Gay and Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review

Editor
Damien W. Riggs

General Information

All submissions or enquires should be directed in the first instance to the Editor. Guidelines for submissions or for advertising within the Gay and Lesbian Issues in Psychology Review ('the Review') are provided on the final page of each issue.

http://www.groups.psychology.org.au/glip/glip_review/

The Review is listed on Ulrich's Periodicals Directory: http://www.ulrichsweb.com/

The Review is indexed by EBSCO, DOAJ, International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement, Pandora Archive NLA and ProQuest (Genderwatch). The Review is eligible for DEST points.

Aims and scope

The Review is a peer-reviewed publication that is available online through the Australian Psychological Society website. Its remit is to encourage research that challenges the stereotypes and assumptions of pathology that have often inhered to research on lesbians and gay men (amongst others). The aim of the Review is thus to facilitate discussion over the direction of lesbian and gay psychology in Australia, and to provide a forum within which academics, practitioners and lay people may publish.

The Review is open to a broad range of material, and especially welcomes research, commentary and reviews that critically evaluate the status quo in regards to lesbian and gay issues. The Review also seeks papers that redress the imbalance that has thus far focused on the issues facing white lesbians and gay men, to the exclusion of other sexual and racial groups. The Review encourages the elaboration of an expansive approach to psychological research on people of a diverse range of sexual and non-gender normative groups.

Copyright

Whilst the Review is a peer-reviewed, ISSN registered journal, in the interest of fair practice the copyright of work published remains with the author. However, the Review requests that work published elsewhere acknowledges that it was originally published in the Review, and that the same piece of work is not published for free elsewhere online.

Upon submitting a manuscript for publication in the Review, contributing authors warrant that they have not already had the manuscript published elsewhere, and that they have the appropriate permission to reproduce any copyrighted material (eg. diagrams) which forms part of their manuscript.

Publications of the Society are distributed to various other publications for review and abstracting purposes. In addition, the Society has contractual agreements with various secondary publishers for the republication, in hard copy, microfilm or digital forms, of individual articles and journal issues as a whole. Upon acceptance of their manuscripts by the Society for publication in this Review, authors who retain copyright in their work are deemed to have licensed the Society to reproduce their works, as they appear in the Review, through secondary publication.

Disclaimer

Work published within the Review does not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Australian Psychological Society. Whilst the APS supports the work of the Gay and Lesbian Issues and Psychology Interest Group, it also adheres to its own standards for practice and research that may at times conflict with those of the Review.

Gay and Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review

Volume 4 Number 3

Contents

EDITORIAL

DAMIEN W. RIGGS

As the fourth year of the publication of the *Review* draws to a close I am pleased to present this general issue of the journal. The journal continues to go from strength to strength, with both Proquest and EBSCO indexing the journal, and with citations for articles continuing to appear in a wide range of journals. GLIP Review also made a submission to the recent Australian Research Council inquiry about journal rankings and we hope to receive positive news that the Review will appear in ARC journal rankings.

This issue of the journal features four articles, one commentary, one conference report and three book reviews. The first paper examines the lives of bisexual people, a group who often receive little attention within psychological research on LGBTQ people. Kirsten McLean examines the psychological consequences that arise for bisexual men and women when their sexual identities are not recognised as valid, and the ways in which this can lead bisexual people to hide their identities.

In the second paper Bouzianis, Malcolm and Hallab explore some of the factors that predict gay and lesbian couples' willingness to reveal their sexual identities in the workplace. Most clearly, they found that experiences of internalised homophobia and the existence (or otherwise) of anti-discrimination policies within the workplace were the most significant predictors of coming out in the workplace. Their findings highlight the need for more inclusive workplace practices for supporting lesbians and gay men.

The third paper by Gemma Edgar explores notions of 'queer' in relation to the experiences of young LGBTQ people experiencing homelessness. Through an examination of issues relating to state sanction and the need for belonging amongst this population, Edgar suggests that queer theory can both open up and also close down opportunities for better understanding experiences of homelessness and the best modes for addressing it.

In the final article, Alan Berman examines from a legal perspective the ways in which constructions of sexuality are deployed within the political sphere in Malaysia to achieve certain ends. Berman's incisive analysis explores how negative constructions of homosexuality continue to be used to attack individuals and to position same-sex sexualities and practices as immoral.

The commentary in this issue is a response piece to an article published in the first issue of 2008. In the commentary Poon and Sin explore what it means to claim that 'love can overcome everything' in relationships between Asian and white men. They argue that what is needed is an examination of the function of racialised power dynamics and their role in shaping the lives of mixed-race couples.

The issues closes with three book reviews and an excellent conference report by Jeffery Adams, focusing on the 2008 LGBT psychology summer institute held at the University of Michigan.

As always, the papers, commentaries, reports and reviews featured in this issue highlight the diversity of voices that are broadly represented within the journal, and draw attention to the important space that the journal creates in supporting the work of scholars researching the lives of LGBTQ people.

SILENCES AND STEREOTYPES: THE IMPACT OF (MIS)CONSTRUCTIONS OF BISEXUALITY ON AUSTRALIAN BISEXUAL MEN AND WOMEN

KIRSTEN MCLEAN

Abstract

This article argues that bisexuality is undermined as a legitimate sexual identity via discourses that construct sexuality as a binary (heterosexual or homosexual) and stereotypes of bisexual men and women as unstable, undecided, or in denial of their 'true' sexuality. It examines the social and psychological consequences of these constructions and the role they play in coming to terms, and living, with a bisexual identity. Interviews with sixty Australian bisexual men and women revealed their significant difficulties coming to terms with a bisexual identity, including feelings of isolation and exclusion, and fears about revealing their bisexuality to others. This raises a number of issues about the impact of binary constructions of sexuality and stereotypes of bisexuals on the psychological and mental health of bisexual men and women.

Introduction

Bisexuality is not a well-understood sexual identity. Instead, it has either been silenced in public discourses about sexuality, or when it has been made visible, is marred by stereotypes and misrepresentations that paint a misleading portrait of bisexual life. As a result, bisexuality is undermined as a valid sexual identity. This not only creates difficulties for those seeking information about bisexuality, but has significant consequences for those coming to terms with a bisexual identity, or coming out as bisexual (Fox, 1993; Weinberg, Williams & Pryor, 1994) including living with 'continued uncertainty' (Weinberg, Williams & Pryor, 1994) about the legitimacy of one's bi-

sexual identity. The difficulties faced by those coming to terms with and coming out as bisexual have a negative impact upon their psychological and mental health (Heath, 2005; Jorm, Korten, Rodgers, Jacomb & Christensen, 2002).

Contemporary discourses of sexuality construct sexual identity as a binary between heterosexuality and homosexuality. According to this binary these sexual categories are mutually exclusive. Sexuality is then seen as an 'either/or' choice: one is either heterosexual or homosexual, or 'straight or gay'. Viewing sexuality as a dichotomy greatly hinders our understandings about the diversity of human sexuality (Paul, 1985, p. 46); but it also contributes to a lack of understanding about bisexuality in the wider world and the destabilisation of bisexuality as an identity category. The binary also works to silence the voices of bisexual people.

The heterosexual/homosexual binary is also reflected in popular understandings that people are either 'straight or gay'. For example, celebrities who begin same-sex relationships are assumed to have 'turned gay': actresses Lindsay Lohan and Cynthia Nixon both had significant heterosexual histories prior to their current same-sex relationships. Regardless of how they actually identify, the fact they might be bisexual is never considered. Furthermore, bisexual men and women who form long-term relationships with either sex are often assumed to be heterosexual if their partner is of the opposite sex or gay/lesbian if their partner is of the same sex (Barker, Bowes-Catton, Iantaffi, Cassidy & Brewer, 2008, p. 145;

George, 1993, p. 104). The understanding that people are either straight or gay has meant some bisexuals have also identified substantial pressure to 'choose a side' (Paul, 1984, p. 30; Weinberg, Williams & Pryor, 1994, p. 145).

Such binary discourses send a powerful cultural message that bisexuality is neither a valid nor acceptable sexual identity, and these constructions contribute to the oppression of bisexual men and women (James, 1996, p. 220). Assuming that people are either straight or gay silences the reality of bisexual lives and further reifies the already-powerful binary between heterosexual and homosexual. Furthermore, it creates enormous difficulties for those seeking validation for a sexuality that is neither of these and can lead to isolation, distress and self-doubt (Paul, 1985, p.46). As a result, developing a healthy sense of self-identity is particularly difficult if one is bisexual.

The heterosexual/homosexual binary also supports many of the stereotypes about bisexuality that undermine bisexuality as a valid sexual identity. Because heterosexuality and homosexuality are constructed as mutually exclusive, bisexuality, as the uncharted 'middle ground', is considered an unacceptable category of sexual identity. Bisexuals are viewed as being unable to decide between these two options, and are consequently seen as being psychologically disturbed. If the only valid sexual identities are heterosexuality (and to a lesser extent homosexuality), then those who do not fit into these categories are subsequently deemed to be indecisive, confused, in denial of their 'true' homosexuality, or 'fence-sitting' – unable or unwilling to decide between heterosexuality and homosexuality. The construction of bisexual men and women as having a problematic psychology means that bisexuality then becomes a 'problematic' sexual identity. Similarly, the concept of the unreliable and unstable bisexual means that bisexuality then becomes an unreliable and unstable sexual identity as well. These stereotypes are often manifest in the belief that bi-

sexual men and women only adopt the bisexual label due to internal psychological conflict or to avoid the stigma of a gay or lesbian identity (Evans, 1993, p. 151).

Stereotypes of bisexuals that focus on sexual behaviour also invalidate bisexuality as a legitimate sexual identity. Because bisexual men and women have the potential to experience attractions for more than one gender, they are often assumed to be more sexually adventurous and promiscuous than heterosexuals or homosexuals. This assumption has led to the stereotype of bisexuals as kinky, non-monogamous, and sexually depraved (Ault 1994, p. 109; Hansen & Evans 1985, p. 2) or as needing to be in concurrent relationships with a man and a woman in order to fulfil their sexuality. The stereotype of the promiscuous, sexually indiscriminate bisexual also constructs bisexual men and women as unable to commit to relationships meaning they are therefore often seen as an unreliable and unstable partner choice.

Bisexuality is undermined as a legitimate sexual identity both through the construction of sexuality as a binary between heterosexual and homosexual, and via misleading and inaccurate stereotypes of bisexuality. As such, bisexuality becomes a "discredited, socially alienated location" (Gurevich, Bower, Mathieson & Dhayanandhan, 2007, p. 220). This has a serious impact on the self-esteem and mental health of those who identify as bisexual. This article argues that constructions of bisexuality that undermine bisexuality as a valid sexual identity create considerable difficulties for bisexual men and women, and examines some of the social and psychological consequences of this for bisexual men and women in Australia.

Methods

The data for this article come from a qualitative study on the lives of forty bisexual women and twenty bisexual men living in Australia. In-depth interviews were conducted that examined issues such as self-identity, coming out

as bisexual, relationships with partners, friends and family, and participation in the gay, lesbian and bisexual communities. The project was advertised widely through both online and offline bisexual networks within Australia as well as through Australian gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender networks. Participants were aged between 21 and 66 years of age, although nearly two-thirds of the sample was under the age of 30. Most participants were well educated, Australian born and lived in capital cities in the eastern states of Australia. This article draws on participants' discussions of coming to terms with being bisexual, and their reflections on both attitudes to bisexuality and being out as bisexual in the wider world.

Isolation, Exclusion and Secrecy

> If I had a choice, I wouldn't choose to be bisexual because it's really difficult. (Sarah, age 29)

As mentioned above, the power of the heterosexual/homosexual binary that undermines bisexuality has a serious impact on those who identify as bisexual. Living as bisexual becomes especially difficult when one is faced with persistent assumptions that one is either straight or gay. For many of my participants, these assumptions occurred on a regular basis, and made them feel that bisexuality was never considered as a possible identity option by other people:

> There's an assumption that you are straight, and if they find out you sleep with women they assume you're a lesbian. If you say you are bisexual they think you aren't serious about it. (Pauline, age 31)

> I'm often assumed to be straight if I'm campaigning for abortion rights, or lesbian if participating in a gay and lesbian group. (Tina, age 24)

Participants acknowledged that the likelihood of being assumed to be heterosexual or homosexual depended on situation and context; they often also faced direct accusations from others of being in denial of their sexuality or being 'really' gay or lesbian or 'really' heterosexual:

> The message from lesbian friends was often 'Oh, you're really a lesbian'. (Lauren, age 27)

> In the first couple of years, some lesbians told me bisexuality was a phase and that I was in the process of finding my true identity. I've always felt comfortable being in the middle of the Kinsey scale but always felt there was a decision to be made. (Amanda, age 26)

> Friends of a lesbian girlfriend of mine said to me: "You're really a lesbian." I said: "No I'm not." They told my girlfriend she was betraying them for going out with a bisexual. (Andrea, age 34)

Many participants experienced challenges to their bisexuality that reinforced constructions of sexuality as either straight or gay. Bisexuality was assumed to be a phase, or a state of denial, rather than a legitimate (and permanent) sexual identity. Equally important, however, was that these challenges reinforced stereotypes of bisexual men and women as confused and unstable.

The belief that sexuality is a choice between heterosexuality and homosexuality, and the stereotypes about bisexuality that follow from this, are illustrated in participants' descriptions of feeling pressured to 'choose a side' (heterosexual or homosexual) or to 'make their mind up' about their sexuality. This pressure not only came from others, but often from within:

> I felt a lot of pressure when I was younger. The pressure came from my Catholic upbringing and my psychiatrist. The psychiatrist suggested I have lots of sex with men – by going to saunas and things like that – to help me make a choice. I took drugs and stuff to cope with the pressure. (Patrick, age 45)

> Some in the gay community and some of my gay friends are intolerant of bisexuals

and I feel they want me to identify as one or the other. I feel like they want me to make my mind up. Sometimes I'll tell them to get stuffed, but sometimes it makes me very withdrawn. (Rhiannon, age 29)

I've felt pressure in the lesbian community and I've been trying to fit in, trying to look a certain way. I feel like they're thinking that you can't be on the fence, you have to be gay or straight. (Leanne, age 25)

I've felt pressure in the gay community and pressure from boyfriends – one man refused to sleep with me and told me to come back when I'd changed my mind about being bi. (Michael, age 36)

As these quotes demonstrate, bisexual men and women face enormous pressures to fit their sexuality into a binary framework that destabilises bisexuality as a valid sexual identity. This makes identifying as bisexual incredibly difficult as revelations about being bisexual leave one open to criticism and disapproval.

Participants also felt that the continued stereotyping of bisexual men meant that few people saw bisexuality as a real sexual identity. They were frustrated by the sense that bisexuality was often only understood in terms of indiscriminate sexual behaviours:

I hate the idea that we are just swingers, or that we can't keep up a monogamous relationship. (Peta, age 25)

Bisexuality's only visible in a negative way, sadly. The only stories you hear about bisexuals are negative ones, like bi men being HIV carriers. There are no positive images at all. (Andrea, age 34)

The only thing that's in the public eye is things like AIDS and promiscuity – and they're just stereotypes. (Daniel, age 22)

I think it is difficult because the word conjures up the idea that you need to have sex with men and women at once. (Mark, age 53)

The equation of bisexuality with sexual behaviour silences the diverse realities of living with a bisexual identity and reduces bisexual men and women to mere sexual beings. As Miles, a 30 year old bisexual man suggested, the main problem was that, unlike heterosexuality and homosexuality which are more commonly referred to as straight, gay or lesbian, there is no other commonly-used identity label for bisexual except the word *bisexual* which has the word 'sex' in it. He suggested that "Maybe to increase visibility we need to invent a new label that allows people to see bisexuality as something more than about sex". More importantly, the sexualisation of bisexuality undermines the legitimacy of bisexual identity and contributes further to difficulties identifying as bisexual when bisexuality is aligned with promiscuity, infidelity and unsafe sexual practices.

