

Queer Singapore

Illiberal Citizenship and Mediated Cultures

Edited by

Audrey Yue and Jun Zubillaga-Pow



香港大學出版社

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong
www.hkupress.org

© Hong Kong University Press 2012

ISBN 978-988-8139-33-0 (*Hardback*)

ISBN 978-988-8139-34-7 (*Paperback*)

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed and bound by Liang Yu Printing Factory Ltd. in Hong Kong, China

Contents

Contributors	vii
Acknowledgements	xi
Introduction: Queer Singapore: A Critical Introduction <i>Audrey Yue</i>	1
Part 1 Cultural Citizenship and Queer Politics	
1. How to Bring Singaporeans Up Straight (1960s–1990s) <i>Aaron K. H. Ho</i>	29
2. Enforcement of 377A: Entering the Twilight Zone <i>Michael Hor</i>	45
3. Sexual Vigilantes Invade Gender Spaces: Religion and Sexuality in the AWARE Saga <i>Laurence Wai-Teng Leong</i>	59
4. “Oi, Recruit! Wake Up Your Idea!”: Homosexuality and Cultural Citizenship in the Singaporean Military <i>Chris K. K. Tan</i>	71
5. Transnational Lesbian Identities: Lessons from Singapore? <i>Shawna Tang</i>	83
6. Both Contagion and Cure: Queer Politics in the Global City-State <i>Simon Obendorf</i>	97
Part 2 Queer Media Cultures	
7. Photo Essay: A Brief History of Early Gay Venues in Singapore <i>Roy Tan</i>	117
8. The Negative Dialectics of Homonationalism, or Singapore English Newspapers and Queer World-Making <i>Jun Zubillaga-Pow</i>	149

9.	Impossible Presence: Toward a Queer Singapore Cinema, 1990s–2000s <i>Kenneth Chan</i>	161
10.	The Kids Are <i>Not</i> All Right: The Curious Case of Sapphic Censorship in City-State Singapore <i>Loretta Chen</i>	175
11.	“Singaporean by birth, Singaporean by faith”: Queer Indians, Internet Technology, and the Reconfiguration of Sexual and National Identity <i>Robert Phillips</i>	187
12.	“We’re the gay company, as gay as it gets”: The Social Enterprise of Fridae <i>Audrey Yue</i>	197
	Notes	213
	References	223
	Index	251

Contributors

Kenneth Chan is Associate Professor of Film Studies at the University of Northern Colorado. He is the author of *Remade in Hollywood: The Global Chinese Presence in Transnational Chinese Cinemas* (Hong Kong University Press, 2009), and his work has also appeared in academic journals such as *Cinema Journal*, *Discourse*, and *Camera Obscura*. He chairs the International Advisory Board of the Asian Film Archive, Singapore, and is a member of the editorial board of *Journal of Chinese Cinemas*.

Loretta Chen is described by *Harper's Bazaar* as "a force of nature", *The Straits Times* labels her "a Rebel with a Twist" and a "Wild Thing" whilst *The Peak* calls her a "critical arts entrepreneur". This multi-hyphenated queer scholar-turned-director topped her Master's cohort at the prestigious Royal Holloway College, University of London and received her PhD from UCLA-NUS. She is currently Visiting Professor and Artist in Residence at University of Toronto, and Creative Director of 360 Productions. Her recent production, *The F Word* received an Amnesty International Freedom of Speech Award nomination. An active campaigner, she was elected as Nominated Member of Parliament and is the ambassador for The Body Shop, Hermes and Evian's outreach programmes. Loretta has also recently been honoured as one of Asia's *Most Inspiring Women*.

Aaron K. H. Ho teaches at SIM University and has published articles on gender, film and Victorian literature in journals like *Genders*, *The Oscholars*, and *General Themes in Literature*. As an editor of *Blame It on the Raging Hormones*, a novella on a gay teenager in Singapore, he wishes to promote literature to the people and, with the help of a few friends, runs a reading group, 'queerbookclub' (<http://queerbookclub.wordpress.com>). He is about to complete his dissertation on Darwin.

Michael Hor is Professor at the Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore where he has taught and researched in criminal law and constitutional due process for over 20 years. He studied law at the National University of Singapore before completing graduate degrees at the Universities of Oxford and Chicago.

Laurence Wai-Teng Leong received his PhD from University of California San Diego. He has been teaching in the Sociology Department, National University of Singapore, in modules such as Human Rights, Mass Media, and Sexuality.

Simon Obendorf is Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Lincoln, United Kingdom. Educated at the University of Melbourne, he obtained degrees in politics and law, before completing a PhD in international relations. He has held academic positions in Australia, Singapore and the United Kingdom. Dr Obendorf's research utilises contemporary East and Southeast Asian materials to explore international theory and postcolonial futures. An Australian citizen, he is a founding member of the Melbourne-based Institute of Postcolonial Studies.

Robert Phillips received his PhD in sociocultural anthropology from the University of California, Irvine in 2008. He is currently a visiting lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Manitoba and is working on a monograph, based on his fieldwork, entitled "Little Pink Dot: Technology, Sexuality, and the Nation in Singapore".

Chris K. K. Tan received his PhD from the University of Illinois. He is Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology at Shandong University. As an anthropologist of the State, he studied the construction of cultural citizenship among Singaporean gay men for his dissertation. He currently researches the roles that the civil service plays in Singaporean state-formation.

Roy Tan is a medical practitioner with a passion for documenting Singapore's LGBT history. He started all the Singaporean LGBT-related articles in Wikipedia in 2005 and has amassed the most comprehensive collection of Singapore LGBT-related news broadcasts, documentaries and videos of local events on YouTube. Tan intended to organise Singapore's first gay pride parade at Hong Lim Park in 2008. This event later morphed into Pink Dot SG, a worldwide movement which "supports the freedom to love".

Shawna Tang is a PhD candidate at the Department of Sociology and Social Policy in the University of Sydney. She received her Master's degree in Sociology from the National University of Singapore. Her interest is in the convergence of postcolonial theory, transnational feminist critique and queer theory in engaging questions of modernity, globalisation, sexuality, gender, citizenship, state and nationalism.

Audrey Yue is Senior Lecturer in Cultural Studies at the University of Melbourne, Australia. She is the author of *Ann Hui's Song of the Exile* (2010) and co-editor of *AsiaPacifiQueer: Rethinking Genders and Sexualities* (2008), with Fran Martin, Peter Jackson and Mark McLelland, and *Mobile Cultures:*

New Media in Queer Asia (2003), with Chris Berry and Fran Martin. Her essays on queer Singapore appear in *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *Feminist Media Studies*, *Circuits of Visibility: Gender and Transnational Media Cultures*, and *Creativity and Academic Activism: Instituting Cultural Studies*. She is currently Chief Investigator in three Australian Research Council funded projects on Asian Australian cinema, transnational large screens and multicultural arts governance.

Jun Zubillaga-Pow is a final-year PhD candidate in music research at King's College, London. His interdisciplinary work draws upon contemporary French theory and social reception. As a queer theorist, Jun has written on the concepts of the body, space and cinema in Singapore. In addition to two forthcoming volumes on Singapore's music history, Jun is currently working on the idea of homonationalism in a Singaporean context.

Introduction

Queer Singapore

A Critical Introduction

Audrey Yue

Introduction

Singapore remains one of the few countries in Asia that has yet to decriminalise homosexuality. Yet it has also been hailed by many as one of the new emerging gay capitals of Asia. This paradox has underpinned the telos of its postcolonial development, and rose to fore in 2007 when the penal code against same-sex intercourse was deliberated in parliament. The topic rekindled old grudges and a hoard of sentimental differences fomented in the public sphere. Some considered the episode an advancement of civil society through a new form of 'symbolic politics' (Chua, 2008) while others begrudged the acute deepening division among the vocal factions. After this provocative event, sexual politics have never been more divergent with opinions stretching from explicit blasphemy to *blasé* self-repression.

This collection of essays from a wide range of disciplines and perspectives aims to uncover the persistent affections borne by various segments of Singaporean society during and after this parliamentary discourse. It brings together original writings by established and emergent local scholars and activists. Focusing on issues concerning the political, economic, cultural, religious and legal frameworks, this is the first lengthy academic analysis on how contemporary queer Singapore has come to light against a contradictory backdrop of sexual repression and cultural liberalisation.

Theorisations of queer Singapore have emerged in recent years through three distinct streams. The first focuses on human rights, social movement and spatial politics to examine the repression of homosexuality, the rise of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) activism and its attendant impact on public culture (e.g. Heng, 2001; Leong, 1997; Lim, 2004; Tan, 2007). The second stream maps specific case studies of cultural productions in theatre, literature and popular culture (e.g. Chan, 2004, 2008; Lim, 2005a, 2005b; Yeoh, 2006). The third focus tracks public and media attitudes towards sexual acceptance (Detenber et al., 2007; Goh, 2008; Lim, 2002). Common to these studies is how

the encounter with the State has created a different imaginary of homosexuality and sexual identity. They raise three factors implicit in the critical consideration of gay and lesbian studies about Singapore. While highlighting the illegality of homosexuality, they also reveal an emergent social movement, a prolific queer cultural milieu of production as well as an unusually high preoccupation with homosexual issues in mainstream media and its broader polity. These factors point to how queer Singapore has emerged through a specific geographical and historic set of conditions tied to the neoliberal regime of its postcolonial modernity. Key to this regime is the ambivalence of illiberal pragmatism. Although these theorisations engage the governance of the civil society, they do not explicitly consider how Singapore is also governed by the logic of illiberal pragmatics.

Illiberal pragmatism is characterised by the ambivalence between non-liberalism and neoliberalism, rationalism and irrationalism that governs the illegality of homosexuality in Singapore. Using the robust, pertinent and original framework of illiberal pragmatism, these essays aim to provide an updated and expansive coverage of the impact of homosexuality in Singapore's media cultures and political economy.

Illiberal pragmatism has underpinned the logic of neoliberal postcolonial development in Singapore (Chua, 1995, 1997, 2003). It has also enabled the cultural liberalisation of the creative economy so much so Singapore is more renowned globally as a gay rather than a creative city (Ross, 2009: 5). While illiberal pragmatics has facilitated the State regulation of social identity, it has also created new subjectivities for the new neoliberal economy (Ong, 2006). This treatise shows how new LGBT subjectivities have been fashioned in and through the governance of illiberal pragmatism, and how pragmatism is appropriated as a form of social and critical democratic action.

This framework locates the specificity of a critical queer Singapore approach that differentiates it from other queer Asian social movements and research methods. While Anglo-centric and homonormative studies have consistently fetishised the relationship between liberalism and the emancipation of same-sex sexual relations (see e.g. Frank and Meeneaney, 1999), the central rubrics underpinning queer Asian studies to date have been through social movement studies, media cultures or queer hybridity (see recent examples such as Martin et al. 2008; Leung, 2008; Martin, 2010). Most of these studies have also focused on the representation of queer identities in popular media cultures and everyday life. The approach taken in this volume departs from these studies. By using the framing of governmental policy to consider the regulation of illiberal pragmatism, contributors show how LGBT subjectivities and their attendant claims to representation and cultural production are produced in and through a logic of queer complicity that complicates the flow of oppositional resistance and grassroots appropriation.

In Singapore's multiracial state of five million people, four races—Chinese, Malay, Indian and Others (also known through its acronym, CMIO)—are officially recognized. The Chinese, making up 75 per cent of the population, maintains a hegemonic hold. This racial distribution is also evident across the local LGBT community where the default queer is the gay Chinese man. This book problematises this hegemony by queering its cultural history as well as including a diversity of non-Chinese gay perspectives from same-sex attracted Indian men and Malay lesbians.

In the last decade, the 'coming of age' of queer Singapore can be traced to three key events. While these events are explored in more critical detail in later chapters, the development of this unofficial LGBT public culture is significant to situating the context of contemporary queer Singapore. As the country does not permit the registration of social organisations, and the only place that allows public assembly and public speaking without a police permit is the Speaker's Corner in Hong Lim Park, an inner-city garden, the emergence of an unofficial public culture is a significant milestone that attests to how a queer social movement and consumer culture have flourished through illiberal pragmatism. Several rallies testify to this pattern.

