisations and honorary life members. Running along the bottom of these four pages is a bright yellow arrow along which each of the Gay Games is placed. The arrow constructs a continuum that begins at Challenge ’82 (marked by the arrow’s fletching) and places each of the succeeding Games along the arrow by displaying its logo and offering a few basic facts about each event. Ironically perhaps, this linear story ‘terminates’ with the 2006 Montréal Games, but these Games are placed on the arrow’s point suggesting that there is no concrete endpoint to the Gay Games movement.

The differences between the 1982 and 2002 guides call into question the role that images and technologies play in reproducing and governing ‘the story we all know’ about the Gay Games. They allow one to ask: How are images used to reinforce the founding aims and principles of the Games? How have digital information and new media technologies changed participants’ experiences of the Games? How, like the film Priscilla, have the Gay Games

122 The Tom Waddell Award is presented at each of the Games to someone who has demonstrated outstanding service in the arts, athletics or volunteerism.
motto and FGG’s objectives been given a ‘make-over’, such that a sexier public image of the
event is offered? How, if at all, does the *image-world* of Sydney 2002 challenge or reinvent
the ‘old’ traditions and values of the Gay Games movement by using ‘new’ images and
technologies?

**Conclusion**

This chapter began by offering a link between Judith Butler’s work on the utterability of the
phrase ‘I am a homosexual’ within the US military context and the horrific images of torture
from Abu Ghraib that showed prisoners being forced to perform homosexual sex acts. These
images illustrate not only the violent ways in which homosexual sex operates as a mechanism
of wartime torture, but also how the digital properties of these photographs allowed the
violence contained in the photos’ frames to ‘reach’ the public in new and powerful ways.

Introducing Ron Burnett’s notion of the *imageworld*, the chapter argued that images cannot
be understood merely as representations of the real world we live in; they are objects that
produce and govern our real-life experience. As such, violent images such as those from Abu
Ghraib do more than simply *represent* the ‘harsh realities’ of sexual violence and homophobia
within state-sanctioned structures like the military, they produce and govern it.

Bringing the chapter’s focus back to the Gay Games, a number of images and examples
were used to argue that Sydney 2002 (and indeed the broader Gay Games movement) can be
viewed as an *image-world* composed of various images and technologies that do not
necessarily come together in any complete or tidy manner. Beginning with a photographic
image that was printed in *The Sydney Morning Herald* in the lead-up to the 2002 Games, this
analysis mapped the irregular and transversal connections that a single text can make to other
images, discourses and events. In tracing these random and scattered connections the chapter
explored the capacity of images and technologies to redefine and indeed *re-imagine* the Gay
Games movement, local gay and lesbian histories and notions of sexuality and citizenship
more broadly.

The succeeding chapter expands on the ideas introduced in this chapter and offers a close
reading of other parts of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games *image-world*. The aim is to provide a
more detailed analysis of the ways in which images and related technologies not only
contributed to the spectacular quality of Sydney 2002, but also how they were used to
produce and govern normative meanings around sex, gender, Australian national identity and
global citizenship.
Chapter Six
Imaging and imagining the ‘story we all know’ about the Gay Games

This chapter continues to explore how the Sydney 2002 Gay Games operate as an image-world. Chapter Five established the central role that images and other technologies play in successfully organising a global event like the Gay Games and in shaping participants’ experiences of the event. It also explored the ways in which the Sydney 2002 image-world made infinite connections with other images and image-worlds. This chapter focuses on the ways in which images and technologies were used to (re)produce ‘the story we all know’ about the Gay Games movement and how they contributed to the production and governance of normative meanings around ‘the local’ (Australian/Asian-Pacific), ‘the global’, citizenship and sexuality.

The chapter’s key arguments are developed through a close reading of the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony, a feature of the Gay Games image-world that combined music, dance and theatre with a spectacular range of images, sound and light technologies. It illustrates how the Opening Ceremony production team constructed the evening’s celebrations around a linear narrative that moved the audience from a place of sadness, shame and oppression to one of hope, love and celebration. Underscoring this ceremonial narrative was the idea that the Gay Games play an integral part in queer ‘world-making’ and that Sydney 2002 participants, by their very presence at the event, are helping to actualise ‘real’ social and political change.

The chapter argues that participants and spectators were invited to reinvent the ‘history’ of the gay and lesbian movement as a time of darkness and struggle, to see the present as a time of self-actualisation, freedom, fluidity and choice, and to narrate the future through discourses of hope and possibility. The chapter also argues that the Gay Games story of progress, liberation and enlightenment engenders a particular colonial sentiment that oversimplifies the diversity and richness of non-western and Indigenous communities and cultures. In particular, the chapter calls attention to the ways in which the historical struggle of the ‘local’ gay and lesbian community is fused with the colonial violence(s) experienced by Indigenous peoples in Australia and how ‘non-western’ countries are described as less progressive and less humane around issues of sexual difference.
Opening the Games, imagining ‘queer’ Australia

The photograph in Figure 6.1 below was taken at the first Gay Games: Challenge ’82. It features an Australian flag blowing high in the skies of Kezar Stadium in San Francisco where the opening ceremonies of the first Games were held. Behind the flag a pack of colourful balloons have been released in a manner announcing celebration. This photo not only captures the relationship between national symbols and those symbols that order queer living (the rainbow and the flag), it also serves as a reminder that only two decades ago gay and lesbian organisations were working on very meagre budgets to host international events of this scale (Symons, 2004). With their limited resources, they were forced to put together very modest ‘do-it-yourself’ community events.

Figure 6.1: Opening Ceremony, 1982 San Francisco Gay Games (Australian Lesbian and Gay Archives)

In contrast, Sydney 2002 organisers used a variety of high-tech light, sound and image effects throughout the Opening Ceremony to assemble “the greatest party [queer Sydney had] ever thrown” (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board [SGGB], 2002m). The Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony was a large-scale production put together on a relatively small budget of just under
1 million Australian dollars. 123 A sub-committee of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board was set up to plan and execute the evening’s celebrations and Ignatius Jones was hired as Ceremony Director and was joined by Katrina Marton who acted as Ceremony Producer. Iain Reed was contracted as the Technical Director and Trudy Dalgleish was the lighting designer. A privately owned Australian company called Chameleon, who regularly service large-scale entertainment events, supplied all of the lighting equipment. Figure 6.2 showcases some of the spectacular lighting effects used at the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony. Later in the chapter the ‘content’ of these images will be considered in greater detail; however, for now they provide a useful link to the discussions introduced in Chapter Five as they illustrate how images and image-related technologies have changed the production quality of the Gay Games Opening Ceremony and made the overall event appear much more professional, glamorous and stylish. They also highlight the importance of the Opening to the overall event.

Figure 6.2: Sydney 2002 Gay Games, Opening Ceremony light and staging effects (Australian Lighting Industry Association)

It is clear from the bid documents that Team Sydney planned for the Opening Ceremony to be one of the showcase events at the Games. The bid offers a one-page description of Team Sydney’s ‘vision’ for the opening celebrations. Originally scheduled to take place at the Baseball Stadium in Sydney Olympic Park (Homebush), the Opening would be a gala of

123 The size of this budget is put into perspective when considered against the budget for the Opening Ceremony of the 2000 Sydney Modern Olympic Games, which totalled approximately 50 million dollars (Tenenbaum, 2000). The 2006 Commonwealth Games in Melbourne had an Opening Ceremony budget of approximately 30 million dollars (Miller & Ker, 2005).
“pride, diversity, inclusion and participation” and “[set] the tone of unity under new skies” (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Ltd., 1997a, p. 19). Organisers aimed to “take the audience on a journey” that would begin “in the dreamtime of Indigenous Australia” (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Ltd., 1997a, p. 19) with an official Welcome given by a gay or lesbian Aboriginal elder. They believed that a welcome of this kind would promote the “spirit of peace and unity” and serve as “recognition of the true heritage of [the Australian] land … [and] set the scene for the first Gay Games in the Southern Hemisphere, a Games where international inclusion [was] embraced” (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid Ltd., 1997a, p. 19). ‘Local’ gay and lesbian struggle was fused with the historical struggles of Aboriginal Australians and the Australian landscape functioned as a symbol of strength and resistance for the Australian gay and lesbian rights movement. For instance, the bid document explained that colour and design would be used throughout the ceremony to “[draw on] the colours of the Australian landscape and the vibrancy of the Australian lesbian and gay community” (p. 19, italics added). The bid document also stated that the Opening would emphasise the uniqueness of the Asian/Pacific region through the incorporation of musical and dance performances specific to various cultures in the region. Early organisers also envisioned a large rainbow serpent acting as one of the night’s major artistic centrepieces. This serpent would enter the stadium after having toured around the country building awareness of the Gay Games in the year before they began. These ‘uniquely local and regional’ features of the Opening would be combined with the more formal traditions of past Gay Games: Speeches from Federation of Gay Games Board members, displaying of the Federation flag, lighting of the Gay Games flame, and singing an official Sydney 2002 anthem.124

What actually took place at the Opening Ceremony was quite different from what organisers had originally envisioned. That said, as the discussions below illustrate, some of the key themes outlined in the bid were upheld in the evening’s final program. The celebrations were held in Aussie Stadium (Moore Park), which is a much more ‘central’ location than the Olympic Baseball Stadium. The ticket price for the event was originally AUD 179 for A grade seats, AUD 125 for B grade seats and AUD 68 for concession seats. However, when sales were down and Team Sydney felt the strain of limited cash flow, a limited ticket release of A-level seats occurred at AUD 60 per seat.

At a press conference days before the Opening, Ignatius Jones was asked what had been the biggest challenges he and his committee members had faced in preparing for the Opening.  

---

124 While there never was an official Sydney 2002 anthem, there was a compilation of ‘special songs’ from the Games put together as a souvenir CD that participants could purchase.
Jones suggested that, apart from budgetary constraints, one of the biggest obstacles was trying to ensure the story the ceremony told reflected the ‘true’ diversity of Sydney’s gay and lesbian community:

I ...suppose one of the biggest [challenges] was that we are talking about a rainbow community....it was so much harder than putting together the Olympic Opening Ceremony. We needed to tell the story of all the different parts of the community and in many ways the gay and lesbian community in this country is like a metaphor for the country itself. There are just so many, many different aspects, and...the gay and lesbian community and Australia are not a melting pot...we are much more like a mixed salad in which every part remains separate yet adds to the wonder of the whole....the whole is so much greater than the sum of its parts. Trying to tell that story...and the way that we did it was that we gathered diverse members of the community and we talked and we talked and we talked and we finally came up with something that tells where we come from, who we are and where we’re going. And that was really hard. And another thing, there are some members of our younger community that think that it has always been alright to be gay and lesbian. It’s just fine, you know? But letting them know, in a moving, and yet not po-faced or really solemn manner, that it wasn’t always alright, that there was a struggle and that that struggle continues in many parts of the world, and that that struggle is a part of the enormous struggle for civil rights on the part of Blacks, gays, lesbians, that was one of the great triumphs of the twentieth century and continues into the 21st. (Heil, 2002a)

For Jones, putting together an appropriate Gay Games welcome was an enormous challenge, a more difficult task even than staging the ceremonial welcome at the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. Although the gay and lesbian community is a ‘metaphor for the country itself’, capturing all of the ‘different aspects’ of the gay and lesbian ‘mixed salad’ was a much more difficult creative endeavour. Jones suggested that viewers would be offered a story about who gays and lesbians are, where they’ve come from and where the community is heading in the future. He also suggested that ‘young’ participants and spectators would be invited to reflect on the fact that being queer “wasn’t always alright” (Heil, 2002a) and that it still is not alright in some parts of the world. Finally, Jones linked the universal struggle for sexual freedom with the rights movements of other disenfranchised groups, specifically the Black civil rights movement in the United States, “one of the great triumphs of the twentieth century...” (Heil, 2002a).

The promise that the Opening Ceremony would tell the audience ‘a story’ about gay and lesbian struggle in Australia was one that Jones often returned to in media interviews and press conferences. In a much earlier press release he anticipated that:
Aussie Stadium will sparkle and burn in a uniquely Australian celebration of who we are – from our rich Indigenous culture to the nation's first steps as a penal colony, from our hidden homosexual history to the politics of pride, from persecution to celebration, from loss to joy. (SGGB, 2002k)

Again for Jones, telling the audience ‘who’ Australians are involved tracing a narrow teleology that began with the nation’s ‘rich indigenous culture’, moved to its role as a penal colony and then through the history of gay and lesbian liberation – from secrecy, persecution and loss to pride, celebration and joy.

This Opening Ceremony story was ‘told’ across nine ceremony chapters or segments, each assigned a segment director and producer: Prelude; Procession of participants; Welcome to Sydney 2002; Our struggle: Persecution and perseverance; Remembrance; Acceptance: Love and pride; Celebration: Under new skies; Official opening; Finale. As mentioned above, segment producers used a combination of music, dance performance, images, light and various special effects to narrate their section of the evening’s story. In an interview with local television provider DV8, Jones described the content of the Opening Ceremony as, “a series of unforgettable images connected with traffic management” (DV8TV, 2002d). As Figure 6.2 shows, images did play a pivotal role in narrating each of the individual segments and creating an effective/affective overall ‘story’ that tied the performances together. Large screens, carefully choreographed lighting and image projections onto the stadium ground were used to enhance the musical and dance performances. The subsections below offer close readings of each ceremony segment and provide a more detailed sense of how they were brought together to “tell a grand gay story” (DV8TV, 2002d) of gay and lesbian liberation in Australia and to officially welcome overseas visitors to the Sydney 2002 Gay Games: Under New Skies. Each segment’s analysis will focus on the role that images, technologies and special effects played in telling a particular story about local and global sexualities, about Australia as a host nation and about the trajectory of the Gay Games movement. These discussions will also elaborate on the ways in which ideas about the ‘unique’ qualities of ‘local’ places and ‘regional’ cultures were actively produced throughout the ceremony and used to offer an emotive reflection of the gay and lesbian movement, both locally and globally.

Segments 1 & 2: Prelude & Procession of athletes

All accredited Games participants could be part of the Opening Ceremony ‘Parade of Heroes’. In preparation for the participants’ grand entrance into the stadium, they were ushered into the
Sydney Cricket Ground hours before the ceremony got underway. As part of the prelude to the official opening of Sydney 2002, spectators were offered a warm welcome from Gillian Minervini, Ignatius Jones and Katrina Márton. The entertainment began with a “disco-stomping rendition” (Mills, 2002g) of ‘Australia, Australia’ by Bob Downe, who wore a shiny, Australian flag tracksuit. Downe was supported by over a dozen male and female dancers; the men donning Australian flag boxer shorts and tight, white singlet tops emblazoned with the Australian flag and the women wearing just Australian flags sewn together above the bust.

Figure 6.3: Still image of Bob Downe singing ‘Australia, Australia’ during the prelude segment of the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony (DV8TV)

Figure 6.3 above is a still image (DV8TV, 2002a) of Downe atop a large portable throne shaped like the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The throne was carried by a group of male dancers dressed as Australian Surf Lifesavers, a familiar feature of Australian beach culture. This particular moment in the performance is interesting given Chapter Five’s suggestion that a double movement occurs when queer bodies are imaged alongside longstanding national symbols or icons like the national flags, the Bridge, and the buff Bondi Beach boys used in

---

125 For images of the athletes assembled in the cricket ground, see Figures A40 and A41, Appendix A. Athletes were able to watch what was happening in Aussie Stadium from the large screens in the Cricket Ground.
126 At the Games Minervini staged the third segment, Acceptance: Love and pride.
127 Bob Downe is the alter ego of Mark Trevorrow. Downe is his well-known cabaret artiste and comedic stage name. Trevorrow is also known for his role as Daryl Lee on the series Kath & Kim.
this performance. On the one hand, the queer bodies seem to ‘need’ these symbols to legitimate themselves. If this ceremony was going to prove itself to be an ‘authentic’ Australian event, it had to adopt these familiar national icons. On the other hand, Downe’s refusal to conform to traditional ideals of Australian masculinity, the sleazy gesture of converting the national flags into scanty toga-like dresses, and the kitsch design of the bridge-shaped king’s throne (carrying a queen no less!) borrow familiar symbols and icons and do something else with them; they disrupt or displace the stronghold that normative culture has on them, if only momentarily. Likewise, although the inclusion of surf lifesavers in this segment upholds the idea of the white, middle-class, sun-bronzed male athlete, a very potent symbol of Australian masculinity (Booth, 2001), their inclusion in the ceremony also calls attention to the homosociality inherent in men’s sporting spaces (Connell, 1995; LeBlanc, 2004a; Messner & Sabo, 1994; Miller, 2001a; Proger, 1990, 1999, 2000).

Downe’s performance was followed by Portia Turbo leading the crowd in a full-stadium Mexican Wave and Ian ‘Molly’ Meldrum who arrived on stage to give the countdown to the official Opening of the Games. The televisual screens located in various spots throughout the stadium posted large numbers counting down from ten to one. At this point, the parade of participants by country began, marking the official start of the ceremony.

In keeping with Gay Games tradition, the parade was led by athletes from Team San Francisco. The procession, which lasted for over two hours, included over 11,000 participants from 77 countries. As the participants from each country entered the stadium, they were introduced by local drag divas Vanessa Wagner and Portia Turbo. Each team sported matching uniforms and various types of national paraphernalia. There were three particular points during the parade that Wagner and Turbo signalled as important historical moments for the audience, and in each case, the audience were on their feet in applause. The first was when Yasir Samir, Iraq’s sole competitor, “took his place amongst the heroes” (DV8TV, 2002d); the second when the East Timorese athlete entered the stadium; and the third was when the athletes from Team India and Team Pakistan decided to march together. The following day, the Sydney Star Observer described these three instances as moments in the programme when

---

128 The Sydney Harbour Bridge was used throughout the Sydney 2002 promotional campaign to sell the event as a uniquely ‘local’ event. Figures A42 & 43 are examples that show how the bridge was used to promote the Opening Ceremony. As discussed later in this chapter, during the Opening Ceremony finale a bridge was made to look just like the photoshopped image featured in A43.