Another concern for participants was that in the face of continued negative images of, and stereotypes about, bisexuality, there were few positive role models or representations for them to identify with. They acknowledged the difficulties of coming to terms with being bisexual as a result of this:

It would have been easier if there had been positive role models, and real ones rather than celebrities, real ordinary people that I could be like. (Michael, age 36)

If there had been things in the media, on TV, or more books, it would have made it easier. I only realised I was bisexual at 20 or 21 because no one talked about it at school. (Daniel, age 22)

It would be good if being bisexual was mentioned in the media – it's rarely mentioned; it's always 'gay and lesbian.' If it was a bit more out there and I'd known the word I may have come to terms with it more quickly. (Rhiannon, age 29)

Participants acknowledged that more positive representations of bisexuality in the media would have enabled them to accept their bisexuality earlier, and with less angst, pain and

confusion. Stereotypes and misrepresentations of bisexual men and women clearly have a significant impact on the self-esteem of those who identify as bisexual. Seeing only one-dimensional images of bisexuality – and seeing few representations of ordinary, well-adjusted bisexuals – greatly contributes to the continuing uncertainties, anxieties and confusion about identifying as bisexual, and to feelings of isolation and exclusion amongst many bisexual men and women.

Some participants described such feelings of isolation and exclusion, often as a result of their belief that bisexuality does not fit in a world where sexuality is dichotomised as either heterosexual or homosexual:

> Initially it was difficult. I felt alone and wanted to die. I still feel alone now, and often go out alone to gay venues, which makes me feel even lonelier because I don't fit in there either. I get tears in my eyes watching others bond. But because of my strong personality and stubbornness I am determined to be me. (Leanne, age 25)

> I felt left out, because I had two main groups in my life: heterosexual – at school, college, and in uni classes, and homosexual – on the scene, and in groups like Young and Gay. Embracing bisexuality meant I didn't fit anywhere. (Daniel, age 22)

> I feel constant pressure from both my straight and lesbian friends, even my gay male friends. I get shitty and I stop talking about my bisexuality. It's one of the few things that really make me see red, where it still feels really isolating, even to this day. (Belinda, age 26)

> I find it difficult in a social sense. I don't see the word very often or hear it spoken very often. This can be isolating and alienating. It makes me a bit keener to talk about it so no one has to suffer this like I do. (Tina, age 24)

For some male participants, the difficulties associated with identifying as bisexual led to more serious mental health problems:

> I had enormous problems, I hated myself. I even made arrangements to commit suicide – I reorganised my will and everything. I ended up hiring the best psychiatric doctor who deals with suicide to stop myself from doing it. (Stephen, age 55)

> In my mid-20s I ended up being quite suicidal – not just about being bisexual but this was a contributing factor. I saw a psychiatrist about my depression and told him much later about my bisexual issues. (Patrick, age 45)

> In the early stages I ignored my feelings. I didn't have any idea it was healthy to be both. When I was in high school I developed an eating disorder because I was so jealous of my best friend and his male partners. (Greg, age 31)

It is clear from the above quotes that the heterosexual/homosexual binary wields much power in undermining bisexuality as a valid sexual identity, and can consequently lead to serious difficulties in coming to terms with being bisexual. This has a significant impact on the mental health of bisexual men and women. This is supported by recent Australian research by Jorm et al (2002), which found that bisexuals overall have poorer mental health as compared with homosexuals and heterosexuals, and that they are a "high-risk group for mental health problems and suicidal ideas and actions" (p. 423, 426). The study attributed these problems to a number of factors, including poor social support, and inferred that feelings of stigma or experiences of discrimination may play a part in this. This stigma and discrimination is partly a product of the construction of bisexuality as a non-legitimate sexual identity and the stereotypes that paint a negative portrait of bisexual life.

It is hardly surprising, then, that living as bisexual often means concealing one's bisexuality to avoid discrimination, isolation, or accusations of being in denial. Previous research has found that bisexuals are less likely to be out than gay men and lesbians, or often practice selective disclosure when coming out as bisexual (King & McKeown, 2003; McLean, 2007; Weinberg, Williams & Pryor, 1994).

162

Many participants felt that being totally open and honest about their bisexuality was impossible, and many chose instead to conceal their bisexuality in certain contexts:

> When I've been surrounded by 'rabid' dykes it's been hard to be honest. I used to hide behind my female partner and not defend myself. (Liz, age 37)

> I selectively tell people. Often I throw something subtle in the conversation to see the reaction. If they flinch, perhaps I won't tell them, especially if I can see it in their body language. So I check out who can handle it and who can't. I don't run in and announce to people that I'm bi straight away. I have to think about it before telling – you've got too much to lose. (Jenny, age 39)

> I often feel that if I openly identify as bisexual I'll be ostracised. (Holly, age 24)

> I get worried about acceptance from others and find it really hard to deal with so I conform or hide. I do secretive stuff and don't tell people about parts of my life. (Jenny, age 39)

Often participants chose to not correct assumptions about their sexual identity when they were assumed to be gay, lesbian or heterosexual:

> I sometimes tell people I'm comfortable with both sexes but when I go to gay and lesbian meetings people think I'm a lesbian and I don't deny it. (Carol, age 54)

> People don't come up to you and say anything, but they do assume you are one or the other. I feel awkward in situations where I'm assumed to be gay but I worry that if I tell them otherwise how are they going to react? I hate all the assumptions. (Megan, age 33)

> People assume I'm heterosexual because most of my partners have been male and I've been in constant relationships with men since I've been sexually active. So it's societal pressure to conform because it makes life easier. (Diana, age 35)

These participants felt frustrated about letting assumptions slide and concealing their bisexuality in these situations, but felt that any attempt to correct these assumptions would be futile given the power of the heterosexual/homosexual binary in undermining bisexuality as a real sexual identity and the belief that bisexuals are in denial about being 'really' gay or lesbian or 'really' heterosexual.

However, concealing a bisexual identity, or letting assumptions of heterosexuality or homosexuality slide, reinforces the idea that there are only two valid sexual identities – heterosexual and homosexual. Rust argues that the perception of only two sexual identity options results in many people with highly varied sexuality attempting to fit themselves into a dichotomous model of sexuality (1993, p. 71), meaning that there could be large numbers of people who may choose identities other than bisexual, but have relationships with both men and women. Indeed, research has found that of all of those who have sexual and/or erotic experiences with both men and women and behave bisexually, only a small proportion may identify as bisexual (Fox, 1995: 64). The recent Australian Study of Health and Relationships found that 0.9% of men and 1.4% of women identified their sexuality as bisexual. They also found, however, that a greater number revealed attractions to and/or experiences with both men and women: 6.2% of men and 12.6% of women reported some degree of sexual attractions to both sexes, while 5.4% of men and 8.4% of women reported sexual experience with both sexes (Smith, Rissel, Richters, Grulich & de Visser, 2003, p. 141).

Moreover, George claims that dishonesty or secrecy about "key areas of one's life create a distance from other people, preventing potentially enriching experiences" (1993, p. 104). Bohrek, referring to gay and lesbian identity, says that concealment reinforces the idea that to be same-sex attracted is to be a second-class citizen (1983, p. 16). Secrecy about one's bisexuality also confirms that bisexuality is not something to be proud of, which only

further compounds feelings of isolation, shame and fear.

Feelings of isolation and exclusion and the need for bisexuals to remain secretive about their bisexuality reveal the power of continued uncertainty in the lives of bisexuals, as suggested by Weinberg, Williams and Pryor (1994). Continued uncertainty involves persistent feelings of confusion and doubt about one's bisexuality as well as feelings of isolation (Weinberg, Williams & Pryor, 1994: 27-37). Participants in this research experienced considerable difficulties coming to terms, and living, with a bisexual identity, and many continued to feel much anxiety and doubt about their bisexuality, despite feeling this was the appropriate sexual identity for them. This suggests that to settle on a bisexual identity is challenging in the face of the prevailing stereotype of the inherently unstable, undecided bisexual, and to be positive and confident with this identity is equally challenging as bisexuality is continually erased as a valid sexual identity.

Conclusion

The assumptions about participants' sexual identities that went unchallenged, the conscious concealment of parts of their lives, and the selective disclosure of bisexuality demonstrate the power of the heterosexual/ homosexual binary. The power of this binary is also evident in stereotypes of bisexuality that undermine bisexuality as a legitimate identity and silence the lives of bisexual men and women. It is clear that, despite a movement towards greater acceptance of homosexuality in society, bisexual men and women still struggle for the same acceptance. The lack of acceptance of bisexuality, evidenced by the considerable assumptions and stereotypes that participants faced, meant that many of the bisexual men and women I interviewed found coming to terms, and living, with a bisexual identity incredibly difficult. These findings are consistent with research in the United Kingdom and United States (see Barker, Bowes-Catton, Iantaffi, *et. al.*, 2008; George

1993; Weinberg, Williams & Pryor 1994).

This research also supports findings that have suggested bisexuals face significant mental health issues in the face of continued stigma and biphobia (Jorm, Korten, Rogers, *et. al.,* 2002). Pitts and Couch claim that in the Australian Study of Health and Relationships, bisexuals scored "higher on anxiety, depression, suicidality and negative effect than heterosexual, lesbian and gay respondents" (2005, p. 31). As this article demonstrates, bisexuals face a number of challenges to their bisexuality, including assumptions they are 'really' gay or lesbian (or indeed straight) or assumptions that their sexuality fits into a range of narrow and negative stereotypes. These silence the realities of bisexual life, making the diverse ways of being bisexual invisible. If the conditions for developing a positive, healthy bisexual identity include recognition, validation and support (Fox, 1991) then it is clear there is some way to go for the many bisexual men and women living in Australia.

Author Note

Kirsten McLean is a lecturer in Sociology in the School of Political and Social Inquiry at Monash University in Melbourne where she teaches subjects on sexuality and social research methods. Her research interests include bisexuality, gay and lesbian issues, same-sex relationships, online communications and non-heterosexual women's health.

References

Ault, A. (1994). Hegemonic discourse in an oppositional community: Lesbian feminists and bisexuality. *Critical Sociology, 20*, 107-122.

Barker, M., Bowes-Catton, H., Iantaffi, A., Cassidy, A. & Brewer, L. (2008). British bisexuality: A snapshot of bisexual representation and identities in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Bisexuality, 8,* 141-162.

Bohrek, M. (1983). *Coming out to parents*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press.

Evans, D. (1993). *Sexual citizenship: The material construction of sexualities*. New York: Routledge.

Fox, A. (1991). Development of a bisexual identity: Understanding the process. In L. Kaahumanu & L. Hutchins (Eds.), *Bi any other name* (pp. 29-36). Boston: Alyson Publications.

Fox, R. (1995). Bisexual identities. In A. D'Augelli & C. Patterson (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay and bisexual identities over the life span* (pp. 48-86). New York: Oxford University Press.

George, S. (1993). *Women and bisexuality*. Scarlet Press: London.

Gurevich, M., Bower, J., Mathieson, C. and Dhayanandhan, B. (2007). 'What do they look like and are they among us?': Bisexuality, (dis)closure and (un)viability. In V. Clarke & E. Peel (Eds.) *Out in psychology: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer perspectives* (pp. 217-241). Chichester: Wiley.

Hansen, C., & Evans, A. (1985). Bisexuality reconsidered: An idea in pursuit of a definition. In F. Klein & T. Wolf (Eds.), *Bisexualities: Theory and research* (pp. 1-6). New York: Haworth Press.

Heath, M. (2005). Pronouncing the silent 'B' (in GLBTTIQ). *Gay and Lesbian Issues in Psychology Review, 1*, 87-91.

James, C. (1996). Denying complexity: The dismissal and appropriation of bisexuality in queer, lesbian and gay theory. In B. Beemyn & M. Eliason (Eds.), *Queer studies: A lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender anthology* (pp. 217-231). New York: New York University Press.

Jorm, A., Korten, A., Rodgers, B., Jacomb, P.,

& Christensen, H. (2002). Sexual orientation and mental health: Results from a community survey of young and middle-aged adults. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 180*, 423-427.

King, M., & McKeown, E. (2003). *Mental health and social well-being of gay men, lesbians and bisexuals in England and Wales: A summary of findings*. London: MIND (National Association for Mental Health).

McLean, K. (2007). Hiding in the closet? Bisexuals, coming out and the disclosure imperative. *Journal of Sociology, 43,* 151-166.

Paul, J. (1984). The bisexual identity: An idea without social recognition. *Journal of Homosexuality, 9*, 45-63.

Paul, J. (1985). Bisexuality: Reassessing our paradigms of sexuality. In F. Klein & T. Wolf (Eds.), *Bisexualities: Theory and research* (pp. 21-34). New York: Haworth Press.

Pitts, M. and Couch, M. (2005). Bisexuality and health psychology – Strange bedfellows? *Health Psychology Update*, *14*, 27-32.

Rust, P. (1993). 'Coming out' in the age of social constructionism: Sexual identity formation among lesbian and bisexual women. *Gender and Society, 7*, 50-77.

Smith, A., Rissel, C., Richters, J., Grulich, A., & de Visser, R. (2003). Sex in Australia: Sexual identity, sexual attraction and sexual experience among a representative sample of adults. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 27*, 138-145.

Weinberg, M., Williams, C., & Pryor, D. (1994). *Dual attraction: Understanding bisexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SEXUAL IDENTITY DISCLOSURE IN THE WORKPLACE BY GAY MEN AND LESBIANS: A COUPLES STUDY

BILL BOUZIANIS, JAMES P. MALCOLM AND LISA HALLAB

Abstract

Associations between internalised homophobia, workplace non-discrimination policies and sexual identity disclosure at work in gay men and lesbians at an individual and dyad level have been previously identified (Rostosky & Riggle, 2002). The current study was concerned with the further investigation of these relationships as well as examination of associations between gender, relationship duration, and work disclosure. Participants were 86 individuals, comprising 22 male and 21 female same-gender couples recruited through snowball sampling. All predictor variables were significantly correlated with disclosure. A multiple regression analysis indicated that internalised homophobia and workplace non-discrimination policies both make a significant unique contribution to work disclosure, with internalised homophobia making the strongest contribution. Multilevel analysis found no significant partner effects. Therefore, strategies aimed at reducing internalised homophobia and increasing workplace non-discrimination policies at the individual level may facilitate sexual identity disclosure in the workplace.

Introduction

Disclosing one's sexual identity has significant implications for an individual's social and psychological well-being. Greater disclosure of sexual identity in the workplace by gay and lesbian employees has been associated with improved social and interpersonal factors (Miller & Higgins, 2006; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002).

Work Disclosure

Heterosexual norms create an assumption of heterosexuality as the default sexual identity of employees within most workplaces (Miller & Higgins, 2006). Consequently, the experience of sexual identity disclosure in the workplace may be challenging for gay men and lesbians who must make a conscious decision to either disclose or conceal their sexual identity in most workplace settings. The current study is concerned with an investigation of factors that influence that decision.

Avoidance of potential discrimination is one reason why gay and lesbian employees do not freely disclose their sexual identity in the workplace, as those who choose to disclose generally experience higher levels of discrimination (Badgett, 2001). This discrimination seems to manifest in two ways: formal, which is experienced at an institutional level; and informal, which is related to one's social work environment (Croteau, 1996). For this reason, gay and lesbian employees who choose to hide their sexual identities often report pervasive feelings of fear and anticipation associated with the potential discrimination (Omoto & Kurtzman, 2006).

Although concealing an individual's sexual identity may be an effective means of protection against discrimination (Croteau, 1996), it may also be associated with various individual disadvantages such as reduced productivity, or a detriment to career development (Boatwright, Gilbert, Forrest, & Ketzenberger, 1996). Furthermore, nondisclosure may influence identification and affiliation with the gay

community (Herek, Cogan, Gillis, & Glunt, 1997), a phenomenon which reportedly has a positive impact on an individual's self-esteem (Meyer, 2003). The disclosure and integration of sexual identity into all social roles is thought to be a key part of identity development for gay men and lesbians. Some studies have also suggested that disclosure may have an influence on psychological well-being, as those who choose to disclose tend to be more well-adjusted and have greater life satisfaction (Ellis & Riggle, 1996; Malcolm, 2008; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002). Furthermore, disclosure in the workplace has been associated with en-hanced job satisfaction, productivity and loy-alty (Miller & Higgins, 2006; Powers, 1996). Despite these important findings, the research in this area has been limited, primarily be-cause of methodological issues such as diffi-culty with random or representative sampling because of sensitivity to sexual identity disclo-sure (Badgett, 1996).