1. Nation Parties: The first public LGBT party in 2001 was attended by 1500 people. The party coincided with Singapore's National Day on 9th August, a celebration of the independence of the postcolonial nation. The party-cum-protest addressed the exclusion of LGBTs from State recognition. By 2003, it had become a three-day event, attracting global media coverage to the power of the regional pink dollar. By 2004, over 8000 partygoers attended. Its success and high profile caught the ire of the State who quickly banned the party. The event moved to Phuket in Thailand at a beach resort booked exclusively for the occasion. The Nation Party was organised by Fridae, a Singapore-based gay web portal for personal ads and news (see Yue's chapter in this volume).
2. IndigNation: Singapore's LGBT annual pride season began in 2005 in the wake of the banning of the Nation Party. The season consists of a series of events including film festivals, readings, art and photographic exhibitions and plays hosted by individual groups coinciding with the country's National Day commemorations. The key organisers are People Like Us, an informal local gay and lesbian activist group that began in 1997 (with more than 2500 members on its email discussion list, SIGNeI) and Fridae.
3. Pink Dot: The annual public rally began in 2009 when 2500 people, dressed in pink, gathered at Speakers' Corner in Hong Lim Park, to celebrate 'freedom to love' regardless of one's sexual orientation. In 2011, over 10,000 people attended the event sponsored by Google and promoted through *Time Out Singapore*. Notably, the colour of pink used

to brand the rally has two references: the pink identity card of Singapore and the pink triangle as a symbol for LGBT liberation.

These occasions exemplify how a range of practices—from activism, advocacy, queer consumption and media culture—are negotiated precariously in a country that still criminalises homosexuality. This book unravels this tactic of negotiation using the logic of illiberal pragmatism that has enabled the Singapore LGBT community to survive and thrive.

The LGBT community is expansive and diverse, comprising localized as well as globalised forms of sexual identity. For gay men, the most common parlance to describe one's sexual identity is 'gay', 'G' or 'on' (meaning: is he 'gay?'). For lesbians, it is 'L', 'butch' or '100 per cent' (two femmes). As 'queer' is not a term commonly used in the community, this book uses 'queer' in its title with two intentions: as an umbrella term for the diverse LGBT community, and; a critical tool to unsettle heteronormativity.

In recent years, the LGBT community has developed a distinct relationship with regional queer Asian centres, especially Thailand. Many trans-men and trans-women make trips to Bangkok for sex reassignment surgery (SRS). Despite Singapore's legal recognition of the transsexual status, many choose to go to Thailand for sex-change operations because it is cheaper and has more skilled doctors (see also Aizura, 2011). Phuket has also become a proxy destination for Singapore's gay parties after the banning of the Nation Party (see also Au, 2011). For queer Singaporeans, queer Asian centres in Taipei or Tokyo are viewed through almost the same global queer imaginary as San Francisco or Amsterdam, only they are cheaper to get to and closer. These places have established scenes and are marked by the history of their social movements. Thailand has a different resonance, which is more like Singapore. In the new millennium, Thai sexual cultures are driven by market capitalism (see Jackson, 2011), which has opened up a consumer culture for trans medical tourism and made it the ultimate destination for the gay circuit party. Rather than following in the telos of liberation and rights, the capitalist queer market that helped queer Bangkok flourish is also the same force that generated queer Singapore. Unlike Thailand where homosexuality has been decriminalised, this book shows how queer capitalism in Singapore quietly goes about its business by governing homosexuality through illiberal pragmatics.

Theorising Queer Singapore: Illiberal Pragmatics¹

The ideology of pragmatism as the conceptual framework for postcolonial governance in Singapore has been a key theorisation in Singapore studies. Chua shows how pragmatism was conceived from the late 1960s to 1980s as "an ideology that embodies a vigorous economic development orientation that

emphasises science and technology and centralised rational public administration as the fundamental basis for industrialisation within a capitalist system, financed largely by multinational capital" (Chua, 1995: 59). This conceptual structure is evident not only in making domestic conditions favourable to foreign investments, but in all aspects of social life including the promotion of education as human capital, meritocracy, population policy, language and multiracialism. Pragmatism rationalises policy implementations as 'natural', 'necessary' and 'realistic'. As an ideology, it has enabled popular legitimacy: "in everyday language, [pragmatism] translates simply into 'being practical' in the sense of earning a living" (Chua, 1997: 131). Following Schein's (1997) application of "strategic pragmatism" within Singapore's cultural institutions, Low also points to how pragmatism is the "singular prerequisite" for the "political will to implement necessary changes ... for continuous self-renewal to manage change and continuity" (Low, 2001: 437). The marked improvement in the material life of the population and the economic ascendancy of the country as a developing nation to a global post-industrial metropolis in the last forty years has made it difficult to argue against the success of pragmatism.

Unique to Singapore's pragmatism is how governmental interventions are "contextual and instrumental" rather than "in principle"; that is, they are "discrete and discontinuous acts, in the sense that a particular intervention in a particular region of social life may radically alter the trajectory that an early intervention may have put in place" (Chua, 1995: 69), so that a rational intervention in one special area of social life may turn out to be quite irrational when the totality of social life is taken into question. These contradictions, evident and well documented in the policy and everyday domains of marriage, reproduction, language and education, highlight the ambivalence of pragmatism. Chua attributes such ambivalence in his formulation of a non-liberal democracy to a state where "the formal features of democratic electoral politics remain in place and intact" but is "thoroughly sceptical regarding the rationality of the ordinary citizen and unapologetically anti-liberal" (Chua, 1995: 185). Actions are rationalised as "pre-emptive interventions which 'ensure' the collective well-being, as measures of good government rather than abuses of individuals' rights" (Chua, 1997: 187). Central to pragmatism is thus the logic of illiberalism where implementations are potentially always liberal and non-liberal, rational and irrational. This ambivalence forms the foundation for the emergence of a queer Singapore, not one based on the Western post-Stonewall emancipation discourse of rights, but through the illiberal pragmatics of survival.

The following discussion demonstrates how this logic is evident in current discourses on homosexuality. These exchanges are scrutinised in detail because they present an account of the cultural and legal histories, practices and events that have shaped the current contexts of oppositional queer activism, and gay

and lesbian lifestyle consumption. The first aim is to position a set of scholarships that can arguably be considered the emergent phase of queer Singapore studies. Written by a disparate group of international and local scholars, they engage historical laws and contemporary formations, and follow a rights-based approach to emancipation and cultural representation. The second and more significant aim here is to critically contextualise this milieu and show how these theorisations point to, yet fail to acknowledge, the illiberal pragmatics of governance.

The (Il)Legality of Contemporary Homosexuality

The prohibition of homosexuality is sustained by the British colonial legacy. Examining criminal law to show how sodomitical acts are charged under Section 377 (Unnatural Offences) and Section 377A (Outrages on Decency) of the Penal Code, Leong argues these laws lack human rights and “[appear] to be the last frontier in the Asian region for positive gay and lesbian developments” (Leong, 1997: 142). While Leong’s human rights model of emancipation sits well in the chronology for the progressive post-Stonewall discourse on liberation, this model does not account for the illiberally pragmatic practices of gender variance and same-sex co-habitation that are legalised and subsidised in Singapore.

Since 1974, this country has led the region in gender reassignment surgery and conducted more than five hundred operations in government-funded hospitals.² Transgenders can legally change their gender identity, and in 1996, were permitted to marry legally. The logic of illiberal pragmatics shows how the institutionalisation of transgenderism does not honour the recognized tradition of indigenous transsexualism or the progressive claims of sexual minorities, but instead, reflects the governance of gender transgression as a disease that can be medically corrected and socially heteronormalised. The human rights model is unable to account for the opening up of an alternative expression of gender variance in a country that does not recognise homosexuality. This anomaly in the governance of sexuality is also evident in property law where same-sex couples were recently permitted to co-purchase cheaper, government-subsidised public housing. Although 80 per cent of the population resides in public housing, gays and lesbians have traditionally been excluded from such homeownership due to the hegemonic discourses of heteronormative domesticity and the proper family. By allowing a single person and/or groups of single people above a certain age group to legally apply and buy a public flat, the ‘queering strategy’ of the new housing policy has maintained sexual norms (Oswin, 2010) but has also unwittingly sanctioned the blossoming of new domestic non-heteronormative sexual partnerships. Rather than legitimating

the interdependency of same-sex relationships, same-sex co-homeownership is a rational instrument introduced to alleviate the over-supply of public housing. Although same-sex relationships are not legally recognized, same-sex couples are now also able to make claims to the everyday intimacies of living together, domesticity and home ownership. These two developments show the anachronism of the laws that regulate homosexuality and the irrational logic by which homosexuality is governed.

Illiberal pragmatism is also evident in the development of the local gay political movement. Heng's (2001) activist account traces the development of the gay scene from the 1950s to the 1980s. In the 1950s the 'ah qua' was a commonly accepted sexual figure. The 'ah qua' is a local nativist transsexual who used to ply the sex trade in Bugis Street, an area in Chinatown that was an icon of the exotic Far East. In the 1970s the figure of the Westernised and English-language speaking 'Orchard Road queen' emerged when gay-friendly bars and discos opened in downtown Orchard Road and were frequented by Caucasian tourists. Heng categorises these figures as belonging to an emergent gay "scene" (Heng, 2001: 83). He shows how the gay community came about in the 1980s with economic affluence and societal liberalisation, and maps the rise of cruising against the increasing surveillance, entrapment and prosecution of homosexuality. In the late 1980s, the globalisation of AIDS, which led to the development of the non-governmental organisation Action for AIDS, provided a platform for gay activists to organise and mobilise. He examines the 1990s activism of a local gay group People Like Us (PLU) and traces its unsuccessful efforts to gain official group registration and attain political legitimacy. Heng warns of "coming out of the closet" in a country where "the relationship between homosexuals and the state will continue to have its share of suspicion and uncertainty" (Heng, 2001: 95). His self-reflexive account follows the progressive logic of Western gay liberation that traces the movement from scene to community towards an end-point of decriminalisation and recognition. By describing the two earlier figures as belonging to just "a gay scene which served their entertainment needs" and comparing them to "a (later) community with an identified purpose of improving the status and welfare of gay people" (Heng, 2001: 90), he attributes hierarchical values to the two different practices that equally sustain the vibrancy of gay lives. His trajectory follows the rights-based discourse cautioned by Warner (1999) and Seidman (2005) as normalising and assimilationist. By focusing on the fight for equal rights based on reforming the stigma of minority discrimination, Heng's account has unknowingly delegitimised the indigeneity of local gay sexuality. Meanwhile, heteronormativity and the effects of colonial and developmental capitalism on homosexuality, remain unchallenged. Although he acknowledges the territorialisation of homosexuality in the social and cultural spheres, he fails to locate these practices within the illiberal pragmatics of governance.

These irrational logics are evident in how the subterranean geography of homosexuality is produced in heteronormative spaces in Singapore. Lim (2004) examines the construction of homosexual practices through interventions in public debates, Internet publishing and public dance parties. Using interviews with gay activists and gay entrepreneurs, and juxtaposing these against print media debates on homosexuality, he argues: “the overt spatial expressions of homosexuality may be occurring, but that does not necessarily mean that homosexuals are accepted as part of ‘mainstream’ society ..., they are merely *tolerated*” (Lim, 2004: 1778, emphasis in original). Although he points to creative strategies of resistance, it is unclear what these strategies are and how exactly spatial tactics of resistance are enacted. What is clear in his analysis however, is the illiberal logic that underlies the production of subcultural homosexual spaces. While gay activists are not allowed to officially register gay and lesbian organisations, and gay Internet content is subjected to censorship, LGBTs can freely publish and access a global audience online, and organise carnivalesque public parties in real life. These contradictions between law and lore show how emergent LGBT expression is shaped by the neoliberal push towards entrepreneurship and digital literacy on the one hand, and non-liberal media surveillance and social control on the other.

Such illiberalisms are further explored in Tan’s (2006) study of how the ‘gay community’ has been envisaged. Using two events—the first, in 2000, regarding the church’s claim that “homosexuals can change”, and the second, in 2003, regarding former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew’s published comments endorsing the employment of openly gay civil servants, he shows how the gay community has been imagined through the views of the conservative majority that support the ideologies of family values, heterosexual social cohesion and neoliberal economic growth: “Through complex and dynamic ideological negotiations that take place within the broader and inherently contradictory trend of political and economic liberalisation, homosexuals are ‘tentatively’ interpellated as gay Singapore subjects who are part of a community that is rejected by an imaginary mainstream and yet grudgingly relied upon by a state anxious to appear sufficiently open-minded in order to attract global capital and talent” (Tan, 2006: 184). He further examines the gay community’s reactions to these events on online forums and shows how a “siege mentality greatly helps in the processes of imagining this community into being” (Tan, 2006: 188). He criticises gay activists, in their struggle for equal rights, for portraying gay Singaporeans as civic minded and nationally patriotic, and colluding with the neoliberal discourse of economic creativity. He argues gay identities are formed not through the ideologies of social structures but “imaginatively formulated with strategic purpose within evolving discursive contexts” (Tan, 2006: 197). Tan’s account clearly highlights the contradictions between the continued

policing of homosexuality on the one hand, and economically driven social liberalisation on the other.