129 In a DV8TV interview with Lucas Wyte in the lead-up to the Games, Trevorrow (in part acting out his alter ego Bob Downe) explained that his Opening Ceremony performance should “put an end to all those nasty rumours that he is straight” (DV8TV, 2002d).
the audience really “gave it up” (Mills, 2002g) for the participants. Speaking specifically about Yasir Samir’s entrance into the stadium as a representative of Iraq, it said:

Samir, who says he is “twenty-twelve”, left Baghdad at the age of nine and has been living in London ever since. Initially he hoped to compete in his sport (touch football) with other Iraqis, but after a fruitless search, he eventually hooked up with one of the two Melbourne teams competing in Sydney. He’s been playing football for eight years, but this is his first time at a Gay Games. So how did he feel hearing the cheer for Iraq at the opening ceremony? “Really, really good,” he says. “I wasn’t really sure what to expect coming in, but it was fantastic, a very nice feeling.” (“Waving the flag”, 2002, p. 13)

Despite having lived in London for many years, Samir is narrated as an outsider of western culture, and his description of his age as ‘twenty-twelve’ is held up as ‘charming’ evidence of this outsider status. Iraq is positioned as a place devoid of any queer life and both Australia and the Gay Games function as spaces of refuge for this small world, gay athlete. Although hopeful of finding ‘other Iraqis like him’, Samir had to turn to Team Melbourne to participate in the sport he loves. This is a familiar narrative in Gay Games promotional items; the Games are often positioned as a place of refuge and safety for gays and lesbians from less developed countries and/or for those who are from countries where homosexuality is still illegal.

This example illustrates how the concept of a global queer community, or of a queer world, is often founded on problematic dualities such as West/Non-West, developed/undeveloped, and here/there. These types of binaries reduce a diverse range of sexual identities and life experiences into singular categories. All ‘western’ sexual minorities are visible, liberated and free, whereas all ‘non-western’ sexual minorities are closeted, oppressed and living in fear. The ‘West’ is thought to be the ‘origin’ of queer politics and queer living and the ways in which ‘non-Western’ countries press the western world to rethink categories of sex and gender are not adequately acknowledged.\footnote{Figure A44, Appendix A shows an advertisement from the Queer Nation party held at the end of the Sydney 2002 official event period. While this party was not organised and run by the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board, it was advertised widely to Games participants and tickets for the event were also promoted through Ticketek. This advertisement featured queer ‘nationals’ in ‘traditional’ dress and with their national flags.}

While in some cases living in a western democratic country means that a greater number of legal and social mechanisms are in place to ‘protect’ gays and lesbians, the freedom to ‘be who you are’ in these western countries is not shared equally across lines of class, race or gender. Likewise, the experience of sexual minorities in so-called ‘non-western countries’ is by no means uniform. Furthermore, these types of binaries overlook the very complex ways in which heteronormativity continues to legitimate certain forms of social and economic violence to sexual minorities living in the ‘western’ world. As Chapter Four explained, the ‘legal’
protection of gays and lesbians written into some country’s legislation does not necessarily ensure safety or transparency around issues of equality or human rights. In the case of the Gay Games, the fact that the first two Gay Games (1982 and 1986) were held in San Francisco and the 1994 Games in New York City, and that, most recently, Chicago hosted the 2006 Games does not necessarily mean that the United States is a model state where issues of rights for sexual minorities are concerned. Despite its legacy as the ‘motherland’ of queer activism in the West (Altman, 1982, 2001a; Binnie, 2004; Manalansan IV, 1995), and despite more than two decades of hosting large queer community events like the Gay Games, the United States remains a contested terrain where issues of gay and lesbian rights and freedoms are concerned. For each of the Games hosted in the US, the border regulation of people living with HIV/AIDS was a significant obstacle in organising the global event. Rhetoric around global gay and lesbian or queer world-making often oversimplifies the complex and contradictory ways in which sexuality organises certain national cultures and erases the diverse experiences of queer individuals around the world by suggesting that there is a singular and shared global queer experience.

When the athletes from Iraq and East Timor ‘took their places amongst’ the Parade of Heroes at the Opening Ceremony – and here, all gays and lesbians are courageous heroes for choosing to participate in an event of this kind – a number of things were presumed about these individuals’ life experiences. For instance, there seemed to be an assumption that, given their countries of ‘origin’, they must have had to overcome a great deal to get to the Games and that this type of community gathering was entirely foreign to the athletes. Likewise, the loud applause for Team India and Team Pakistan was underscored by the idea that at the Gay Games national harmony, peace and reconciliation are real possibilities. In that moment, the Gay Games showed the audience how things should be and opened up the possibility of what the world could be like. In both cases, participants and spectators were invited to reinscribe various mythologies associated with queer ‘world-making’. The presumption that these athletes were ‘less fortunate’ and/or less ‘cosmopolitan’ somehow reaffirmed the personal and cultural good fortune of those participants and audience members from ‘more developed’ or ‘peaceful’ nations and upheld the idea that the Gay Games were indeed ‘changing the world’ (see Chapter Four).
The third segment opened with Deborah Cheetham singing an official Aboriginal Welcome, acknowledging the original owners of the land, the Eora people. This was followed by her rendition of the Australian national anthem. Figure 6.4 is a still image from DV8TV’s coverage of the Opening Ceremony. This image shows Cheetham dressed in an elaborate, ‘exotic’ costume, one of many devices used throughout this segment to give the audience a sense of being ‘somewhere else’. The lighting, staging and special effects used in both the Welcome and the singing of the national anthem were particularly elaborate and many of the main stage dancers and stunt people were highly skilled performers.

Throughout the Welcome, the stadium floor was illuminated in yellowish-brown and orange shades that were suggestive of Australian grasses and other vegetation. In addition, white handprints, white dots and fire were projected across the stadium ground. There was a sense of being transported out of the stadium to a different time and place. In his summary of the ceremony, Sydney Morning Herald reporter Bryce Hallett described the role that the lighting effects played in making this particular moment in the ceremony so memorable:

Cheetham is a lesbian soprano who wrote *White Baptist Abba Fan*, a musical theatrical production that is semi-autobiographical. She has also spoken out as someone who is part of Australia’s Stolen Generation. Cheetham was taken from her Aboriginal (Koori) mother and raised by a white Baptist family in Oatley, NSW.
...the indigenous [sic] Welcome segment was striking with the use of fire and handprints projected onto the stadium ground, while Deborah Cheetham’s interpretation of Dali Mana Gamarada was soul-stirring. Acknowledging the Eora people, the welcome set an inclusive tone. The lighting was excellent. (Hallett, 2002, p. 16)

Hallett seemed as impressed with the elaborate lighting display as he was with Cheetham’s ‘soul-stirring’ Welcome. He also suggested that the presence of Indigenous traditions in the ceremony was evidence of its ‘inclusive tone’. A number of ‘Aboriginal’ symbols and motifs were used throughout this segment to establish the beginning of the Opening Ceremony narrative. Interestingly, taking the audience ‘back’ in time (though, as this analysis suggests, the ‘times’ and ‘places’ created here were by no means ‘real’) involved putting on a very high-tech, carefully choreographed light and special effects show. Contemporary, cutting-edge technologies were used to create a mythical, primitive, almost primordial, starting point for the evening. What, one could ask, did the organisers hope these Indigenous symbols would ‘tell’ their audience about Australia and/or about the Sydney 2002 Gay Games? Furthermore, why does the addition of Indigenous cultural artefacts at an event of this kind function, as Hallett suggests, as proof or evidence that the event is being ‘inclusive’? And, if these symbols are read by organisers and/or the audience as ‘inclusive’, at whose expense do they function as such?

Figure 6.5 shows the Biame spirit sculpture designed by local Indigenous artist, Idis Stewart. This was perhaps the most remarkable feature of the Welcome to Sydney segment. The 15 metre long and 8 metres high inflatable artwork was assembled using traditional techniques of Indigenous basket-weaving (Mills, 2002g) and rose up out of the staging platform, illuminated with white, yellow and pink internal lighting. Biame is one of the Goori ancestral beings linked to the Creation period. Indigenous Australian communities map his journeys through their Dreaming sites, song, dance, art and oral histories. He gave life and law to the land and all its living beings and is said to reappear at times when his people need to be reminded of his laws (Mills, 2002g, p. 21).

Throughout this discussion, and elsewhere in the chapter, ‘Aboriginal’ and/or ‘Aboriginality’ function as categories of identity that are imbued with a number of different, and often conflicting, meanings. As Marcia Langton (2003) points out, ‘Aboriginal’ and ‘Aboriginality’ are terms that organise people based on ‘racial difference’ and racial difference was not, before colonisation, a way that Indigenous groups in ‘Australia’ ordered or governed ‘difference’. These terms therefore carry with them the colonial legacy of naming and differentiating people by race. At the same time, they engender the colonial practice of singularising the richness and diversity of Indigenous tribes into a single, umbrella term. Langton argues that these terms are also defined by the enduring stereotypes and beliefs that non-Indigenous Australians place around them in private conversation, public policy and in popular culture. That said, she insists that these terms are also defined by the counter-narratives that Indigenous people themselves attach to these terms. In other words, Aboriginal and Aboriginality also function as terms that are remobilised and reinvented as a matter of resistance and/or cultural rejuvenation.
As the Biame art piece was inflated, smoke was released around it and the dancers involved in the segment positioned themselves around the stadium ground to form the word ‘WELCOME’. These dancers (see Figure 6.6) had their bodies painted in primary colours (collectively their bodies made a rainbow of sorts), wore small grass skirts and were carrying large reflective disks that cast the vectors of overhead lighting around the stadium in various directions. Most of these rainbow dancers were volunteers from the local community and were, perhaps by chance, primarily white. They were joined by a more professional team of dancers who supported Cheetham on the main stage, and by various performers dressed in unusual, exotic costumes moving about the Stadium grounds (see Figures 6.7 & 6.8). Unlike the rainbow dancers, most of the costumed performers were black and had traditional Indigenous Australian markings painted onto their arms and legs. There was a sense that this Welcome was one that combined the symbols of two marginalised local groups – the Eora...
people of New South Wales, represented by Cheetham and other black bodies\textsuperscript{133}, and Sydney’s gay and lesbian community, here represented as a ‘rainbow’ community, albeit a rather white one!

The audience was given no context for the various ‘Indigenous’ elements used throughout this segment. There was no explanation or pretext offered for the significance of an Indigenous Australian Welcome, nor did organisers offer a broader historical context for who the Eora people are, what any of the props or costumes meant, who designed them, or how they were significant to this particular event, the Sydney 2002 Gay Games.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Rainbow dancers map out Australia in the Welcome segment at the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony (\textit{Sydney Star Observer}, 2002)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{133} I am not implying here that ‘blackness’ and ‘whiteness’ are simple or uniform categories, nor that they operate in a simple dichotomy. Furthermore, I am not suggesting that these categories – black and white – differentiate Indigenous bodies from non-Indigenous bodies in simple or absolute terms. What I am pointing to, however, is that gay community events of this size and nature tend to be attended predominantly by white, middle-class members of the queer community, with a disproportionate number of gay white men (Brady, 2001; Chasin, 2000; Lenskyj, 2002a; Murray, 2007; Podmore, 2006; Symons, 2004; Ward, 2003). Wendy Brady (2001) argues that the dominant model of ‘queer community’ does not necessarily encapsulate the concerns and struggles of queer Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, even for those who live in Sydney, the ‘queer city’. Brady insists that for queer Indigenous Australians, sexuality is not the primary lens through which they frame their personal identity, nor is homophobia their primary point of struggle and oppression. Issues of race and/or Australia’s painful colonial past are often more central to how queer Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people understand themselves as individuals and as a community.
Gordon Waitt (1997) suggests that tourist events often represent Indigenous cultures using oversimplified or generic images and/or objects. The diversity and complexities of the Indigenous communities are reduced to simple sets of signifiers that tourists can easily consume. A tourist’s encounter with the ‘unique’ or ‘primitive’ features of a place make the traveller’s journey seem more ‘authentic’ or complete (Mawani, 2005; Puar, 2001; Waitt, 1997). Waitt maintains that this is certainly the case for Indigenous Australians whose art, culture and traditions are re-colonised again and again by the representations tourism initiatives conjure up of ‘their’ culture:

Indigenous people’s representations are stereotypical of the noble savage; male, dark-skinned savages, loin clothed primitives with boomerangs, stone axes, spears, located at their ancestral sites in the outback, performing secret rituals expressed in songs, dances and Dreamtime stories in their stone age art and body paintings. This all occurs against a colourful background of sunset and red-rock. The conjunction of these features implies that Aborigines are living in harmony with nature, and represent the beginnings of humankind. (Waitt, 1997, p.51)

The diversity within Australia’s Indigenous cultures is reduced to souvenir-sized objects and rituals. Counter-narratives about Australia’s ‘past’ and/or accurate representations of Indigenous Australian’s contemporary cultural practices are almost always absent. Nowhere are urban Indigenous communities represented, and non-urban representations reinstate early colonial and anthropological mythologies of “Native cultures in a static, ‘prehistoric’ state” (Godwell, 2000, p. 246). Indigeneity is used to demonstrate the ‘uniqueness’ of

---

134 At the Sydney 2002 Gay Games an exhibition of urban Indigenous art was put together as part of the Cultural Festival. The aim of the exhibition was to challenge Western constructions of Indigeneity and to highlight the diverse ways in which Indigenous artists express their experiences of urban living. They worked to interrupt the idea that all Aboriginal artists paint traditional dot or x-ray style paintings (Benzie, 2002).
Darren Godwell’s (2000) work critiques the ways in which these oversimplified representations were used to help Australia secure the Sydney 2000 Olympic bid. He argues that Indigenous peoples’ culture and art forms were used to highlight the uniqueness of Sydney as a potential Olympic city and to make Australia seem like a peculiar and original host nation, setting it apart from other bidders. The Bid Committee used a didgeridoo player at bid presentations around the world and integrated Aboriginal ‘dot art’ into the bid logo in order to give the IOC the impression that the local Indigenous people wholeheartedly supported the Olympic bid. These types of snapshot representations of Aboriginal culture not only oversimplify the richness of Australia’s Indigenous cultures, they also contribute to the production of a normative national culture. In other words, through cultural practices and events such as the preparation of an Olympic bid, Australia’s history and culture are reproduced using age-old stereotypes and myths about Aboriginality.

In the same way, the images, figures and costumes used to ‘represent’ Indigenous culture at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Opening Ceremony (re)produced a particular set of narratives about Aboriginality and about Australia’s colonial past. Without a cultural context, these representations could be read as tokenistic and self-serving. The almost eerie lighting, elaborate projections and smoke effects together with the slow, rhythmic motions of the dancers, iconised Indigenous cultures as primitive, ‘simplistic’ and un-evolved.

This is not to suggest that the Indigenous community were at the mercy of Sydney 2002 organisers or spectators. Arguing that the Opening was entirely exploitative or disempowering for the Indigenous community would fail to acknowledge the efforts and/or agency of those community members involved in the segment itself (e.g. Deborah Cheetman and Idis Stewart). Moreover, that type of critique is premised on the idea that power acts in uniform and absolute ways and risks reinstating the very thing this discussion is attempting to challenge, that there is a singular, shared Indigenous experience. That said, Marcia Langton (2003) maintains that, “although ideas about Aboriginal culture are constantly recirculated and renegotiated in Australian society, many non-Indigenous Australians continue to hold to the trope of a ‘Stone Age’ Aboriginal culture frozen in time” (p. 81). The aim of this

---

135 Godwell explains that when the first round of bid logo proposals were submitted the committee felt that nothing “jumped off the page” (Godwell, 2000, p. 246). One committee member suggested that the logos needed to have ‘Aboriginal content’ and thus invited design firms to resubmit their entries. Godwell also notes that while the bid logo was reminiscent of traditional dot art, the official logo did not use these motifs. Aboriginality was thus used to secure the bid, but not central to the event’s overall publicity campaign/
discussion is therefore to highlight the ways in which racial politics are played out at large queer tourist events like the Gay Games and to ask how stories of colonisation and/or racism get reinstated in the ‘making’ of national culture and gay and lesbian histories at large-scale events of this kind.

As mentioned previously, the Indigenous Welcome was followed by the Australian national anthem, part of which was sung by Cheetham. The audience was thus transported from an Indigenous ‘Stone-age’ land occupied by spirits and other ‘Aboriginal’ figures to the space of colonial Australia. The various ‘primitive’ figures like those featured above exited the stadium but the coloured dancers remained on the field, this time forming themselves into a large map of Australia. An ABC news story outlined the organisers’ decision to have Cheetham sing both the Indigenous Welcome and the national anthem:

Mr Jones says it will be the first time an indigenous [sic] performer has sung the Australian National Anthem at a major international sporting event. Indigenous soprano Deborah Cheetham will sing the anthem during the opening ceremony. Mr Jones says a traditional Aboriginal “welcome to country” will also be performed. “First thing they said was that they were really miffed that at the Olympic Opening Ceremony the welcome to country was not part of the show...it was stuck away in the prelude and nobody saw it,” Mr Jones said. “We actually turned it around and made it a huge feature and that’s how we open...as we say with Deborah, who sings the bejesus out of it,” he said. (“International Gay Games”, 2002, p. 1)

Unlike the Opening Ceremony of the Sydney Olympics (or of any other international sporting event for that matter), in the idyllic world created by the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, Indigenous Australians are not ‘stuck away in the prelude’. At this event, not only was an official and authentic Welcome used as the starting point of the ceremony, Cheetham was given permission to ‘sing the bejesus’ out of the Australian national anthem.