Minority Stress and Internalised Homophobia

Minority stress theory explains that when an individual is managing a minority identity, they can experience chronic psychological distress that can be triggered by one or more of three causes: stigma, prejudice and internalised ho-mophobia (Meyer, 2003). The construct of homophobia has recently been reconceptual-ised by Herek (2004) as sexual prejudice to more fully reflect the notion that the term re-fers to negative attitudes or hostility based on sexual orientation rather than 'fear' or 'phobia'. Nevertheless, the construct of inter-nalised homophobia has been consistently reported as the most powerful stressor within minority stress theory, and   has been tradi-tionally defined as "the gay person's direction of negative social attitudes toward the self, leading to a devaluation of the self and resul-tant internal conflicts and poor self-regard" (Meyer & Dean, 1998, p. 161). Inter-nalised homophobia is thought to influence an individual's self acceptance (Schope, 2004) and has been reported as an important, influ-ential factor in the decision to disclose an indi-vidual's sexual identity (Herek et al., 1997; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002). In the workplace in particular, lower levels of internalised homo-phobia are associated with greater disclosure of sexual identity (Rostosky & Riggle, 2002). This finding has been replicated at the dyad level, that is, an individual's disclosure status in the workplace has been positively linked with their partner also having lower levels of internalised homophobia (Rostosky & Riggle, 2002).

Organisational Policies

Organisational efforts to affirm sexual diversity have resulted in an improved view of fair and equitable treatment by employees (Griffith & Hebl, 2002). Organisational practises such as non-discrimination policies have been associ-ated with lower levels of discrimination and perceived discrimination (Button, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). These policies can send a message to workers that it is safe to disclose their sexual identity. Indeed, a number of studies have reported greater levels of disclo-sure by gay men and lesbians in workplaces that implement non-discrimination policies (Badgett, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002). In addition, Rostosky and Riggle (2002) found that disclo-sure in the workplace was positively associ-ated with the presence of a workplace non-discrimination policy at the dyad level. For instance, organisational non-discrimination policies may indirectly influence the disclosure status of an employee's partner due to the interdependent nature of intimate relation-ships (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Rostosky & Rig-gle, 2002).

Partner Effects

Homosexual men and women who are in inti-mate relationships are more likely to disclose their sexual identity in the workplace com-pared to those who are single (Omoto & Kurtzman, 2006). Intimate relationships are a major supportive resource for gay men and lesbians and this may assist the disclosure process (Kurdek, 1988). Despite this finding,

research has predominately investigated disclosure at the individual level (Cook & Kenny, 2005). Theories of romantic relationships including theories of equity (Messick & Cook, 1983), interdependence (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978), and attachment (Bowlby, 1980) have acknowledged that one partner's attributes and behaviours can affect the other partner's outcomes. More recently the effects of non-independence have been analysed through the Actor Partner Independence Model (APIM). The two key components of this model are Actor effects, which occur when a person's own characteristics influences his or her own outcomes; and Partner effects, whereby a person's partner's characteristics influences their outcomes (Cook & Kenny, 2005).

Relationship Duration

Relationship duration can also affect disclosure. Driscoll, Kelley and Fassinger (1996) found that couples in long-term relationships tend to disclose their sexual identity more frequently than those in relatively new relationships. However, other studies failed to support this finding (Jordan & Deluty, 2000; Schneider, 1986). One possible limitation to these few studies was the all-female population that were used; therefore it is necessary to also investigate the effect of relationship duration on disclosure in gay male couples.

Gender

Although differences exist between the female and male working experience, there is confusion in the literature on just how significant these differences are. Although Badgett (2001) reported that lesbians experience less discrimination, other findings suggest that lesbians in the workplace are more affected by gender issues, rather than their sexual identity issues (Omoto & Kurtzman, 2006). In some workplaces, particularly those that are mostly male dominated, women may experience hostility in the workplace because of their gender (Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2004) and in this context lesbians may have a perceived need

to negotiate multiple oppressed identities in the workplace (i.e. gender and sexual identity), and therefore may experience greater levels of stress. This could result in them managing their sexual identity disclosure more selectively, although this may not occur in all workplaces. Such differences in the management of disclosure among individuals who identify with multiple minority identities have been observed in a study by Kennamer, Honnold, Bradford, and Hendricks (2000), who reported that African American gay males were less likely to disclose sexual identity and associate with the gay community, compared to white American gay males

The Current Study

The current study aims to replicate Rostosky and Riggle (2002) by investigating the relationships between internalised homophobia, non-discrimination policies, and partner effects on sexual identity disclosure in the workplace among gay men and lesbians who are in romantic relationships. In addition, gender differences and relationship duration are investigated as factors in sexual identity disclosure.

On the basis of previous research it is hypothesised that at an individual level, workplace disclosure will be negatively associated with higher internalised homophobia; but positively associated with the presence and awareness of non-discrimination policies at work; and relationship duration. Internalised homophobia will show a more substantial relationship with work disclosure, than other measured predictors.

At a dyadic level we predict that internalised homophobia in the partner will be negatively associated with the individual's disclosure status; and the presence and awareness of non-discrimination policies in the partner's workplace will be positively associated with the individual's disclosure status.

It is also predicted that there will be significant gender differences in levels of work disclosure.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Demographic Characteristics	N	%
Gender		
Male	44	51
Female	42	49
Country of Residence		
Australia	82	95
New Zealand	4	5
Education Level		
Tertiary Education	44	51
No Tertiary Education	42	49
Occupation		
Professional	50	59
Sales/Clerical	18	21
Trade/Technical	12	14
Unskilled role	6	7
Annual Income		
Less than $30 000	9	10
Between $30 000 and $50 000	25	29
Between $50 000 and $70 000	25	29
More than $70 000	27	31
Couple Living Situation		
Living together	78	91
Living separately	8	9

Method

Participants

Participants were 86 (N = 86) individuals aged between 20 and 48 (M = 34, SD = 6.30) and included 22 male and 21 female couples. The majority of participants resided in Australia (95%), had completed tertiary education (51%), were employed in professional occupations (59%) and had an annual income of over $70 000 per annum (31%). The majority of couples reported living together (91%) rather than separately (9%). Demographic characteristics are displayed in Table 1.

Design

Individual-level analysis

Pearson's product-moment correlations and a multiple regression were performed to test hypothesised predictors on individual responses.

Couple-level analysis

Due to the nature of dyadic analysis using same-sex couples, where dyad members are indistinguishable, non-independence was measured with intraclass correlation using one-way coefficient, in order to test for significant co-variation between couple members for internalised homophobia and non-discrimination policies (Cook & Kenny, 2005).

Once the non-independence was established, the association between the individual and the partner responses were examined. To examine the separate actor and partner effects of internalised homophobia and non-discrimination policies on work disclosure, a multilevel analysis described by Kenny, Kashy, Cook and Simpson (2006) was performed.

Measures

Internalised Homophobia Scale (IHP)

The IHP is a self-administered 9-item measure developed by Martin and Dean (1988) assess-

ing internalised homophobia. The IHP items were originally derived from the diagnostic criteria for ego-dystonic homosexuality contained in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, third edition (DSM-III, American Psychiatric Association, 1980). Respondents indicate the extent of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Item content focuses on the desire for a heterosexual identity, e.g. "If someone offered me the chance to be completely heterosexual, I would accept the chance". Scores are calculated by summing all 9 items with higher scores indicating higher levels of internalised homophobia. The self-administered version of the IHP scale has good convergent validity and acceptable internal consistency (Herek et al., 1997; Williamson, 2000).

Organisational policies

As part of the questionnaire participants were asked "Does your employer have a non-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation?" The presence or absence of a non-discrimination policy was assessed from five possible responses: *yes*, *no*, *uncertain*, *self-employed*, or *does not apply*.

Measurement of disclosure

Sexual identity disclosure at work was measured as a continuous variable, derived from the scaled responses to three questions regarding the extent to which clients, co-workers, and bosses were aware of the individual's sexual identity. The response categories for each question were mapped onto a 100-point scale: all = 100, most = 75, about half = 50, a few = 25, none = 0. Those respondents who did not work with clients, co-workers, or bosses (indicated by an, *I do not have any clients/co-workers/bosses* response), were accounted for by summing these scaled values across questions and dividing by the number of questions contributing to the sum to minimise missing data.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through snowball sampling as well as through a number of gay male and lesbian websites, email lists, and forums. Permission was granted by the relevant authorities of each medium, who then distributed the advertisements for participation in the study. Advertisements described the study as investigating internalised homophobia, mental health, and workplace disclosure in gay male and lesbian couples. To be eligible for participation, respondents had to be at least 18 years of age, currently employed, and self identify as a gay male or a lesbian. Couples needed to have been together continuously for a minimum of the previous six months, with each member of the relationship seeing the other as their partner. Couples received questionnaires either in hardcopy accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope, or electronically via email with an information page attached.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Eighty six per cent of respondents (n=74) completed a hardcopy of the questionnaire, while 14% (n=12) completed an online copy, giving a 57% completion rate.

Assumptions of normality were met for all variables except internalised homophobia, which was violated by moderate levels of positive skewness and kurtosis. A square root transformation was performed in order to improve normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), however analyses of the data using both the transformed and untransformed variable revealed no major differences between the two outcomes. Therefore results are reported based on untransformed data. There were no univariate or multivariate outliers. Any missing values were replaced with mean values. The sample size was deemed adequate for all analyses.

170

Individual-Level Analysis

Descriptive statistics for internalised homophobia and work disclosure are displayed in Table 2. Relationship duration was a dichotomous variable and as such, couples were categorised as either being together for less than 5 years (n= 30, 70%), or more than 5 years (n=13, 30%). The majority of respondents were aware of workplace non-discrimination policies (n= 60, 69.8%). Work disclosure was significantly correlated to all variables and these correlations are presented in Table 3.

Standard multiple regression was conducted to assess the ability of the four variables: internalised homophobia, non-discrimination policies, relationship duration, and gender to predict levels of work disclosure. The four variables together accounted for 31% of the variance in workplace disclosure (F (4, 81) = 9.22, p < .01). Internalised homophobia made the largest significant unique contribution (β = -0.46), followed by non-discrimination policies (β = -0.20). Unique contributions made by relationship duration and gender were insignificant. When shared variance was removed, internalised homophobia uniquely accounted for 19% of the variance in workplace disclosure, whereas non-discrimination policies accounted for 4%. These results are presented in Table 4.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Respondents on Internalised Homophobia and Work Disclosure

Measure	*M*	*SD*	Range
IH	5.02	5.27	21
Work disclosure	67.23	28.08	100

Table 3
Inter-correlations between the Predictor Variables and Workplace Disclosure

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Internalised homophobia (sq. root)	-				
2. Non-discrimination policies	.002	-			
3. Relationship Duration	-.312**	-.008	-		
4. Gender	-.049	.035	.035	-	
5. Workplace disclosure	-.493**	-.191*	.232*	.183*	-

Note. *p* < .05. **p* < .01.

Table 4
Summary of Standard Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Workplace Disclosure

Variables	B	SE B	β	sr²
Internalised Homophobia	-2.44	0.52	-.46**	.19
Non-discrimination policy	-11.94	5.60	.20*	.04
Relationship Duration	5.19	5.89	-.09	.01
Gender	9.18	5.15	.16	.03

Note: Adjusted R² = .28. ** p<.01, * p<.05.

Table 5
Actor, Partner, and Interaction Effects of Internalised Homophobia and Work Disclosure

Measure	Actor Effect	Partner Effect	Interaction Effect
Predictor of work disclosure			
Internalised homophobia	$t(61) = -2.31$**	$t(61) = .30$	$t(40) = -.05$
Non-discrimination policies	$t(61) = -47.34$*	$t(61) = -18.85$	$t(57) = 21.42$

Note: *p<.05, ** p<.01.

Couple-Level Analysis

Intraclass correlation was used to assess non-independence. Due to the possibility that failure to detect non-independence may lead to bias in significance tests (Cook & Kenny, 2005), a more liberal test was used, with alpha set at 0.25 as recommended by Kenny, Kashy, and Bolger (1998). The intraclass correlations for internalised homophobia and non-discrimination policies were significant indicating that couples' internalised homophobia ($r = .24$, $p < .25$) and couples' work non-discrimination policies ($r = .13$, $p < .25$) were interdependent. The intraclass correlation for couples' workplace disclosure was not significant ($r = .08$, $p > .25$). As can be seen in Table 5, the multilevel analysis for both internalised homophobia and non-discrimination policies revealed significant actor effects, and insignificant partner effects. Furthermore, interaction effects between the actor and the partner were also insignificant in both instances.

Discussion

As hypothesised, internalised homophobia was significantly negatively correlated with workplace disclosure and made the largest significant unique contribution to the prediction of sexual identity disclosure, consistent with previous research (Herek et al., 1997; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002). In addition, as predicted, the presence and awareness of a non-discrimination policy was associated with significantly greater work disclosure. This is also consistent with previous findings (Badgett, 2001; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002) and can be explained in a number of ways. Non discrimi-

nation policies may create a more supportive environment, making it safer for employees to disclose their sexual identity (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001) or it may be that employees self-select into organisations that have these policies in place. However it is also possible that employees who choose to disclose may actually bring about those organisational policy changes. Alternatively, employees who choose not to disclose may pursue careers and workplaces that implicitly reinforce this identity management strategy of nondisclosure (Griffith & Hebl, 2002).

Significant gender differences were found in workplace disclosure among respondents, with males choosing to disclose sexual identity in the workplace more frequently than females. This may be consistent with previous findings that women can sometimes experience hostility in the workplace based on their gender (Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2004), and that in the context of gender discrimination, lesbians may choose not to disclose their sexual identity to avoid further discrimination. This notion is also consistent with minority stress theory (Meyer, 1995) where individuals with multiple minority identities may be less likely to disclose sexual identity, especially if the other minority identity, such as gender, cannot be concealed. For example, Kennamer et al. (2000) found that gay African American males were less likely than gay white males to disclose their sexual identity. Nevertheless, the gender differences found in the current study were not significant when analysed with other variables, suggesting the association may be indirect. Overall, our results lend support to the notion that levels of disclosure differ be-

tween genders, contrary to the findings of Rostosky and Riggle (2002). It may be important to investigate the nature of these gender differences in future research as lesbians and gay men may have varying experiences based on the different socialisation of men and women (Rostosky & Riggle, 2002).

Similarly, and consistent with Driscoll et al. (1996), relationship duration, when analysed separately, was significantly positively correlated with work disclosure. However, when analysed with other predictor variables, the association between relationship duration and work disclosure was insignificant, indicating that the relationship may be mediated by other variables. Furthermore, and contrary to the findings of Rostosky and Riggle (2002), significant partner effects on an individual's disclosure were not found for either internalised homophobia or non-discrimination policies.

The current study suggests there are two pathways to increase workplace disclosure of sexual identity. The first of these is to address individual's internalised homo-negativity, perhaps though the provision of psycho-educational or psychotherapeutic resources. The second pathway open to organisations is via the active implementation of non-discriminatory work place policies and practices that deliberately target gay men and lesbian employees. Organisations can actively foster a sense of inclusion through policies such as same-gender partner benefits, welcoming partners at company events, and providing gay and lesbian support groups, which have already been found to be positively related to disclosure (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001).

There are a number of limitations to this investigation. Firstly, the correlation between internalised homophobia and non-discrimination policies was only small to moderate, which could be explained by the relatively small sample size, perhaps compromising the power of the analysis. Another issue may be the measurement of internalised homophobia. In the context of the work of Herek

(2004) who recognises the ambiguous nature of defining internalised homophobia, measurement of such a phenomenon may have to be revised in order to ensure consistency in its conceptualisation across studies. In the current study the use of the IHP scale may have distorted the degree of association between internalised homophobia and other variables. Of the 86 individuals in the study, 30 reported an internalised homophobia score of 0. One strength of the IHP is its narrow interpretation of internalised homophobia; however, it may not be a sufficient measure to detect low or moderate levels of internalised homophobia (Williamson, 2000). Future studies should address this issue, perhaps utilising more than one measure of internalised homophobia for comparative purposes. Secondly, the study utilised non-random convenience sampling and findings are limited to same-gender couples. Therefore results cannot be generalised to those individuals who are not in relationships. Despite the absence of partner effects in the current study, we recommend that future investigations analyse data at the dyadic level without assumed independence. Even if partner effects are not significant, dyadic analysis allows for more accurate determination of the role of the individual. Thirdly, workplace disclosure in gay men and lesbians who are not in relationships may also be influenced by other variables not examined in this study, such as social class (McDermott, 2006), fear of being stigmatised, or the extent of their workplace satisfaction/commitment (Miller & Higgins, 2006). Finally, given the correlational nature of the study, it is not possible to identify definitive causal pathways. It may be that internalised homophobia and work disclosure are bi-directionally related or that that internalised homophobia has an indirect effect on disclosure, perhaps mediated by external variables not considered in the current study.