These discourses discussed above provide a contemporary backdrop to the (il)legality of homosexuality by inscribing an indigenous tradition of same-sex eroticism, accounting for the emergence of a rights-based social movement, and gesturing towards a neoliberal market agenda of economic reform and queer inclusion. Although they do not focus on the central role illiberal pragmatism plays in these transformations, these accounts highlight the country's irrational and ambivalent modes of governance.

The following text introduces the critical role of creative industries in augmenting the logic of illiberal pragmatism. Using gay literature, gay theatre and lesbian nightlife, readers can see how illiberal pragmatism is characterised by a disjunctive mode of displacement that has enabled local queer cultural productions to flourish.

Creative Queer Cultural Productions

Creative industries sell the business of the arts and culture by transforming arts and culture into services and commodities that add value to the economy. In 2002 Singapore published its policy blueprint, *Creative Industries Development Strategy*, for the new economy, detailing reforms in the clusters of arts and culture, media and design (Media Development Authority, 2002). This followed the release of Japan's Copyright White Paper developed to strengthen its intellectual property infrastructure (Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications, 2001). Since then, regional neighbours such as Indonesia, Hong Kong and Korea have also implemented policies to pursue their creative industries of copyright, cinema and information technology. All these reforms are characterised by a sectoral approach of cultural mapping (Global Alliance for Cultural Diversity, 2006: 6). Framed by the 'catch-up' thesis, this approach follows sectors identified in Western economies, uses universal statistics from global reports such as world and competitiveness yearbooks and models industries after influential studies by Florida (2002) and Howkins (2002). The normative use of these universal frameworks and empirical data, argue Gibson and Kong, "make[s] generalizations about the cultural economy ... where meaning[s] ... coalesce around singular, definitive interpretations" (Gibson and Kong, 2005: 549). In 2005, UNESCO introduced the second approach of 'cultural indigenisation' to frame the development of Asian creative industries by emphasizing how local communities are created through new networks of cultural industries that focus on participation and community-based development: "The industries in general are smaller and mobilize communities at a level that is closer to the grassroots than more traditional

industry development" (UNESCO, 2005: 1). The 'cultural indigenisation' thesis incorporates culture into national development plans for the purpose of achieving "sustainable development" (ibid.).

While these two approaches support the economic rationale behind cultural liberalisation and queer inclusion, they inadequately account for the local specificities of creative queer cultural productions. The discourse of 'catch up' is problematic if it simply rehearses the post-Stonewall logic of progress and liberation; similarly, the discourse of 'sustainability' is also problematic if it is simply a nativist reaction to protect local cultures from global erosion. Catching up, as a process of belatedly speeding up, is also a process of what Derrida has called tele-technic dislocation (cited in Bhabha, 1999: ix). Catching up is thus a process that simultaneously provides access to and disrupts the essential temporality of the West. It unsettles the ontology of the native and its organic being-and-belonging of the nation. It entails "the move from organic temporality to disjunctive, displaced *acceleration*" (Bhabha, 1999: x, emphasis in original). This mode of disjunctive, displaced acceleration is evident in the queer productions of the recent creative and cultural industries. Using the industries of literature, theatre and entertainment, the following shows how the transsexual, the gay man and the butch have emerged as exemplary tropes for demonstrating this mode of displaced acceleration.

Disjunctive Acceleration: The Sister Transsexual and the Glocal Gay

Popular fiction has been one of the earliest cultural industries to examine homosexuality. More than ten novels have been locally published since the 1990s that examine the various themes of transsexuality, coming out, and living with HIV/AIDS. In 1990, Joash Moo published *Sisterhood: The Untold Story* based on his interviews with local transsexuals and transvestites. 'The sisterhood' is a collective term for local transgenders who call themselves 'sisters'. In the preface, Moo explains: "They are defined as 'transsexuals' or 'transvestites'. Transsexuals undergo surgery to change their gender. Transvestites dress up superficially to look like members of the opposite sex. They are not just 'gays'. Physically, they *are* men and women; psychologically they *are not*" (Moo, 1990: vii, emphases in original). The book traces the experiences of thirteen transgenders through the characters of lascivious prostitutes, effeminate soldiers and dandy undergraduate students. It details their ordeals of adolescent same-sex attraction, the shock of their sexual desire, the trauma of sex-change operations and the joys of marriage. The sequel, *Sisterhood: New Moons in San Francisco* (Moo, 1993), is a book—ended with an endorsement by Professor S.S. Ratnam, the surgeon and gynaecologist who performed the first sex-change operation in Singapore, and an acclaim by the local entertainment magazine guide, *8 Days*,

claiming the book as the “[f]irst in local literary history to deal with the social phenomenon” (n.p.). These collections, published by Times Book International, a subsidiary of the conglomerate Fraser and Neave (and partially owned by the Singapore government’s Temasek Holdings company), present personal portraits and inscribe an indigenous tradition of transsexuality that has only begun to be ‘made present’ as a result of the legality of gender reassignment surgery and the official support given to local writers to publish local stories. Here, the instrumental rationality of heteronormative incorporation that has endorsed and facilitated the medicalisation of gender reassignment has been disrupted by the rise and recognition of the transsexual as a gender deviant figure of ‘both and not man and woman’. In doing so, the illiberal pragmatics of medical and literary modernisation have inadvertently produced the transsexual as a figure that negotiates not only the indigenous pre-gay and the Eurocentric post-queer (Jackson, 2001), but also the local modern. As a trope of disjunctive acceleration, the sister transsexual exemplifies this mode of displacement.

Two other seminal ‘coming out’ novels, Lee’s *Peculiar Chris* (1992) and Koh’s *Glass Cathedral* (1995), further show how the gay man has emerged as a critical site to challenge colonial heteronormativity. *Peculiar Chris* is the first novel to deal with the theme of ‘coming out’. The author wrote the book when he was nineteen and in the army doing ‘National Service’ (NS). NS is a two-year compulsory government project aimed at training young men to fit the standards of national masculinity. *Glass Cathedral*, commended in the 1994 Singapore Literature Awards, centres around Colin’s association with James, whose father is the director of a multi-national company. It explores Colin’s initial infatuation with James’ rebellious and alternative arts lifestyle, and his relationship with Norbet, a gay priest who encourages him to reconcile his sexuality with faith. Colin refuses the material trappings of James’ gay lifestyle and chooses, instead, to work with street kids and prostitutes.

Yeoh (2006) examines these two novels against the genre of gay protest literature and within the contexts of national patriotism and the globalisation of queer. In particular, he focuses on how these texts offer queer subjects avenues to challenge and revise locally, nationally and globally endorsed models of masculinity. In *Peculiar Chris*, the gay characters exploit the physical rigour and surveillance of the army into “a means of queer networking”: “In aesthetic terms, the physical rigors of NS produced masculine bodies in sync with global gay fashions” (Yeoh, 2006: 123). He further examines how the central protagonist, Chris, comes to terms with his sexual identity by comparing his different sexual encounters at underground beats, and with middle-class and straight-acting lovers, and shows how Chris’ choice of the latter points to an imagined gay ideal that is similar to the dominant ideology of the nation. The world of gay domestic bliss, economic privilege, monogamy and family ties, compared

to the underbelly of degeneracy, secrecy and guilt, have left “largely intact” the dominant Singapore values of “(r)ationality, order, meritocracy, elitism, family values and material comfort” (Yeoh, 2006: 127). In *Glass Cathedral*, Yeoh further shows how the novel “reinvigorate(s) the queer by insisting on a queer which is firmly embedded within the particulars of Singapore culture” (Yeoh, 2006: 130). Yeoh argues these two books display a “transgressive hybridity” where “the capacity of a hybrid, localized queer” can “trouble normative social categories” (Yeoh, 2006: 131).

Yeoh’s transgressive hybridity highlights how the gay man has emerged in the logic of illiberalism as an effect of pragmatic complicity and performing conformity. Pragmatic complicity is the process of complying, in the sense of being practical, with the norms in order to ‘fit in’ and ‘pass’. Performing conformity is also a similar process of enacting socially approved models so as to suit the norms of the hegemonic culture. While the rituals of both are similar, performing conformity points more specifically to the types of everyday rehearsals that are based on the assumption that the norms of the status quo are maintained through repetitions. Pragmatic complicity, on the other hand, does not emphasise the repetition of everyday rituals; rather, it singles out how forms of conduct are self-consciously altered by groups and/or individuals to accord with existing and/or new modes of governance.

Colin’s work ethic, together with Chris’ choice of economic privilege, domesticity, monogamy and family ties, resonate with the Asian values of communitarianism and neo-Confucianism. These signifiers show how the pragmatism of Singapore’s performance principle has irrationally also created an environment where the non-liberal local gay discourse of catch-up has emerged to replicate the homonormative values of neoliberalism in the West. In this artifice, the logics of temporal and spatial progress that characterise queer liberation in the West are out of joint, unsettling the teleology of rights, recognition and liberation.

These modes of disjunctive acceleration and displacement are further evident in theatre. Theatre has the longest history of LGBT representations dating back to the 1980s. It is also the site where politics are explicitly contested, especially through censorship (Chua, 2004). Recently, the pressures of cultural liberalisation have made the government more secretive. Rather than front stage, censorship takes place in the ‘back regions’ of pre-production where companies regularly face the threat of defunding and scripts are subject to a higher degree of scrutiny (Chong, 2010). In spite of this censoring, theatre continues to receive the highest percentage of funding from the National Arts Council, over and above music, visual arts, dance, arts administration and literature (Chong, 2005). Non-profit companies such as The Necessary Stage, Action Theatre and Wild Rice are renowned for staging gay and lesbian themed

plays, and playwrights such as Eleanor Wong, Ivan Heng and Alfian Sa'at have become local queer icons.

While Chong criticises how the government predominantly funds English-language plays as a strategy for asserting the country's global consciousness (Chong, 2005: 562), Lim (2005a) argues the use of English-language cannot simply be viewed as following the universalising strategies of Western culture. Lim examines the groundbreaking 2000 gay male theatrical production, *Asian Boys Vol. 1*, and shows how the colonial legacy of the figure of the Orientalist gay boy is recuperated and re-imagined through the diasporic and inter-Asian circuits of "Indian gods, Japanese pop icons, Chinese rickshawmen, *samsui* women, and Malay online chat addicts" (Lim, 2005a: 403). These different modalities of queer productions highlight what Lim suggests as the tactics of "glocalqueering", a process of revealing the "complex circuits of mobility that follow neither a model of bilateral cultural transmission (West to East and vice versa) nor a contextual study of national productions that attempts to locate a quintessential Singaporean queerness" (Lim, 2005a: 387). Although Lim calls these tactics "a set of pragmatic homoerotic practices with many inter-Asian and diasporic resonances" (Lim, 2005a: 404), he does not elaborate how pragmatism works as an instrumental logic for understanding this optic. West's philosophy of pragmatism is insightful here.

Redefining Pragmatism: Doing Gay, Doing Butch

West's philosophical conception of pragmatism differs from Chua's commonplace conception of pragmatism. The commonplace conception of pragmatism is evident from *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, where pragmatism is defined as "the truth of any assertion is to be evaluated from its practical consequences and its bearing on human interests" (1993 vol. 2: 2319). This popular definition emphasises 'getting things done or tackling difficulties in the most practical way', or a 'can do and whatever works' attitude. Westbrook cautions against this apparent conjunction between commonplace and philosophical pragmatism. He criticises the popular currency of the commonplace definition as "pragmatism at its worst" (Westbrook, 2005: x). West's pragmatism extends such commonplace definitions with a focus on social action and creative democracy.