Segment 4: Our struggle: persecution and severance

The fourth segment was broken down into three acts that were tied together by the notion of ‘struggle’. Segment director James Lee felt that this segment would provide the audience with some insight into the isolation and homophobia experienced by gays and lesbians in Australia before the first Mardi Gras demonstrations as this is often thought of as the starting point of the local gay and lesbian history (Dennis, 2002c). The first act featured Jimmy Somerville

---

136 In his summary of the Opening Ceremony, Lucas Wyte (2002a) points out that this map of Australia contained “an almost all lesbian map of Tasmania”, which, in Australia, references women’s pubic hair, which is likened to a map of Tasmania.

137 In actual fact, the first verse of the anthem was sung by the Children of the Rainbow choir, the second was sung by Cheetham and the mass Gay and Lesbian Choirs of the World sung the third and final verse.
(formerly of London-based band Bronski Beat and the Comrades) who “dazzled spectators as a convict being persecuted for his unnatural life with a thumping rendition of Why” (DV8TV, 2002a). Somerville was followed by Australian diva Judy Connelli who sang This is my life and I am what I am.

Connelli moved the audience from the struggle of the convicted homosexual living in the penal colony to the life of queers in Sydney pre-1970. A special tribute was made to the Purple Onion, one of Sydney’s early gay and lesbian drag venues.138 Figures 6.9 shows how, once again, lighting was used to help create a magical and carnivalesque atmosphere during

---

138 Sydney’s Purple Onion was in fact named after a venue in San Francisco. On a trip to America, one of its original owners, Dormie McIver, visited San Francisco’s Purple Onion and felt that its name and concept would be a success in Australia (Harris & Witt, 2006). It is interesting that segment organisers chose to pay tribute to ‘The Onion’ rather than other gay drag venues that were established before it was. In an interview with The Sydney Morning Herald, Lee maintains that “based on his research...the Purple Onion was Sydney’s first genuine gay bar” (Dennis, 2002c, p. 8). He argues that other clubs might have predated The Onion, but these venues were “designed to attract a straight clientele” (Dennis, 2002c, p.8). The work of the Pride History Group (Harris & Witt, 2006), however, suggests otherwise. In Camp Nites: Sydney’s emerging drag scene in the ’60s, the Purple Onion is described as a very similar venue to those that were established before it, such as Les Girls, Kandy’s Garden of Eden and the Jewel Box. The Onion was open from Thursday to Saturday and accommodated straight or mixed crowds most nights. That said, Sunday nights were designated camp/drag nights. Interestingly, Harris & Witt (2006) do acknowledge that the Onion moved camp and drag culture outside the ‘seedy’ Kings Cross district (often a very dangerous place of employment for drag queens) to Kensington, and that it put on the “first professional drag productions with cohesive casts and specially designed costumes” (Harris & Witt, 2006, p. 11). Perhaps then the Onion more accurately marks both the Americanisation and gentrification of the drag/camp scene in Sydney.
this part of the segment. Bright pink and white script told the audience ‘where they were’ and large fuchsia onions were projected onto the stadium ground. Elaborate staging, props and costumes also contributed to the larger-than-life, cabaret feel of the act. Segment designers constructed enormous mobile purple onions that moved around the stadium ground and beautifully dressed drag queens (some part of the original cast at ‘the Onion’) supported Connelli on stage.

This tribute called attention to the ‘struggles’ faced by those performers who worked in Sydney’s first drag/camp or gay and lesbian clubs. Often drag or diva performers worked for next to nothing (Harris & Witt, 2006) and were the victims of harassment by patrons and unprovoked police brutality and arrests (Dennis, 2002c; Harris & Witt, 2006). At the same time, Connelli’s legacy as a local diva herself gave the audience a sense that even during times of great difficulty, the gay and lesbian community always finds spaces for celebration, defiance and fun. The words to her song, ‘I am what I am’ reinforced this sentiment: ‘your life is a sham, till you can shout out, I am what I am’. They reinforced the linear shift from shame and silence to liberation traced throughout the evening and suggested that unless gays and lesbians are free to publicly proclaim (shout out) who they ‘naturally’ are (I am, who I am), they will continue to live unresolved and incomplete lives (shams).

The third act in this segment provided the audience with a cathartic break from the tension of the previous two acts of ‘struggle’. It offered a dramatic interpretation of the 1978 Mardi Gras demonstrations. As DV8TV’s Lucas Wyte described it: “Paul Capsis tore through Suffragette City as a rousing story of the first Mardi Gras demonstration was told complete with ’78ers and police baton charges” (DV8TV, 2002a). Capsis, dressed in a bright pink leotard was joined by masses of protestors and topless police driving around the stadium grounds in paddy-wagon style trucks bashing impassioned protestors over the heads with enormous cardboard guns and batons.

As mentioned above, the first Mardi Gras demonstration in Sydney is central to the story of Australia’s gay and lesbian history. Mardi Gras was intended to be a peaceful demonstration in honour of international Gay Solidarity Day (Carbery, 1995; Markwell, 2002). A number of large cities around the world put together demonstrations and marches to commemorate the New York City Stonewall Riots that had taken place in June, 1969. In

---

139 Although the segment director obviously associated Bowie’s song with the women’s Suffragette movement, and thus the broader struggle for equality and rights, the lyrics in this song actually tell the story of a man advising his friends that he cannot see them because he is in ‘Suffragette city’, that is, he is busy having sex with a woman, and it seems that Suffragette is used more so in a slang or even derogatory way than as a way of referencing women’s strength or power in their efforts to obtain equality.
Sydney, organisers planned a “fancy dress street parade” (Carbery, 1995, p. 10) with the aim of increasing gay and lesbian visibility and disrupting the presumed heterosexuality of the city space. The march started at Taylor Square on Oxford Street and proceeded down the street towards Hyde Park. Although the demonstrators had permission to march down Oxford Street, when they reached Hyde Park they were met by police officers who confiscated their sound system and began to block off their path. Police and marchers locked heads and violence erupted, with 53 marchers arrested and charged.

Each year Sydney commemorates these early struggles and celebrates its queer community by hosting a month-long Mardi Gras festival. The annual parade up Oxford Street is by far one of the most widely attended events in the Mardi Gras programme. Over 600,000 locals and visitors line the footpaths of Oxford Street to enjoy an outrageous display of street theatrics blended with political and religious satire dressed in a camp aesthetic. Kevin Markwell (2002) maintains that Sydney’s reputation as the “gay capital of the South Pacific” is “closely tied to the growth and development of the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras” (p. 81). The event provides a generous boost to the local economy each year; for instance, in 1999 the regional impact of Mardi Gras totalled 98.8 million dollars (Haire, 2001). What began as a moment of resistance and protest has been transformed into a cause of celebration and pride each year. In a similar way, this Opening Ceremony carried the audience through this segment marked by struggle toward a place of resistance and empowerment. Collectively, the audience were invited to reflect on the past and to acknowledge how hard the pioneers of the gay and lesbian movement fought for the freedoms and choices enjoyed today. However, before taking the audience to a place of complete emancipation, the Opening Ceremony narrative led the audience into segment five, which offered a reflection on the impact that the HIV/AIDS epidemic has had on both the local and global queer communities since the 1980s.

**Segment 5: Remembrance**

The fifth segment of the night was led by the Canadian high-profile lesbian singer k.d. lang, who, accompanied by the Gay and Lesbian Choirs of the World, sang Rodgers and Hammerstein’s *You’ll never walk alone*, followed by Garson and Hilliard’s *Our day will come*. The stadium was transformed into a large AIDS memorial as “a symbolic memorial

---

140 For an image of Taylor Square, see Figure A44, Appendix A. The photograph shows the square recreated for the Games. A large, serpent-like rainbow was painted into the square’s paving. Also, for a map that shows the exact location of Taylor Square, see Figure A25, Appendix A.

141 Protests in reaction to the violence continued around the country for many weeks after the street festival. There were many more arrests made and charges laid. For comprehensive discussions of Mardi Gras see Carbury, 1995; Haire, 2001; Markwell, 2002; Willet, 2000.
quilt unfolded, candles were lit and [the audience] remembered all those who [had] fallen victim to AIDS” (DV8TV, 2002a). The richly theatrical and high-energy atmosphere of the previous segments was replaced by a simple, dimly lit stage and the crowd’s energy was still and sombre as they gazed over the glow of candles. In this stillness, there was a sense that the energy and buzz of the liberation movement recreated in the first three segments of the ceremony had come to a sudden standstill; HIV/AIDS had arrived as a grave force of disruption to the struggle and progress of this movement and the absence of any major lighting or image effects reinforced this. In this moment the local focus of the evening was interrupted by a global epidemic and personal moments of grief and loss around AIDS were publicly shared through the unfolding of panels from the Australian AIDS Memorial Quilt, alongside panels from other Quilt projects from around the world (Gould, 2002).

The idea of a quilt memorial began in San Francisco in 1987 with the NAMES Project AIDS Quilt. The founder of the project, Clive Jones, had members of the San Francisco community prepare placards bearing the names of the loved ones they had lost to AIDS-related illnesses and carry them at the annual march held in honour of Harvey Milk (Brown, 1997; Hawkins, 1993). Jones then had the placards hung on the façade of the Federal building, publicly outing an epidemic that was surrounded by shame and silence. Peter Hawkins (1993) explains that when Jones saw the placards memorialised in this very public manner it reminded him of the American tradition of patchwork quilt making (also a tradition passed down from one generation to the next in Jones’ Quaker family). The first official NAMES Project AIDS Quilt was displayed at the 1987 San Francisco Lesbian and Gay Freedom Day Parade. Since then, the NAMES Quilt has become enormous and has inspired other national AIDS organisations to do the same. The first panels of the Australian AIDS Memorial Quilt were unveiled in Sydney on the first World AIDS Day in 1988.

As intimated above, the quilts were originally designed by activists as a creative and personal way of memorialising those who had died of AIDS, while at the same time working to counter national indifference to the AIDS epidemic. As an artistic display, the quilt transforms the private loss that individuals experience (often on their own) into an enormous public display housed in a highly trafficked public space. In this capacity, the quilt forces the

142 Harvey Milk was a San Francisco based GLBT activist and the first openly gay politician – Milk was elected in 1977 to the Board of Supervisors for San Francisco. In 1978 he and San Francisco Mayor George Moscone were assassinated.
143 The Australian quilt initiative was founded by Andrew Carter and Richard Johnson in 1988 and was inspired by the NAMES project quilt.
144 The quilt symbolises hand-crafted comfort and family traditions (Hawkins, 1993).
public to come to terms with the enormous amount of personal loss that has accompanied the disease.

In his recent collection of essays entitled *Melancholia and Moralism*, Douglas Crimp (2002) expresses his ambivalence about the ritual of mourning bound to the NAMES Project AIDS Quilt. Like Hawkins, he suggests that the quilt functions as both a tool for private and personal mourning (e.g. the intimacy of sewing a frame for someone we know) and opens up a space for the expression of a public or collective grief (e.g. viewing a sea of faceless names that we do not know and yet being called to recognise these lives and deaths in meaningful and respectful ways). Unlike Hawkins, however, Crimp suggests that as an apparatus for collective grief the quilt functions as a “spectacle of mourning, [a] vast public-relations effort to humanize and dignify our losses for those who have not shared them” (Crimp, 2002, p. 98). In other words, the quilt tries to dignify and qualify the lives and deaths of those who were deemed unintelligibly human (namely gay men and IV drug users), and were therefore denied the ‘normal’, humane traditions associated with the grieving process – family members by the bedside, discrimination-free access to health care, obituaries acknowledging the cause of death, and so on. Crimp questions for whom the quilt is really displayed, those who have died from AIDS, those left behind, or those who have generated a great deal of homophobic hatred and denial around the disease. He asks:

Does a visit to the quilt, or the media’s approving attention to it, assuage the guilt of those who otherwise have been so callous, whether that callousness takes the form of denial or of outright disgust? Does it provide a form of catharsis, an easing of conscience, for those who have cared and done so little about this great tragedy? ... What kind of ordinariness do others see? Does the quilt sanitize or sentimentalize gay life? Does it render invisible what makes people hate us? Does it make their continuing disavowal possible? (Crimp, 2002, p. 198, 200)

Crimp questions what it is about the Quilt that makes it so palatable to those who continue to offer limited and cautious responses to the AIDS epidemic. In other words, he is cautious of the levels and types of comfort it allows for. He is also concerned that the Quilt ‘cleans up’ the sexual lives of gay men when in fact their sexual culture is integral to understanding both the lives and the deaths of gay men who die from AIDS. He queries the ‘political’ effectiveness of AIDS activism that further silences that which the majoritarian culture loathes and fears. Finally, he suggests that while many will have a sympathetic response to the large numbers lost to AIDS, he fears that the Quilt functions as evidence of gay men’s mass death, and that this evidence somehow satisfies a hidden desire to have all sexual and social deviants eliminated.
What then is there to say about the attempt to “remember those who have fallen victim to AIDS” (DV8TV, 2002a) at the Opening Ceremony of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games? Was there an underlying suggestion that members of the audience had a singular or shared experience of loss and grief around the disease? Were familiar symbols of the AIDS memorial – candles, quilt, moment of silence – used to honour the dead or to draw out the ceremony’s linear narrative, telling the audience, as Ignatius Jones promised, who they are and where they come from? How were the lives and deaths of those with AIDS, and the grief experienced by those who mourned them, (re)produced in this segment? Was AIDS framed through normative discourses of the disease as an unpredictable menace that invades and destroys the fabric of nations and communities? Why was there no celebration around the advancements in treatments for people living with HIV? Finally, did the quilt serve to sanitise the impact AIDS has had on the queer community and its link to gay male sexual cultures? Or, did the memorial attempt to neutralise the raw emotions bound to the range of individual experiences audience members might have had around the disease?

Segment 6: Acceptance: Love and pride

In keeping with the linear story of the evening, Segment Six brought the audience out of the space of exclusion, grief and loss towards the space of celebration and hope. This segment kicked off with Leah Howard singing Sexual Revolution. Figure 6.10 below is a still of Howard arriving on stage with a Dykes On Bikes escort. Forty motorcyclists entered the stadium, moving around the grounds in spectacularly choreographed formations. The bikes’ bright headlights combined with the colourful overhead lighting made this part of the evening “luminous and bold” (Hallett, 2002, p. 16). There was a sense that negativity and exclusion belonged to the past (both literally and in terms of the ceremony’s earlier reflection on struggle and loss) and that the present was a time of celebration, love and freedom (Rowe, Markwell & Stevenson, 2006).

---

145 In Australia, 2007 marks the 20th anniversary of the ‘Grim Reaper’ HIV/AIDS television advertising campaign, celebrated as one of the country’s most effective steps in combating the spread of HIV/AIDS. The ad featured an ominous, deathly creature at a bowling alley indiscriminately ‘striking’ Australians down with the AIDS disease. While the aim of the campaign was to shock and scare middle Australians into acknowledging that every citizen was at risk of contracting the HIV virus (and thus dying of AIDS), it heightened perceptions of HIV/AIDS infected people as mysterious, contagious and threatening. In particular, the Reaper was thought to represent a gay man whose moral and physical illness was bringing death sentences to innocent, ‘normal’ Australian citizens.
This seemed to be the part of the ceremony that supported Ignatius Jones’ promise that the Opening would tell Sydney’s “story...in the irreverent and spectacular way the gay and lesbian community is famous for” (SGGB, 2002k). Howard’s act brought together the edgier parts of queer culture and the lighting and special effects seemed to mirror this. For instance, her hair was styled in a big Mohawk and she was dressed in very short, tight read leather shorts and a small leather vest. Her backup dancers were wearing small bra tops and skimp, leather harnesses. The bold, high-energy performance was matched by the daring choreography of the Dykes on Bikes, the sporadic revving of the engines and the release of small fire crackers and smoke off the back of the bikes. Amidst the edgey symbols of this ‘sexual revolution’, a large, luminous, pink love heart was erected centre-stage (see Figure 6.11), another figure of openness, acceptance and love to guide the audience towards a space of celebration.
Howard was followed by “lesbian soul goddess” (Mills, 2002d), Shauna Jensen who sang the Des’ree hit *You Gotta Be* with “great soul and verve” (Mills, 2002f, p. 3). Jensen was accompanied by dozens of same-sex ballroom dancers scattered around the stadium grounds. Like Howard’s high-energy performance, Jensen’s words offered hope and reassurance as the audience was brought from struggle towards liberation: “You gotta be cool, you gotta be calm, you gotta stand together … All I know, all I know, is that love will save the day”. These words also reinforced the idea that in a world filled with great uncertainty and hardship, the microcosm created by/at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games was one that transcended hatred and oppression and offered a vision of unity, hope, joy and love.

**Segment 7: Celebration: *Under New Skies***

The seventh segment, Celebration: *Under New Skies*, moved the story of gay and lesbian struggle (and liberation) established in the previous segments from the ‘local’, Australian context to a more regional (Asian-Pacific) focus. There was a sense that the future of the gay and lesbian movement was less about focusing on the local or national alliances, and more so about queer ‘world-building’, building pathways, to the regional and to the global.
Australia’s place in the South Pacific region was emphasised not only at this opening celebration, but throughout the Games as a whole. Interestingly, rather than speaking about other regional nations as ‘partners’, Australia was described as the leader or centre of the region. Where gay and lesbian politics were concerned, Sydney, as host city to the Gay Games, was described as the gay and lesbian centre point, or “gay capital” (Markwell, 2002) of both Australia and the South Pacific. The Opening Ceremony was thus about reinforcing Australia’s central place in the region and this was illustrated in the promotional overview for the Ceremony published in the *Official Guide* (McAdam, 2002). It stated that:

The ceremony will not only reflect Australia but also our region. These are the first Gay Games to be held in the southern hemisphere and the event will highlight Australia’s unique position at the centre of the Asia Pacific. This is considered particularly important by the organisers, as in some parts of the region the gay and lesbian community is not only invisible, but continues to struggle against persecution. (McAdam, 2002, p. 15)

Again, Australia is held up as the leader in gay and lesbians rights and described as a place that fosters a national culture of diversity and inclusion. Although never named, other countries in the region are described as less progressive where issues of sexual difference are concerned. As suggested above, coming to Sydney to attend the Games is thought to provide athletes from these peripheral countries in the ‘gay region’ a novel experience of freedom, visibility and pride. In a separate SGGB press release this idea is reinforced:

Some countries in the Asia/Pacific have oppressive laws on homosexuality. Gay, lesbians, transgender and bisexual people from these countries will be able to celebrate identity through culture and sport at Gay Games VI. (SGGB, 2002)

Throughout this segment, the range of different regional nations and the diversity of regional cultures were reduced to a homogenous whole and a variety of generic symbols and stereotypes were used that obliterated their differences. In a manner similar to that used in the Welcome segment, this segment’s story of ‘celebration’ was told using elaborate, ‘exotic’ costumes and props that together created a spectacle, “like a scene from *South Pacific*” (DV8TV, 2002a). The segment’s main performer, Australian counter-tenor Peretta Anggerek sang another Rodgers and Hammerstein song, *Bali Ha’i*, followed by Puccini’s *Un bel Di*.