Conclusion

This study provides further evidence for the link between internalised homophobia, non-discrimination policies and work disclosure. In doing so, it validates internalised homophobia

as making the largest unique contribution to the prediction of work disclosure. Contrary to previous findings, the current study did not find any significant partner effects on disclosure levels, suggesting that changes directed at an individual level may result in greater levels of work disclosure. However, the negative view of the self that IH represents is derived from the internalisation of dominant social positions that devalue homosexual desire and identity. As suggested by Meyer (2003), the broader construct of minority stress incorporates internalised homophobia as a representation of that stress; and, its full resolution is dependent not only upon the development of individual agency in managing social stress but also on actions that modify stress inducing environments. The finding of this study support this position and indicates that efforts to assist gay men and lesbians with managing their sexual identity in the workplace should aim to address both processes of internalised homophobia and the content and operation of workplace non-discrimination policies.

Author Note

Dr James P. Malcolm, School of Psychology, University of Western Sydney, Locked Bag 1797, Penrith South DC New South Wales 1797, Australia. Email: j.malcolm@uws.edu.au.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington DC.

Badgett, M. V. L. (1996). Employment and sexual orientation: Disclosure and discrimination in the workplace. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 4*, 29-52.

Badgett, M. V. L. (2001). *Costs of the closet: Money, myths and change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boatwright, K. J., Gilbert, M. S., Forrest, L., & Ketzenberger, K. (1996). Impact of identity development upon career trajectory: Listening to the voices of lesbian women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*, 210-228.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Sadness and depression*. New York: Basic Books.

Button, S. B. (2001). Organizational efforts to affirm sexual diversity: A cross-level examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 17-28.

Cook, W. L., & Kenny, D. A. (2005). The Actor-Partner Interdependence Model: A model of bidirectional effects in developmental studies. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*, 101-109.

Croteau, J. M. (1996). Research on the work experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: An integrative review of methodology and findings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*, 195-209.

Driscoll, J. M., Kelley, F. A., & Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Lesbian identity and disclosure in the workplace: Relation to occupational stress and satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*, 229-242.

Ellis, A. L., & Riggle, E. D. B. (1996). *Sexual identity on the job: Issues and services*. New York: Haworth Press.

Griffith, K. H., & Hebl, M. R. (2002). The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: 'Coming out' at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1191-1199.

Herek, G. M. (2004). Beyond "homophobia": Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC, 1*, 6-24.

Herek, G. M., Cogan, J. C., Gillis, J. R., & Glunt, E. K. (1997). Correlates of internalized homophobia in a community sample of lesbians and gay men. *Journal of the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association, 2*, 17-25.

Jordan, K. M., & Deluty, R. H. (2000). Social support, coming out, and relationship satisfaction in lesbian couples. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 4*, 145-164.

Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relationships: A theory of interdependence*. New York: Wiley.

Kennamer, J. D., Honnold, J., Bradford, J., & Hendricks, M. (2000). Differences in disclo-

sure can be traced to higher social stigma apparently attached to being gay in the African American community, which may be exacerbated for more educated men. *Aids Education and Prevention, 12*, 519-531.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Bolger, N. (1998). Data analysis in social psychology In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., Cook, W. L., & Simpson, J. A. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

Kurdek, L. A. (1988). Perceived social support in gays and lesbians in cohabitating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 504-509.

Malcolm, J.P. (2008). Heterosexually married men who have sex with men: marital separation and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Sex Research, 45,* 350-357.Martin, J. L., & Dean, L. L. (1988). The impact of AIDS on gay men: A research instrument. Unpublished Technical Report. Columbia University.

McDermott, E. (2006). Surviving in dangerous places: Lesbian identity performances in the workplace, social class and psychological health. *Feminism Psychology, 16*, 193-211.

Messick, D. M., & Cook, K. S. (1983). *Equity theory: Psychological and sociological perspectives*. New York: Praeger.

Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 36*, 38-56.

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 674-697.

Meyer, I. H., & Dean, L. L. (1998). Internalized homophobia, intimacy and sexual behavior among gay and bisexual men. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 160-186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, D., & Higgins, D. J. (2006). The role of sexual orientation disclosure and harassment in predicting job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *Lesbian and Gay Psychology Review, 7*, 216-229.

Miner-Rubino, K., & Cortina, L. M. (2004). Working in a context of hostility toward women: Implications for employees' well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*, 107-122.

Omoto, A. M., & Kurtzman, H. S. (2006). *Sexual orientation and mental health: Examining identity and development in lesbian, gay, and bisexual people*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Powers, B. (1996). The impact of gay, lesbian, and bisexual workplace issues on productivity. In A. L. Ellis & E. D. B. Riggle (Eds.), *Sexual identity on the job: Issues and services*. New York: Haworth Press.

Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1244-1261.

Rostosky, S. S., & Riggle, E. D. B. (2002). 'Out' at work: The relation of actor and partner workplace policy and internalized homophobia to disclosure status. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 411-419.

Schneider, B. E. (1986). Coming out at work: Bridging the private/public gap. *Work and Occupations, 13*, 463-487.

Schope, R., D. (2004). Practitioners need ask: culturally competent practice requires knowing where the gay male client is in the coming out process. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 74*, 257-270.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Williamson, I. R. (2000). Internalized homophobia and health issues affecting lesbians and gay men. *Health Education Research, 15*, 97-107.

ENGAGING WITH THE STATE: CITIZENSHIP, INJUSTICE, AND THE PROBLEM WITH QUEER

GEMMA EDGAR

Abstract

This paper argues for the utility of citizenship discourses in addressing injustice. It takes the concerns of young LGBTI people experiencing homelessness as its starting point. While recognising the queer critique that engaging with the state can entail some 'gay purification' (Seidman 2001: 323), it nonetheless argues that the state provides a democratically accountable mechanism to redistribute economic resources. In the current Australian climate, any political project that intends to address the needs of young LGBTI people experiencing some form of economic disadvantage, without engaging the state, is likely to fail.

Introduction

The impetus for this paper was fieldwork I conducted in 2007.[1] I engaged in participant observation at the non-government organisation (NGO) Twenty10 Gay and Lesbian Youth Support, located in Sydney, Australia.[2] Twenty10 works with young people (under 26) who are same-sex attracted and/or gender diverse.[3] Many, though not all, of the young people who access Twenty10 also experience homelessness, or are in a housing crisis.

When I began my fieldwork I was especially interested to explore how queer theory had, or could, be used to address the injustices experienced by the young people of Twenty10. However, after meeting and interviewing some of Twenty10's young people and staff, I began reassessing the utility of queer theory as a tool for addressing the coalescence of injustices the young people faced: Queer theory, it is my position, is too suspicious of the state's normalising capacities for it to provide a practical plan of activism for an organisation like Twenty10, which relies upon the financial support of both the Federal and NSW State Governments. This support allows Twenty10 to supply diverse and strategic services for LGBT young people. In other words, Twenty10 relies upon the state in order to do its work. This form of activism, in which an organisation engages closely with the state, is rejected by many proponents of queer theory, who build on Foucault's governmentality thesis to instead push for a style of activism that is "at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant" (Halperin, 1995, p. 62). This form of activism has been useful in many contexts, for example in the early days of ACT UP (Halperin, 1995, pp. 15-16). But, it is my position, it may not be so useful when addressing the injustices experienced by LGBT young people who require the support of the state.

Rather than advocating for the use of queer theory, then, I have turned to citizenship discourses as a more effective tool for addressing the concerns of these young people. Citizenship, while demanding some forms of 'normalisation' for those included within its sphere, is, on balance, better equipped to re-

---

3 Throughout this paper I will use the term LGBTI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and/or intersex) to encompass those individuals who are same-sex attracted and/or gender diverse.

spond to the injustices experienced by the young people at Twenty10. This is because citizens are able to make demands upon the state for help. This paper is hence an argument for the value of citizenship discourses and engaging with the state when addressing the concerns of young LGBTI people experiencing economic disadvantage.

Defining Injustice: What is it that we want to fix?

Within this paper I approach injustice using the binary framework developed by Nancy Fraser (1995; 2003). Fraser conceives of injustice as being due to either mis-recognition or mal-distribution. Mis-recognition is cultural injustice; it is "to be constituted by *institutionalized patterns of cultural value* in ways that prevent one from participating as a peer in social life" (Fraser, 2003, p. 29, original italics). Claims for proper recognition are about producing a "difference-friendly world" in which the price of 'respect' is not assimilation (Fraser, 2003, p. 8). In contrast, redistributive claims are those "which seek a more just distribution of resources and wealth" (Fraser, 2003, p. 7). Redistributive activism is about class and examining the economic structure of society. Key to Fraser's analysis is that neither recognition nor redistribution can be reduced "to a mere epiphenomenon" of the other (Fraser & Honneth, 200,: 2), that is, neither can be subsumed under the other. Rather, they are "co-fundamental and mutually irreducible dimensions of justice: (Fraser & Honneth, 2003, p. 3).[4]

This is a useful framework for my case study as the young people of Twenty10 experience both these forms of injustice. They experience economic disadvantage (redistribution) evidenced by their housing crisis, but they are also culturally devalued (recognition) through homophobia and heteronormativity, which make them "subject to sexually specific forms of status subordination" (Fraser, 2003, p. 18, original italics).[5] The theoretical framework I rely on must therefore works to remedy the injustices of both homophobia/heteronormativity *and* economic disadvantage. Neither of these injustices outranks the other in the cases of the young people of Twenty10: both demand redress.

Unpacking Citizenship

In response to the mis-recognition based injustices of homophobia and heteronormativity, many Anglophone LGBTI rights groups have made claims upon the state for full citizenship rights. These rights claims are about "seeking access into mainstream culture through de-*manding equal rights of citizen-ship*" (Richardson, 2005, p. 515). In many respects, Australian LGB[6] people do have these rights, hard won through decades of struggle. For example, same-sex sexual acts are no longer illegal and we are not denied the right to vote or to stand for Parliament. In most Australian states, however, LGBTI people do not yet have the same rights that non-LGBTI people do.[7]

---

4 I prefer Fraser's analysis here over Judith Butler's position that it is impossible to separate oppressions from the political economy and the cultural sphere (Butler, 1997, p. 39).

---

1 These injustices are not always experienced separately. For example, it may be because of their sexuality that a young person is forced to leave home and hence become homeless. This, however, was rarely the story of the young people I interviewed; often their sexuality was a complicating factor rather than the cause of their housing crisis.

2 I am using the term 'LGB here because the rights claims of transgendered and intersex individuals are not wholly addressed through changes in laws addressing same sex relationships. Further, gay and lesbian rights groups have not always sought the enfranchisement of BTI individuals.

3 For example, in 2007 the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission identified 58 pieces of federal legislation that disadvantage same-sex partners and their children. At the time of writing legislation had just passed the Federal Parliament to address some of these inequities.

To better understand what it is that LGBTI movements have been demanding, it is worth considering the work of T.H. Marshall. Marshall is arguably the most influential citizenship theorist of the twentieth century. He articulated the post World War II theory of citizenship as being about more than simply membership of a nation state, instead defining it as "a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community" (1950, pp. 28–29). Marshall argued that three sets of rights were necessary to achieve full citizenship: civil/legal rights, political rights and social rights.

Marshall's analysis of social rights has been particularly influential for modern citizenship theorists, because he questioned the legitimacy of democracy without equity. He did this by describing the resources required by individuals to access their civil and political rights. He argued that to achieve participatory equality, the state must provide a welfare scheme, an accessible education system, and universal health care. These policy tools were about equipping the individual so that they could "share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society" and hence to participate fully as a citizen (Marshall, 1965, pp. 78-79).

Therefore, central to Marshall's thesis is the role played by the state in addressing injustice. For Marshall, the state is a structure able to prevent the isolation and disadvantage of its citizens by upholding political and civil rights, and the provision of social services. This is a relatively thick conception of citizenship because it assumes that those more economically advantaged members of the community will support those less well off, and that this redistribution will occur through the mechanism of the state. As Bryan S. Turner (1993) has noted, the worth of Marshall's concept of citizenship was the protection it sought to provide for the economically disadvantaged. For Turner:

> Citizenship, once inscribed in the institutions of the welfare state, is a buffer against the

vagaries of the marketplace and the inequalities of the class system, because citizenship is a method of redistribution of resources to those who are unable to provide for their own needs as a consequence of some contingent feature of their life circumstances (p. xi).

It is my position that citizenship is even thicker than as explained by Marshall. It is not just about the progression to full civil, political and social rights. Citizenship is also about being acknowledged, recognised and included, by both the state and the community (Phelan, 2001). Within this paper then, I define citizenship as including the rights mapped by Marshall, and hence, I give the state a crucial role in ensuring participatory equality. But I also use the term more thickly, to suggest, as former Prime Minister John Howard has said, that being a citizen is about being part of the "national family" (Howard 2007) and about "belonging" (Nolan & Rubenstein forthcoming; Weeks 1995, 1998).

It is perhaps, then, not difficult to understand why LGBTI movements have sought full enfranchisement through citizenship claims. It is not just that they have desired the rights mapped by Marshall: They have also have demanded the creation of a "difference-friendly world" (Fraser, 2003, p. 8), and a place in Howard's "national family" (2007).[8]

Queer theory, however, disagrees with the state focused activism of the LGBTI movement. In opposition to claims for full citizenship, queer "wants to reconsider … appeals to the state" (Brandzel, 2005, p. 172). It takes a suspicious view, seeing the state less as a provider of rights, but rather as one of the sites that produces heteronormative notions of the 'good' (Brandzel, 2005; Patton, 1993; Phelan, 2001; Seidman, 2001). Why queer theory takes this position is a complex issue, in part

---

8 Mark A. Nolan and Kim Rubenstein have argued that citizenship is one way to satisfy 'the basic human need for inclusion' (forthcoming).

because there is no single 'queer theory of the state', nor is there one within sexuality studies more broadly. Nonetheless, it is crucial for an LGBT organisation, such as Twenty10, to have a clear understanding of why queer theorists may take this position, because it is in clear contradiction to the way the organisation works.

Queer Thinking on the State

Queer theorists do not devote much thinking to the state, as Davina Cooper explains, analysis of the state within lesbian and gay studies has been limited. This is not to say the state is entirely absent; however, it tends to remain in the background, tangential to the topic discussed (2002, p. 231). Dennis Altman has also argued that "queer theorists" have a "lack of emphasis on political institutions as distinct from discourse" (2001, p. 158). Both Altman and Cooper highlight the lack of theorisation of the state in sexuality studies more broadly and in queer theory more specifically.[9] As to why this is the case, both suggest that the influence of Foucault upon queer theory, and his concern with 'micropolitics', has helped direct attention away from working on "the macro-sources of power, corporations, the state, and the military" (Altman, 2001, p. 158).

Still, when queer theorists do turn to the state, they usually rely on Foucault, and in particular, his governmentality thesis (Goldberg-Hiller, 1998; Halperin, 1995; Halley,

_____

9 This is so even in some of the more recent work on sexual citizenship which focuses more on the agenda than the form of the state (see Berlant, 1997; Phelan, 2001). Cooper also points to Lisa Duggan's work 'Queering the state' (1994) which "offers no conceptualisation of the state, queer or otherwise". For Cooper, this "illustrates how far the state has become evacuated as an analytical concept amongst radical gay theorists, that even an article on queering the state does not explore the form and character of the state itself" (2002, p. 236).

1999; Kinsman, 1996; Patton, 1993). While not all queer theorists would likely equate this thesis with queer, I think that it is a crucial influence. This influence is perhaps most obvious when proponents of queer argue against expanding marriage. These arguments are concerned about "sexual normalization and state regulation" (Warner, 1999, p. 95), and, while often unacknowledged, are usually made within the governmentality framework.