Arising out of American philosophy drawn from the writings of Emerson, Peirce, James, Dewey and Rorty, pragmatism is a method that advocates how ideas are connected to action, theory and practice, which challenges the traditional belief that action comes after knowledge (De Waal, 2005: 4). Peirce's anti-Cartesianism and Dewey's engaged instrumentalism, for example, emphasise how experimentalism and experience constitute knowledge as a product of a

situation that requires resolution. In *The American Evasion of Philosophy*, West highlights the radical potentials of pragmatism through its focus on “future-oriented instrumentalism”, a preoccupation with the “materiality of language” and the evasion of an epistemology-centred philosophy (West, 1989: 5, 4). West points to how these distinctions have contemporary appeal because they share with postmodernism the scepticism about the fixity of truth. Their critical, destabilising and creative drives also have a moral and ethical emphasis on how power and social hierarchy can be transformed: “Its basic impulse is a plebian radicalism that fuels an antipatrician rebelliousness for the moral aim of enriching individuals and expanding democracy” (West, 1989: 5). Influenced by Marxism, African American social thought and liberation theology, he shares with Dewey a pragmatism that promotes “creative democracy by means of critical action and social action” (West, 1989: 212). West’s pragmatism is less a philosophical inquiry concerned with the nature of knowledge and the fallibility of truth, and more about knowledge as a form of cultural criticism where meanings and solutions are put forward as a response to social crisis and problems. His pragmatism is ‘prophetic’ because he draws upon his Christian background to express the problems about black nihilism in America. Religion, however, is not a requisite for prophetic pragmatism:

I have dubbed it ‘prophetic’ in that it harks back to Jewish and Christian traditions of prophets who brought urgent and compassionate critique to bear on the evils of their day. The mark of the prophet is to speak the truth in love with courage—come what may. Prophetic pragmatism proceeds from this impulse. It neither requires a religious foundation nor entails a religious perspective, yet prophetic pragmatism is compatible with certain religious outlooks (West, 1993: 233).

Mills criticises the casual synthesis between pragmatism and religion. He puts forth two interpretive solutions to understand this synthesis; the first comprising a thin “(theologically neutral kind) having universalist aspirations” and; the second, a thick “(religiously committed kind)” (Mills, 2001: 198). “For prophetic pragmatism to be taken as an interesting and viable contender,” he suggests, “it must be taken in the religious sense” (Mills, 2001: 199). Wood argues this synthesis is not at all casual, but critical; it represents “the existentialist issues of dread, despair, and death and the political concerns of democracy, equality, and justice” (Wood, 2000: 8). Putnam succinctly calls this synthesis of empowerment and engagement a form of “democratic faith” (Putnam, 2001: 35). Putnam’s useful departure point is also echoed by Westbrook who describes West’s prophetic pragmatism as a “reappropriation of pragmatism” (Westbrook, 2006: 202) that reconceptualises philosophy as a politically-engaged attempt to “transform linguistic, social, cultural, and political traditions for the purposes of increasing the scope of individual development and

democratic operations" (West, 1989: 230). West's prophetic pragmatism is thus located "in the everyday life experiences of ordinary people" and shares not only with Marxism's critique of class, but also Gramsci's praxis of the common sense and Foucault's operations of power (West, 1989: 213). Cowan elegantly summarises it as "a practical, engaged philosophy and a cultural commentary that attempts to explain America to itself" (Cowan, 2003: 55). Central here is its status as a "material force" for individuality and democracy, "a practice that has some potency and effect that makes a difference in the world" (West, 1989: 232).

These characteristics of pragmatism as a form of democratic faith that is action oriented, concerned with consequences, and possessing a dynamic position of social and cultural critique, is significant to extend the relevance of pragmatism to Singapore's creative queer cultural productions. Positioned in this context, the glocalqueering optic, a critical vision that queers the localizing processes of globalization, offered by Lim's gay boys can be further conceptualised not simply as a commonplace set of pragmatic moves under the governance of cultural liberalisation or the alliances created by the shared histories of cultural proximity and diasporic homelands, but a conscious mode of 'doing gay' that bears a commitment to challenging the shame of gay sex. Dowsett (2003) uses the term 'doing gay' to differentiate it from 'being gay'. 'Being gay' refers to the rights-based politics of fighting stigma and discrimination while 'doing gay' refers to fighting the shame that comes with gay sex. Following Warner's (1999) thesis that identity politics have resulted in the normalisation of gay men into mainstream culture through the erasure of sex, Dowsett argues identity politics can still be meaningful if it focuses on 'doing gay'. In Lim's accounts, the spectacle of the boys can be argued as potentially demonstrating this practice of 'doing gay'. Lim points to how these men follow the "global gay worlds featuring the homoerotic cult of male youth and urban male practices ... (They) wear muscle tank tops with feather boas, use skincare and cosmetic products, work out at trendy gyms, and attend pride parades and circuit dance parties" (Lim, 2005b: 296). Although Lim contends they exploit the global gay aesthetic, depoliticise a homoerotic aesthetic, and share no affiliation with the local grassroots or a radical politics of sexuality, this chapter suggests that these men, in their visible sexualised body aesthetics, embody the self-fashioning ethics of 'doing gay'. By going to the gyms, dance clubs, and saunas, and participating in body cultivation, cruising and public sex, they reappropriate what have been shamed in the post-AIDS West as the decadent places and practices of gay sex. In the pre-AIDS era, these practices formed some of the central tenets of radical LGBT activism in the West. From the psychedelic trance of dance parties, the rites of cruising to the obsession with body building, they described the faith-like rituals of prophetic pragmatism by actualising the material practices of everyday life that connected faith to politics, art, literacy and economic

production. Queer activism in this context exemplified the rhetorical performance and social action of liberation theology (Herndl and Bauer, 2003). Warner shows how, in the post-AIDS West, these practices have been disavowed by the rights-based discourse through embracing the stigma of being gay but not the shame of gay sex (Warner, 1999: 33). For gay men in Singapore, these reappropriated practices embody the most abject and the least reputable acts of 'doing gay', and in doing so, resonate with what Warner has described as the ethics of a queer life, as a "special kind of sociability that holds queer culture together" and a "relation to others" that begins by acknowledging the shame of gay sex (Warner, 1999: 33). They also recall Foucault's ethics of care as a set of self-fashioning practices designed to empower the self and engage the self through knowledge in its conduct with others (Foucault, 1979). The ethics of 'doing gay' in this manner exposes the shame used by both the straight and gay mainstream to repress gay identity; it focuses on the materiality of everyday life experiences to emphasise how the self is governed through individual cultivation, group management and official representation. As pragmatism, it recognises the agency, choices and constraints by which groups construct their self-presence and self-autonomy. This befits a consensual society like Singapore that prides itself on the successful interpellation of its communitarian ideology to socially discipline its population and self-regulate the individual. This section's final example of creative entertainment further demonstrates such pragmatics of 'doing butch' in the lesbian nightlife of Singapore.

Since 2001, Singapore's annual popular Butch Hunt competition has instituted a new sensibility of 'doing butch'. Organised by Club Herstory, a lesbian-owned events management company and an online lesbian portal, these competitions have drawn hundreds of butches out of the closet and legitimated 'doing butch' as an embodied way of everyday life in the country. One thousand six hundred people attended the first finals at Zouk, a well-known dance club located in the Chinatown creative precinct. During the event contestants parade in a pageant, field questions on dating and romance, and pass a skills test ranging from singing, kung fu, dancing to stand-up comedy. The average age of the contestants is between nineteen and twenty-two.

Not all the contestants are outwardly 'masculine'. Some refer to themselves as pretty boys, most sport the trendy Asian *bishonen* long hair, and very few flex their pectoral muscles. They don hip-hop gear, smart suits and ties, leather shoes, cowboy shirts or just plain street wear. They come from all walks of life; university students, sales assistants, chefs, teachers and graphic designers. Common to all is the breast binder. The breast binder is made out of DIY elastic bands, bandages, duct tape or clear wraps, or professionally manufactured spandex and Velcro-adjusted sports bras and tee-shirts in assorted colours purchased on the Herstory website or at the events. The breast binder is not only *de*

rigueur among the contestants, but all young butches on the streets, in the clubs and at the bars. Unlike the older generation of butches who may wear a normal sports bra with a tee-shirt under a baggy shirt, these young butches flaunt the flat chest at every opportunity, with sleeveless tank tops or tight-fitting shirts. The competition has popularised the breast binder as the technology *par excellence* in the practice of 'doing butch' in Singapore. It has liberated the sexual shame associated with being butch.

Where 'doing gay' is directly related to the shame of gay sex, 'doing butch' is also directly related to the most abject and debased of lesbian gender, what Munt (1998) has theorised as the shame experienced by the butch. Munt describes such sexual shame through the butch's experience of her body, breasts, genitals and sexual behaviour, as well as her male impersonation as a "failed copy" (Munt, 1998: 5). She also locates the butch's fantasy of impermeability as a sad and brave act expended to fight the toil of maintaining her masculine body. Shame, Munt argues, "is the foundational moment in lesbian identity, ... (in) butch/femme identity" (Munt, 1998: 7). Unlike the macho bulldagger or stone butches in the West, the musculature of the Asian or Singaporean butch is more lithe and less slight. Breasts, rather than womanly hips, are the first external physiological signs of the butch's failure to pass and the beginning of her internalisation of shame. In these competitions and in the materiality of everyday life among the young butches, the spectre of the breast is reconstituted through the explicit use of the breast binder as a new signifier of 'doing butch'. 'Doing butch' recasts shame with a new agency, making it a source of empowerment and engagement, and a new material force for individuality and sexual democracy. As Gea reports on the 2006 competition, "On pageant nights, the sheer amount of lesbian visibility creates a palpable sense of excitement. One can almost sense a proud, unspoken declaration among the women who attend—a declaration along the lines of, 'I'm lesbian and proud of it!'" (Gea, 2006: np).

This critical discussion of how the cultural liberalisation of the creative economy has enabled the emergence of a uniquely local Singapore queer culture (characterised by the logic of illiberal pragmatics), also extends this logic with the philosophy of pragmatics as a method for critically instrumentalising creative democracy and social action. This section began by introducing the specificity of illiberal pragmatics within the developmental and postcolonial capitalist logic of Singapore. Illiberal pragmatism is characterised by the ambivalence between non-liberalism and neoliberalism, rationalism and irrationalism. It pointed to how this logic is evident in the contemporary (il)legal discourses of homosexuality in the country. It further showed how the new creative industries provided a fertile arena to consolidate this logic as central to the production of LGBT cultures in Singapore. It argued how a local Singaporean queer culture has been constituted, not as a result of the

recognition of rights and liberation, but through the disjunctive acceleration caused by economic and cultural reforms. In the popular cultures of contemporary gay fiction, gay theatre and lesbian nightlife, the sister transsexual, the Asian Mardi Gras gay boy, and the tomboy butch have emerged as exemplary figures of this creative queer culture. In their reconstitution of pragmatism with democratic faith, cultural critique and social action, they have reclaimed the shame of their deviant homosexualities and localised new embodiments of doing queer.

The Book

Structured in two parts, the chapters in this book showcase a diverse range of methodologies ranging from textual and discourse analysis, policy review, archival studies and empirical research, across a range of case studies including history, literature, religion, law, military, print media, lesbian theatre, queer cinema, creative arts, social media and queer commerce. These chapters are written by scholars who have strong attachments to Singapore: most are Singaporean-born and bred, most work in Singapore universities or industries, and some live in the Singapore diasporas in the West while others have conducted longitudinal research in the country. Although these scholars have received their research training internationally—notably, the UK, USA and Australia—the critique they present in this book shows a localizing approach to Singapore queer studies. Beginning with engaged interventions in social and cultural institutions, and bringing critical theory to bear on the impacts of its practices, the chapters show how queer theory is mediated through localized sites and identities. Rather than writing from within queer theory, the chapters are positioned in distinct disciplinary fields—sociology, anthropology, legal studies, media communications, film and theatre studies, public relations and entrepreneurship studies. This multi-disciplinary framework reflects the emergent field of sexuality studies in the country. There are no gender programs in the universities, and the study of sexuality is introduced through course modules on human rights, media and cultural studies.

The first part examines how issues of access, equity and representation are articulated, contested and claimed through cultural citizenship. Chua (2007) suggests cultural citizenship exists in Singapore through the narrow form of political culturalism, a governmental process of steering participation through ethnic channels to promote multiracial harmony as a public good. This book extends this conceptualisation to suggest that for minority LGBT groups, cultural and creative industrial policy developments have extended the scope of political culturalism and facilitated the potential to make claims to cultural citizenship.