---

146 As Chapter Four pointed out, this is particularly interesting given that Australia is not necessarily the most open-minded country where issues of same-sex relationships are concerned. New Zealand, for instance, has legalised same-sex civil unions whereas Australia has not. Likewise, some countries in the South Pacific (e.g. Samoa) organise gender across three categories, male, female and transgender (for Samoans this third category is faafafine).

147 Interestingly, Rodgers and Hammerstein are both American. The song *Bali Ha’i* features in their Broadway hit musical *South Pacific* (1949). This musical production is a love story set on an island in the Pacific during the Second World War.
and was accompanied by a vast sea of dancers wearing kimonos, coconut shell halters and grass skirts, butterfly wings and other exotic costumes. A number of large props were also integrated into the act including large, moveable cut-out monkeys, dragons and serpents. Anggerek himself was dressed in an elaborate headdress made of strips of leather and metal (see still image in Figure 6.12 below) and a costume that seemed to suggest a warrior or tribal theme.

Figure 6.12: Still image of Peretta Anggerek during the Celebration segment of the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony (DV8TV)

As Figure 6.13 shows, an “impressive swirling ocean lighting design” was used to enhance the sense of the exotic and of being ‘elsewhere’. A large, colourful, brightly lit volcano was erected centre stage and when it erupted, it sent huge volumes of colourful glitter into the air (see Figure 6.14 below). Although not native to Australia, the volcano symbolised the uniqueness of the regional landscape (e.g. New Zealand, Japan, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea). Through the use of the glitter, this ‘regional symbol’ is marked by a hidden, internal ‘campness’ or queerness. Through its dramatic eruption there is a sense that this queerness cannot be contained, it is explosive and jubilant (one might add that this jubilance occurs in a
rather phallic manner!). The following day, *Sydney Star Observer* reporter David Mills commented on the volcano’s function in the ceremony:

They said there would be glitter, and they delivered. The volcano centrepiece of the stadium erupted in a glitter-storm at the end of the ceremony, showering performers and athletes alike. When ceremony director Ignatius Jones promised last week that footballers competing in Aussie Stadium “would be picking glitter out of their navels for the next 10 years”, it was obviously no idle boast. (Mills, 2002g, p. 21)

The volcano’s queer eruption not only symbolised the bubbling and explosive force of ‘gayness’ internal to the Asian-Pacific region, it also left its mark on a very heteronormative national space, the Australian football pitch.

Figure 6.13: ‘Asian-Pacific’ volcano and dancers at the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony (*Sydney Star Observer*, 2002)
The high energy of the stadium ground after the seventh segment was transformed into a rather formal space by changing the lighting from bright, moving green, blue and yellow projections to still pinks. In addition, Sydney 2002 logos (in yellows, oranges and whites) were projected onto the ground (see main image in Figure 6.15), directing the audience’s attention away from the centre of the field, back to the main stage where the official programme got underway. This segment started with welcoming addresses from the Governor of New South Wales, Her Excellency Marie Bashir AC; Federation of Gay Games officials Roberto Mantaci and Kathleen Webster; and Sydney 2002 Gay Games co-chairs Peter Bailey and Bev Lange. A Games participant, Emma Young, was then called on to read the oath of the participants:

I, Emma Young, on behalf of all the participants in this stadium, pledge to fully participate in the Gay Games by honouring the spirit of their origins. I pledge to celebrate the uniqueness of these Games in their purest realm of sportsmanship where there is no shame or failure, only glory and achievement and the shared fulfilment of each person’s personal best. In these games I have no rivals, only comrades in unity. (Heil, 2002a)
Here again the Sydney Gay Games are inserted into the overall Gay Games legacy and individual participants are called on to honour “the spirit of their origins” (Heil, 2002a). Sport is held out as a pure realm where real change is actualised. It functions as the ultimate equaliser, erasing human difference and/or national conflict. At the Gay Games, “there is no shame or failure, only glory and achievement and the shared fulfilment of each person’s personal best” (Heil, 2002a). Likewise, participants are not sporting or cultural rivals, but “comrades in unity” (Heil, 2002a), extolling the values and virtues of sportsmanship and community building.

The centrepiece of the official programme was the address offered by Supreme Court Judge, The Honourable Justice Michael Kirby. Kirby’s speech is given in full in Appendix B. The aim here, however, is to point out the ways in which Kirby’s speech contributed to the story of change and progress produced throughout the Opening Ceremony and how it framed the Gay Games as an apparatus for political and social change.

The title of Kirby’s address was ‘Courage’ and throughout his speech he suggested that the individuals who pioneered both the local and global gay and lesbian movements are heroic and exemplary men and women. Likewise, taking part in the Games demonstrates participants’ individual courage and their respect for the work of those that came before them. Gay and lesbian community ‘politics’ is thus equated with ‘being present’, not only being ‘out and proud’, but also about the labour of ‘getting there’ and ‘being counted’ amongst the Gay Games ‘heroes’. In other words, gay and lesbian community politics are inextricably bound to the economy of the global queer tourism industry, and to other practices of consumption through which one experiences ‘community’ at the Games.

Throughout his address Kirby reinforces the story of political and social evolution or progress introduced in the previous ceremony segments. To open his speech he says:

Under different skies, at the beginning of a new millennium, in an old land and a young nation, we join together in the hope and conviction that the future will be kinder and more just than the past. (Heil, 2002a)

While Kirby acknowledged that the land upon which the celebrations were taking place is ‘old land’, and in doing so acknowledged that it was inhabited for many years before colonisation, the past, present and future of both the Gay Games movement and of the broader gay and lesbian/queer movements in Australia are marked by linearity and progress.

 Kirby also served as President of the NSW Court of Appsal, the highest court in NSW. He is currently on the United Nations AIDS global reference panel and advocates for the human rights of people living with HIV/AIDS.
As mentioned earlier in this discussion, during the ceremony’s Welcome segment the colonisation of Australia’s Indigenous peoples was weaved together with the historical struggle of gays and lesbians and the history of Australia as penal colony to construct a singular, teleological story about Australia’s history of struggle and oppression. In a similar manner, Kirby described a range of past injustices and inequalities in constructing his linear description of Australia’s social advancements:

This is a great night for Australia because we are a nation in the process of reinventing ourselves. We began our modern history by denying the existence of our indigenous peoples and their rights. We embraced White Australia. Women could play little part in public life: their place was in the kitchen. And as for gays, lesbians and other sexual minorities, they were an abomination. Lock them up. Throw away the key. We have not corrected all these wrongs. But we are surely on the road to enlightenment. Tonight, we are part of it. There will be no U-turns. (Heil, 2002a)

While Kirby acknowledges that Australia has ‘not corrected all [its] wrongs’, he also maintains that these Games demonstrate that Australia is on the ‘road to enlightenment’ and that on this road, there are ‘no U-turns’. In marking this ‘road to enlightenment’, he dismisses the ways in which certain historical injustices and inequalities (e.g. the logic of colonial rule) still exist and/or are re-animated in contemporary socio-political discourses. Furthermore, he once again positions the Gay Games as a vehicle for change and suggests that participants (and arguably spectators), by their very presence, are contributing to real social/political change.

Speaking of himself and his partner Johan, who he points out he has been in a relationship with for over thirty years, Kirby explains that “had an angel tapped [them] on [their] youthful and beautiful shoulders and told [them] of [the Opening Ceremony of a Gay Games in Australia], [they] would have said ‘Impossible’” (Heil, 2002a)! Again, the reality of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games marks progress and acts as proof that, in Kirby’s words, “nothing is impossible to the human spirit, and science and truth ultimately prevail” (Heil, 2002a). Here the implication is that the ‘truth’ that has ‘prevailed’ and which science has uncovered is that being gay or lesbian is ‘natural’ and therefore should not be something for which an individual citizen can be discriminated against. In creating this space of celebration and possibility, he is in fact essentialising gay identity in exclusive and exclusionary ways. Real gayness (and thus real salvation after the enlightenment) belongs to those who understand their ‘sexual orientation’ as something inherent, biological, natural.

Kirby then listed a number of “people of courage” (Heil, 2002a) who helped Australian society change its attitudes towards issues of sexual difference: Don Dunstan, former Premier
of South Australia; Rodney Croome and Nick Toonen, who took Tasmania to the United Nations in a fight to legalise homosexual sex; Neal Blewett, who pioneered Australia’s early fight against HIV/AIDS; Australian performers Judy Connelli, Molly Meldrum and Robyn Archer; Kerryn Phelps, President of the Australian Medical Association; and Ian Roberts, who was the first Australian rugby football player to publicly come out. But Kirby then assures the audience that “this is not just an Australian story. In every land a previously frightened and oppressed minority is awakening from a long sleep to assert its dignity” (Heil, 2002a). Like sleeping or hibernating animals, the oppressed have risen up around the world to join in the fight against homophobic discrimination. He again provides examples, including the founding father of the Gay Games, Dr. Tom Waddell; ex-Olympic diver Greg Louganis, who came out publicly as gay and HIV positive at the 1994 New York City Gay Games; Mark Bingham, the gay American rugby player who died in the crash of Flight 93 in Pennsylvania during the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks; and Bertrand Dalanoe, the ex-Mayor of Paris who was stabbed by a homophobe because he was openly gay.

Kirby suggests that the lives (and in some cases, deaths) of these people and their efforts to change social attitudes should inspire Gay Games participants to “dance till dawn” (Heil, 2002a). There is a sense in which these ‘people of courage’ struggled so that the participants of Sydney 2002 could be freer. Oppression and inequalities are a thing of the past and the present is a time of self-expression, freedom and choice. That said, Kirby points out that the celebration in Sydney should also be had for those whose lives remind us that the struggle for equality is not yet over: the Cairo 52, the Sister Movement in Namibia and Al-Fatiha. Here again the universal story of struggle, survival and resistance is applied to a range of cultural and political contexts and there is a suggestion that these ‘less advanced’ social movements are themselves on the ‘road to Enlightenment’ and will eventually catch up. Finally, Kirby validates those present for they have come together “to reject ignorance, hatred, error and to embrace love which is the foundation of all human rights” (Heil, 2002a). He concludes:

---

149 In 1991 the UN found Tasmania violated an international covenant with its anti-gay laws, prompting Federal Court and High Court intervention.
150 The Cairo 52 refers to the 52 Egyptian men who were arrested, brutally interrogated and charged with criminal offences when their boat, used as a space for gay men to socialise, was docked on the Nile. The sister movement in Namibia fights for the sexual and reproductive rights for African women and Al-Fatiha is the gay movement of Muslims.
So, let the word go out from Sydney and the Gay Games of 2002 that the movement for equality is unstoppable. Its message will eventually reach the four corners of the world. And these Gay Games in Sydney will be another catalyst to help make that happen. Be sure, be very sure, in the end inclusion will replace exclusion, for the sake of the planet and for the sake of humanity it must be so. Amusez-vous bien, et par l’exemple de nos vies défendons les droits de l’humanité. Non seulement pour les gays, pour tout le monde. Enjoy yourselves, and by our lives let us be an example of respect for human rights. Not just for gays, for everyone! (Heil, 2002a)

Kirby reminds the audience that their participation in these Games is catalyst for change and commands them to let their lives serve as examples of respect for human rights, not just respect for difference based on sexuality, but for all basic human rights! The queer Gay Games participant is a model neo-liberal subject: who, by her and his very presence at the Games, is choosing to contribute to social and political change and is capable of making a difference in the lives of gays and lesbians worldwide.

When the official procedures were completed, the evening’s narrative was brought to a close in the ceremonial finale called ‘Fabulous’. The stage was filled with dozens of drag queens, firecrackers were set off from the stadium roof and a large fluorescent Harbour Bridge was lit up on the main stage with the word ‘Fabulous’ scrolled across it.

Under whose skies?: Re-imagining that ‘special’ gay night

Figures 6.15-6.18 below were printed in the Sydney Star Observer’s Sydney 2002 Gay Games IV Photo Edition (Sydney Star Observer [SSO], 2002) as a way of ‘looking back’ at the Opening Ceremony. These images are particularly interesting because they link the discussion in this chapter to some of the key ideas presented in Chapter Five. It argued that images and image-worlds are not fixed objects or entities; instead, they are constantly shifting and changing. As such, one cannot speak of an image-world’s limits or boundaries, or trace its point of origin in simple or easy ways. With the capacity to create, copy, alter and store images differently, they are forever becoming something else, and are always open to a variety of readings or interpretations.

The images assembled together by the SSO editors in their efforts to memorialise the Opening reproduce the narrative that framed the evening’s celebrations. Each montage reinforces the meanings the ceremonial story attached to global and local sexualities, the Gay Games movement and to Sydney as the host city. Like the nine ceremony segments, these images offer a story of progress, freedom and inclusivity, and do so in a highly stylised and stylish manner. At the same time, these images fragment the order of the evening’s program.
and insert images of the audience into the ceremonial story. In doing so, these images demonstrate the capacity of images and technologies to extend and/or re-imagine our experience of and affective responses to certain 'moments in times'.
Figure 6.15: *Sydney Star Observer* Opening Ceremony Montage #1 (*Sydney Star Observer*, 2002)
Figure 6.16: *Sydney Star Observer* Opening Ceremony Montage #2 (*Sydney Star Observer*, 2002)

“IN EVERY LAND A PREVIOUSLY FRIGHTENED AND OPPRESSED MINORITY IS AWAKENING FROM A LONG SLEEP TO ASSERT ITS HUMAN DIGNITY.” — JUSTICE MICHAEL KIRBY
Figure 6.17: *Sydney Star Observer* Opening Ceremony Montage #3 (*Sydney Star Observer*, 2002)
Figure 6.18: *Sydney Star Observer* Opening Ceremony Montage #4 (*Sydney Star Observer*, 2002)
Figure 6.19 is another interesting example of how *image-worlds* can *become* something else when transported into another context or linked to another *image-world*. It shows a small glossy flyer that was part of Team Chicago’s early advertising campaign for the 2006 Gay Games. Interestingly, the central image on the flyer is the Biame creation spirit used in the official Indigenous Welcome during the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Opening Ceremony. The transportation of this ‘local’, Indigenous figure from its ‘original’ context to another, illustrates the free-flow of images and technologies within the current phase of global capital and challenges the idea that images can ever be bound to an original time and place. This flyer also demonstrates the ways in which the Gay Games continue to be narrated as a singular sports and cultural movement rather than as a string of individual events; each of the Gay Games is one part of the movement’s broader socio-political aim of building a global ‘Gay Games’ world. More importantly, however, the use of this Indigenous Australian representation to sell an American event illustrates how Indigeneity is reduced to ‘generic’ representations of the ‘exotic’ and ‘authentic’ Other, and how this type of ‘Otherness’ is used to increase the symbolic economy of the Gay Games as a global, gay and lesbian ‘community’ event.

![Advertisement for the Chicago 2006 Gay Games (Team Chicago)](image)

Figure 6.19: Advertisement for the Chicago 2006 Gay Games (Team Chicago)

---

151 See Figure A46, Appendix A for another reproduction of this image by Team Chicago, this time on their website in anticipation of their event.
Conclusion

By offering a close reading of the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony, this chapter asked how the Sydney 2002 image-world contributed to the production and governance of normative meanings around (queer) sexualities and citizenship. It argued that the nine performance segments that framed the evening’s celebrations (re)produced a very linear ‘story’ about the history of ‘gay and lesbian’ culture and positioned the Sydney 2002 Gay Games as a significant political moment for both ‘local’ and ‘global’ community politics.

Elaborate light and image projections, music, sound technologies, costumes, theatre and special effects were used to take the audience on an emotional journey from a place of isolation and struggle to one of celebration and joy. Members of early gay and lesbian liberation movements and the founders of the Gay Games were positioned as pioneers of freedom and Sydney 2002 participants were invited to view themselves as ‘courageous heroes’ carrying on the legacy of the past. Contemporary queer living was conceived through discourses of pride, self-awareness, celebration, inclusiveness and respect and the Gay Games were testament to this time of hope and optimism. Although participants came from various places around the world and identified with a variety of categories of sexual identity, very narrow definitions of sexuality and community politics were applied throughout the evening. The rights and freedoms gained by the queer community in Australia and within other ‘enlightened’ (western) nations were used to define non-western nations as less progressive and/or less culturally developed. The singular models of queer living and of queer political life mobilised throughout the evening oversimplified the complex ways in which sexuality and sexual identity politics are negotiated in various (non-western) parts of the world.

Chapter Seven, ‘This should be Interesting’, reminds the reader of the major threads running through the project and offers a reflection on the future of the Gay Games sporting movement and suggests areas for future research.
Chapter Seven

‘This should be interesting …’

We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get out of this kind of political “double bind,” which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of modern power structures. The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state, and from the state’s institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualization which is linked to the state. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries.