Foucault's description of power as something dispersed, productive and evident in all relationships has received enormous academic attention and there is little need to add to this here (Halperin, 1995; McNay, 1992; Rabinow, 1991). What is relevant, though, is how the Foucauldian understanding of power impacts how authority is appreciated. Put simply, authority is assumed to no longer be solely located in the state. Rather, there exist competing authorities, competing sites for the production of discourse. And while the state remains a site (or a number of sites) of power, it too contains competing discourses and divergent strategies. As Wendy Brown explains, for Foucault, the state:

> … is not a thing, system, or subject but a significantly unbounded terrain of powers and techniques, an ensemble of discourses, rules and practices, cohabiting in limited tension-ridden, often contradictory relation with one another (1992, p. 12).

Despite adopting this view of the state, Foucault still recognised government in his work on 'governmentality'. However, his focus was on the particular techniques used by government to legitimate and define itself and who it governed. For Foucault, one such technique was the discourse of modern, liberal 'freedom'. He disagreed with the idea that subjects were more 'free' in modern times. Rather, he argued that this was a discourse encouraged by the state in order to make subjects regulate their own behaviour (Halperin 1995: 18). In this thesis, 'the state' has not retreated, despite our apparent new 'freedoms'. In fact, governmentality theorists

emphasise "that the state is intervening all the time" (Bacchi, 1999, p. 58).[10] But this intervention occurs under:

> ... new methods of power whose operation is not ensured by right but by technique, not by law but by normalization, not by punishment but by control, methods that are employed on all levels and in forms that go beyond the state and its apparatus (Foucault 1998: 89).

In this thinking, one such way the state intervenes is through the social policies demanded by Marshall. For example, Marshall's demand that all citizens be provided with adequate education is read in the governmentality thesis as being part of the state's normalising strategy. Eric Gorham explains the worry that:

> ... in progressing through any nation's public education system one does not only become a citizen, one's subjectivity is transformed... public education... has functioned not only as a social right or entitlement, but as a set of institutions that impose lessons on student-citizens as to what sorts of civilised activities are acceptable (1995: 45).

With such techniques at the disposal of the state, it is possible for people to be 'governed' without the use of repressive power because they have been taught how to behave.

The governmental understanding of the state is clearly in contrast to that described by Marshall. And this difference in understanding points to the divergence in activist strategies between those who emphasise state focused activism, and queer activists. Rather than making claims upon the state, queer is about resisting "regimes of the normal" (Warner

_____

10 Johnson notes the similarities between this postmodern conception of the state with those of the femocrats, "The state was also rarely conceived in practice as a unified bloc but rather, various units and departments were seen as places offering different opportunities for feminist activity" (Johnson, 2000, p. 186).

1993: xxvi). According to this perspective, when LGBTI movements take a state and rights based approach to addressing injustice, they are engaging with a regime of the normal and are therefore not challenging the demands of heteronormativity. They may affect the legal status of some individuals, but this does not change "the more intangible aspects of belonging to a national community" (Mackie, 2001, p. 190) which will still require citizens to police themselves and behave 'normally'.

This is one of the reasons that not everyone wants to 'belong' to the 'national family' (Howard, 2007). Belonging, many posit, will only occur at the cost of less 'normal' individuals, those who are unable and/or unwilling to conform; for example transgendered individuals, or those in non-monogamous or non-procreative relationships (Brandzel, 2005; Clarke, 2000; Cossman, 2002; Halperin, 1995; Phelan, 2001; Richardson, 2005; Seidman, 2001; Warner 1999). In this thinking, citizenship is a technique used by the state to enforce heteronormativity, and it is therefore not a useful tool for addressing injustice.

Techniques of Power: Purchaser-Provider Contracts

When beginning my fieldwork at Twenty10, I found these arguments convincing. And indeed, they were somewhat supported by my fieldwork. I did find that some costs arose for Twenty10 because of their close engagement with the state. For example, like many Australian NGOs, Twenty10's work has been impacted upon by the policy shift away from funding NGOs for their core activities and instead funding them for specific projects and outcomes. Previously, NGOs had significant discretion as to how they spent their money and were able to fund not only service provision but also activities such as research, which they could then use to improve their own service delivery and to lobby government. Core funding has now generally been replaced with purchaser-provider contracts, which "require the delivery of specific outcomes directly re-

lated to government policy and objectives" (Staples, 2006, p. 9). One Twenty10 staff member explained that:

> … funding requirements are becoming more and more specific, being put into performance indicator systems and outcomes measurements. And I don't think that necessarily fits with the qualitative improvements made in people's lives after accessing a service like Twenty10. I don't know that you can quantitatively relay someone not feeling suicidal anymore because they don't feel alone … I can't write that on the form.

One of the (many) problems that can arise from these types of contracts is that the independence of an organisation is undermined when its activities are so tightly controlled; without this independence, the organisation loses some of the creative capacity that makes their involvement in service provision so effective.

The problems that purchaser-provider contracts create support the argument that engaging with the state can be assimilatory. This is because the tight control the government has over how an organisation works can normalise and 'capture' that organisation, so that its agenda shifts as demanded. This is far from the queer struggle with "whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant" (Halperin, 1995, p. 62). Indeed, the example of purchaser-provider contracts in the funding of NGOs fits squarely with the governmentality thesis that engaging with the state will see the state attempt to "shape" one's "conduct, aspirations, needs, desires, and capacities" (Dean, 1994, p. 156). These contracts are intended to normalise and constrain, just as queer warns us engagement with the state will do.

Strange Bedfellows; Queer and Neoliberalism

Queer theorists are not the only ones who are suspicious of giving the state a large role, indeed this position is probably more often associated with neo-liberalism. Michael Warner has suggested that it is no coincidence that the success of queer theory, as an activist strategy and as an academic discipline, should coalesce with that of neo-liberalism. He has argued that queer's "potential for transformation seems mostly specific to a cultural context" (1995, p. 361) and that context is born post 1991, in an Anglo-American space, in a period in which neoliberalism has all but triumphed in policy making arenas. In fact, when we consider queer perceptions of the state through the use of Foucault's governmentality thesis, it becomes clear that queer and neoliberalism have more in common than a joint appearance towards the end of the twentieth century. Queer's move away from making claims upon the state parallels that of neoliberal discourses, which also argue for a society free from the intrusive hand of government (Self, 2000, p. 99-101). Neoliberalism argues that citizens should be 'self-reliant' and hence not be dependent upon welfare. Similarly, those relying upon a Foucauldian view of the state argue that there are "dangers … in looking to the state as provider, equalizer, protector, or liberator" (Brown. 1995, p. 196, 195) because "the rise of welfare states have been accompanied by more insidious methods of surveillance in information-gathering technologies" (Gorham, 1995, p. 36).[11]

My concern with queer activism is this similarity with neoliberalism. Through rejecting the dominant role played by the state, and in arguing against the worth of LGBTI citizens making demands upon the state, just like neo-

---

11 Epistemologically of course, queer and neoliberalism are very different. Sawer states that for neoliberalism, 'the citizen is an essentially self-contained individual, rather than the social-liberal/ feminist view of the individual caught up in a web of interdependence within the community' (Sawer, 2003, p. 90). This does not fit with queer's post-structuralist conception of the subject as wholly bound up and produced through the social. Nonetheless, it is my argument that in effect, not foundation, these theories share similar concerns re-

liberalism, queer supports a form of activism that is unable to rectify socio-economic injustice. Or perhaps more accurately, it is suspicious of the mechanism that would best do so. A movement away from the state, and a focus instead upon culture, may well destabilise the foundations of heteronormativity as the hetero/homo binary is thrown into question, but what use is it to those who rely on the state to house them? How is it useful for these individuals, such as the young people of Twenty10, for theorists to undermine the value of the welfare state, especially when it has been so undermined through neoliberal reforms? How, in this thinking, are injustices of redistribution to be addressed? Marshall was rightly criticised for presenting the developments of rights as a linear, teleological progression (Turner 1991: 122). He was criticised because welfare clearly is reversible and should not be taken for granted; supporting it should be a goal for all those who seek to redress economic disadvantage.

The queer suspicion of the state and therefore of its welfare programmes, makes it difficult to accept the argument that queer activism is useful for those experiencing economic disadvantage. Gorham embodies the governmental concern about the normalising capacities of welfare, he states:

> In 'providing' rights, society and the state do not simply give them to citizens *gratis*; citizens must subject themselves to the procedures and institutions necessary to ensure that the state can continue to provide rights… The recipient of welfare provision must learn correct procedure – i.e., bureaucratic or market behaviour – in learning to be a citizen (1995, pp. 29-30, original emphasis).

The problem with Gorham and queer's arguments is in the assumption that normalising is necessarily bad. The demand for basic standards of education, welfare, health, and housing all produce a particular type of citizen, one that is normalised through these institutions. But in rejecting these norms, we produce the sort of 'self-reliant' citizen that neoliberalism

demands, and ignore the needs of those experiencing economic disadvantage.

Some queer theorists would disagree with my reading here and argue that queer does have a wider conception of justice than only the restitution of identity (Fraser's recognition based injustice). For example, Brandzel argues that queer is able to capture the interests of "all who are displaced from normative regimes and practices for example, nonwhite or racialized others" (2005, p. 191). Her argument is that heteronormativity is founded on the ideal of the "married, monogamous, white, and upper-middle class", and hence queer works in opposition to these "norms of race, class, and nation" (2005, pp. 190-191).[12] I am, however, more inclined to heed the concerns of Helen (Charles), who worries that "queer culture is urban and metropolitan, not universal" (1993, p. 98), and that queer "is being used to attract *anybody*" so that it may be "glossing over difference(s) and inequality" (1993, p. 101). (Charles)'s argument is valuable as she recognises that queer has a normalising capacity of its own.

This argument is not about rejecting the breadth of queer work, especially as the critique it brings to the construction of sexual identities is useful for an organisation like Twenty10. Rather, the concern is about what happens to activism when the focus upon the state is lost, when our suspicions of it lead us to let it off the hook.

Reconstituting Citizenship and the State

One response to the worry that LGBTI individuals and other minorities will be subsumed

---

12 This position is in opposition to Fraser's 'two-dimensional conception' of injustice. It is rather, a 'normative monism', in which recognition 'represent[s] the unified framework' most useful for explaining even distributional injustice (Fraser & Honneth, 2003, p. 3).

by heteronormativity is that the inclusion of LGBTI and other non-mainstream individuals into the body politic also reconstitutes citizenship. It is my position that the work performed by Twenty10 evidences the ability of citizenship claims to both challenge heteronormativity and redress redistributive injustice. Twenty10 engages with the state through the receipt of both Federal and NSW State Government funding. In a Marshellian vein it takes advantage of the redistributive capacity of the state in order to provide programmes that redress both the socio-economic and identity based disadvantages experienced by its young people. Financial support from government has allowed Twenty10 to provide significant services to its young people, including: medium term supported accommodation; counselling; case management; social and support groups; family support services; and community-based early intervention. That is, a politics of citizenship, of engaging with the state, has allowed Twenty10 to attempt to address injustices of both redistribution and recognition.

One example of this work is Twenty10's provision of six medium-term, LGBTI specific units. As medium-term housing, these units offer the young people who live in them a safe and secure place to live for 3-18 months. I interviewed one young person who was living in one of these apartments. She described what it was like as:

> I guess it just feels more familiar and safe you know … I've been to like different youth centres that aren't queer and like here I just feel like I can make myself at home and like feel safe … And it's just nice to have queer people all around you like you know people that you identify with (God Pie).[13]

God Pie's comments highlight the value of LGBTI specific accommodation for queer

_____

13 The young people I interviewed chose their own pseudonyms.

young people, which is that 'mainstream' services are not always safe places for LGBTI people. LGBTI specific accommodation is one way to create safer places for LGBTI individuals experiencing homelessness. These units, however, would be extremely difficult for Twenty10 to provide if it did not have the financial support of the state. In this example, we can see how relying upon a mechanism to redistribute economic resources is a valuable way to address redistributive injustice experienced by LGBTI young people.

More, however, is occurring in this example than just a response to redistributive injustice. By funding Twenty10, the Government recognises the citizenship of LGBTI young people. Receiving government funding is a symbol of community inclusion, as well as being a redress to redistributive injustice. If you are concerned about community embrace, acknowledgment and ultimately, belonging, then it matters that the welfare of young LGBTI people is supported by the government, because it means that they are being acknowledged.

Another example of how engaging with the state has allowed Twenty10 to address the injustices experienced by their young people is their community-based early intervention programme called *Ready or Not*. *Ready or Not* is funded through the Federal Government's Reconnect programme. This funds Twenty10 staff to travel throughout NSW to conduct training sessions with key community members, such as police, teachers and health, youth and welfare workers. This training is intended to resource communities so that queer young people are less likely to become isolated. The idea is that if key community members know how to work with and support queer young people, then these young people are less likely to turn up on the doorstep of Twenty10 needing help.

Ready or Not is one way Twenty10 attempts to create community change, and it is able to provide it only because of the financial support of the state. One staff member explained

the impact of it as:

> … the Ready Or Not training … we certainly get our message across and we do talk about, we talk about how homophobia hurts, so we talk about things like, increased rates of suicidality and a whole range of things, so we don't just gloss it over so it's in a nice little tidy package, so people find it palatable. But at the same time I think the way that we do it, in that professional way has more of an impact, people can actually take it and I kind of think that by the way that we are doing, I think if we were running around with banners here and there, that maybe that would make people a little bit more defensive about hearing our message.

Ready or Not again highlights the advantages of Twenty10's relationship with the state. In this example, Twenty10 addresses injustices of both recognition and redistribution because by challenging heteronormativity and homophobia (recognition), they are also attempting to address the causes of LGBTI youth homelessness (redistribution). What is occurring is not to do with LGBTI individuals conforming to the demands of the state. Rather, the 'mainstream' community is being challenged by Twenty10 staff to itself change. Rather than the demand that young LGBTI people must become 'like' the majority, the majority itself is what is being disrupted. *Ready or Not* fits squarely with the argument that engaging with the 'mainstream' in order to make it more accepting, and relying upon the state to do so, can reconstitute citizenship and is hence an effective way to address both recognition and redistributive based injustice.

Twenty10 is, I would posit, only able to provide LGBTI specific housing and the *Ready or Not* programme because it presents a face that is *not* "at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant" (Halperin, 1995, p. 62). That is, Twenty10 appears to be the good gay citizen that the governmental thesis warns us of, in that it works in the 'mainstream' community and relies upon the state to support it. However, Twenty10 still confronts heteronormative notions of citizenship through challeng-

ing youth and community workers to recognise the needs of LGBTI young people. Further, Twenty10 uses state funds to assist young LGBTI people experiencing homelessness. It also provides further services, including: counseling, case management, social and support groups and family support services. All of these examples highlight how a reliance upon the state can help to address the injustices of redistribution and recognition experienced by LGBTI young people.   As queer theorists warn us, there are costs to this and the constraints of the purchaser-provider contracts required by government evidence this. But the idea of citizenship as always being heteronormative and exclusionary is difficult to maintain when citizenship tools are able to provide a response to the injustices experienced by the young people at Twenty10.

Twenty10 would not be able to do this work if it engaged in the style of politics suggested by queer, that is, if it was suspicious of the state. As Altman writes, "queer theories are relatively unhelpful in constructing this sort of politics because of their lack of emphasis on political institutions as distinct from discourse" (2001, p. 158). It is Twenty10's emphasis on political institutions, its demand to fully belong, that has allowed it to do the work it does.

Conclusion

Citizenship can, indeed must, be reconstituted if it is to do what it intends to do, that is, to allow people to "live the life of a civilized being" (Marshall, 1965, p. 78-79). For LGBTI individuals to be better recognised, citizenship must be transformed to include individuals such as the young people at Twenty10. It must involve "the broadest forms of social provision and political participation" (Johnson, 2000, p. 186). Queer theorists are not wrong to argue that culture is a key site in this struggle for recognition, as Phelan argues, "there is no answer for strangeness short of the transformation of the dominant culture" (Miller & Phelan, 2001, p. 4) and queer remains a valuable tool in this regard. But it cannot be the

only one in the box.