Cultural citizenship refers to the process of how different groups make claims to their right to a culture. As a result of the cultururation of the modern economy and contemporary society, cultural understandings of citizenship have emerged to be concerned not only with "'formal' processes, such as who is entitled to vote and the maintenance of an active civil society, but crucially with whose cultural practices are disrespected, marginalised, stereotyped and rendered invisible" (Stevenson, 2003: 23). Advocating the use of cultural expression as a claim to public rights and culture, cultural citizenship addresses dominant exclusion and subordinate aspirations by focusing on the "redistribution of resources" and a politics of "recognition and responsiveness" (Rosaldo, 1999: 255). Through multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism, cultural citizenship is also a site for shaping common culture and providing the capacity for autonomy (Kymlicka, 1995). Cultural rights not only bring "a new breed of claims for unhindered representation, recognition without marginalisation, acceptance and integration without normalizing distortion," they also propagate a cultural identity and a lifestyle (Pakulski, 1997: 80). A dual process "of self-making and being made in relation to nation-states and transnational processes," it is shaped by "negotiating the often ambivalent and contested relations with the state and its hegemonic forms that establish the criteria of belonging within a national population and territory" (Ong, 1999: 262, 264). For LGBT communities in Singapore without the right to sexual citizenship, cultural citizenship is another arena to consider new ways of making claims to and contesting normative citizenship, and participation in national life. Precisely because citizenship is being reconstructed and reformulated in a neoliberal economy (Ong, 2006), cultural citizenship furnishes a rich site for the new oppositional and compliant subjectivities of the Singaporean LGBT communities. This framing provides a theoretical backdrop for illiberal pragmatics in a way that unravels the contradictions between rights and recognition, sexual repression and cultural liberalisation, everyday life and governance.

Aaron Ho's Foucauldian account of cultural and sexual history uses three case studies in public health, racial science and the aesthetic movement to compare Victorian Britain and postcolonial Singapore. He shows how government strategies enforcing compulsory heterosexuality are similar to those practised in Victorian Britain that posited homosexuality as a threat to the nation-state. He further surveys the pragmatic governance of compulsory heterosexual masculinity in the realms of politics, law, media and education, and argues such practices of regulation have resulted in the erasure of queer migrant history and denial of sexual citizenship.

Michael Hor provides a critical legal framework to discuss how the 377A Penal Code is retained as an ambivalent but pragmatic tool for minimising

risk and instigating fear. The Code, which criminalises an act of 'gross indecency' between males 'in public and private', and punishes the offence with a two-year imprisonment, afflicts the spectre of everyday homosexual life. Although the government assured the gay lobby in 2007 that there would be no direct enforcement of this law, Hor shows how the Code is still applied to judicial cases of selective passive enforcement. He surveys the period between 1995 and 2010 and considers why underage offences and public disturbances are prosecuted under 377A rather than other constitutional laws that could be used for fairer prosecutions. He reveals how prosecutorial discretion has led to an ambiguous interpretation and application of 377A. This ambiguity, he argues, reflects the pragmatic 'messiness' of liberalism and illiberalism that surrounds the governance of homosexuality. While free to choose same-sex partners, gays and lesbians are bound by a law that does not approve sexual rights. The law, on the other hand, while pretending to ignore their presence, nonetheless continues to thrive as 'a bad romance'.

Laurence Wai-Teng Leong provides a critical development of 'the AWARE saga' to consider the intersections of sex, sexuality, religion and education. This saga, as it is generally known in local parlance, refers to an event that took place in 2009 when a group of women from the same church seized control of AWARE, Singapore's premiere non-governmental organisation that advocates and defends the rights of women. Developments revealed that the leaders who led the coup were less concerned with the position of women than with sexuality in general and homosexuality in particular. The saga culminated in an extraordinary public meeting where 3000 women turned up and voted out the coup leaders. Using media reporting, Leong shows how, in a country where the State plays a major role in shaping the lives of the citizens, and where sex comes under the purview of the State in the areas of criminal law and welfare policy such as allocation of housing to heterosexual families, issues of sex and sexuality are also regulated by 'moral entrepreneurs'. He further examines the practices that surround the event as reflective of the liberal and illiberal nation-state. Hailed as the coming of age of the modern civil society, this event saw women from all walks of life come to fore and be heard. Through the gender platform of a State-sanctioned women's organisation, minority sexual rights were advocated as cultural rights. In its aftermath however, the State stopped AWARE's delivery of sexuality education program in secondary schools. While endorsing the rights of women to voice their diverse sexualities, it does not condone the pedagogy of diverse sex and sexualities.

Chris Tan examines how the military is a 'prime site' for gay men to negotiate their cultural citizenship. Using anthropological fieldwork, he discusses the life experiences of gay men serving in the National Service (NS). NS is compulsory for all Singapore male citizens; from the age of sixteen and a half, they are

required to serve full-time for two years, and after discharge from this period of active duty, remain in the reserve, and attend yearly training camps, until they are least forty years old. Tan compares the differences between gay soldiers who are open about their sexual identity and those who are not. He reveals the military as a site of masculine nationality and shows how marginalised gay soldiers appropriate its hegemony to create cultural belonging. Gay soldiers enact cultural citizenship by performing pragmatic belonging in a heterosexist, patriarchal and nationalist institution.

Shawna Tang examines how Singapore lesbians embody a transnational sexual identity that is 'a contradictory, complicit and contingent negotiation of the local and global'. She frames her ethnographic data against transnational feminist sexuality scholarship, and shows how working and middle-class lesbians negotiate the State's heteronormative regulation of sexuality. In sexual practices such as activism, coming out, and being in the closet, local lesbians construct sexual identity through the pragmatics of national ideologies that negotiate the dominant values of heterosexual family and meritocracy. Reproducing the postcolony's collusion with the colonial regulation of sexuality, lesbian identities are pragmatic processes of legitimating desire and selfhood.

Simon Obendorf uses international relations studies to examine the contradictions between the official representation of queer lifestyles in Singapore's narratives of global city developments, and the regulation of queer politics within the nation-state. Analysing foreign and public policies to consider how official discourses on the global city appropriate homosexuality to create Singapore as cosmopolitan, tolerant and open, Obendorf suggests these signifiers are also refuted in international diplomatic discourses of State sovereignty that linked homosexuality to 'compromised citizenship and threats to national security'. While the image of the global city is secured on the promotion of homosexuality, the construction of the nation-state depends on the continuing marginalisation and criminalisation of homosexuality: 'the tension between Singapore's status as both global city and nation-state [gives] rise to the government's illiberal and seemingly paradoxical regulation of Singaporean queer lives'. This contradiction between 'cure and contagion', he argues, has limited queer politics and empowerment.

Through each chapter's review of history, law, religion, education, the military, the creative economy and everyday life, we understand how the State has constructed an illiberal regime for governing homosexuality. Rather than directly enforcing 377A, it is pragmatically mobilised by the government to insinuate fear and shape compliant subjects. In such a regime, gays and lesbians make claims to cultural rather than sexual citizenships. Cultural citizenship claims are evident in the ways minority and diverse sexualities are articulated within the gender platforms of community organisations, and in

the everyday negotiation of non-heteronormative identity within the family, the army and the nation-state. Rather than following emancipatory politics that aim to empower queer constituencies, these claims are life politics that empower queer individuals.

The second part shows how mediated cultures, as sites of cultural citizenship, have emerged in the city-state. Mediated cultures are critical intersections that express the politics of people, resources and power. This section traces Singapore's queer mediated culture through media networks, and examines the LGBT use of media, and the media's constitution of sexual identities.

The media has always been central in the shaping of Western and non-Western sexual cultures (e.g. Signorile, 1993; Martin et al., 2008). In Asia, the emergence of queer cultures since the mid-1990s was advanced by the Internet and its capacity to create virtual communities, link isolated individuals and bond collective identities (Berry et al., 2003). As suggested in the earlier section, the hub of this emergence, arguably, is the LGBT scene in Singapore, with its illiberal but pragmatic proliferation of queer cultural production, nightclub cultures and circuit parties, and new status as a destination for regional pink tourism (Price, 2003; Prystay, 2007).

Media in Singapore is highly regulated and predominantly State-owned (Ang and Yeo, 1998). With media globalization came increasing media regulation (Rodan, 2003). Singapore was the first country in the world to implement a nation-wide digital network: it was also one of the first to notoriously impose Internet censorship (Ang and Nadarajan, 1996; Lee, 2000). New media regulation followed old media's practices of policing sexually deviant content on television and radio, including news reporting on homosexuality through sensationalism and abjection (Goh, 2008). Despite tight State control, Singapore's marginal and underground LGBT's communities have also seized the media to challenge stereotypes, self-narrate identities and organise collectively (Tan, 2007; Yue, 2011). The second part of this book develops these practices by examining the newspaper reporting of homosexuality, the media censorship on LGBT content, the development of queer cinema, photography and subcultural gay spaces, the racialised sexual cyberculture and the rise of queer media entrepreneurship.

Roy Tan's photo essay provides illustration, histories and an ethnographic analysis of Singapore's gay meeting places. Mapping the urban sites of gay activity, and examining newspaper reports and institutional reactions, Tan plots the history of the city's gay urban geography. Creating 'a record of the collective local gay memory', Tan outlines the features which made particular sites exemplary for 'nocturnal gay cruising'. Examining attempts by Singaporean authorities to police and deter such activities—like installing lighting and police harassment—Tan points to the diminishing of Singapore's 'cruisy' locales. His essay portrays the waxing and waning of open-air meeting

spots, saunas, clubs, bars and discos and speculates about differences between a history of restrictive practices exercised in these spaces, and the possibility of more permissive and empowered contemporary responses. Tan concludes that the use of social media such as Facebook will fuel the evolution of gay spaces in Singapore, marking a progression from the 'seedy' toward the 'mainstream'.

Exploring archives of a conservative English-language print media alongside the impact of a nationalist politics directed against homosexuals in Singapore, Jun Zubillaga-Pow uses a 'queer world-making' methodology in order to argue for a repositioning of 'queer lives and practices' within heteronormative public information systems. By using the National Library Board's digital archive of Singapore newspapers (1831–2006), Zubillaga-Pow's discussion highlights almost two hundred years of data dealing with LGBT-related news in Singapore. The discussion indicates how these largely negative reports become part of a national apparatus that seeks to regulate homonormativity. This governmental apparatus, Zubillaga-Pow suggests, works to position homosexuals as 'a priori anti-national'. Through an analysis of a number of news items, the chapter outlines dialectics between positive and negative homosexual genealogies in Singapore. Establishing an axis between a 'homonationalist' discourse and a 'world making' method, the writer argues that negative representations of the homosexual are being used as the impetus for nation-building, and that a useful response to this is a critical method which practically surveys and positions the genealogies of queer life in Singapore.

Kenneth Chan frames his analysis of Kan Lume and Loo Zihan's feature-length film *Solos* (2007) with a historical overview of the representation of queer sexualities in new Singaporean cinema. This approach also takes in the realities of the Penal Code Section 377A, arguing that not only do these repressive laws force queer sexualities to the margins of culture and society, but also that the State's censorship laws are a means by which it can reify 'the Asian value system's supposed rejection of queerness'. A close reading of *Solos* allows Chan to celebrate possibilities, but also lament the complicity, of representations of homosexuality in Singaporean cinema. By doing so, he emphasises the 'uneasy flexibility' which those in the film industry adopt in order to traverse the unstable morays of sexual acceptability, while they also attempt to make use of 'tactically opportune moments to push back and/or to resist the legal and political structures of heteronormative disciplining'. Chan takes this discussion a step further by suggesting that in the Singaporean context it is the very play between the national and transnational that makes the existence of a queer Singaporean cinema possible.

Loretta Chen examines Singapore's Media Development Authority's censorship of representations of lesbianism in film, music video, television and theatre. Her discussion juxtaposes the banning of Lisa Cholodenko's *The Kids*

Are All Right (2010), with fines imposed for the broadcast of the *Silly Child* music video, censure of episodes of the reality show *Cheaters*, and the restrictions placed upon the staging of the play *251*. Chen highlights the government surveillance and repression of portrayals of LGBT cultures and communities in Singapore by unpacking the ambiguities and contradictions underlying the censorship of these popular media forms. The discussion of the bans placed upon screening the award-winning film *The Kids Are All Right* suggests that positive depictions of lesbian relationships are restricted in favour of negative ones, a tactic designed to directly influence public opinion. At odds with the Singaporean authorities' prohibitive response to the music video *Silly Child*, Chen's reflection on this film reveals its apparent *anti-lesbianism*, thus highlighting an institutional 'inability to read lesbians'. Developing this argument, her chapter draws attention to the ambiguous legal status of lesbianism in Singapore and suggests that the administrative reactions to episodes of the program *Cheaters* and the play *251* point towards a deep unease regarding the representation of lesbianism in the performing arts. These media case studies are mobilised in order to support an argument concerning the fundamental flaws and indeterminacies inherent in the Singaporean censorship authority's approach to female homosexuality.