-Michel Foucault, ‘The subject of power’, in Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982)

We belong to social apparatuses [dispositifs] and act within them. The newness of an apparatus in relation to those which have gone before is what we call its actuality, our actuality. The new is the current. The current is not what we are but rather what we are in the process of becoming – that is the Other, our becoming-other.

-Gilles Deleuze, ‘What is a dispositif?’ (1992)

...we have to create a gay life. To become.


This thesis began with a promotional flyer from the Sydney 2002 Gay Games (see Figure 1.1) that read, ‘Blood, sweat and queers’. I used this flyer to call attention to the practices of labour and (self-)management that are bound to the Gay Games as an international sporting and cultural event – exercise, tourism, sex, consumption – but also to highlight the important labour involved in rethinking the critical responses one has to self-proclaimed ‘gay and lesbian’ or ‘queer’ events like the Games. The image thus engendered the project’s two broad aims: to provide the reader with a new critical perspective on the Sydney 2002 Gay Games, and to develop a new set of theoretical ‘tools’ (Deleuze & Foucault, 2004) with which to analyse other queer community events of this kind.

To this end, Chapters Two and Three began the process of re-imagining Sydney 2002 by introducing the problem of ‘government’ – How is one governed? How does one govern others? How does one govern oneself (Miller, 1998b)? In Chapter Two I introduced Foucault’s notion of governmentality alongside his contention that an individual comes to ‘know’ him-or herself from within the discursive conditions that define (and govern) what is or is not knowable, sayable or seeable. I also asked how, for Foucault, sexuality is understood as a tool or mechanism of governance that defines and orders the conduct or actions of individuals and/or certain populations. Judith Butler’s work was instrumental in teasing out
the question of how sex or sexuality governs. In particular, three of her central ideas offered salience to the chapter’s overall argument. First, that the structures and practices of everyday life that define sex and gender in very narrow, binary terms establish the conditions for what constitutes an intelligible sexed/gendered body or life. Second, that the conditions through which one qualifies as intelligibly ‘human’ are always defined against normative meanings of sex and gender. Those bodies and lives that fall outside the preview of ‘normal’ sex/gender binaries fail to count as ‘human’ subjects and are often scrutinised and regulated in very violent ways. And third, that the conditions of contemporary citizenship rely on similar governing mechanisms (that are sometimes exercised through more sovereign ‘arts of government’) that deem some bodies and lives suitably ‘human’ whilst casting all ‘Others’ on the outside of this precarious category.

Building on the ideas introduced in Chapter Two, in Chapter Three I used Foucault’s notion of governmentality to rethink the ‘story we all know about’ globalisation (Lamer & Walters, 2002). Here I provided a detailed overview of Wendy Lamer and William Walters’ (2002, 2004) argument that too often studies of the global limit their concern to what globalisation is and fail to engage with what globalisation does, how it acts to name and describe a diverse set of practices and processes under a rather singular umbrella term. Lamer and Walters advocate for a theory of global governance and suggest that rather than seeking to define and understand the ‘substance’ of the global, what it is, emphasis needs to be placed on the ‘surface’ of globalisation, asking how it defines and organises the practices and processes of everyday life.

In developing the idea of globalisation as governmentality, Larner and Walters (2002) introduce Foucault’s idea of the dispositif (Foucault, 1994). They suggest that globalisation should be theorised less as a uniform, uni-directional object or process and more so as an assemblage of complex and contradictory relationships and effects that normalise and naturalise what we have come to know as ‘globalisation’. They insist that conceptualising globalisation in more irregular, contradictory terms allows one to critically rethink the ways in which the bodies of knowledge that have, roughly speaking, come to be known as ‘globalisation studies’ set out in advance what is ‘thinkable’ or ‘knowable’ about the global, and also about what it means to be a global citizen-subject.

In the second half of Chapter Three I used Larner and Walters’ questions of global governance to ask how neo-liberal mentalities of government converge with discourses of global living to define the global citizen-subject in particular ways. Specifically I asked what role the imagination plays in ordering and managing our experiences as global citizens. In
other words, I asked how the imagination becomes a technology with which individuals constitute themselves as certain types of global citizens and/or global consumers.

Collectively, Chapters Two and Three established that, for Foucault, an analytics of governmentality moves away from naming and describing the objects, outcomes or effects of power, but instead traces the ‘hows’ of power and identifies the various practices and mechanisms that allow certain truth effects to sediment or hold. They also established that as a contemporary ‘art of government’ neo-liberalism emphasises the central role that the ‘free’, self-enterprising individual plays in mapping out his or her own social and economic destiny and in upholding the broader social order. These chapters provided the theoretical backbone from which the remaining three chapters of the thesis took their shape.

In Chapter Four I began with the question, how were the Gay Games political? The aim was to map the conditions within which the broader Gay Games movement frames its political aims and to ask how notions of citizenship, rights and sexuality were defined within the events’ ‘political’ appeals. In a great deal of research around commodified events like the Gay Games, scholars critique these events’ lack of ‘effective’ political reach (Altman, 2001a; Chasin, 2000; Manalansan IV, 1995; Pronger, 2000; Symons, 2002a, Warner, 1999). They claim that the increasingly synergistic relationship between event organisers and mainstream corporate sponsors makes it necessary for events to adopt a ‘normal’ public face and that this ‘normalness’ diminishes opportunities to impart real, serious political change. In other words, they maintain that the power and pressure of the pink economy has not only led the market to gays and lesbians, it has also invited gays and lesbians to partake in a wide range of normalising, identity-based consumer practices (Chasin, 2000). While I certainly agree that identity-based consumption has ‘replaced’ older forms of community action and that this type of consumption is exclusive, I am hesitant to dismiss the importance of these types of events (pride festivals and parades, designated ‘gay days’ at amusement parks, queer film festivals, gay cruises and other forms of niche tourism) to the constitution of contemporary gay and lesbian community life (at least in the western world). Lamenting the days when rallies and protests offered a more serious or effective political life fails to come to terms with the conditions of the present or to acknowledge that events of this kind are integral in the shaping of contemporary queer identities. Moreover, these types of analyses risk strengthening what I have called elsewhere ‘the pink discourse’ (Burns, 2003), that is, the enormous assemblage of subjects, objects and bodies of knowledge that name and give strength to the very idea of an omnipotent, all-powerful, gay-niche or ‘pink’ economy.
Taking this into account, Chapter Four investigated how Diane Richardson’s (2000b) three categories of sexual citizenship – practice-based rights, identity-based rights and relationship-based rights – have been, if at all, taken up over the course of the Gay Games movement (and, in the case of relationship-based rights, at the 2006 World Outgames). I wanted to tease out how a ‘politics’ of inclusivity and transformation has been constructed from within the events’ discursive terrains.

Where practice-based rights are concerned, I concluded that, like other queer events that rely on mainstream sponsors to stay afloat, the Gay Games seek the affirmation of both the straight and corporate worlds and do so by de-emphasising the sexual nature of queer relationships such that Gay Games participants are just like every other ‘normal’ citizen – they are clean-cut, cosmopolitan, global travellers who play sport. In an effort to gain a more nuanced understanding of the ‘normalising’ agenda of the Gay Games movement, I noted that while organisers of Sydney 2002 worked to desexualise and normalise their promotional campaign, it seemed that event sponsors sold a brand of queer sexuality (namely white, gay male sexuality) back to participants through their advertising campaigns. Drawing on Katherine Sender’s (2004) contention that some forms of queer sexuality constitute a more ‘tasteful’ form of sexuality than others, I argued that the design and production quality of sponsors’ ‘sexy’ ads, coupled with their depiction of non-explicit, playful, homoerotic forms of gay male intimacy, allowed them to ‘pass’ as tasteful and acceptable expressions of sexuality. In passing, these advertisements reinforced a very singular, cosmopolitan brand of global queer citizenship.

My exploration of both identity-based and relationship-based rights claims confirmed this idea that the ‘political’ appeal of the Gay Games validates the lifestyle and consumer practices of a select group of queer individuals. Both of these overviews also argued that, in keeping with neo-liberalism’s focus on ‘the individual’, participants who ‘fit’ the normative mould of ‘queerness’ ascribed by the Games were invited to see their own inclusion as ‘proof’ that the Gay Games are a truly transformative political event. Offering a critical reading of the Sydney 2002 Gender Policy, I argued that although Sydney 2002 was promoted as a safe and inclusive space for all participants regardless of their race, religion, gender or sexuality, its commitment to providing officially sanctioned sporting competitions meant that transgendered athletes were forced to prove the seriousness of their chosen identity. Asking athletes to meet certain sex/gender conditions or standards upholds the idea that gender is the only way to organise ‘fair’ sporting competition. I also suggested that the promise of inclusion and safety serves as an empty political promise except for those whose normative
sex/gender identification does allow them to ‘feel included’. This feeling of inclusion, which is validated by the majority of people in attendance since most participants are white, middle-class men confirms the organisations’ political aims and validates ‘normal’ athletes’ personal sense of transformation at the Games.

Finally, in Chapter Four I overviewed the place of relationship-based rights claims in the Gay Games ‘political’ agenda. Here I explored the ways in which 2006 Montréal Outgames participants were invited to get married while in Canada for the Games. I argued that in planning for both their Outgames experience and their wedding, participants could imagine themselves as politically-minded, mobile, cosmopolitan citizens. Here I also illustrated how same-sex marriage was used to not only sell the Games as an authentically ‘political’ community event, but also to promote the city of Montréal and Canada as ‘host nation’, as worthy global queer destinations.

Chapter Four thus established that in light of the importance of fixed and stable ‘identities’ to the global gay tourist industry and to the logic of gay niche marketing, and given the reliance of global queer community events on the sustainability of this niche market, questions of government move away from simply naming and describing what Sydney 2002 was or evaluating its political effectiveness. Questions of governance trace the discursive conditions within which an event’s political profile is produced and allow one to consider the ways in which individuals are constituted as ‘global’, ‘urban’, ‘cosmopolitan’, ‘an athlete’, ‘a citizen’ and so on.

In Chapters Five and Six I looked specifically at the role images and image-based technologies played in the production and governance of normative models of the global queer citizen-subject at the Games. In Chapter Five I introduced Ron Burnett’s notion of the image-world to argue that while very often images and media technologies are thought to reflect or represent our experience of the real, they are in fact (inter)active objects that contribute to the production of our lived experiences. Extending the metaphor of a disordered network or assemblage that was introduced in the previous chapters, I argued that the Sydney 2002 Gay Games can be viewed as an image-world, composed of various images and image-related technologies, and the language and discourses we use to make sense of these things. I emphasised Burnett’s point that image-worlds are changeable and alterable entities by showing the various ways in which the Sydney 2002 image-world linked up with another queer, Australian image-world, Stephen Elliot’s feature film, The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert.
In Chapter Six I developed this idea of the Sydney 2002 as an *image-world* by offering a close reading of the Sydney 2002 Opening Ceremony. I asked how images, technologies and the various special effects were used in each of the ceremony segments to construct an overall ceremonial narrative of linearity and progress. What became evident through this chapter’s discussion was that ‘queer’ sexuality was constructed as something one ‘uncovers’ both through the personal processes of discovering one’s ‘true self’ and through the collective experience of celebrating ‘queer’ sexual freedom, choice and community. Throughout these discussions I also emphasised how the normative or idealised model of global queer citizenship, defined as free, progressive, urban, flexible, cosmopolitan, etc., is always defined against what it is *not*, that is, oppressed, rural, tied to one place or uncultured. The establishment of these types of dichotomies privileges a very particular form of white, western queer identity that reduced other cultures and experiences of sexual identity to a homogenous and ‘primitive’ brand of sexuality.

**Suggestions for future research on the Gay Games**

In 1986 when Tom Waddell made the decision to hasten the end of his life by taking a very large dose of morphine, he turned to his friends and family to offer his last words: ‘This should be interesting’. Waddell then slipped into a state of unconsciousness (Waddell & Schaap, 1996). The audience at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games were reminded of these words during Michael Kirby’s Opening Ceremony keynote address. Kirby suggested that, looking around the stadium, Waddell’s words were certainly an understatement. The implication was that, two decades later, Waddell could never have imagined how large and successful the Gay Games movement would have become.

While I am hesitant to uphold the progress narratives this thesis has worked to dismantle, there is little doubt that between 1986 when Waddell died and 2002 when the Gay Games were in Sydney, a great deal had changed. Apart from the sheer size of the Games by that stage, a number of other social and political factors had significantly altered what the Gay Games were and who was in attendance. One of these changes Kirby pointed to in his speech: A representative of Her Majesty the Queen, the Governor of New South Wales (NSW) was present, and the Governor was a woman! I outlined other key changes throughout this thesis, most notably, the involvement of large corporate sponsors in the Games, the introduction of the Internet and email, and the growth of other digital technologies. All of these things, I have argued, have changed the face of the Gay Games movement. Of course, for Waddell perhaps the most significant change would have been the enormous developments in the area of
HIV/AIDS treatment options that now offer people longer and less illness-controlled HIV+ lives.

Since 2002 a number of additional changes have altered the terrain of international gay and lesbian sporting competitions and I believe these changes open up a number of opportunities for building on the questions I have developed in this thesis. As I intimated in Chapter Four, there is a great deal more that needs to be said about the decision of Équipe / Team Montréal to leave the FGG and establish a separate international sporting body (GLISA). The organisational structure of this body is quite different from the FGG and each World Outgames is much more driven by the host city’s local tourism industry. For instance, the next world Outgames will be held in Copenhagen in 2009 and this event is hosted in conjunction with Wonderful Copenhagen, the official tourism organisation for the Greater Copenhagen area. There is a great deal that needs to be said about the alignment of global queer sporting and cultural events with the mainstream tourism industry. A growing body of work explores the operations of an emerging gay and lesbian niche tourism industry (see for instance, Murray, 2007; Podmore, 2006; Puar, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c; Rushbrook, 2002; Waitt & Markwell, 2006). However, I argue that scholars need to look more closely at the ways in which mainstream tourism relies on the presence of gay and lesbian events to give their city, state/province or country a global, cosmopolitan edge.

Another noteworthy GLISA emergence is the recent establishment of regional Outgames competitions. In July, 2007 Calgary, Alberta, hosted the first North American regional competition and in February, 2008 Melbourne, Australia, will play host to the first Asia-Pacific Outgames. The former competition was used by the local tourism industry to reposition Calgary as more than just a typical city in the Canadian prairies. This area of the country, notoriously more conservative than other areas in Canada, used the Outgames as an opportunity to highlight the openness and inclusivity of Calgarians and to thus position the city as one amongst other global queer cities in the region (e.g. New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Montréal, Toronto, Vancouver). In a similar way, organisers of the 1st Asia-Pacific Outgames invite participants to come, ‘play with [their] neighbours’, emphasising the unique opportunity this competition offers to celebrate the diversity of the region and reposition it within the broader ‘queer world’ as a much more significant player.

There is a need to think through the practice of ‘regionalising’ the international gay and lesbian sporting movement and to ask how this type of spatial ordering reinforces broader

---

152 Pan Idraet, the Danish umbrella GLBTI sporting organisation, is the other ‘partner’ for the event.
economic and political ‘regionalising’ trends. More importantly perhaps, consideration should be given to the ways in which the division of the queer sporting ‘world’ into smaller regions reinforces the strength and presence of some national queer (sporting) communities whilst leaving others on the periphery or the outside.

The Gay Games movement itself will be put to the test in 2010 when Team Cologne hosts the Eighth Gay Games. These Games will, once again, raise the question as to whether or not an event of this scale can be economically viable outside North America. Cologne’s promotional campaign also opens up a new set of exciting questions for the study of queer image-worlds. Cologne’s local movie production company, Carasana Films, has produced a short movie for the promotion of the event (see, www.games-cologne.com). The film brings the use of digital technologies at the Games to a whole new level. An animated stick figure morphs between human figure and sporting object (ball, stick, puck, racquet, javelin, bike) as it makes its way across Cologne’s queer urbanscape at a very exhilarating speed. It moves the viewer quickly through sporting venues, nightclubs, beer gardens, across parks and beaches, over bridges, up skyscrapers and into the middle of a gay pride parade. Again, this video signals the need to ask more questions about the relationships between ‘global’ gay and lesbian sporting events and the global queer tourism industry, but also about the role of images in forging these relationships. More attention needs to be given to the ways in which certain spaces are imagined by event organisers in their promotional and media campaigns and the ways in which these ‘imaginings’ reinforce divisions between local and global, urban and rural and urban and suburban. Attention should also be given to the ways in which neo-liberal (re)orderings of the urban environment produce and govern who the global queer citizen-subject is and who they can become.
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Additional Images

Figure A1: Gay Games flag arrives in Sydney for the 2002 Gay Games (Kellie Burns)

Figure A2: Gay Games flag at Sydney’s Mardi Gras ’06, official send-off to the Chicago 2006 Gay Games (Sydney Frontrunners)
Figure A3: Members of Team Sydney in their official team uniforms at Gay Games III: 
*Celebration 1990* in Vancouver, Canada (Dennis Johnson)

Figure A4: Members of Team Sydney in their official uniforms for Gay Games VI: 
*Under New Skies 2002* (Annette White)
Figure A5: Gay Olympic Games ticket, San Francisco 1982 (Australian Lesbian and Gay Archives)

Figure A6: New York City Games rainbow flag (Labrecque, 1994)
Figure A7: Rendez-Vous 2006 promotional campaign in 2002 (Team Montréal)
HELP PROTECT AUSTRALIA FROM TERRORISM

Small pieces of information from members of the public can help keep Australia safe from terrorism. Police and security agencies are working hard but you could help them complete the picture.

If you see anything suspicious call the 24-hour National Security Hotline on 1800 123 400. Our trained operators take every call seriously and you can remain anonymous.

Remember, every piece of information helps.