Returning to my task, to define and defend a political discourse to redress the injustices of both recognition and redistribution: I am not convinced that queer theory provides the tools to achieve these ends because its antipathy towards the equalising capacity of the state must extend to the normalising capabilities of welfare. If one is to truly resist the state and citizenship discourses, then one must also reject the social rights that Marshall mapped. This is only likely to produce greater injustices for the economically disadvantaged. Queer may be useful in addressing recognition based injustice, but, as Fraser argues, "the goal should be … to develop an integrated approach that can encompass, and harmonize, both dimension of social justice" (2003, p. 26). Rather than adopting the queer rejection of citizenship theory and the activism aimed at the state, I draw on the ideals of citizenship discourses because they more readily address both the injustices of socio-economic disadvantage and cultural mis-recognition experienced by the young people at Twenty10.

While I agree that citizenship discourses are likely to remain normalising in some capacity, in my view the benefits outweigh the costs. As Cossman argues, citizenship "is never wholly disciplined" (2002, p. 487). It cannot be fully captured by heteronormative, racialised and gendered values. The inclusion of young, LGBTI people, who may be experiencing homelessness or in a housing crisis, does reconstitute it. It means that they have been recognised by their community, are entitled to participate at the same level as other citizens, and therefore are afforded the social rights to enable them to more fully participate in that community.

It is hence the argument of this paper that a democratically accountable site within society, that is able to redistribute economic resources, is fundamental when addressing the concerns of young people who are experiencing periods of homelessness, insecure housing and/or economic hardship. Queer theory pro-

vides valuable insights into identity formation and it has allowed LGBTI politics to move beyond the exclusionary capacities and constraints of identity politics. However, it is my contention that *it is not* the most appropriate theoretical tool with which to redress the compounded injustices experienced by the young people of Twenty10 because it takes the pressure off the state to support them.

Author note

Gemma Edgar is a PhD Candidate in the School of Social Sciences and International Studies at the University of New South Wales.

Acknowledgments

References

Altman, D. (2001). *Global sex*. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin.

Bacchi, C. (1999). *Women, policy and politics: The construction of policy problems*. London: Sage.

Berlant, L. (1997). *The queen of America goes to Washington city: Essays on sex and citizenship*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Brandzel, A.L. (2005). Queering citizenship? Same-cex marriage and the state. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 11*, 171-204.

Brown, W. (1995). *States of injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Butler, J. (1997). Merely cultural. *Social* Text, 52-53, 265-177.

(Charles), H. (1993). 'Queer nigger': Theorizing 'white' activism. In J. Bristow & A.R. Wil-

son (Eds.), *Activating theory: Lesbian, gay, bisexual politics* (pp. 97-117)*.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Clarke, E.O. (2000). *Virtuous vice: Homoeroticism and the public sphere.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Cooper, D. (2002). Imagining the place of the state: Where governance and social power meet. In D. Richardson & S. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of lesbian and gay studies* (pp. 231-252)*.* London: Sage Publications.

Cossman, B. (2002). Sexing citizenship, privatizing sex. *Citizenship Studies, 6*, 483-506.

Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's method and historical sociology.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1998). *The will to knowledge: The history of sexuality volume one* (R. Hurley, Trans). England: Penguin Books.

Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'Postsocialist' age. *New Left Review, 212*, 68-93.

Fraser, N. (2003). Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition, and participation. In N. Fraser & A. Honneth (Eds.), *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange* (pp.7-109). London: Verso.

Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). Introduction. In N. Fraser & A. Honneth (Eds.), *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange* (pp.1-5)*.* London: Verso.

Goldberg-Hiller, J. (1998). Entitled to be hostile: Narrating the political economy of civil rights. *Social and Legal Studies, 7*, 517-538.

Gorham, E. (1995). Social citizenship and its fetters. *Polity, 28*, 25-47.

Halley, J. (1999). *Don't: A reader's guide to the military's anti-gay policy*. London: Duke University Press.

Halperin, D. (1995). *Saint Foucault: Towards a gay hagiography.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howard, J. (2007, 26 January). *Address at Australia Day citizenship ceremony.*Speech given at Commonwealth Park, Canberra, ACT. Retrieved 3 October, 2008, from http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/10052/20070321-0000/www.pm.gov.au/media/Speech/2007/speech2344.html.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (2007). *Same sex: Same entitlements. National inquiry into discrimination against people in same-sex relationships: Financial and work-related entitlements and benefits*. Retrieved 3 October, 2008, from www.humanrights.gov.au/human_rights/samesex/report/pdf/SSSE_Report.pdf.

Johnson, C. (2000). The fragility of democratic reform: New challenges to Australian women's citizenship. In S. Rai (Ed.), *International perspectives on gender and democratisation* (pp.182-201). Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Kinsman, G. (1996). Responsibility as a strategy of governance: Regulating people living with AIDS and lesbians and gay men in Ontario. *Economy and Society, 25*, 393-409.

Mackenzie, A. (2003, 6-8 April). *Young gay and homeless.* Paper presented at the 3rd National Homelessness Conference Beyond the Divide, Brisbane, QLD. Retrieved 2 June, 2007, from www.afho.org.au/4_publications/conference_papers/Mackenzie.pdf.

MacKie, V. (2001). The trans-sexual citizen: Queering sameness and difference. *Australian Feminist Studies, 16*, 185-192.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class, and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, T.H. (1965). *Class, citizenship, and social development.* New York: Anchor Books.

McNay, L. (1992). *Foucault and feminism: Power, gender and the self*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Miller, T., & Phelan, S. (2001). The citizenship of strangers. *The gay & lesbian review worldwide, 8*, 12-13.

Nolan, M., & Rubenstein, K. (2008). Citizenship and Identity in Diverse Societies. Humanities Research, xv(1).

Patton, C. (1993). Tremble, hetero swine! In M. Warner (Ed.), *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory* (pp.143-177). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Phelan, S. (2001). *Sexual strangers: Gays, lesbians, and dilemmas of citizenship.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rabinow, P. (1991). *The Foucault reader: An introduction to Foucault's thought.* London: Penguin Books.

Richardson, D. (2005). Desiring sameness? The rise of a neoliberal politics of normalisation. *Antipode, 37*, 515-535.

Sawer, M. (2003). *The ethical state? Social liberalism in Australia.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Seidman, S. (2001). From identity to queer politics: Shifts in normative heterosexuality and the meaning of citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 5* 321-328.

Self, P. (2000). *Rolling back the market: Economic dogma and political choice.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Staples, J. (2006). *NGOs out in the cold: The Howard government policy towards NGOs.* UNSW Law Research Paper No. 2007-8, De-

mocratic Audit of Australia Discussion Paper No. 19/06. Retrieved 3 October, 2008, from http://ssrn.com/abstract=959533.

Turner, B.S. (1991). Further specification of the citizenship concept: A reply to M.L. Harrison. *Sociology*, *25*, 215-218.

Turner, B.S. (1993). Preface. In B.S. Turner (Ed.), *Citizenship and social theory* (pp.vii-xii)*.* London: Sage Publications.

Warner, M. (1993). Introduction. In M. Warner (Ed.), *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory* (pp.vii-xxxi). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Warner, M. (1995). Something queer about the nation-state. In C. Newfield & R. Strickland (Eds.), *After political correctness: The humanities and society in the 1990s* (pp.361-371). Colorado: Westview Press.

Warner, M. (1999). *The trouble with normal: Sex, politics and the ethics of queer life*. New York: The Free Press.

Weeks, J. (1995). *Invented moralities: Sexual values in an age of uncertainty*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Weeks, J. (1998). The sexual citizen. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *15*, 35-52.

THE ANWAR SAGA: SEXUALITY AND POLITICS IN CONTEMPORARY MALAYSIA

ALAN BERMAN

Introduction

Internationally, sodomy laws - originally intended to control non-procreative sexual activity (Feree, 1988) - have been used to target homosexual activity for political purposes since the nineteenth century (Feree, 1988, p. 600; Obendorf, 2006, p. 178; Honen, 1999; A9). While these laws have been repealed in sixty nations - including the United States and Australia - as of May 2008 they still exist in eighty-six states which are members of the United Nations. This piece begins by exploring the factors contributing to the ultimate repeal of sodomy laws in the United States ('US') and Australia, as well as the factors militating against the repeal of such laws in Malaysia (Berman, 2008), having first outlined the limitations of comparative legal studies.

This paper then goes on to argue that sodomy laws in Malaysia should be repealed for the same reasons they have been repealed in the US and Australia. Comparison of historical experiences in relation to sodomy laws in all three contexts provides an insight into the evolution of the human rights movement globally. The repeal of these laws in many countries reflects advances in the human rights movement globally, and the increasing recognition that certain key principles of human rights – such as privacy, personal dignity, autonomy and equality – extend to rights regarding lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people (Long, 2004, pp. 3, 17).

By focusing on one specific example of the deployment of sodomy laws within Malaysia to produce particular political outcomes, this paper examines the way in which issues concerning homosexuality often become entangled with political process. The discussion of one specific case draws upon a range of media articles documented in Appendix 1.[1]

Limits of Comparative Studies

The author recognises that there are limitations of engaging in comparative methodology. First, laws of each country are shaped by their own particular historical context. Though it is important to recognise the potential utility of law as a means of bringing about social change, it is just as important to acknowledge that a law or principle in a particular jurisdiction can represent distinct historical legal conventions, customary traditions and mores. There are thus limitations with historical accounts. (See, for example, the differences in the historical development of judicial review and the principle of separation of powers in individual countries: Berman, 2006, p. 12; Blackshield & Williams 2006, p.19-28; Yatim 2007, p. 5, 6).

Jansen (2006) has suggested that descriptions and comparisons between laws in domestic and overseas jurisdictions are inherently related to an author's own impressions and perceptions that produce 'choices' (both conscious and subliminal) about what the law is and what the law should be (see also Kennedy, 1986). The author thus acknowledges

---

1 Articles that appear in the appendix are referred to throughout this paper by the number allocated to them.

that his own subjectivities (race, class, gender, socio-economic background, age, educational experience, sexual orientation, religious upbringing, etc.) shape his impressions about the sodomy laws in each context.

As a white western male, the author also recognises the particular difficulty in advocating a consistent approach to homosexual relations when the comparisons involve western and non-western legal systems. The author is also aware that the issue of 'globalisation' further complicates comparative methodology and advocating legal change brought about by emerging international norms of human rights risks being viewed by non-western countries as a form of colonialism that seeks to impose western neo-liberal values on non-western countries. Globalisation, with all its varied normative understandings in the western and non-western world, has certainly had an impact on all countries in the world (Dannemann, 2006, p. 409, 410).

International Legislative Change

The repeal of sodomy laws has been brought about to some extent in Australia and the US due to the international pressures flowing from the emergence and growth of discourse in human rights on a global level (Watt 2006, p. 579-592). One arguable consequence of globalisation is the greater sharing of information via the internet between marginalised communities (such as LGBTI communities) and movements of peoples between nation-states around the globe, resulting in different identities within nation-states and transcending national borders. This has resulted in a broadening of dialogue on issues of human rights and other related fields (e.g., religion, sociology, economics, biology, political science and history) and the initiation of certain basic standards of human rights that extend beyond territorial borders and systems of hierarchy (Cotterrell, 2006, p. 731; Long, 2004; Watt 2006, p. 581). The growing ineffectiveness of using sodomy laws as a political fear-mongering technique is also a testament to the impact of the globalising factors mentioned previously.

Comparisons and calls for uniform laws are accomplished with least difficulty by the comparativist in those situations in which there are not great differences between the legal systems of two countries. Each of the countries in this comparative piece share both similarities and differences in their legal systems. This makes such a comparison both more challenging and fruitful (Dannemann, 2006, p. 409-10).

Australia, the United States and Malaysia have federal systems of government. Australia and Malaysia are both monarchies based on the parliamentary Westminster system. Individual rights are expressly provided for in both the US and Malaysian Constitutions. Unlike the US Constitution, the rights in the Malaysian Constitution are subject to Parliament to uphold morality, public order or national security (Tan, 2007, p. 43-45; Davidson, 1998, p. 102-105; Goodroad, 1999). In addition, differences in historical development and independence from the British Empire mean there are essential discrepancies between these countries. Indeed, values cherished in the legal systems of Australia and the United States, such as separation of powers and judicial independence, have not actually been embraced for over twenty-five years in Malaysia. Differences in historical development help explain why such principles have only rhetorically been supported (Blackshield & Williams, 2006, p. 19-28; Yatim, 2007, p. 5, 6; Berman, 2006; Michaels, 2006, p. 378-380; Dannemann, 2006, p. 389-391).

In Australia, the Commonwealth Parliament passed legislation to comply with its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), following the momentous decision of the United Nations Human Rights Committee in *Toonen* (see United Nations Committee on Human Rights, 2004), which resulted in the ultimate repeal of the sodomy laws in Tasmania (now repealed *Criminal Code Act 1924* (Tas), s. 112(a), (c)). International legal scholars and highly re-

spected members of the Bench, such as High Court Justice Michael Kirby, have persuasively reasoned that a certain 'transnational jurisprudence' has developed as one aspect of globalisation in most ultimate courts around the globe. This is clear from greater recourse to international human rights law in the process of constitutional interpretation. For example, four decisions of the European Court of Human Rights informed and were expressly relied upon by the majority justices in the landmark US Supreme Court decision in 2003 in *Lawrence v Texas* in which the sodomy laws were ruled unconstitutional (Honen, 1999; A9; Kirby, 2004; Koh, 2002; 2004). The repeal of these laws in the United States and Australia reflects advances in the human rights movement globally, and the growing legislative and judicial recognition that freedom to enjoy one's homosexuality is a key aspect of other basic fundamental human rights (Long, 2004, p. 9, 12).

Malaysia gained independence from the United Kingdom in 1957, and that year the Malaysian Constitution created a monarchy based on the Westminster system (Tan, 2007, p. 43-45; Davidson, 1998, p. 102-105; Goodroad, 1999). The Constitution was amended several times, and although free speech and expression as well as personal liberty, associational freedoms and equal protection of the laws are provided for, these rights can be abridged for a wide range of reasons. This allows for significant restrictions on freedom of expression as parliament can pass laws to suppress speech to maintain morality, public order or national security (Tan, 2007, p. 43-45; Davidson, 1998, p. 102-105; Goodroad, 1999; Fritz & Flaherty, 2003, p. 1373-1374). These restrictions were designed to protect and preserve harmony within Malaysia's multi-cultural, multi-racial and multi-religious population (Harding, 2007, p. 115-133). The Malaysian Constitution has been sufficiently adaptable to changing times, and represents "local, distinctively Malaysian values, historical, political and economic factors and also cultural traditions" (Harding, 2007, p. 115).

Despite Malaysia's history as a pseudo-secular state (Smith, 2004, p. 361-363; Karean, 2006, p. 49), recently there have been suggestions by the ruling UMNO party that Malaysia is, and/or should formally become, an Islamic State (Harding, 2002; Karean, 2006). Due to the emerging Islamic movement, and the growing influence of the Islamic faith amongst members of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of Malaysian government, the country's pseudo-secular nature has increasingly been questioned. Liberal democracies such as the United States and Australia are committed to the 'rule of law' (Blackshield & Williams, 2006, p. 19-28; Yatim, 2007, p. 5, 6; Berman, 2006; Michaels, 2006, p. 378-380; Dannemann, 2006, p. 389-391), a separation of religion and state, free political expression and impartiality and independence of the judiciary. These features of liberal democracies are not evident in some Islamic states, and their manifestation presents a challenge for Malaysia.

Sodomy laws still exist in Malaysia and carry a sentence of up to twenty years' imprisonment and whipping (Ottoson, 2008). Failure to repeal the sodomy laws in Malaysia reflects the resistance to emerging international human rights norms in domestic jurisdictions, in which political leaders and the judiciary view such developments as encroachments on state sovereignty and national identity (Kirby, 2004).

The Anwar Saga

Malaysian sodomy laws were enforced in 1998, in a case lasting over one year, against Anwar Ibrahim, the former Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia. This was designed to destroy his political career after Anwar disagreed with the economic policies of the former Prime Minister, Mohammed Mahathir, on how to respond to the encircling Asian economic crisis in 1997. Anwar also levelled charges of corruption and cronyism amongst the ruling elite, and demanded a more open-minded and robust media, free from meddling by the few privileged governing leaders (Obendorf, 2006;

Aun, 2007, p. 273-290; Yatim, 2007, p. 5; Cheng & Hossain, 2001, p. 126; Hang, 1999).