Interrogating racialised discourses in Singapore, Robert F. Phillips offers an analysis of queer Indian-Singaporeans' use of new and emerging communications technologies, outlining how these facilities have impacted upon developments in sexual and national identity. He examines the racialised discourses within the queer community and uses fieldwork data from interviews with 'self-identified queer Indian-Singaporean men' in order to explore issues related to wider concepts of race, sex and nation. Phillips considers the 'double minority status of queer Indian men in Singapore' and examines how these unique identities are part of a larger process of transnational diasporic identity formation. This perspective allows Phillips to shed light upon both sexual and national identity in Singapore. He also uses this nexus to investigate how a minority group 'use[s] the Internet as an alternative public sphere where they are able to construct and debate narratives of culture, identity, and national belonging', arguing that through the use of such technology queer Indian-Singaporean men complicate the relationship between sexual and national identity. Phillips highlights the importance of anonymity in online exchanges, which allows a virtual alternative for those uncomfortable in a physical public space. At the same time, technologies such as the Internet have allowed minority Singaporeans to transcend their national boundaries and interact in a transnational space of social exchange. Despite this move beyond national borders, Phillips' research shows how this process can actually contribute to a re-definition of the nation or home country itself. Queer Indian-Singaporean social interaction on the

Internet thus becomes the impetus for social change and a political contribution to the shifting ways in which Singapore is imagined.

Audrey Yue provides a critical examination of *Fridae*, the Singapore-based gay web portal. The chapter positions the aesthetics, activities and activism of Asia's largest online LGBT community forum within Singapore's culture of 'unofficial tolerance', and innovatively frames *Fridae* as a social movement with an entrepreneurial underpinning. This methodology offers a new way of approaching the content and consumption of gay social media, and means by which to understand the 'emergence of a gay social movement and queer entrepreneurship in a country where homosexuality is still illegal'. Yue argues that *Fridae*'s blend of the social and the commercial taps into the neoliberal agenda of Singaporean culture and administration, and thus presents a 'model for the future of queer organisations in contemporary neoliberal economies'. Through its media, marketing and activist presence *Fridae* is able to contribute substantially to the development of gay social capital in Singapore and beyond. By establishing this new critical perspective, the discussion broadens the potential for scholarly engagements with gay and lesbian new media cultures and suggests that *Fridae*'s 'illiberal yet pragmatic moral legitimacy' is a novel institutional mode that allows it to contribute to the visibility of gay cultures in an otherwise restrictive neoliberal environment.

All these chapters cover official and unofficial media, including archival gay photographs, mainstream newspapers, film, theatre, television and the Internet. They explore how local LGBT communities have thrived underground and above ground through pragmatic modes of resistance and complicity. From subcultural and abject beginnings to the national embrace of queer cinema and the global acclaim of social media, they show how contemporary queer Singapore has emerged as a self-aware, action-oriented and entrepreneurial culture that has worked within and twisted the illiberal logic of State control. Together, the chapters in this book provide a Singaporean queer critique of Asian neoliberalisms and build a platform for understanding the shaping of queer Asian futures.

Notes

Introduction: Queer Singapore

1. A longer and earlier version of this section has been published in the *Gay and Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review* (see Yue, 2007). The author thanks the Journal for permission to reprint parts of the article here.
2. Although a considerably larger number of gender reassignment surgeries have been conducted in Bangkok over this period (see Aizura, 2011), in Singapore, these surgeries are State-sanctioned. Through these surgeries, Singapore has become one of the first countries in the region to legally recognise transsexual status.

Chapter 1: How to Bring Singaporeans Up Straight (1960s–1990s)

1. For a detailed history of the Nation Party, see Audrey Yue's introduction in this volume.
2. The telemovie was broadcasted on 30 December 2007 on Arts Central, a T.V. channel in Singapore and is available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hjo28ya5rDI> (accessed on 14 September 2009).
3. See International Monetary Fund (2009); World Bank (2009); Central Intelligence Agency (2004).
4. Three SDP supporters were charged for contempt of court when they turned up in identical t-shirts with a print of a kangaroo dressed in a judge's robe to hear a defamation suit against Dr. Chee by Lee and his son, Lee Hsien Loong. See Koh (2008).
5. See *BBC* (2008).
6. In recent years, these institutions have allowed public feedback on issues such as the building of a casino or the repeal of the sodomy law, 377A, but such acts are gestural and act as strategies to retain electoral votes. Authority and deciding power are still incumbent on the State: the casino is still a go-ahead and 377A still stands despite public opinion.
7. For censorship in films, see Kenneth Chan's chapter in this book.
8. See Chris K. K. Tan's chapter in this book.
9. The stories during the 'Stop at Two' campaign, surfacing only now in the age of digital reproduction, are devastating. Miss Rebecca Lim (2008) writes, "My mother was pressurized heavily when she was pregnant with her third child. Whether it was a boy or girl, she never got to find out as the pressure on her was so great (nurses chiding her to follow the law, having to pay a fine should she produce more

than two) that she had an abortion a few weeks after she found out about her pregnancy." In an article in *The Straits Times*, Mavis Toh (2008) reports on the plight of several women who lived through that period: Margaret Chua, who had a tubal ligation, said, "The pressure was high. The Government clearly didn't want us to have more than two ... Now, more than 30 years later, I wish I had more"; Teo Gek Eng was lambasted by doctors and nurses for her third pregnancy and was asked if she wanted an abortion; Mary Koh aborted her third child because she could not afford to pay the fine; Dr. Paul Tan claims to have performed as many as 9 sterilization operations a day. He said, "Pregnant women came in saying, 'Doctor, I think I'm pregnant again' as if they committed a crime."

Chapter 2: Enforcement of 377A

1. Singapore's Penal Code borrowed heavily, and often in a word-for-word fashion, from the Indian Penal Code, the imported section 377 which had criminalised "carnal intercourse against the course of nature" (which was judicially interpreted to include same sex intercourse); a statement that was eventually repealed in 2007. Remaining in the books was 377A, which had been introduced into the Penal Code some decades later, apparently inspired by contemporaneous legislation in England.
2. The context was a piece of legislation intended to reform the Penal Code (which houses 377A). Anti-377A activists had urged the government to include the repeal of 377A in the reform. The essentially religiously motivated pro-377A lobby was spurred into action to oppose such a move.
3. The most prominent of whom is Alex Au (2010a), who has been making this argument for years.
4. See also the unreported decision (i.e., a judicial decision which did not find its way into the official reports) of Mohamed Ibrahim Mohamed Hussain where a religious teacher was charged with 377A for an act with a 16-year-old, although there appeared also to have been elements of non-consent (*The Straits Times*, 2006).
5. The idea of taking into consideration (popularly known as 'TIC') additional charges is actually at heart a humane policy of both reducing the punishment and sparing the accused of a longer criminal record where he is indeed properly prosecuted for several offences. It is not so when the accused ought not to have been prosecuted for the additional offences.
6. Five others were punished for soliciting the same boy (*The Straits Times*, 2009). I do not discuss the three who were charged under the now defunct section 377. It is to be noted that the absence of 377 does not disconcert the prosecution or the police. As we have seen, they can easily be charged under alternative provisions now.
7. See, for example, Au (2010b).
8. In *Chief Military Prosecutor v CPL Ang Eng Sui* (2001), the accused was convicted of a 377A offence for consensual activity in a detention barracks gym with a fellow military policeman; refer 'Man abetted indecent act in public pool' (*The Straits Times*, 1999), the accused had allowed another man to perform oral sex on him in a public pool. More recently, 377A was used in the "toilet sex" case of Muhammad Noor Izuan Saad and Timothy Ang Ah Sai (*Channel News, Asia*, 2010). Both appeared to have pleaded guilty; Timothy Ang was sentenced to two weeks' imprisonment, and Muhammad to four weeks' imprisonment (apparently for subsequently alleging that Ang had molested him).

9. See the ‘One Seven’ case (Au, 2010b) for which I could uncover no other source, but have no reason to doubt the authenticity of. This scenario was to be replayed in the case of Tan Eng Hong where 377A was again the officially preferred provision for what was alleged to have been sexual activity in a public toilet (see *Fridae*, 2010). The 377A charge was eventually substituted for a charge under section 294 of the Penal Code:

Whoever, to the annoyance of others does any obscene act in any public place ... shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to 3 months, or with fine, or with both.

The reason for the substitution was again unclear. There is no evidence of a plea bargain; at the time of writing the accused has not pleaded guilty. It is possible that the accused’s threatened challenge to the constitutionality of 377A prompted the prosecution to act in order to deprive the accused *locus standi* (a doctrine which allows someone to challenge the constitutionality of a law only if he or she is sufficiently affected) to take up the challenge.

The choice of section 294 of the Penal Code (public obscenity) over section 20 of the MOPOA (public indecency) is interesting. It is unclear if the prosecutorial mind was directed at this choice. Section 294 is apparently the more serious offence (see the punishment structures in footnote 26), but its requirements are also higher. “Annoyance” to at least one other person is necessary. The act must also be “obscene” and not merely indecent. Section 42 of the Penal Code defines “obscene” in these terms:

any thing or matter the effect of which is, if taken as a whole, such as to tend to deprave and corrupt persons who are likely, having regard to all relevant circumstances, to read, see or hear the matter contained or embodied in it.

Whilst “indecency” is commonly thought to be something merely offensive, “obscenity” appears to require evidence of some sort of pernicious effect on the observer. Sex in a locked cubicle of a public toilet is much more clearly an indecency and much less clearly an obscenity.

10. Unlike the situation of sex with minors, the potential use of 377A as a bargaining chip in public sex cases has real bite; imprisonment is mandatory for 377A and the maximum term is two years. In comparison, Section 294 of the Penal Code (public obscenity) permits either a fine, imprisonment of up to 1 year, or both, while Section 20 of the MOPOA (public indecency) permits either a fine of up to S\$1000, or imprisonment up to 1 month (but apparently not both), with those limits rising to S\$2000 and 6 months for subsequent offending.
11. Sexual activity inside a motor vehicle parked in a public car park is apparently not considered by law enforcers to be deserving of prosecution, at least if such activity cannot be perceived with the naked eye (because of makeshift curtains, or the lack of illumination). There is no obvious reason why this is different from sexual activity in a locked cubicle of a public toilet.
12. Section 23, carries a maximum penalty of ten years imprisonment, five times more than the maximum for 377A.
13. Famously showcased in *Public Prosecutor v Tan Boon Hock* (1994) (see also Au, 2010b). Oddly, the charges preferred were not under 377A, but outrage of modesty.
14. See the relevant extract (*Parliamentary Debates*, 2007: 52). I do not pretend to comprehend these terms beyond the general sentiment that homosexuals are not to be too

publicly assertive about their sexuality. But even that is sufficient for the purposes of this discussion.

15. I have argued elsewhere that even the symbolic use of 377A is constitutionally questionable (see Hor, 2010). The fact that its existence provides the opportunity for actual illegitimate and unconstitutional prosecutions bolsters that proposition, and it is open to the courts to declare the retention of 377A itself to be unconstitutional. Since the writing of this chapter, an application has been made to the court to declare 377A unconstitutional. That application was denied in the High Court on the ground that the applicant, once but no longer charged under 377A, did not have the standing to make such an application (*Tan Eng Hong v Attorney-General*, 2011). The appeal from this decision has been heard and the Court of Appeal has reserved judgment (see Petrat, 2011).

Chapter 5: Transnational Lesbian Identities

1. See Manalansan, 1997; Wieringa, et al. 2007; Boellstorff, 2007; Leung, 2008; Cruz-Malavé and Manalansan, 2002 among others.
2. See Chalmers, 2008; Bacchetta, 2002; Bhaskaran, 2004; Blackwood, 1999, 2005, 2008; Sinnott, 2004; Chao, 2000.
3. After Singapore gained independence in 1965, the postcolonial state maintained the law, Section 377A, instituted by the British colonial government in the 19th century, which prohibits ‘gross indecency’ between two men. Although targeted at male same-sex relations, this law could be widely interpreted as making same-sex sexual lives illegal in Singapore.
4. In some of these non-Western contexts, women who love women do not identify with the term ‘lesbian’ or ‘queer’. These terms, for example, are either absent or as yet uncommon in the local lexicon of India (Bacchetta, 1999, 2002) and Indonesia (Blackwood, 2008). In Thailand, women who love women completely resist the term ‘lesbian’ (Sinnott, 2004). Researchers have resorted in various ways to represent this reality by either referring to “lesbian” women in inverted commas (see for example Bacchetta, 2002: 954) or italicising the indigenised term to underscore its distinction with English terms (see for example Boellstorff, 2005: 8).
5. Bunzl’s made a similar albeit more eloquent point for the case of Austria, observing that “homosexuals became central players in the social drama of modernity. Constituted as always already outside the margins of respectability, their abjection gave coherence to the fiction of German nationness” (2004: 13).
6. In 2009, local gay activists organised what was the first public gathering of the community at a national park. Up to 2,500 members and friends of the gay community wore pink to form a human dot. ‘Pink Dot’, as it is called, has since become an annual event with over 4,000 people attending in 2010, and over 8,000 in 2011. The ‘Pink Dot’ draws on the global gay signifier ‘pink’ as the colour is often associated with the global gay LGBT community. But ‘more importantly’, the Singaporean organisers say, pink ‘is the colour of our national identity cards and it is what you get when you mix the colours of our national flag’ (Pinkdotsg 2009). The idea of a ‘dot’ is drawn from the representation of Singapore as a red dot on the world map, a geographic imaginary frequently appropriated by the State in its nationalistic discourse emphasising the fragility of the nation and the need to defend it.