SOME THINGS TO LOOK OUT FOR

Terrorists rely on surprise, so there's no definitive list, however, local and overseas experience has given us some possible warning signs to look out for. Examples include:

- Unusual surveillance, videotaping or photography of official buildings, energy installations and important sites
- Vehicles parked near significant buildings or in busy public places for long periods of time
- Packages or bags abandoned in public places such as malls, buildings or train stations
- Suspicious purchases or possession of large quantities of fertilizer, chemicals or explosives
- Unusual use of accommodation such as garages being used at odd times of the day or night

1800 123 400

NATIONAL SECURITY HOTLINE

www.nathionalsecurity.gov.au

Figure A8: Australian Government Authorised Advertisement (Byron Shire Echo)

Figure A9: Inside Display, Supporter and Party Products Brochure (SGGB)
The Sydney 2002 Official Merchandise Outlets will be a one-stop shop for athletes, family and friends to do their supporter and souvenir shopping.

All purchases of Official Licensed Merchandise helps support the Sydney 2002 Gay Games.

Official Merchandise Outlets

- Accreditation Centre, Sydney Town Hall
  (October 28 - November 9)

- City Hub, Hyde Park North
  Mini Hub, Sydney Olympic Park
  Physique, Convention Centre Darling Harbour
  Opening Ceremony, Aussie Stadium

Figure A10: Sydney 2002 official merchandise advertisement (McAdam, 2002)
Figure A11: Official merchandise souvenir cart at Homebush Stadium (Kellie Burns)

Figure A12: House in Camperdown, NSW decorated for Sydney 2002 (Kellie Burns)
Proud sponsor of the Gay Games.

Understanding. Commitment. Respect. Qantas is proud to offer these values as a sponsor and supporter of the 2002 Gay Games. That's the spirit. The Spirit of Australia.
quantas.com

Figure A13: Qantas Pride Advertisement (McAdam, 2002)
Figure A14: Trick or Treat?, Aussie Bodies Protein Whip, Featured in *Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Official Guide* (SGGB)
Figure A15: Advertisement for Ansell LifeStyles Extra Strong Condoms, Featured in *Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Guide* (SGGB)
Figure A16: Ansell Strawberry Lubricant Advertisement featured in *Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Official Guide* (SGGB)
Work Out
Feel Great

Shop in the same place
• Just 5 minutes from Surry Hills, up Alison Road past the race course
• State of the art fitness centre
• Best quality & selection of fresh food & groceries in the Eastern Suburbs; includes a multi-award winning fruit & vegetable market, outstanding continental deli, meats, fish, chicken, pasta, bread, health food, liquor store & grocery store/supermarket.
• Big selection of services including post office, all major banks at our doorstep, medical centre, dry cleaner, beautician, car wash, to name a few.
• Over 70 specialty stores including gifts, fashion & one of the most exquisite florist’s you’ll ever find.
• Open 7 Days
• Easy undercover parking

Figure A17: Royal Randwick Shopping Centre Advertisement, featured in Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Official Guide (SGGB)
Figure A18: Dirtcheapcameras.com.au Advertisement, Sydney 2002 Gay Games Special Edition of *Blue* magazine (October, 2002)
Interflora...

...leap into the spirit of the Gay Games 2002.

Call your local Interflora florist
Interflora Flowerline 1800 808 500
www.interflora.com.au

Figure A19: Interflora Flowers World Wide Advertisement, Sydney 2002 Gay Games Special Edition of Blue magazine (October, 2002)
Figure A20: ‘After FX?’, Aussie Body Advertisement in *Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Official Guide* (SGGB)
Figure A21: Sydney 2002 Gay Games participant passport (Kellie Burns)

Figure A22: Gay Games information flyer from Sydney hotel (Park Lodge Hotel)
Figure A23: Sydney 2002 official City of Sydney Map #1 (SGGB)

Figure A24: Sydney 2002 official map of western suburbs (SGGB)
Figure A25: Central city map with image of the Opera House (SGGB)
Figure A26: Sydney 2002 Official City of Sydney Olympic Stadium (SGGB)

Figure A27: Digital score board at Sydney 2002 diving competition (Stuart Borrie)
Figure A28: Welcoming participants to the Sydney Olympic Park (Kellie Burns)

Figure A29: Welcoming participants to the Sydney Olympic Park (Kellie Burns)
Figure A30: Flags to mark off the ‘Hub’ of Sydney 2002, Hyde Park (Kellie Burns)
Figure A31: Vendors setting up in Hyde Park, the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Hub (Kellie Burns)

Figure A32: Sydney 2002 information office, Oxford Street (Kellie Burns)
Figure A33: Bridge climb advertisement for men (McAdam, 2002)

Figure A34: Bridge climb advertisement for women (Lesbians on the Loose)
Figure A35: Sydney 2002 participants socialising on Oxford Street, Sydney  

(The Sydney Morning Herald)

Figure A36: Aerobics participants celebrating their victory at the Sydney Opera House

(The Sydney Morning Herald)
Figure A37: Ignatius Jones and Drag Diva prepare for the Sydney 2002 opening ceremonies (The Sydney Morning Herald)

Figure A38: Inside cover of Priscilla 10th Anniversary Special Edition DVD
Figure A39: Adventures of Priscilla Queen of the Desert, The Musical (The Sydney Morning Herald)

Figure A40: ‘Captain Canada’ waits for her entrance into the Stadium (Kellie Burns)
Figure A41: Athlete waiting for entrance in Aussie Stadium (Kellie Burns)

Figure A42: Sydney 2002 Ceremony and Party Flyer (SGGB)
Figure A43: Advertisement for Sydney '02 featuring the ‘fabulous’ Harbour Bridge (McAdams, 2002)

Figure A43: Taylor Square ‘rainbow’ to mark the Sydney 2002 Gay Games (Kellie Burns)
Figure A45: Queer Sporting Nation party, October advertisement (Kate Hansen)
Chicago-based Jam Productions Will Produce 2006 Gay Games Ceremonies

Television Ceremonies Take Place in July of 2006 at Soldier Field, Wrigley Field, and Millennium Park

When 12,000 athletes and artists march into the Gay Games VII Opening Ceremony at Soldier Field on 15 July 2006, proudly watching with 40,000 or more spectators will be a production “dream team” put together by Chicago’s very own Jam Productions.

Chicago Games, Inc. (CGI) today announced that Chicago-based Jam Productions has been selected to produce the ceremonies associated with Gay Games VII in Chicago. The 34-year old firm was selected by the CGI Board of Directors after a rigorous five-month review process which attracted bids from top producers around the USA.

Figure A46: Biame featured on the Chicago 2006 Gay Games website (Team Chicago)
Appendix B

Opening Ceremony Address for Sydney 2002: Under New Skies

Courage¹⁵³

Under different skies, at the beginning of a new millennium, in an old land and a young nation, we join together in the hope and conviction that the future will be kinder and more just than the past.

At a time when there is so much fear and danger, anger and destruction, this event represents an alternative vision struggling for the soul of humanity. This is the competitive idea for all of us: Acceptance. Diversity. Inclusiveness. Participation. Tolerance and joy. Ours is a world of love, questing to find the common links that bind all people. We are here, because whatever our sexuality we know that the days of exclusion are numbered.

This is a great night, a great night for Australia because we are a nation in the process of reinventing ourselves. We began our modern history by denying our indigenous peoples and their rights. We embraced White Australia. Women could play little part in public life - their place was in the kitchen. And as for gays and lesbians, transgender, bisexuals, intersex and other sexual minorities, they were an abomination. Lock’em up, throw away the key. Well, we have not corrected all these wrongs, but we are surely on the road to enlightenment and there will be no U-turns.

Little did my partner Johan, who is up there in the stadium, little did he know, thirty years ago as we danced the night away at the Purple Onion, less than a mile from this place, that we would be at the opening of a Gay Games with the Representative of her majesty the Queen and all of you, to bear witness to such a revolution. Nor did I think, nor did we think, that we would be in a football stadium dancing with the Governor and that the Governor would be a woman! True, true it is we rubbed shoulders on that dance floor with Knights of the Realm such as Sir Robert Helpmann and with a future Premier such as Don Dunstan. But if an angel

¹⁵³ I transcribed this speech from the video recording of opening ceremonies (Heil, 2002a). For whatever reasons, speeches published in various gay community papers were not complete or correct transcriptions of Kirby’s address. Two significant omissions should be noted: First, Kirby makes a point of including bisexual, transgender and intersex people in his description of the queer community and yet this was not printed in the Sydney Morning Herald or in any of the community papers other than the Melbourne Star Observer (MSO). Also, the places in which Kirby address the crowd in French were either paraphrased in English or excluded in the published version of the speech.
had tapped us on our youthful and beautiful shoulders and told us of tonight we would have
said, Impossible! Well, nothing is impossible to the human spirit, and science and truth
ultimately prevail. So here we are tonight, men and women, indigenous and newcomers, black
and white, Australians and visitors, religious and atheist, young and not so young, straight and
gay – together!

It’s put best in your programmes (and in the sober light of morning you must read the
programme) by Corey Czok, an Australian basketballer in the Games. He says: “It’s good to
be able to throw out the stereotypes – we’re not all sissies, we don’t all look the same and
we’re not all pretty!” Now, you may think that his last comment should be disputed because
real beauty lies in the fact that we are here united, not in negatives of hate and exclusion, so
common, but in the positives of love and inclusion.

The changes over the past thirty years wouldn’t have happened if it hadn’t been for people
of courage who rejected the common ignorance about sexuality. Who taught that variations
are a normal and universal aspect of the human species, that they’re not going away, that
they’re no big deal, and that between consenting adults, we all just have to get used to it and
g et on with life.

My people of courage certainly include Oscar Wilde, his suffering, his interpretation of
suffering and the ordeal of others brought the changes we witness tonight. And, I would
include Alfred Kinsey. In the midst of the McCarthyist era in the United States he, and those
who followed him, dared to investigate the real facts about human sexual diversity. In
Australia, I also include as heroes politicians of every major political party, most of them
heterosexual. Over thirty years they have dismantled many of the unjust laws; but the first of
them was Don Dunstan. He proved once again, Don proved in South Australia, the
astonishing fact that good things sometimes happen when the dancing stops.

I’d also add Rodney Croome and Nick Toonen. They took Australia to the United Nations;
they took our country to the United Nations to get rid of the last criminal laws against gay
men in Tasmania. And now the decision in their name stands for the whole world. I’d include
Neal Blewett who led Australia’s first battle against AIDS. Judy Connelli, Molly Meldrum,
Robyn Archer, Kerryn Phelps, Ian Roberts and many, many others.

But this is not just an Australian story. In every land a previously frightened and oppressed
minority is awakening from a long sleep to assert its dignity. We should honour those who’ve
looked into themselves and spoken the truth, now they are legion, and it’s the truth that makes
us free. I think of Tom Waddell, the inspired founder of these Games. His last word, the last
words of his life were: “This should be interesting”. Well, look around, what an understatement. I think of Greg Louganis, twice Olympic gold medallist, who came out as gay and HIV positive and said that it was the Gay Games that emboldened him to tell it as it was. I too, like Roberto, think of Mark Bingham.

Je pense a Bertrand Dalanoe, le Maire ouvertement gai de Paris, poignardé a l’hôtel de Ville au course de la Nuit Blanche. Il a fait preuve d’un très grand courage, et il est un homme exceptionnel. And when the gay mayor of Paris was stabbed by a homophobe he commanded that the party at which it happened should dance til dawn. Do that in his honour tonight! Do it in honour of the Cairo 52. Do it in the honour of the Sister Movement in Namibia. Do it for Al-Fatiha, the gay movement of Muslims. Do it for all who are struggling for their dignity.

And I think of all of you who have come together on this magical night to affirm the fundamental unity of all human beings. To reject ignorance, hatred, error and to embrace love which is the foundation of all human rights.

So, let the word go out from Sydney and the Gay Games of 2002 that the movement for equality is unstoppable! Its message will eventually reach the four corners of the world. And these Gay Games in Sydney will be another catalyst to help make that happen. Be sure, be very sure, in the end inclusion will replace exclusion, for the sake of the planet and for the sake of humanity it must be so.

Amusez-vous bien, et par l’exemple de nos vies defendons les droits de l’humanite. Non seulement pour les gays, pour tout le monde! Enjoy yourselves, and by our lives let us be an example of respect for human rights. No just for gays, for everyone!

The Honourable Justice Michael Kirby (AC CMG), 2002
## Appendix C

### Sydney 2002 programme overviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And Then There's Bea</td>
<td>Parade Theatre</td>
<td>Cabaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat On Your Backwards</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Cabaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Enrique &quot;Divine&quot;</td>
<td>Midnight Shift</td>
<td>Cabaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blak Kweer 'n Out There</td>
<td>Performance Space</td>
<td>Cabaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing Out to the World</td>
<td>Concert Hall, SOH</td>
<td>Choral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Choirs Concert</td>
<td>Art Gallery of NSW</td>
<td>Choral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starline Concert Series</td>
<td>Art Gallery of NSW</td>
<td>Choral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Strings &amp; Jock Straps</td>
<td>The Studio, SOH</td>
<td>Comedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate: All Artists are Gay...</td>
<td>Art Gallery of NSW</td>
<td>Comedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Love Leszie</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Comedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC/Beallity</td>
<td>University Of Technology</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International Australia</td>
<td>&quot;Y&quot; on the Park</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Cultures</td>
<td>Mortdale Town Hall</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Out</td>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health in Difference</td>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual Histories</td>
<td>Newcastle City Hall</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Studies</td>
<td>Newcastle Town Hall</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Mambo</td>
<td>Seymour Centre</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a Boy Thing</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai'i Ho</td>
<td>New Theatre</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichanda</td>
<td>New Theatre</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondi Rocks</td>
<td>Bondi Pavilion</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Party</td>
<td>Fox Studios</td>
<td>Celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Party</td>
<td>Fleet Steps</td>
<td>Celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butch!</td>
<td>Dome</td>
<td>Celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Party</td>
<td>Dome + Morten</td>
<td>Celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farewell Party</td>
<td>Fox Studios</td>
<td>Celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adventures of Priscilla</td>
<td>Park Cinema</td>
<td>Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Chi</td>
<td>Park Cinema</td>
<td>Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag King Dred</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion Play</td>
<td>ASN Gallery 3</td>
<td>Play Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetic Justice: Poetry Slam</td>
<td>Woolloomooloo Hotel</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Fit to Print</td>
<td>State Library of NSW</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello Kitty</td>
<td>Mardi Gras Club</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Best</td>
<td>ASN Gallery</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Love Goes Wrong</td>
<td>ASN Gallery</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Taronga Zoo</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Taronga Zoo</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High T</td>
<td>Taronga Zoo</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Attraction</td>
<td>Call of Broken Dreams</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But Isn't it Meant to Rhyme?</td>
<td>Hollywood Hotel</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Apart</td>
<td>Woolloomooloo Hotel</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Fire</td>
<td>Woolloomooloo Hotel</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of Gay Australian Writing</td>
<td>Midnight Shift</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Off the Press: New Fiction</td>
<td>Senate Nightclub</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Word</td>
<td>Senate Nightclub</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita Seckville-West</td>
<td>State Library of NSW</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Writer's Life: Felice Picano</td>
<td>Woolloomooloo Hotel</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathe</td>
<td>ARQ Nightclub</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Love the Nightlife</td>
<td>Sydney Town Hall</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Stage to Screen</td>
<td>Concert Hall, SOH</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Little Twilight Music</td>
<td>Paddington Town Hall</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All About Love</td>
<td>Government House</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Freedman</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach: A Sonic Exhibition</td>
<td>Performance Space</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegies for Angels, Punks...</td>
<td>Parade Theatre</td>
<td>Music Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick Me</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Music Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Flesh</td>
<td>New Theatre</td>
<td>Music Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindy</td>
<td>Opera Theatre, SOH</td>
<td>Opera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure C1: Sydney 2002 cultural programme (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Guide)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body-Celebration of the Machine</td>
<td>The Studio, SOH</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Defied</td>
<td>New Theatre</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Maiden Aunt’s Story</td>
<td>Paddington Town Hall</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Screen</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Play Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming Together</td>
<td>Luna Park (ACT)</td>
<td>Standby Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Ceremony</td>
<td>Aussie Stadium</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboree</td>
<td>Fox Studios</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grand Ball</td>
<td>Sydney Town Hall</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania - Pacific Paradise Party</td>
<td>Sydney Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Manfield</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Food &amp; Wine Fair 2003</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's Get Physical</td>
<td>Convention Centre</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool On Ice</td>
<td>Marigold Ice Rink</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Spectacular Finals</td>
<td>Sydney Town Hall</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquamania</td>
<td>Sydney Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics Finals</td>
<td>Paddington Town Hall</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Finals</td>
<td>North Sydney Sports</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey Finals</td>
<td>Canterbury Ice Rink</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>Sydney Athletic Centre</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Finals</td>
<td>State Sports Centre</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>Anna Clark Centre</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Aids</td>
<td>Playhouse, SOH</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His Spirit Flies</td>
<td>Riverside Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His Spirit Flies</td>
<td>New Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Life as a Dyke</td>
<td>Paddington Uniting Church Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Life as a Dyke Too</td>
<td>Paddington Uniting Church Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink Ladies and Steak</td>
<td>Newtown Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallowing Geography</td>
<td>New Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falling Off the Edge</td>
<td>New Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Architect &amp; the Emperor of Assyria</td>
<td>Downstairs, Balmain St Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Queer Theatre/Sports</td>
<td>Ragers Studio</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chapels of Love</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Sex</td>
<td>Taronga Zoo</td>
<td>Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Balloon to Boot Boys</td>
<td>The Studio Foyer, SOH</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destiny Deacon + Rene</td>
<td>Art Gallery of NSW</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queering the Streets</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Public Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International AIDS Memorial Quilt</td>
<td>Convention &amp; Exhibition</td>
<td>Community Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With and Without You</td>
<td>Ian Dagnall Gallery</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Jones / Simon Stirling</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>display</td>
<td>Museum of Sydney</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Everlasting Story</td>
<td>Object Gallery</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Lives</td>
<td>Parliament House</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Sensational</td>
<td>Liverpool Museum</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwee Art</td>
<td>Boorall Gallery</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Obsessions</td>
<td>Toffs Gallery</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport + Water</td>
<td>Maritime Museum</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Identifications</td>
<td>Centre for Photography</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players &amp; Pushers/Pushers &amp; Players</td>
<td>Brenda *Joy Gallery</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson / Scott / McRae + Jordan</td>
<td>Photo Technica</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine Lorraine</td>
<td>Taylors Square</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not what I see</td>
<td>Taylors Square</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYBER/QUEER</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>New Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULSE &amp; Our Body of Work</td>
<td>ASN Gallery</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given a Sporting Stance</td>
<td>Sydney Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys + Sex</td>
<td>Olympic Boulevard</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports men</td>
<td>Kirkscoe Hotel</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>Performance Space</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate ENounters</td>
<td>Argyle Stores</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starfish Natives</td>
<td>Starfish Studios</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C2: Sydney 2002 cultural programme continued (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Guide)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics</td>
<td>Paddington Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Five Dock Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Ryde Aquatic Leisure Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>North Sydney Indoor Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowing - Tenpin</td>
<td>AMF Bankstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowing - Tenpin</td>
<td>AMF Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowing - Tenpin</td>
<td>AMF Parramatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Centennial Parklands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Royal Botanic Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Western Sydney MTB Course Yarramundi Regional Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>Sydney Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>Sydney Aquatic Centre Sydney Olympic Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>Sydney International Hockey Stadium Sydney Olympic Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Skating</td>
<td>Macquarie Ice Rink North Ryde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool On Ice Show</td>
<td>Macquarie Ice Rink North Ryde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Moore Park Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>Canterbury Ice Rink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>Sydney Indoor Sports Centre East Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon</td>
<td>Sydney Indoor Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>Anne Clark Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool Billiard</td>
<td>Caesars Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlifting</td>
<td>Cook and Phillip Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>Sir David Martin Resort (Main office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Football)</td>
<td>Meadowbank Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Georges River Softball Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>Sydney University Aquatic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>Sydney University Manning Squash and Tennis Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Sydney Aquatic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquamania</td>
<td>Sydney Aquatic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td>Anne Clark Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Sydney International Tennis Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Centre Tennis Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Illawarra Tennis Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Powells Creek Tennis Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch Rugby</td>
<td>Centennial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>Sydney Athletic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon</td>
<td>Sydney International Regatta Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>State Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Sydney Indoor Sports Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpolo</td>
<td>Sydney Aquatic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water polo</td>
<td>Sydney University Sports and Aquatic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>Anne Clark Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TOURNAMENT OF THE MINDS*

| Bridge | Novotel |
| Chess | Novotel |

Figures C3: Sydney 2002 sports programme (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Cultural Festival Guide)
Appendix D