In mid-2000, Anwar was sentenced to a nine-year prison term after being found guilty of engaging in acts of sodomy with another male. The prominence of the sodomy trial and subsequent conviction demonstrated the power of vilifying the homosexual 'other' through use of the term 'sodomy' and all of its associated connotations (Long, 2004; Obendorf, 2006). The conduct of the trial raised genuine concerns about procedural fairness, and highlighted scepticism amongst Malaysians and the international community about the impartiality and independence of the judiciary. The trial and subsequent conviction eroded public faith about the dispensation of criminal justice, thereby undermining confidence in the ability of the judiciary to uphold the 'rule of law' (Aun, 2007). Perhaps it was a reflection of political, social and cultural changes that, after serving almost six years in prison, Anwar's conviction was overturned by two judges of the Federal Court of Malaysia in 2004 (Aun, 2007, p. 286-287; A5). Though finding evidence that Anwar was involved in homosexual activities, the Federal Court of Malaysia overturned the conviction on the basis the violation of the sodomy laws was not proven beyond a reasonable doubt by the prosecution (Aun, 2007, p. 286-287).

Anwar and an opposition alliance (which included his People's Justice Party) enjoyed a political resurgence in the elections in March 2008. Malaysia's ruling party had governed since independence in 1957, but in these elections it failed to win a two-thirds majority and the opposition alliance gained control of five states and one third of Parliament A17; A18; A20). The previous charges and trial of Anwar for sodomy played no role in the recent election, which was decided on other factors including inflation, increasing crime rates and perceptions of corruption (Harding, 2007, p. 120-122). This demonstrated an unwillingness to malign Malaysia's homosexuals for political purposes. It also demonstrated that the previous trial was insufficient to destroy Anwar's

political aspirations, as the issues that influenced the outcome were the ones he had raised before his conviction. Overturning Anwar's sodomy conviction and other recent developments in Malaysia also reflect the impact of globalisation and the growing interaction between evolving international human rights norms and domestic attitudes. This may result in a greater tolerance of homosexuality and less of a discrepancy between the rhetoric and reality of liberal democratic legal principles as procedural fairness, judicial impartiality and independence (Aun, 2007, p. 289-290).

Unfortunately, recent developments suggest such conclusions are overstated, at least in the short term. Anwar recently sued (for defamation) a male assistant who filed a complaint with the police over alleged acts of sodomy. Anwar took refuge in the Turkish embassy, fearing assassination and concerned that further trumped-up charges would provoke widespread public outrage and create political instability in the nation (A2; A4; A8; A15; A22; Beach, 2008). Anwar subsequently left the Turkish Ambassador's residence after receiving government assurances of his personal safety (A21). There had been a ban on Anwar seeking political office until after April 2008. After the disastrous results for the ruling party in the recent elections, Anwar was seeking to enter parliament via a by-election, with the prospect of ultimately becoming the next Prime Minister (A15; A23). As a result of the new allegations, Anwar initially decided to defer a planned announcement to run as a candidate (A6), and asserted that the latest political manoeuvre was "clearly a desperate attempt by the... regime to arrest the movement of the Malaysian people towards freedom, democracy and justice" (A22). He addressed public rallies of more than twenty thousand supporters in early July, and accused the ruling elite of responsibility for many of the problems facing the country, including escalating fuel prices, corruption and lack of compassion (A3; A16; Murray, 2008).

Perhaps due to these developments, Prime Minister Badawi announced he would not

191

serve his full term. The current Deputy Prime Minister, Najib, would ordinarily become his successor, although his role in the latest attempt to sensationalise allegations of sodomy against Anwar have rebounded on him. Najib has been accused of having an affair with a Mongolian woman who has since been murdered. A close associate of the Deputy Prime Minister has been accused of involvement with the murder of this woman. It has also been suggested in media reports that Najib may have engaged in acts of sodomy (which are non-gender specific in Malaysia) with the murder victim (A19; Berthelsen, 2008). The political opposition filed a motion to debate the issue of the loss of public confidence in the ruling government, although the Speaker refused to allow the motion to be debated (Y-Sing, 2008). The relative lack of concern over the allegations against Najib suggests that the ruling elite in Malaysia believe homosexual acts of sodomy can be used more effectively than heterosexual acts of sodomy as a political ploy.

In late July, Anwar's wife (Dr Wan Azizah Ismail) the President of Parti Keadilan Rakyat (Anwar's Peoples Justice Party is commonly known as PKR) stood aside from her seat in Parliament in order to allow Anwar to run in a by-election scheduled for August 26 2008 (Ting, 2008). Then, on August 7 2008, Anwar was formally charged in the Sessions Court with sodomy and now faces up to twenty years' imprisonment (A1). He was released on bail to campaign for the Parliamentary seat vacated by his wife (A1). In early July, polling data suggested merely 6% of the respondents believed the accusations of sodomy were genuine: a firm majority of Malays believed that the accusations of sodomy were politically motivated. The election results suggest that the new charges of sodomy had little, if any, impact on the outcome of the by-election. Anwar received approximately 66% of the votes cast, notwithstanding alleged attempts to manipulate the outcome of the by-election (A14), and has now been sworn in as a Member of Parliament (and formally appointed as Opposition Leader) (A7). As Anwar observed

following his larger than expected victory: "The message is clear, we in Permatang Pauh and in Malaysia, we demand change for freedom and justice … [w]e want an independent judiciary, we want the economy to benefit the vast majority not the corrupt few…" (Hamid, 2008).

These developments demonstrate there is arguably a continued willingness to use fear of the homosexual 'other' for political purposes in an effort to destroy the rising political popularity and aspirations of Anwar. The recent events in Malaysia are retrograde, and in the short term dampen optimism amongst international human rights advocates to foster a greater understanding and respect for the basic international human rights principles of privacy, dignity, autonomy and equality – as reflected in the freedom to form intimate associational homosexual relationships. The events have troubling implications for a more robust political process, which allows dissenting voices to be embraced openly. Advocates of the values in liberal democracies can only hope these events do not spiral down to repeat the mistakes of the past, when principles of procedural fairness, judicial independence and impartiality as well as the rule of law were cast aside to maintain a hold on political power (A15; A23).

Time will reveal whether the hopeful signs of change lacked substance. I am confident that the long-term impact will be to strengthen the movement for greater freedom to enjoy one's own homosexuality. Public reaction to the recent events certainly provide hope that homosexual fear-mongering is a ploy that seems to have failed. It is unclear whether Badawi's recent announcement of his plans to step down as Prime Minister and hand over power to the current Deputy Prime Minister will mollify an increasingly dissatisfied populace, and whether Anwar will ultimately prevail in his attempt to realise his political aspirations (A19; Berthelsen, 2008). The factual circumstances in Malaysia arguably reflect 'the backward looking and the forward looking' in relation to recognition of freedom to enjoy one's

own homosexuality as an aspect of basic human rights principles (Kirby, 2004).

Conclusion

As stated earlier in this piece, repealing of the sodomy laws in the US and Australia has been brought about to some extent in both contexts due to the international pressures flowing from the emergence and growth of discourse in human rights on a global level (Watt, 2006, p. 579-592) One arguable consequence of globalisation is the greater sharing of information via the internet between marginalised communites (such as LGBTI communities) and movements of peoples between nation-states around the globe, resulting in a broadening of dialogue on issues of human rights and other related fields, and the initiation of certain basic standards of human rights that extend beyond territorial borders and systems of hierarchy (Watt, 2006, p. 581; Cotterrell, 2006, p. 731; Long, 2004). The growing ineffectiveness of using the sodomy laws as a political fear-mongering tool is also a testament to the impact of the globalising factors mentioned previously.

Dignity, autonomy, and the acceptance of diversity are fundamental aspects of prohibitions on discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (Long, 2004, p. 17). There should be universal recognition of the rights of all individuals to live their lives free of discrimination and persecution. However, as one comparative methodologist - Roger Cotterrell - has explained, diversity can be confronting between different nations and to groups (whether marginalised or part of the mainstream) within particular nations: "Here the politics of difference becomes a politics of resistance to standardisation and a fierce assertion of identity: the other *refuses* to disappear: it subsists, it persists, it is the hard bone on which reason breaks its teeth'" (Cotterrell, 2006, p. 731) Thus, it is not surprising that the promotion of universal values, such as diversity, is met with resistance.

The repeal of sodomy laws will not result in

the elimination of homophobia, which is perpetuated by a complex mix of historical, political, religious and other factors that remain relevant in all three countries. Nonetheless, as with human rights principles generally, it is extremely important symbolically to begin with the repeal of sodomy laws. Addressing homophobia requires multi-disciplinary approaches that transcend changes in the law and include the involvement of, and consultation with, communities to foster a greater understanding and respect for international human rights principles of privacy, dignity, autonomy and equality – as reflected in the freedom to form intimate homosexual relationships (Flood & Hamilton, 2005; Long, 2004, p. 17).

Human Rights Watch has emphasised the importance of beginning a discourse between those seeking to preserve their cultural traditions and those seeking to advance international human rights norms. Advocates of the recognition of freedom with regard to sexual orientation have been resisted because we are arguably at "the most vulnerable edge of the human rights movement" (Long, 2004, p. 2). Human rights campaigners are often portrayed in a variety of discursive fora not as advancers of the virtue of diversity, but rather as outsiders eroding state sovereignty and undermining cultural, religious and communal traditions and mores. Discussions between communities concerned with preserving cultural, religious and communal traditions and those interested in advancing domestic application of international human rights norms regarding sexual orientation will take place, as Scott Long points out, "only if true conservatives, who respect the past because they grapple with its complexities, dismiss the false ideologies of cultural uniformity that exploit sexuality with no other real goal than to reject, exclude and destroy" (2004, p. 17). As Long goes on to suggest:

> "[Parochialism] not only pits 'culture' against rights, it paints a sombre picture of society in which sexuality – and, implicitly, a range of other human experiences – demands continual and restrictive state scrutiny and con-

trol. Against this bleak and onerous vision, rights activists must reassert basic principles of personal freedom; but they must also affirm that human beings require the autonomous enjoyment of their sexualities to lead satisfying, fulfilled, fully human lives… rights activists must see defending sexual rights not as a distraction from their traditional preoccupations, but as a necessary and logical development. Human rights are the possessions of embodied human beings, whose dignity is bound up with the capacity to inhabit and experience their bodies as their own. Everyone deserves the free enjoyment of their sexuality. No one who does not hurt other people should be a prisoner of others' consciences' (Long, 2004, p. 3).

Like human rights generally, sexual freedoms have come a long way. Nonetheless, they still have a long way to go, as the political abuse of the sodomy laws in Malaysia demonstrates.

Author Note

Dr. Alan Berman is an Adjunct Research Fellow of the Socio-Legal Research Centre at Griffith University and Senior Lecturer at the University of Newcastle School of Law, Callaghan, NSW, Australia. 2308. His has previously taught in the areas of International Human Rights Law and American and Australian Constitutional Law. The author gratefully acknowledges the helpful research assistance of Joseph Wenta in citechecking this piece and conforming the sources of authority to the style of this journal. The author may be contacted at Alan.Berman@newcastle.edu.au

References

Aun, J.W.M. (2007). The saga of Anwar Ibrahim. In A. Harding & H.P. Lee (Eds.), *Constitutional landmarks in Malaysia – The first 50 years: 1957-2007* (pp. 273-290). Singapore: LexisNexis.

Beach, H. (2008, July 3). *Back to the future*. Retrieved July 9, 2008, from http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1819923,00.html.

Berman, A. (2006). Kanak women and the colonial process. *International Journal of Law in Context*, *2*(1), 11-36.

Berman, A. (2008) The experiences of denying constitutional protection to sodomy laws in the United States, Australia and Malaysia: You've come a long way baby and you still have a long way to go!. *Oxford University Comparative Law Forum,* 2. Retrieved December 5, 2008, from http://www.ouclf.iuscomp.org/articles/berman2.shtml

Berthelsen, J. (2008, August 1). *Malaysia's legal pursuit of Anwar Ibrahim is destroying the country's reputation*. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from http://bloggingr4life.blogspot.com/2008/08/malaysias-legal-pursuit-of-anwar.html.

Blackshield, T. & Williams, G. (2006). *Australian constitutional law and theory: Commentary and materials*. Newton NSW: Federation Press.

Cheng, M. & Hossain, S. (2001). Malaysia and the Asian turmoil. *Asia Pacific Law and Policy Journal*, *2*(1), 125-143.

Cotterrell, R. (2006). Comparative law and legal culture. In M. Reimann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative law* (pp. 709-738). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dannemann, G. (2006). Comparative law: Study of similarities or differences? In M. Reimann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative law* (pp. 383-420). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davidson, A.D. (1998). 'I want my censored MTV': Malaysia's censorship regime collides with the economic realities of the twenty-first century. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, *31*(5), 97-152.

Feree, C.W. (1988). *Bowers v Hardwick*: The Supreme Court closes the door on the right

to privacy and opens the door to the bed-room. *Denver University Law Review, 64*(3), 599-612.

Flood, M. & Hamilton, C. (2005). *Mapping homophobia in Australia*. Retrieved July 9, 2008, from https://www.tai.org.au/file.php?file=WP79.pdf.

Fritz, N. & Flaherty, M. (2003). Special Report – Unjust order: Malaysia's Internal Security Act. *Fordham International Law Journal, 26*(5), 1345-1437.

Goodroad, S.L. (1999). The challenge of free speech: Asian values v unfettered free speech, an analysis of Singapore and Malaysia in the new global order. *Indiana International and Comparative Lasw Review, 9*(1), 259-318.

Hamid, J. (2008, August 26). *Anwar's Malaysia election win boosts push for power*. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from http://today.reuters.co.uk/news/articlenews.aspx?type=worldNews&storyid=2008-08-26T152947Z_01_SP55161_RTRUKOC_0_UK-MALAYSIA-ANWAR.xml.

Hang, T.T. (1999). The financial meltdown in Asia: Crisis and response Malaysia: The fierce politico-legal backlash. *Singapore Journal of International and Comparative Law, 3*(1), 1-26.

Harding, A. (2002). The *keris*, the crescent and the blind goddess: The State, Islam and the Constitution in Malaysia'. *Singapore Journal of International and Comparative Law, 6*(1), 154-180.

Harding, A. (2007). The Rukunegara Amendments of 1971. In A. Harding & H.P. Lee (Eds.), *Constitutional landmarks in Malaysia – The first 50 years: 1957-2007* (pp. 115-133). Singapore: LexisNexis.

Honen, W.H. (1999, November 21). Peter Wildeblood, 76, Writer Who Fought Against Britain's Laws Against Homosexuality [Obituary]. *The New York Times*.

Jansen, N. (2006). Comparative law and comparative knowledge. In M. Reimann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative law* (pp. 305-338). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karean, V.S. (2006). The Malaysian Constitution and its identity crisis – secular or theocratic? *LAWASIA Journal*, 47-61.

Kennedy, D. (1986) Freedom and constraint in adjudication: A critical phenomenology. *Journal of Legal Education, 36*, 518-562.

Kirby, M.D. (2004). *Take heart: International law comes, ever comes*. Retrieved July 7, 2008, from http://www.hcourt.gov.au/speeches/kirbyj/kirbyj_27feb04.html.

Koh, H.H. (2004). International law as part of our law. *American Journal of International Law, 98*(1), 43-56.

Koh, H.H. (2006). The globalisation of freedom. *Yale Journal of International Law, 26*(2), 305-312.

Long, S. (2004). *Anatomy of a backlash: Sexuality and the 'cultural' war on human rights*. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from http://www.hrw.org/wr2k5/anatomy/index.htm.

Mallat, C. (2006). Comparative law and the Islamic (Middle Eastern) legal culture. In M. Reimann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative law* (pp. 609-640). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Michaels, R. (2006). The functional method of comparative law. In M. Reimann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative law* (pp. 339-382). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, L. (2008, July 8). *Witnesses put pressure on Anwar*. Retrieved July 9, 2008, from http://www.smh.com.au/news/world/

witnesses-put-pressure-on-anwar/2008/07/07/1215282747921.html.

Obendorf, S. (2006). Sodomy as metaphor. In P. Darby (Ed.), *Postcolonizing the international: Working to change the way we are* (pp. 178-197). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.