7. Yue relies on Cornel West's (1989) philosophy of pragmatism to expound her argument in relation to queer cultural productions in Singapore. For the full theoretical treatise, see Yue (2007: 155–58).

Chapter 6: Both Contagion and Cure

1. Other contemporary instances of sovereign city-states are the Vatican City State and the Principality of Monaco. Neither of these functions as a global city to the extent Singapore does (despite the Vatican's influence globally over members of the Roman Catholic faith). Conversely, while Macau and Hong Kong are similar to city-states, enjoying a high degree of legal, political and economic autonomy as Special Administrative Regions of the People's Republic of China (under the one-country two-systems arrangement), and Hong Kong confidently asserts its role as a global city, unlike Singapore, Monaco and the Vatican City State, they are not sovereign entities.
2. In this, the understandings of cosmopolitanism are quite similar to those developed by Ulf Hannerz who distinguishes between cosmopolitans and locals within the world cultures created by globalizing processes (See Hannerz, 1996: 102–11, 27–39).
3. The other is Kuala Lumpur, the capital of neighbouring, and predominantly Muslim, Malaysia. It is worth noting the extensive shared histories—colonial and postcolonial—that link these two cities.
4. The interview from which this quote is drawn was reported by Reuters (2007) and Trevvy (Team Trevvy, 2007), among others. A transcript of the relevant part of the interview was provided by Au (2007a).

Chapter 8: The Negative Dialectics of Homonationalism, or Singapore English Newspapers and Queer World-Making

1. For more information, please access 'Singapore Pages/NewspaperSG' at <http://newspapers.nl.sg/>.
2. For the historical illustrations and justifications, see George, 2007.
3. According to Turnbull, the number of English, Chinese, Malay and Tamil dailies stood at 4, 2, 2 and 3 respectively. See Turnbull, 2009: 323.
4. For a similar appraisal on the reproductive role of women, see Heng and Devan, 1992.
5. For essays on these matters, see Goh, 2008 and Amirthalingam, 2009.
6. For a heteronormative treatment of Singapore's economy, see Chua, 2003.
7. In the first volume of his *Parerga and Paralipomena*, Schopenhauer (1974) states that "the cheapest form of pride is national pride; for the man affected therewith betrays a want of individual qualities of which he might be proud, since he would not otherwise resort to that which he shares with so many millions" (Schopenhauer, 1974: 360).
8. Two criticisms against the bias of the local press stems from Prof. Thio Li-Ann's speech, which can be obtained from the Hansard (2009), as well as from Au (2010).
9. If the accused is proven to be a homosexual psychopath, as justified by the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders I* (1952), he could plead for 'diminished responsibility' and receive pardon from capital punishment. Then, he would only be charged for manslaughter (which was the case) and the illegal act of gross indecency between two male persons as stipulated in

section 377A of the 1938 Straits Settlements Penal Code, which remained in the 1955 Singapore Penal Code. It is significant to also note that the removal of homosexuality as a mental disorder in 1974 was not reported in *The Straits Times*.

10. For an exposition of the film *Saint Jack*, refer to the chapter by Kenneth Chan in this volume.

Chapter 9: Impossible Presence

1. While the Uhdes are more generous in their assessment of the government's role in fostering the revival of the film industry, they acknowledge that Singapore's economic "success" led to "a relative neglect of the arts, considered inessential by the government" (Uhde and Uhde, 2010: 54).
2. My characterization of these complex institutional entities here is somewhat unfairly reductive. For a more nuanced narration of the Singapore Film Commission, see Millet, 2006: 100–1. Millet credits the Singapore Film Commission for supporting, for instance, Djinn's edgy *Perth* (2004) and Royston Tan's subtly homoerotic paean to Singapore's violent gangster youth culture in *15* (2003). See also the Uhdes' interview with Daniel Yun, who heads MediaCorp Raintree Pictures, for a more conflicted understanding of the organization's economic imperative (Uhde and Uhde, 2010: 68–70).
3. For "how sexuality functions as technology for cultural policy" in Singapore as a "creative city", see Yue, 2007: 366.
4. Spatial constraints do not permit me to indulge in extended reflections on this matter, an issue that my fellow contributors in this collection have delved into with greater efficacy and rigor. From a personal observational standpoint, I have noticed growing public usage of "queer" in Singapore, as a mode of complicating essentialist identity categories. Because I am not of the theoretical mind that rejects Western theory *in toto* as a mode of cultural nationalist politics, I pragmatically embrace "queerness" as a theoretically useful paradigm within a Singapore context.
5. Williams cites Benjamin, 1999.
6. I am in happy possession of a DVD copy distributed legally in Singapore by an Australian company, Umbrella Entertainment. See especially the DVD's extra feature "Interview with Director Peter Bogdanovich" as he describes in his own words the production's struggles with the Singapore censors. *Saint Jack*, dir. Peter Bogdanovich, 112 min., Umbrella Entertainment, 2004, DVD. In chapter eight of this book, Jun Zubillaga-Pow also references the Singapore government's official take on *Saint Jack*, as represented by the country's main English-language newspaper *The Straits Times* in 1980.
7. Lim, 2004. For gay prostitution, see pages 105–23.
8. Millet suggests that *Saint Jack*'s "1970s American independent filmmaking ... style ... would resurface 10 to 15 years later in the works of young local filmmakers like Djinn, who were attracted by the fringes and underbelly of Singapore society" (Millet, 2006: 77).
9. Because of its soft-core sexuality, DVDs of the film are not available in Singapore.
10. It is both interesting and perplexing to note that lesbian cinematic representations have thus far been limited in Singapore.

11. In his excellent analysis of Royston Tan's oeuvre, political scientist Kenneth Paul Tan alludes subtly to the queer possibilities in Tan's films. He notes how *15* offers a "homoerotic subtext [that] is clear and poignant" despite the filmmaker's disavowal of such a reading (Tan, 2008: 240). He also characterizes Tan's autobiographical confessions in *Mother* as references to the filmmaker's "vaguely implied homosexuality" (Tan, 2008: 236).
12. The Uhdes label *Solos* as "the first gay fiction feature" (Uhde and Uhde, 2010: 154) and praise it as "one of the best films the city has produced" (Uhde and Uhde, 2010: 153).
13. In her trenchant analysis of the "revisionist, ego-based psychoanalytic" work of Richard C. Friedman and Richard Green in the 1980s (Sedgwick, 1993: 70), Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick critiques the notion that "mothers ... have nothing to contribute to this process of masculine validation [in gay boys], and [points out how] women are reduced in the light of its urgency to a null set: any involvement in it by a woman is overinvolvement; any protectiveness is overprotectiveness; and, for instance, mothers 'proud of their sons' nonviolent qualities' are manifesting unmistakable 'family pathology'" (Sedgwick, 1993: 75; Sedgwick quotes from Friedman, 1988: 193).

Chapter 10: The Kids Are *Not* All Right

1. An earlier version of this essay appears as 'Censure and Censor', 19 March 2010, in *S/PORES: New Directions in Singapore Studies*, <http://s-pores.com/page/3/?s>. I thank the editors for allowing me to reproduce the ideas introduced in that paper here.

Chapter 11: "Singaporean by birth, Singaporean by faith"

1. One preliminary note on terminology: In my time doing fieldwork in Singapore, I found that for the most part, the individuals with whom I interacted used the terms "LGBT", "gay", "lesbian", "bisexual" or "queer" when referring to themselves and to those in their social and activist circles. Some informants did speak in local terms such as *ah qua* (a derogatory Hokkien term for gay men) or *pondan* (Malay for effeminate male) at different times and in different contexts. For the sake of consistency, simplicity, and inclusivity, I utilize queer. My research in Singapore suggests that the logic of enumeration, in which potentially endless number of initialisms such as LGBT, LGBTQ, and LGBTQI etc. is insufficient to capture the "unstable identity process" (Phelan, 1997: 60) demonstrated by many of my Singaporean interlocutors. Additionally, most names and many identifying details have been changed to protect the anonymity of informants.
2. In my research, I have interacted with numerous Singaporean men of Indian descent who have sex with other men (MSM), a majority of whom are married with children. While their sexual behaviour may be etically perceived and described as bisexual or even gay, this particular group of men does not self-identify in this manner. As such, their experiences are not represented in the current essay.
3. Due to the relative anonymity that comes with communications that occur in cyberspace, it was impossible to definitively determine if the persons with whom I were interacting online were truly Indian-Singaporeans. However, most of the men and women whom I encountered online eventually agreed to meet offline. In these instances, their identity was verified.

4. It should be emphasised that a vast majority of current Singaporeans are the product of diasporic migrations that have taken place since the early nineteenth century. In addition to the minority ethnic Indians, ethnic Malays are a minority in Singapore despite being politically portrayed as indigenous *bumiputras*. Singapore's majority Chinese are themselves a minority within the greater Southeast Asian region.
5. While this essay primarily examines marginalization of queer Indian-Singaporeans, it should be noted that in many instances queer Malay-Singaporeans face similar problems.
6. The People's Republic of China (PRC) is viewed as the "first" China whereas Taiwan (Republic of China) is seen as the "second" China. Depending on the perspective of the speaker, Singapore or Hong Kong is often spoken of as the "third" China.
7. There are four official languages in Singapore. English is the language of administration and commerce. Among the other languages, Malay is the national language and Mandarin and Tamil are considered official languages.
8. For more on the idea of "Chineseness" see Chun 1996. For a comparative discussion of the idea of "Americanness" see Grewal, 2005.
9. The marginalization encountered by queer Indian-Singaporeans is, of course, not unique (See, for example, Bhaskaran, 2004; Gopinath, 2005; Ratti, 1993). In addition to the interviews conducted in Singapore, I conducted abbreviated interviews with queers of Indian origin in other cosmopolitan cities including Kuala Lumpur, Bangkok, and Hong Kong. While the content of these interviews varied widely, interlocutors in all locations spoke of marginalization along racial lines.
10. People Like Us (2011), <http://www.plu.sg/society/?p=39> (accessed on 13 October 2011).
11. For a full listing of content guidelines see People Like Us (2011), <http://www.plu.sg/society/?p=40> (accessed on 13 October 2011).
12. Fridae (2011), <http://www.fridae.com/aboutus/> (accessed on 13 October 2011).
13. The other site discussed in this chapter, *SiGNeL*, is a Yahoo group and as such, the servers are located in the United States.
14. At the time of writing there were approximately 350 profiles posted by men who identify as Malay.

Chapter 12: "We're the gay company, as gay as it gets"

1. Although the official website is known as 'Fridae.com', this chapter uses 'Fridae' rather than 'Fridae.com' to refer to how the website has become a 'brand' or 'cultural icon' for other offline and online practices. This usage is also consistent with how the company names itself on its website. See Fridae (2010).
2. See Davis (2008) for a toolkit for sustainable LGBT businesses that includes a short profile on Fridae.
3. On how the State embraces new media and suppresses the civil society, see Rodan (2003).
4. On the legal and political ramifications of Singapore's Internet censorship laws, see Hogan (1999) and Rodan (1998). On gay business raids, see Anonymous (2010).

5. Queer consumption studies is a burgeoning field that includes niche marketing, pink tourism, gay advertising and the media commodification of sex and sexual identity. Recent studies here include Branchik (2006); Gobe (2001); Fejes (2002); Sender (2004); and Streitmatter (2004).
6. For a history of these developments and the specificities of lesbian consumption practices, see Yue (2011).
7. For a useful representation of these debates, see groyn88 (2010).
8. The Speaker's Corner is the only place in the country where public assembly and public speaking are allowed without a police permit.