Cover images from Sydney 2002 promotional materials

Figure D1: Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI Official Guide (McAdam, 2002)
Figure D2: Display, supporter and party product catalogue (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board (SGGB))
Figure D3: Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI pamphlet (SGGB)

Figure D4: Sydney 2002 participant travel pass (SGGB)
Figure D5: Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI logo pamphlet (SGGB)

Figure D6: Sydney 2002 fold-out transport guide (SGGB)
Figure D7: On-field view of On-field/Off-field pamphlet (SGGB)

Figure D8: Off-field view of On-field/Off-field pamphlet (SGGB)

Figure D9: ‘Blood, sweat and queers’ promotional flyer (SGGB)
Figure D10: Women at Sydney 2002 pamphlet (SGGB)
Figure D11: Black Party flyer (SGGB)
Figure D12: Butch Party flyer (SGGB)
Figure D13: Business Supporters guide (SGGB)

Figure D14: Mini Cultural Festival guide (SGGB)
Figure D15: Federation of Gay Games pamphlet (FGG)
Appendix E
Summary of Data Collected

Sydney 2002 Gay Games Documents

In addition to all of the official Sydney 2002 print promotional materials (see Appendix D) and the official website (www.sydney2002.org.au) information, the following items were collected and used for this analysis:

Archives Pre-2002
- Gay Games I, Official Programme
- Gay Games IV, Official Programme
- Triumph in '86 newsletters
- Sydney 2002 Official Bid Documents
- Sydney 2002 Bid Presentation to Team Melbourne

Photographic Collections
- Australian Gay and Lesbian Archives Photographic Collection
- Private Collection (Kellie Burns)
- Private Collection (Kate Hansen)
- Private Collection (Annette White)
- Private Collection (Bernadette Walsh)
- Private Collection (Dennis Johnson)
- Private Collection (Stuart Borrie)
- Private Collection (Karen Lambert)

Mainstream Broadsheets
- The Sydney Morning Herald
- The Melbourne Age
- The Australian
- The New York Times
- The Globe and Mail

Gay and Lesbian Broadsheets
- Sydney Star Observer (1 January 2002 – present)
- Queensland Pride (11 October 2002)
Gay and Lesbian Magazines

- *Lesbians on the Loose*
- *Blue* (September 2002 – Gay Games Special Edition)
- *DNA* (November 2002, Gay Games Souvenir Issue)
- *Queensland gay and lesbian visitor’s guide*
- *Sydney gay and lesbian visitor’s guide*
- *Gay and lesbian guide Adelaide and South Australia*
- *Sydney Gay and Lesbian Business Association Business Directory*

Sydney 2002 Advertising Flyers for Specific Events

- The Official Video Guide to Sydney 2002 Gay Games
- People Living with HIV/AIDS (NSW) Inc.
- Health in Difference 4: Fourth national lesbian, gay, transgender and bisexual health conference
- *Food of love* (Ventura Pons)
- Pristine Latrine
- Flesh: Memo
- Display (Andy Davey)
- Starfish Natives, photographs on canvas
- Body: Celebration of the Machine (Amanda Owen and Donna Jackson)
- Foreign Aids (Pieter-Dirk Uys)
- Swallowing Geography (Lex Lindsay)
- Gay Games VI in Newtown
- Just Sensational!: Queer histories of Western Sydney

Additional Items

- Minutes from Team Melbourne (9 December 1996) and private correspondence of Team Melbourne (1996)
- Media launch of Sydney 2002 Gay Games Bid (26 March 1997)
- *Pulse: Lesbian and Gay Sport, Culture and Recreation Newsletter* (Summer 1997)
- Sydney Opera House Events Calendar Nov./Dec. 2002
- *Stop Violence: A guide to dealing with anti-lesbian and anti-gay violence*
- Sydney City Shopping Map
- *Fellow Traveller: The 2002 gay and lesbian accommodation guide to Australia*
Broadcast & Audio-visual


DV8TV coverage of Sydney 2002 (Includes five short television segments, see bibliography, DV8TV, 2002a – 2002e)

Participant Brochures

- GALIB, gay and lesbian private health insurance
- Fox Studios
- Eatstreetsatnight
- Stonewall Inn
- Aussie Bodies
- City Rail
Appendix F
List of Gay Games Sponsors

Major Sponsors

- American Airlines
- Aussie Bodies
- City of Sydney
- Gay.com
- South Sydney Council
- Qantas Airlines

Partners

- dattatech
- DNA Magazine
- Genre
- Sydney Star Observer (SSO)

Sponsors

- Ansell
- Avillion Hotel Sydney
- Cody Premium Outdoor
- Curve magazine (US)
- Diva magazine (UK)
- DNA Creative Sydney
- Four Points Sheraton Sydney
- Gay Australian Guide
- Gay Times (UK)
- Hertz
- Hotel Inter-Continental Sydney
- Hot Water, Still Mineral Water
- Melbourne Community Voice
- Newtown Hotel
- Nova 96.9
- Novatel Hotel, Sydney Olympic Park
- Passport magazine (US)
- Queensland Pride
- Rosemount Estate
- Sheraton on the Park Hotel Sydney
• Vodafone
Appendix G
Declaration of Montréal

Preamble

'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights'. This famous first sentence of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted almost sixty years ago by the General Assembly of the United Nations, still contains in a nutshell our political agenda, as lesbian, gay, bisexual transgender, transsexual, transitioned and intersexual persons.

The world has gradually accepted that individual human beings have different sexes, racial or ethnic origins, and religions, and that these differences must be respected and not be used as reasons for discrimination. But most countries still do not accept two other aspects of human diversity: that people have different sexual orientations and different gender identities that two women or two men can fall in love with each other; and that a person's identity, as female or male or neither, is not always determined by the type of body into which they were born.

Refusal to accept and respect these differences means that oppression of LGBT people is still a daily reality in most parts of the world. In some countries, discrimination and violence against LGBT people are getting worse. But more and more, brave individuals and groups are standing up for LGBT human rights in every region of the world. In particular, LGBT individuals and groups in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Eastern Europe no longer accept prejudice and discrimination, and are becoming increasingly impatient to achieve freedom and equality. But progress is very uneven and is not automatic. Worldwide, we are seeing advances and setbacks.

Progress in realizing LGBT human rights demands multi-layered change in all parts of the world: rights must be secured, laws changed, new policies designed and implemented, and institutional practices adapted. LGBT individuals and groups are the prime agents of change. But we will only win if we enlist others as allies in our struggle. The purpose of this declaration is to list and explain the changes that we need, and build an agenda for global action.

1. ESSENTIAL RIGHTS

A first demand is to safeguard and protect the most basic rights of LGBT people, rights which are well established and not legally controversial.

(a) Protection against state and private violence

- Nine countries punish homosexuality with the death penalty – a human rights violation in itself, regardless of the reason for imposing the sentence.
· Extradually, we witness in many countries torture and other violence against - and sometimes killings of - LGBT individuals simply because they are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender. These hate crimes are committed by private actors (with the active help or passive condonation of public officials, as at some pride marches), or by police, soldiers and other public officials themselves. These hate crimes against LGBT individuals are a subject of growing concern; many states are failing in their obligation to protect LGBT persons from this violence.

· In many parts of the world, LGBT individuals are still forced to marry a person of the opposite sex against their will, and risk heavy penalties (including violence and death at the hands of members of their families) if they try to escape such arrangements. Forced marriages are indisputably a human rights violation that must be combated.

· Intersexual individuals experience a particular form of violence, in the form of genital mutilation resulting from unnecessary post-birth surgery designed to make them conform to a rigid binary model of physical sex characteristics.

(b) Freedom of expression, assembly and association

· In a number of countries, LGBT human rights groups and courageous LGBT individuals see their rights to free expression, assembly and association blocked by hostile public authorities. Pride marches are denied permits, journalists are jailed, clubs are closed, and NGOs are refused registration. Without the essential right of LGBT non-governmental organisations to carry on their work, free of repressive and discriminatory restrictions, it can become impossible to campaign for the reform of discriminatory laws LGBT activists are entitled to protection and support, and to express themselves without fear of retribution, just like other human rights defenders.

(c) Freedom to engage in (private, consensual, adult) same-sex sexual activity

· Seventy-five countries — over one third of the countries in the world — still have laws in place criminalizing same-sex sexual acts between consenting adults. Acts that harm nobody. Under international human rights standards, this violates the right to privacy, as recognised by the UN Human Rights Committee in its Toonen decision in 1994, and is also discrimination; a refusal to recognise the equal dignity and worth of LGBT individuals. Even where such laws are not enforced in practice, they stigmatise, perpetuate prejudices, encourage blackmail and intimidation, and serve as justifications for other forms of discrimination.

> We urge the international community to put pressure on the governments of countries that keep violating the essential human rights of LGBT people.
> We demand an immediate end to use of the death penalty worldwide—especially for the so-called "crime" of same-sex sexual activity between consenting adults.
> We demand that national governments and international organisations develop and implement effective policies to prevent, investigate and punish hate crimes based on sexual orientation or gender identity.
> We demand that genital surgery on intersexual persons be prohibited unless they are old enough to understand it and consent to it.
> We demand that international organizations (at the global and regional levels) systematically monitor the human rights situation of LGBT people and widely publicize their findings.
> We call on the international community to protect and give political and financial support to LGBT human rights defenders and organisations, in particular in those countries of the world where LGBT persons still have to fear for their lives or their safety on a daily basis.
> We demand that national governments and international organisations make their international development aid conditional on real progress concerning respect for human rights, including the human rights of LGBT people.
> We demand the repeal of all laws criminalizing private, consensual, adult, same-sex sexual activity.

2. GLOBAL ISSUES

A world where LGBT human rights are systematically violated, is a world where nobody can feel safe and free. 'All human rights are universal, indivisible and interdependent and interconnected' (World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna, 1993).
LGBT identities or practices have existed and continue to exist in every culture and corner of the world; they are simply part of the human condition. Fighting ignorance and prejudice remains our first priority. More information about LGBT persons, and more openness on the part of LGBT persons (when this can be done safely), are conditions for further progress to be made.

- We therefore call for the preparation of a world-wide information campaign.
- We ask the organizers of the International Conference on LGBT Human Rights at the 2nd World Outcomes in Copenhagen in 2009 to launch such a campaign.
- We demand the support of like-minded NGOs and sympathetic governments in the preparation and running of the campaign.

LGBT people do not live on an island, but form part of all societies, and rightly expect that their situations and their demands will be taken into account in formulating all public policies. Accordingly, LGBT human rights must be mainstreamed into global debates about social and political issues. This can only be achieved if the international LGBT human rights movement takes part in wider struggles, such as the fight for development and fair trade, worldwide social and economic rights, and international peace and stability. LGBT human rights may seem a far cry in those parts of the world where coping with poverty and violence top the daily agenda. Working to overcome these problems, however, should include working for better living conditions for LGBT individuals.

One crucial global issue is the HIV/AIDS pandemic. "Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS." That is UN Development Goal number 6, with a target date of 2015, endorsed by 189 Heads of State and Government in 2000. This goal can only be reached by deploying a human-rights-based approach that includes the human rights of LGBT individuals. Criminalizing sexual activity between men, and banning freedom of expression for LGBT groups, still common practices in some countries, have a directly detrimental effect on the prevention of HIV/AIDS. Access to information, adequate health services, and the elimination of violence and discrimination are crucial for both the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS.

- We urge governments to stop threating LGBT groups which spread information on the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS among LGBT individuals, but instead to make it their own responsibility to include LGBT people in their fight against HIV/AIDS.
- We urge donor countries and international institutions to step up their aid programmes for the prevention of HIV/AIDS, and work with local LGBT health groups to ensure that LGBT people are included in these programmes.
- We demand the removal of morality-based restrictions on HIV/AIDS education, prevention and treatment campaigns, including restrictions on promoting the use of condoms.

Another global issue is asylum. Our primary goal is to work for a safe environment in every country, so that LGBT people do not need to leave their countries because of fear for their lives. But every nation has an obligation to grant asylum to persons persecuted on the basis of their race, religion, political opinion and the like. LGBT persons who have a well-founded fear of persecution, by state or non-state actors, based on their sexual orientation or gender identity, must find similar protection within the framework of the 1951 Geneva Refugee Convention. A growing number of countries explicitly interpret this Convention in this way. And so does the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. We think that more countries should follow their example.

- We demand that national governments explicitly recognize in their national laws and practices a right to asylum based on a well-founded fear of persecution because of sexual orientation or gender identity.
- We demand that the UN High Commissioner for Refugees step up his actions to convince national governments to implement the Guidelines on Gender-related Persecution, adopted in 2002.

A third global issue: migration. The world is getting smaller and smaller; more and more people travel the world, make friends, and meet lovers who sometimes become partners. But most countries deny bi-national same-sex couples the right of one partner to sponsor the other for immigration, which different-sex married couples take for granted. Even same-sex couples who have a marriage certificate or a registered partnership, recognized by the country of origin of one of the partners, cannot be sure of their status when they move somewhere else.
We demand of our respective national governments residence rights for our partners from abroad under the same conditions as different-sex married couples, without discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation or gender identity.

We demand that international treaties on these matters be reformed and grant same-sex couples the same rights as different-sex married couples.

The United Nations has so far been unwilling or unable to recognize that LGBT rights are human rights, and fully incorporate LGBT issues into its human rights work. Some specific UN treaty bodies and special rapporteurs have taken LGBT rights into account. But in 2005, the UN Commission on Human Rights refused for the third time to decide on a general resolution on 'Human Rights and Sexual Orientation', first tabled by Brazil in 2003. And in 2006, the Economic and Social Council of the UN for the third time refused to grant consultative status to ILGA – the International Lesbian and Gay Association – as in 1992, in 1994 (when the consultative status granted in 1993 was suspended) and in 2002.

We will continue knocking on the door of the United Nations. We do not accept that a world organisation can be closed to a specific part of the Earth’s population, and can decide that it does not want to deal with their issues.

We therefore urge governments to put LGBT human rights on the agenda of the new UN Human Rights Council, and to work for the adoption of a text, that will give a mandate to the Council and to other UN bodies to deal with LGBT human rights as a normal part of their work.

We demand that ILGA and other LGBT organisations be granted the place they deserve among the many other NGOs that are entitled to consult with the Human Rights Council.

We urge the Human Rights Committee and other UN treaty bodies to integrate the systematic monitoring of LGBT human rights into their work.

We call upon lawyers, human rights institutions, and NGOs to continue studying which human rights of LGBT individuals are protected by existing international human rights treaties, and whether there are any gaps in the protection these treaties provide. This could lead to a discussion of the potential benefits of a UN Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Discrimination (CESCOD).

We urge all UN Special Procedures to address LGBT human rights issues within their relevant mandates.

3. THE DIVERSE LGBT COMMUNITY

Our demand that the heterosexual, non-transgender majority respect our human rights and our diversity does not stop at our own doorstep. We must also work to build an LGBT community that is open to all, and offers fair chances to everyone, regardless of their sex, race, religion, disability, age, economic status or other similar characteristic.

We must fight discrimination within our own ranks. We cannot tolerate sexism and racism inside our movement. We are Muslims, Christians, Jews, non-believers, Buddhists, Hindus, Sikhs, and humanists. Among us, we have every form of disability, members of every age group, and members of every social and economic class.

The growing visibility and activism of LGBT groups in the Global South must be taken into account. We must work as hard as we can to make it possible for LGBT activists from Asia, Africa, Latin America and Eastern Europe to participate in the global LGBT human rights movement on an equal footing. Our long-term goal, as resources permit, should be much more proportionate representation of the Global South at international LGBT conferences. We must remember that 88% of LGBT people live in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Eastern Europe.

The unequal position of women inside the our movement reflects the still unequal power relations between women and men in the world as a whole. Despite all the progress made over the last few decades, women are still in a different sex, and lesbian women are no exception. We must therefore seek more co-operation with the women’s movement, and stress our common ground. The commonality is our right to control our own bodies and to choose how we live our own lives. Our joint goal is to challenge the rigidity of the fixed roles allocated to women and men, and the dominance of heterosexual male norms and interests. This joint goal is not something marginal, but is part of the core business of the LGBT human rights movement.

Transgender, transsexual, transitioned and intersexed individuals have become a more and more visible part of our movement, and have seen some of their demands taken on board. Non-transgender lesbian, gay and bisexual
persons will have to recognise that questioning the meaning of sex, and challenging rigid gender roles, are in fact two sides of the same coin. Transgender issues therefore should be considered as part and parcel of our common struggle for equality and dignity.

- We recommend that international LGBT organisations expand their pools of candidates for leadership positions by offering training courses, information seminars and the like to new – female, male or transgender – activists from Asia, Africa, Latin America and Eastern Europe.
- We ask the organizers of the International Conference on LGBT Human Rights at the 2nd World Outgames in Copenhagen in 2009 to make an extra effort to realise an equal participation of women and men to maximise participation from the Global South and from ethnic and cultural minorities, and to ensure full inclusion of transgender people and issues.
- We would also like to see at that conference more workshops on the role of women inside and outside our movement, and on increasing co-operation with the women’s movement.

4. PARTICIPATION IN SOCIETY

[a] General

In many countries, the fight against discriminatory rules and practices, started more than fifty years ago, has brought success. We are proud of the victories of the international LGBT human rights movement. As such we count:

- the elimination of homosexuality from the official list of psychiatric diseases;
- the long list of countries that have abolished discriminatory criminal laws;
- new constitutional equality clauses that explicitly mention sexual orientation;
- the growing number of countries, states, provinces, territories, counties or cities that have outlawed discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity;
- the still small, but growing, number of countries that have opened up legal marriage to same-sex couples;
- the more substantial increase in the number of countries that recognize registered same-sex partnerships;
- the increasing openness of LGBT people in public life in many countries, so that openly LGBT artists or politicians, for example, are no longer so unusual;
- the changes in public opinion that make it possible for LGBT individuals to be themselves and live their lives as they wish, without fear; and
- the growing number of public and private institutions, including human rights organisations, trade unions and other NGOs, that make it their responsibility to integrate the protection of LGBT human rights into their daily work

BUT, ...

These successes are only part of the story, and are valid for only a small part of the world. Much work still needs to be done. Over time, all sectors of society must be scrutinized for existing rules and practices that still hinder the free, open and equal participation of LGBT individuals. Among these sectors, specific priorities for action must be decided by the LGBT human rights movement in each country, depending on their local circumstances.

- We demand that all governments develop and implement a comprehensive policy against sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination in all sectors of society. This should preferably be done within the framework of an overall anti-discrimination policy designed to tackle all forms of discrimination in all spheres of life on all grounds - but without sweeping LGBT issues under the carpet.
- We demand that such an anti-discrimination policy focus on both legal equality, ending second-class treatment by the state, as well as on social equality, fighting discrimination and prejudice throughout society, including on the part of private parties.
- We demand that national parliaments hold their respective governments accountable; guaranteeing the rights of all citizens, including LGBT citizens.
- We demand that LGBT experts and organization be involved in the planning and execution of such policies and that the effects be properly monitored.
- We demand that LGBT human rights issues be mainstreamed in overall governmental policy-making. This means that, before decisions are taken, the effects of policy proposals on the situation of LGBT individuals must be identified and taken into account.
We urge international LGBT organisations to

- continue to monitor national policy-making on LGBT issues,
- design comparable indicators of progress and improve their databases documenting legislation and practices in different countries around the world,
- distribute information on best practices.

(b) By Sector

Fair chances in employment or business are essential for LGBT individuals to be economically independent, maintain self-esteem, and lead a fulfilling and productive life. Sexual orientation or gender identity discrimination in the workplace must be combated by all parties concerned, working together on the basis of well-designed programmes, that are properly monitored.

- We therefore endorse the Plans of Action adopted yesterday by the "Workers Out!" and "Out for Business!" conferences and will support the activities they have planned for the future.
- We demand that governments and public institutions set a good example, by eliminating discrimination against their LGBT employees, and promoting their equality and safety in the workplace.

LGBT people are not isolated individuals. We fall in love, and establish relationships and families – however configured. For many of us, these relationships and families are the most important parts of our lives. Unless they are legally recognized, our rights to equality and dignity cannot be fully secured. Indeed, many countries are willing to grant us equality in every area of our lives except in relation to our relationships and families, to ensure that our relationships and families are stigmatized as inferior. As a matter of simple equality, same-sex couples are entitled to the full range of relationship options available to different-sex couples, including marriage for those who choose it. Similarly, LGBT individuals and same-sex couples who are parents, or wish to become parents, are entitled to equal rights, and to equal access to the full range of parenting options available to heterosexual individuals and different-sex couples, including adoption, fostering, and use of medically assisted procreation. Doing justice to the changing realities of family life also entails recognizing and granting equal rights to non-marital relationships, and extending this option to all couples, without discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation or gender identity.

- We therefore demand that all governments that have not yet done so reform family law in order to reflect the growing diversity of family life,
  - by opening-up legal marriage to same-sex couples,
  - introducing similar partnership rights for all unmarried couples, and
  - ensuring equal access for all to every option for parenthood.

Education, the media, health care, and religion are social institutions of crucial importance to the success or failure of the struggle for LGBT human rights. Each has its own role to play and its own contribution to make.

- We demand that the competent (national or local) government authorities in charge of education policies, including school boards
  - include lessons on LGBT human rights in the school curriculum; and
  - take action to combat intimidation and violence against LGBT pupils and teachers.

- We demand that the mainstream media contribute to breaking down stereotypes, and promote a realistic visibility of LGBT people.

- We demand that health care facilities and individual health care providers be open to the special health needs of LGBT people, fight prejudice, and supply relevant information on a non-discriminatory basis.

- We demand that governments permit all medical treatment necessary for gender reassignment, that they fund such treatment to the same extent that their resources permit them to fund other medically necessary treatment, and that they amend their legislation so as to permit a transgender person to change their legal sex to the one that corresponds to their gender identity.
> We urge religious institutions and non-confessional organisations to put into practice the principles of tolerance and equality towards LGBT individuals among their own ranks, and to contribute to the fight for LGBT human rights in the world at large.

5. CREATING SOCIAL CHANGE

The legal, political and social changes that will bring LGBT individuals equal rights do not serve our interests only. In a society where some people are oppressed, nobody can be free and equal. Bringing about the changes we want must therefore be the result of the combined efforts of the LGBT human rights movement and other groups and organisations, which share our vision and our goals.

> We call on LGBT organisations to continue their fight for LGBT human rights in all countries, as well as at the international level, by
> • mobilizing their rank and file, enlarging their constituencies and broadening their bases of financial support;
> • promoting better cooperation, coordination and solidarity among the LGBT communities within countries, and throughout the world;
> • making more LGBT and non-LGBT individuals aware of the need of further global action, and invoking their sense of solidarity;
> • building strategic alliances and co-operation between different organisations and institutions inside and outside of the LGBT human rights movement;
> • strengthening their knowledge and expertise and making their actions more professional;
> • encouraging LGBT cultural activities, so as to show a living reality and use culture to get the message of LGBT equality across.

> We call on trade unions, professional organisations and NGOs working for human rights and social welfare to participate in our fight against discrimination, to lend us their support, and to share resources.

> We call on national and international companies to grant equal opportunities to their LGBT workers, cater for the needs of their LGBT customers, and meet their social responsibility by supporting the global fight for LGBT human rights.

> We call on religious institutions and non-confessional organisations to help their LGBT members to overcome traditional prejudices and fight homophobia among their own ranks and in the outside world.

> We call on funders to ensure that funding programmes support NGOs in working towards legal and social equality for LGBT people, by advancing all of the objectives set out in this Declaration.

> We call on national governments to protect the rights and promote the interests and well-being of all their citizens, including their LGBT citizens.

> We call on the international community to include LGBT human rights in the international human rights agenda, and to support and protect LGBT human rights defenders.

> And – last but not least – we call on all countries in the world, and on the United Nations, to recognize and promote the 17th of May each year as the International Day against Homophobia.

These are our demands. It will take tremendous courage, great personal sacrifice, and countless hours of hard work by many thousands of LGBT activists and friends of the global LGBT community. But our goal, equal rights for every LGBT person in every country of the world, can be and will be achieved.
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Gender Policy

Gay Games Contacts
As staff and committee membership may change please contact the Gay Games office for the officer responsible for the Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI Gender Policy on
Phone (612) 9235 7000, or check the website at http://www.sydney2002.org.au/
Sydney 2002 Gay Games also has the following relevant committees or working groups: Indigenous National Advisory Committee; Sydney 2002 Gay Games Women’s Advisory Group; and, Moana Pacifika (Sydney 2002 Gay Games Pacific Islands Advisory Group)

External Contacts
Transgender issues: The Gender Centre, PO Box 266, Petersham, NSW, Australia, 2049.
Phone: (612) 9569 2366; Fax: (612) 9569 1176; Email: gendercentre@bigpond.com;
Web: http://www.gendercentre.org.au/
Intersex issues: Androgen Insensitivity Syndrome (AIS) Support Group Australia,
PO Box 1089, Altona Meadows, Victoria, 3028. Phone: (613) 9315 8809;
Email: aissg@iprimus.com.au; Web: http://www.zicnet.net.au/~aissg
Australian Sports Commission, Participation Division: Phone: (612) 6214 1960;
Fax: (612) 6214 1640; Web: http://www.ausport.gov.au/
New South Wales Department of Sport and Recreation, Community Participation Unit, Locked Bag 1422, Concord West DC, NSW, Australia, 2138.
Phone: (612) 9006 3833; Fax: (612) 9006 3884; Email: ClientServicesCentre@dsr.nsw.gov.au;
Anti-Discrimination Board of New South Wales, PO Box A2122, Sydney South, NSW, Australia, 1235. Phone: (612) 9318 5444 Fax: (612) 9310 2235
Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, National Office, GPO Box 5218 Sydney NSW Australia 1042. Phone: (612) 9284 9600; Fax: (612) 9284 9611; Freecall (within
Australia) 1800 021 199; Complaints Infoline 1300 656 419; TTY: 1800 620 241;
Phone: (612) 9223 1044; Fax: (612) 9221 4746

Resources and Guides


Dedication

Tr. Vasanthi Shetty was a Nirwan Hijra who worked at the Humsafar Centre HIV/AIDS support service in Mumbai, India. Vasanthi died of HIV/AIDS in early 2002 at the age of 29. She came from a poor agricultural caste, but had overcome illiteracy and learnt working English. As a Nirwan Hijra, one of the traditional transgender identities of India, Vasanthi had been ritually castrated without medical supervision. Vasanthi became Hijra at 20 following abandonment by her boyfriend of six years, who left her to marry, as Vasanthi who was then a young man, could not have children. Hijra are generally confined to working as sex workers, beggars, or singers and dancers at weddings and births. They are highly marginalised, and generally extremely poor. Vasanthi was one person who moved beyond these restrictions. She undertook “barefoot” community health training, and managed the testing clinic at Humsafar, as well as supporting other HIV+ members of her community. Rather than either Mr. or Ms. she used the title “Tr.” (for Transgender), reflecting the emerging assertion of transgender empowerment she represented. No-one knew until very late that Vasanthi was HIV+. She had decided that as she could not get sustainable medication, there was no point making a fuss.

I was privileged to work with her for several months in 2001, and despite the tremendous suffering in her life she was a very warm and generous person, dedicated to her work, and her Goddess Yellama-Renuka Devi.

It has been Vasanthi I have always kept in mind as an inspiration while drafting the Sydney 2002 Gay Games Gender Policy, which for the first time in the history of the Gay Games, reflects the reality of Asia Pacific and Indigenous transgender experience. This policy is dedicated to her memory.

Quentin Buckle
Equity and Diversity Portfolio
Sydney 2002 Gay Games Board
Purpose

The Sydney 2002 Gay Games Gender Policy outlines the policy framework in which the Gay Games principles of Inclusion, Participation and Personal Best will be upheld in relation to Gender.

The Gender Policy also governs the basis on which gender accreditation decisions will be made for participation in Sydney 2002 Gay Games sports, and provides guidance where a person carries a passport or birth documents that describe the person as being of a gender other than the one with which the person identifies.

Persons in this situation will have to seek accreditation from the Sydney 2002 Gay Games to participate in sports as their chosen or self-identified gender identity.

Sydney 2002 Gay Games officials are bound to use this policy and the criteria provided, when accrediting transgender and intersex persons who carry passports or birth documents which do not agree with their chosen or self-identified gender.

Accordingly, this policy addresses: equity and diversity; consultation; gender; transgender; intersex conditions; Australian and NSW Law and Equal Opportunity; accreditation criteria; performance records and sanctioned events; drug testing; grievances and appeals; and privacy and confidentiality.

Equity and Diversity

Statement adopted by Sydney 2002 Board: 12 September 2001 Revised: 8 June 2002

Sydney 2002 Gay Games VI affirms the Gay Games principle of inclusion regardless of people’s sexual orientation, age, gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, political belief, physical ability, athletic/artistic ability, or HIV status. Noting the social exclusion lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) community members often face, Sydney 2002 will do all it can to enable inclusive participation reflecting the wide diversity of backgrounds and situations of our communities.

To achieve this Sydney 2002 affirms that facilitation of diversity and equity are underpinning principles to all policies, activities and operations.

The diversity principle recognises that participants, including LGBTI people, have diverse cultural, racial, gender, and religious identities, and have differing abilities, ages, economic resources, political views, family commitments and living environments.

The equity principle recognises that there are across all societies significant barriers to equal enjoyment of rights and to participation in the life of those societies.

In an Australian context, managing for equity and diversity provides a focus that is broader than just minority participation, and recognises the human rights of all. Equity is about
valuing diversity, and it is about fairness, impartiality, even-handedness. Equity is about providing an opportunity to participate to as wide a range of members as possible of our lesbian, gay, bisexual transgender and intersex communities.

This equity statement recognises the following may be significant barriers to this participation:

- Race
- Gender
- Disability
- Regional location
- Age
- Political constraints

Sydney 2002 has developed and is implementing an Equity in Diversity Workplan, of which this statement is a part. The Workplan provides for recognition of diversity and promotion of equity throughout Sydney 2002, and aims to reduce the impact of barriers to participation. The Workplan outlines specific actions to be taken in all areas of Gay Games VI. The Workplan sets targets for achieving specific equity in diversity outcomes, and addresses event management through:

- Commitment, policy and planning.
- Participation and public image.
- Administration and management.

The Workplan is a social contract between Sydney 2002 and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people and their supporters worldwide.

Finally, Sydney 2002 acknowledges that achieving equity is a long-term process. We are committed to identifying the need for further action and development as our legacy to future Gay Games.

**Harassment Free Events**

Sydney 2002 Gay Games endorses the principles espoused in the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) policy of Anti-harassment in Sport Strategy (see ASC Website: [www.ausport.gov.au](http://www.ausport.gov.au)). Although these ASC policies are designed primarily for sport, Sydney 2002 Gay Games will apply these principles across all events.

The Anti-harassment in Sport Strategy aims to create a safer sport environment by developing a system for dealing effectively and appropriately with and whenever possible preventing harassment in sport.

Sydney 2002 Gay Games notes and endorses the definition of harassment as provided by the ASC:

**Harassment consists of offensive, abusive, belittling or threatening behaviour directed at a person or people because of a**
particular characteristic of that person or people (including the person or persons' level of empowerment relative to the harasser). The behaviour must be unwelcome and the sort of behaviour a reasonable person would recognise as unwelcome.

(Harassment Free Sport)

Harassment in this context is deemed to include: sexual harassment, racial harassment; harassment on grounds of sexuality; and abusive behaviour generally. Further, in the context of this policy, Sydney 2002 Gay Games will not accept harassment on the basis of gender or gender identity.

Sydney 2002 Gay Games is committed to providing an environment free of harassment. We believe that anyone who works for us or represents us, and everyone with whom we deal, has the right to be treated with respect and dignity. We will not tolerate harassment within the Sydney 2002 Gay Games nor any of the associated activities. We will take complaints of harassment seriously, sensitively and confidentially. Disciplinary action can be taken against a person who is found in breach of this policy. See the Sydney 2002 Gay Games position paper, Harassment and Discrimination in the Workplace.

This policy applies to all employees and representatives of Sydney 2002 Gay Games, and also to officials, volunteers, and participants in and spectators at Sydney 2002 Gay Games events.

Consultation

This policy is built on previous policies of the Gay Games addressing gender issues, the most recent being the policy for the Amsterdam 1998 Gay Games.

Consultation has been carried out with the Gender Centre (Sydney), Australian Intersex Support (Australia), Sydney 2002 Women’s Advisory Group, Sydney 2002 National Indigenous Advisory Committee, AIDS Council of NSW Indigenous Officer, Moana Pacifika (Sydney 2002 Pacific Islands Working Group), Sydney 2002 Asia Committee and the Federation of Gay Games.

Gender

The Sydney 2002 Gay Games welcomes all people regardless of gender identity. Gender identities may include men, women, transgender or intersex. There are also a variety of ethno-local and Indigenous transgender identities. Gender is a social identity, and may or may not accord with the biological birth sex of the person (male, female, or intersex).

For the purposes of this policy the following definitions apply.