Index

- Absence*, 169
activism,
 HIV/AIDS, 7
 lesbian, 21, 87, 90
 LGBT, 1, 4–5, 15–16, 25, 101, 164, 200, 209
Adorno, Theodor, 155
Ahmed, Sara, 149, 154
Ah qua, 7, 219n1
Althusser, Louis, 39
Anglo-American perspective, 83
Ann Siang Hill/Road, 123, 125–26, 131, 133
Army Daze, 169
Au, Alex, 4, 55, 63, 89, 97, 101, 110, 112, 133,
 169, 199, 214n3, 214n7, 215n9, 217n4
Autopsy, 169, 172
AWARE (Association of Women for
 Action and Research), 20, 59–69, 154
- Beautiful Boxer*, 169
Benjamin, Walter, 165, 218n5
Bi, Kenneth, 169
Boat Quay, 123, 125
Bogdanovich, Peter, 166, 218n6
Boo, Junfeng, 162, 168–69
Box, The (sauna), 134
breast binding, 16–17
Bugis Street, 7, 31, 118–19
Bugis Street (film), 167–68
butch, 4, 10, 13, 16–18, 201, 207
- Café Vienna, 138–39
censorship, 176–79, 184–85, 219n1, 220n4
 media, 8, 22–24, 38, 104, 111, 158, 161–70,
 200, 213n7
 theatre, 12, 102, 183
- Censorship Review Committee (CRC),
 178–79, 185
Cheaters, 24, 177–80, 184
Children and Young Persons Act (CYPA),
 48–50
China, 35–36, 43, 190, 198, 202, 208, 217n1,
 220n6
Chinese Singaporeans, 40, 189–90, 194
Cholodenko, Lisa, 23, 175
Chua, Beng Huat, 1–2, 4–5, 12–13, 18, 61,
 94, 99, 151
Church of Our Saviour, 61, 65
citizenship, 103–7, 153, 195
 cultural, 18–22, 29–43, 71–81
 legal, 71–73
 sexual, 19, 21
 spatial, 59
civil society, 1–2, 8, 19–20, 59, 61–65, 68–69,
 104, 209, 220
colonialism, 6–7, 11, 13, 21, 30, 35, 98, 103,
 156, 166, 200, 216n3
coming out, 7, 10–11, 21, 40, 76, 80, 91,
 93–94, 172
communitarianism, 12
compulsory heterosexuality, 19, 30, 33, 37,
 40–42, 178
cosmopolitanism, 19, 21, 98, 100–4, 107–13,
 153, 217n2
creative industries, 2, 9–17, 21, 102, 198–99,
 205–7, 210–11
creativity, 8, 15–18, 95–96, 100–4, 107–9,
 169, 179, 185, 201–7
crisis, narrative, 36, 106
Cut, 169
Cut Sleeve Boys, 169

- deviant/deviance, 11, 18, 22, 29, 62–63, 69, 78, 94, 105, 152, 156–58
- Diamond Health Centre, 135
- Duggan, Lisa, 152
- economic development, 4, 100
- education, 5, 19–21, 37–42, 59, 63, 67–69, 91, 94, 99–100, 110, 190–92, 203–10
- election, 37
- enforcement, passive, 20, 45–46, 54–58, 108
- Esplanade, 121–22, 180–83
- ethics,
 - business, 203
 - gay, 15–16, 170–71
 - political, 159
 - social, 14, 167, 219n2
 - work, 12
- eugenics, 32, 41
- Facebook, 23, 29, 95, 147
- Fanon, Frantz, 35, 39
- femininity, 76–79
- feminism, 21, 60, 62, 66, 72, 84–85, 90
- Florida, Richard, 9, 101–2
- Floyd, Kevin, 149, 155
- Focus on the Family, 62–63
- Forever Fever*, 169
- Fort Road Beach, 122–23
- Foucault, Michel, 15–16, 29, 35, 42, 89, 159
- Free Community Church, 146
- Fridae, 3, 25, 192–94, 197–212
- gay,
 - cruising, 7, 15, 22, 119–28, 133–35, 147, 188
 - doing, 13, 15–17, 95–96
 - entrepreneurs, 8, 22, 25, 129, 141, 193, 198, 201
 - saunas, 15, 23, 52, 111, 128–35, 143, 188–89, 201
 - venues, 117–47
- George, Cherian, 59, 113, 151
- Glass Cathedral*, 11–12
- global city, Singapore as, 21, 97–114, 163
- global gay, 11, 15, 84, 88, 90, 93–96, 204, 216n6
- globalization, 15, 22, 85, 98–99, 103, 109, 168
- Goei, Glen, 169
- Hangar, The (bar), 137–38
- Happy (club), 144
- Harvey, David, 153, 155
- heartlander, 111
- Heng, Ivan, 13, 169
- heteronormativity, 4, 6–11, 21–23, 37, 67, 71, 76, 81, 91–93, 149, 152, 162–63, 168, 177
- HIV/AIDS, 10, 31–34, 49–50, 55–56, 63, 67, 89, 154, 199–203, 210–11
- homonationalism, 23, 149–59
- homonormativity, 2, 12, 23, 152–59
- homosexuality, 163, 212
- Hong Lim Park (Hong Lim Green), 3, 120–25, 209
- human rights, 1, 6, 18, 33, 59, 107, 199
- illiberal pragmatics, 2–11, 17–19, 81, 87, 108, 120, 161, 163, 192, 196, 198
- impossible presence, 162–73
- Indian-Singaporeans, 24, 188–96
- IndigNation, 3, 146, 162, 203–4, 211
- Infectious Diseases Act, 55
- Internal Security Act, 39
- Internet, 8, 22–25, 29, 38, 43, 87–90, 147, 188, 192–95, 199–210
- Jalan Kubor, 119
- karaoke, 89, 135, 141, 143
- Katong Fugue*, 169, 172
- The Kids Are All Right*, 23–24, 175
- Lau, Josie, 61–65
- Le Bistro (bar), 136
- Lee, Hsien Loong, 40, 45, 102
- Lee, Kuan Yew, 8, 30–37, 40, 43, 89, 104, 109–11, 149
- legislation, anti-sodomy, 35, 103–4, 108; *see also* Section 377A
- lesbian, 175–85
 - Asian, 3, 17, 83–96, 193
 - nightlife, 9, 16–18, 130
 - performing arts, 24–25, 184–86
 - “sexually challenged women”, 64
 - transnational identities, 2, 83–96, 193, 212
- LGBT, 1–4, 8–25, 59, 87, 120, 163, 175–76, 198, 203–4, 207–12, 216n6, 219n1, 220n2

- Liang Po Po The Movie*, 169
 Lian, Teng Bee, 169
 Lim, Max, 129–33
Locust, 169
 Lo, Jacqueline, 184
 Loo, Zihan, 23, 162, 167–71
Lucky 7, 168, 174
 Lume, Kan, 23, 162, 170
- Marmota (disco), 140–41
 masculinity
 and gay men, 78–80, 140, 156, 199, 219n13
 and nationality, 11, 21, 36–38, 40–42, 169
 lesbian, 16–17, 92
 media,
 control, 8, 23–24, 38, 66, 192, 220n3
 new, 22, 25, 29, 198–99, 206, 212, 220n3
 social, 18, 23, 25, 43, 147, 201–4
 Media Development Authority (MDA), 9, 23, 38, 162, 175–82, 205
 MediaCorp Raintree Pictures, 161, 218n2
 military, 20–21, 37, 40, 71–81, 104
 Military Security Department, 79
 Ministry of Education, 38–39, 67–69
 Miscellaneous Offences (Public Order and Nuisance) Act (MOPOA), 51–56, 215n9–n10
Money No Enough, 169
 Moo, Joash, 10
 morality, 32, 62, 179, 209
Mother, 169, 172, 219n11
 Mox Bar and Café, 145–46
 multiracialism, 3, 5, 18
- National Council of Churches of Singapore, 65
 nationalism, 105, 114, 152–55, 194, 208
 compulsory, 149, 155
 National Library Board, 23, 150, 159
 National Service, 11, 20, 71, 74–78, 80–81
 nation-building, 23, 40, 71, 75, 89, 151, 155, 157, 159, 196
 Nation Party, 3–4, 32, 197, 211, 213n1
 negative dialectics, 155–59
 neoliberalism/neoliberal, 2, 8–9, 12, 19, 25, 33, 84, 87, 109, 151–53, 155, 198, 211–12
- neo-Victorianism, 33–34, 37, 40–43
 newspapers,
 Chinese-language, 38
 English-language, 60, 65, 149–59, 218n6
- Pebbles Bar, 136–38, 141
Peculiar Chris, 11, 34
 penal code, 1, 35, 154
 People Like Us, 3, 7, 39, 89, 193, 200, 220n10–n11
- pink,
 dollar, 3, 103, 112, 141, 163, 197–98
 dot, 95, 209, 211, 216n6
 tourism, 22, 201, 221n5
Pleasure Factory, 167–68
- politics,
 identity, 15, 84, 153, 163
 queer, 15, 21, 27–37, 96–113, 163
 sexual, 1, 152, 154
- postcolonial, 1–4, 17, 19, 29, 31, 34, 37, 84–95, 98, 107, 150–54, 157, 159, 208
 pragmatism, 15–18, 81, 87, 91, 95, 108, 151, 161, 198
- prosecution, 7, 20, 46–57
 prostitution, homosexual, 30, 166–67
 Puar, Jasbir, 152–53, 155
- public housing, 6–7, 20, 41, 91–92, 99, 105, 110–11
 public indecency, 215n9–n10
 public toilets, 49, 53, 55, 121, 128, 215n9–n11
- queer,
 Asia, 2, 4, 25, 93, 207–8
 cinema, 18–25, 163–73
 complicity, 2
 rights, 97, 103, 106–9
 space, 112
 theory, 18, 164
 world-making, 156–59
- racialised, 22–24
 Rairua (sauna), 132–33
 Rajagopal, K, 169
 Raw (sauna), 133
 RedQuEEen, 90, 200
 religion, 14, 40, 59–69
Rice Rhapsody, 169, 172–73
 River Valley Swimming Pool, 122, 128

- Sa'at, Alfian, 13, 31, 40
Saint Jack, 158, 166–70, 218n6–n8, 218n10
 same-sex marriage, 62
 Section 377A, 6, 23, 35, 49, 53–54, 61, 87, 89, 161, 184, 216n3
 Sen, Ong Keng, 169
 sex education, 59, 63, 67–69, 162, 210
 shame, 15–18, 33–34, 94, 154, 156
SiGNeL, 192–93, 220n13
Silly Child, 24, 176–77, 184
 Singapore Armed Forces, 73, 106
 Singapore Film Commission, 161, 218n2
 Singapore International Film Festival, 166, 169–70
 Singapore Tourist Promotion Board, 166
 social enterprise, 197–212
 social movement, *see* activism
Solos, 23, 162, 164, 168–71, 173, 219n12
 sovereignty, 21, 105–7, 113
 Spartacus (sauna), 120, 129–31
 Spivak, Gayatri, 89
 Stonewall (post), 5–6, 10
Straits Times, The, 60–68, 154–59, 193
 Stroke (sauna), 131
 subjectivities,
 lesbian, 84–87, 90–91, 95
 sexual, 84–86, 94–95, 106, 191
- Taboo (club), 143–44, 201
 Tanjong Pagar Road, 142–44
Tanjong Rhu, 162, 168
 television, 22–25, 38, 179
 Thailand, 3–4, 83–84, 128, 198, 208, 216n4
 theatre, 12, 89
 Thio, Su Mien, 62–67, 217n8
 Thng, Victric, 169
Threshold, 162, 168
- Tong, Goh Chok, 88, 99
 transgender/transsexual/transvestite,
 4–7, 10–11, 18, 31, 63, 77–78, 118–19,
 167–69, 213n2
 transnational, 19, 21–24, 83–96, 98–99, 105,
 109–12, 162–63, 188, 195
 Treetops Bar, 138–39
 Turnbull, Mary Constance, 30, 36–42,
 150–51, 217n3
 Tutu, Desmond, 66
- Uekrongtham, Ekachai, 167–69
- values,
 Asian, 12, 32, 34, 36, 89, 151, 169, 190–91
 family, 8, 12, 21, 67–68, 89, 92, 179, 199, 209
 hierarchical, 7
 homonormative, 12
 masculine, 38
 national, 71–72
 Western, 191
- Victorian England, 31–37, 41
 Vincent's (bar), 141
- Wedding Game, The*, 169
 Williams, Linda, 164–67, 170, 218n5
Women Who Love Women, 168
 World Health Organization (WHO), 78,
- Yan, Olivia, 176–77, 184
Yellow Fever, 169
 Yeung, Ray, 169
 Yonfan, 167–68
 Yu-Beng, Lim, 170–71
 Yue, Audrey, 1–27, 87, 95, 98, 108, 163,
 197–212, 217n7, 221n6