Ottoson, D. (2008). *State-sponsored homophobia: a world survey of laws prohibiting same-sex activity between consenting adults*. Retrieved July 10, 2008, from http://www.ilga.org/statehomophobia/ILGA_State_Sponsored_Homophobia_2008.pdf.

Smith, P.S. (2004). Speak no evil: Apostasy, blasphemy and heresy in Malaysian Syariah law. *UC Davis Journal of International Law and Policy*, *10*(2), 357-404.

Tan, P. (2007). From Malaya to Malaysia. In A. Harding & H.P. Lee (Eds.), *Constitutional landmarks in Malaysia – The first 50 years: 1957-2007* (pp. 25-46). Singapore: LexisNexis.

Ting, A. (2008, July 31). *Anwar ups ante, takes battle to next level*. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v3/news.php?id=349859.

United Nations Committee on Human Rights. (2004). *Views of the Human Rights Committee: Communication No 488/1992*. New York: United Nations UN Doc CCPR/C/50/D/488/1992.

Watt, H.M. (2006). Globalization and comparative law. In M. Reimann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative law* (pp. 579-592). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yatim, R. (2007). The road to Merdeka. In A. Harding & H.P. Lee (Eds.), *Constitutional landmarks in Malaysia – The first 50 years: 1957-2007* (pp. 1-24). Singapore: LexisNexis.

Y-Sing, L. (2008, July 14). *Malaysia's Anwar snubs police, risks arrest*. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from http://www.reuters.com/article/latestCrisis/idUSKLR122187.

Appendix 1

Anwar Ibrahim charged with sodomy. (2008, August 7). Retrieved August 27, 2008, from http://www.news.com.au/adelaidenow/story/0,,24142598-912,00.html.

Anwar Ibrahim files lawsuit against aide. (2008, June 30). Retrieved July 7, 2008, from http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23945105-2703,00.html.

Anwar Ibrahim vows to seize power in Malaysia. (2008, July 3). Retrieved July 4, 2008, from http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23959307-25837,00.html.

Anwar Ibrahim won't leave embassy until safety assured. (2008, June 30). Retrieved June 30, 2008, from http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23945105-2703,00.html.

Anwar is freed. (2004, March 3). Retrieved July 8, 2008, from http://www.glapn.org/sodomylaws/world/malaysia/mynews044.htm.

Anwar says charge derails poll plan. (2008, July 1). Retrieved July 7, 2008, from http://news.smh.com.au/world/anwar-says-charge-derails-poll-plan-20080701-2zli.html.

Anwar sworn in as MP (updated). (2008, August 28). Retrieved August 29, 2008, from http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2008/8/28/nation/20080828100910&sec=nation.

Anwar takes refuge in Turkish embassy. (2008, June 30). Retrieved July 4, 2008, from http://news.smh.com.au/world/anwar-takes-refuge-in-turkish-embassy-20080630-2yyp.html.

BBC On This Day (4 September): Homosexuality 'should not be a crime'. (n.d.) Retrieved August 27, 2008, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/september/4/newsid_3007000/3007686.stm.

International Lesbian and Gay Association, (2007, 24 July). *Gaining the Right to Speak at the UN: United Nations Grant Consultative Status to Groups Working to Address Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues*. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from http://www.ilga.org/news_results.asp?LanguageID=1&FileCategoryID=44&FileID=1090&ZoneID=7.

International Lesbian and Gay Association, (2008, 13 February). *Gaining the Right to speak in Our Name at the UN: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender groups still face Discrimination in Accessing Consultative Status*. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from http://www.ilga.org/news_results.asp?LanguageID=1&FileCategoryID=44&FileID=1142&ZoneID=7.

International Lesbian and Gay Association, (2008, 7 April). *Supportive Governments: 60 countries have publicly supported sexual orientation at the CHR/HRC between 2003 and 2008*. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from http://www.ilga.org/news_results.asp?LanguageID=1&FileCategory=61&ZoneID=7&FileID=583.

International Lesbian and Gay Association. (2008, 14 May). *ILGA publishes 2008 report on State-sponsored Homophobia Report - Being lesbian or gay is risking jail time in 86 countries and death penalty in 7*. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from http://www.ilga.org/news_results.asp?LanguageID=1&FileCategory=9&ZoneID=7&FileID=1165.

Latest news from Permatang Pauh. (2008, August 26). Retrieved August 28, 2008, from http://malaysia-today.net/2008/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=11803.

Malaysia's deputy PM says met Anwar sodomy accuser. (2008, July 3). Retrieved July 9, 2008, from http://www.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUSKLR29440520080703.

Malaysia's embattled Anwar comes out swinging. (2008, July 1). Retrieved July 4, 2008, from http://news.smh.com.au/world/malaysias-embattled-anwar-comes-out-swinging-20080701-2zv1.html.

Malaysian accord aims to avert split. (2008, March 13). Retrieved July 7, 2008, from http://linkenlim.blogspot.com/2008/03/malaysian-accord-aims-to-avert-split.html.

Malaysian opposition scores upset. (2008, March 9). Retrieved April 1, 2008, from http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/asiapcf/03/08/malaysia.elections/index.html.

Malaysian PM Abdullah Badawi to step down in 2010. (2008, July 11). Retrieved July 11, 2008, from http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,,24002520-25837,00.html.

Malaysian PM suffers election shock. (2008, March 8). Retrieved April 1, 2008, from http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/asiapcf/03/07/malay.elex.ap/index.html.

Sodomy charge a political spoiler: Ibrahim Anwar. (2008, July 1). Retrieved July 2, 2008, from http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23950273-2703,00.html.

Sodomy claim 'desperate': Anwar. (2008, June 30). Retrieved July 7, 2008, from http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23943773-25837,00.html.

The trials of Anwar. (2008, July 1). Retrieved July 2, 2008, from http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23948507-16382,00.html.

'WITHOUT POWER ANALYSIS, THERE WON'T BE EQUALITY': INTERROGATING THE IDEA OF LOVE IN ASIAN/CAUCASIAN GAY RELATIONSHIPS

MAURICE KWONG-LAI POON AND RICK SIN

In his article "'Without love, there won't be us': A narrative of a GAM-GWM couple", Budiadi Sudarto attempts to debunk the stereotype that Asian/Caucasian gay relationships are predicated on racial oppression and marginalisation. What bounds these couples together, Sudarto argues, is not race, but "romantic love," "emotional attachment" and "desire to be together for the long haul" (2008, p. 30). Thus for Sudarto, race no longer matters in this type of relationship. Here we argue that Sudarto's article does not provide a critical intervention to challenge the negative stereotype of Asian/Caucasian gay relationships as he claims but, rather, reproduces the neo-liberal ideology that maintains the cultural hegemony of whiteness in contemporary Western societies.

Methodological Fallacy

Sudarto's study is a relatively simple one. He interviews an Asian/Caucasian gay couple and, using their words "as much as possible", "provides an in-depth story into" their "lived experiences" (2008, p. 24). These narratives, Sudarto assumes, give him access to the couple's lived experiences reflecting the authenticity and truth of Asian/Caucasian gay relationships. He treats their experiences as uncontestable evidence as to the nature of Asian/Caucasian gay relationships – rather than as something produced discursively through historical process. Sudarto's assumption is rather strange particularly when he seems to be in tune with the language of postmodernism. He uses words such as "negotiate", "construct", and "reconstruct" to describe the relationship and to tell us "how

intimacy" now "operates in a post-modern world" (2008, p. 30).

In her seminal article "Experience", Joan Scott challenges the common assumption that experience is self-evident. For Scott, subjects "are constituted discursively" and "experience is a linguistic event" – one that "does not happen outside established meanings". "Since discourse is by definition shared", Scott continues, "experience is collective as well as individual." Thus, "the social and the personal are imbricated in one another and… both are historically variable" (1992, pp. 34-35). By treating the couple's experiences solely as their individual attributes, Sudarto decontextualises their experiences and fails to question both the power relation and the cultural politics in which they are produced.

Sudarto also ignores some methodological issues commonly recognised in qualitative research that affect what the participants tell us during the interview – for example: the interviewer and how they conduct the interview, as well as the context and perceived objectives of the research project. "As performance contexts change, as we discover new audiences, and as we renegotiate our sense of self", Katherine Borland reminds us, "our narratives will also change" (1991, p. 63). Thus, narratives are always fluid and can only be a contingent representation of lived experience. Sudarto's failure to acknowledge this methodological issue leads to highly problematic analysis and unwarranted generalisations.

Critical Intervention or Neo-Liberalism Ideology?

Sudarto positions himself as a pioneer in challenging the negative stereotypes of Asian/Caucasian gay relationships. For Sudarto, the current discourse of these relationships in contemporary Western society primarily centers on racialisation and power imbalance. To challenge it, Sudarto uses the couple's narratives to demonstrate otherwise and concludes that Asian/Caucasian gay relationships are not founded on fetishism or racial characters, but love and emotional commitment. He calls for a critical intervention and asks us to see race "as a non-primary factor" in these relationships. "By looking beyond the racial divide, and acknowledging a strong level of commitment that interethnic pairings have", Sudarto contends, "social prejudice against interethnic desire would start to be challenged" (2008, p. 31).

No doubt, not all Asian/Caucasian gay couples mimic the colonised/coloniser relationship: This perception is too old and simplistic to help us understand the complexity of these relationships. In his article "The discourse of oppression in contemporary gay Asian diasporal literature: Liberation or limitation?" Maurice Poon, like Sudarto, is concerned with the discourse of Asian/Caucasian gay relationships that commonly assumes that the Asian partner is in a subordinated position. However, unlike Sudarto, Poon does not suggest the erasure of race (or racialisation) from our analytical framework in these relationships. Rather, he recognises that the proliferation of gay Asian men's economic power and the changing perception of Asian people in the West (now a celebrated identity, a model minority and a lifestyle that produces different forms of racialisation) have complicated the power relations underlying these relationships. Poon urges us "to expand our analysis to include other social categories in order to understand how power actually plays out within the interracial relationships" (2006, p. 50). In so doing, we can see how race (or the racialised body) manifests itself very differently in different contexts (see Ho & Tsang, 2000; Poon & Ho, 2008; Yue, 2008).

Does Love 'Cure' Oppression?

The question remains: Can love and strong emotional commitment overturn racialisation and white privilege in these relationships? Of course, we do not question that love and strong emotional commitment are important in relationships. However, we found it strange for Sudarto to assume that love and oppression are mutually exclusive in Asian/Caucasian gay relationships. He is unable to see how love and emotional commitment are themselves constituted within white privilege, racism (racial discourse) and other intersecting forms of social relations. All of these things can co-exist with one another in relationships. For example, our own parents are in their 70s and they have been together for more than 50 years. No doubt, some of what holds them together is their love and strong emotional commitment to each other. However, we would not venture to say that patriarchy and sexism do not exist in their relationships. It is quite clear that they structure the division of labor in our families.

For Sudarto, love "eliminates" power imbalance and leads to equality. As a result, Sudarto fails to critically interrogate how racialisation and white privilege work within these relationships. In his book *Tongzhi: Politics of same-sex eroticism in Chinese societies*, Chou Wah-shan, unlike Sudarto, recognises how "power relations work at more subtle levels, especially in the age when everyone talks about equality and liberty" (2000, p. 202). He does not take the narratives at face value when his Chinese participant, Herman, talks about sharing his housework equally with his Belgian partner, Billy. Rather, Chou further examines how race (or racialisation) and white privilege structure their relationship:

> When I ask Herman why cooking is his task whereas washing is Billy's, why cleaning the house is his whereas driving him for shopping is Billy's, Herman attributes this to personal

choice and ability. The clear racial division of labor with the tedious and repetitive work left to the Chinese *tongzhi* does not seem to disturb Herman. More interestingly, Herman seems to have detached himself from 'male identity', as when he refers to Billy's masculinity by saying, 'men have to be taught especially in terms of housework'. It sounds as if Herman does not consider himself a man. (2000, pp. 202-203)

As a result, Chou's work is more analytical and far more thought provoking. It stands in stark contrast to Sudarto's depoliticised suggestion that love 'cures' oppression and eliminates white privilege.

In sum, Sudarto's article invokes the neoliberal agenda that would have us believe we are all equal regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation and disability. It renders whiteness invisible and turns a blind eye to social injustice with obvious consequences. To promote equality in romantic relationships, we cannot situate our understanding of love outside of intersecting power relations. We must reject the idea that race (racism) and white privilege no longer matter.

Author Note

Maurice Poon is Assistant Professor in the School of Social Work at York University, 4700 Keele St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3 [e-mail: mklpoon@yorku.ca]. Rick Sin teaches social work at McMaster University, Canada [sinr@mcmaster.ca].

References

Borland, K. (1991). "That's not what I said": Interpretive conflict in oral narrative research. In S. B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 63-75). New York: Routledge.

Chou, W. (2000). *Tongzhi: Politics of same-sex eroticism in Chinese societies.* New York: The Haworth Press.

Ho, P. S. Y., & Tsang, A. K. T. (2000). Negotiating anal intercourse in inter-racial gay relationships in Hong Kong. *Sexualities, 3* (3), 299-323.

Poon, M. K. L. (2006). The discourse of oppression in contemporary gay Asian diasporal literature: Liberation or limitation? *Sexuality & Culture, 10* (3), 29-58.

Poon, M. K. L., & Ho, P. T. T. (2008). Negotiating social stigma among gay Asian men. *Sexualities, 11* (1/2), 245-268.

Scott, J. W. (1992). Experience. In J. Butler & J. W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 22-40). New York: Routledge.

Sudarto, B. (2008). "Without love, there won't be us": A narrative of a GAM-GWM couple. *Gay & Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review, 4* (1), 23-33.

Yue, A. (2008). Same-sex migration in Australia: From interdependency to intimacy. *GLQ, 14* (2/3), 239-262.

CONFERENCE REPORT: INTERNATIONAL LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL and TRANSGENDER PSYCHOLOGY SUMMER INSTITUTE

JEFFERY ADAMS

This report outlines my experiences attending the first International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Psychology Summer Institute, held at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, 3-8 August 2008. This Institute aimed to provide for an intensive exchange of ideas among senior, junior and graduate student scholars located across LGBT psychology.

After an initial burst of enthusiasm leading to my successful application to attend the Institute, I later came to worry how I was going to cope with being immersed in 'psychology' for a week. Although I am currently completing my PhD in psychology investigating issues around gay men's health, I do not have a background in psychology – in fact I have only completed one undergraduate paper. Because of this and my 'critical' leanings I sometimes feel out of place studying in a psychology department and in the discipline of (mainstream) psychology.

Getting to Ann Arbor from Auckland is not a quick trip. It typically involves an overnight stay at the point of arrival in the US, or alternatively an overnight flight following a lengthy layover after arrival in the US. I chose the latter option, and after 48 hours of no sleep found myself at the welcoming function. If first impressions do count, then the friendliness and genuine interest in the work of others amongst all participants was immediately obvious – I felt this was going to be a very worthwhile event.

The Institute was organised around presentations by 10 senior scholars:

Lisa Diamond (University of Utah): Female sexual fluidity: Evidence from a 12-year longitudinal study.
Oliva Espin (San Diego State University): Lesbian among Latinos or Latina among Lesbians? Multiple identities as multiple sources of growth.
Peter Hegarty (University of Surrey): Alfred Kinsey and Lewis Terman: The co-construction of high intelligence and rational psychological science through a silence about homosexuality.
Lih-Mei Liao (University College London): Formulating psychological care for people with 'disorders of sex development.'
Allen Omoto (Claremont Graduate University): Psychological processes underlying community involvement and social action.
Mark Padilla (University of Michigan): Stigma, social inequality, and HIV/AIDS among LGBT populations: Theory and research on a pernicious intersection.
Charlotte Patterson (University of Virginia): Sexual orientation and family lives: Psychological perspectives.
Esther Rothblum (San Diego State University): Same-sex couples in legal relationships: I do, or do I?
Stephanie Sanders (Indiana University): Sexual identity and gender diversity in sexual behavior and the semantics of "having sex": Implications for research and intervention.
Leonore Tiefer (New York University): How analyzing the marketing of "female sexual dysfunction" (FSD) illuminates shifting constructions of sex.

Over the five days of the Institute each of these scholars presented a one hour colloquia session on an aspect of their research pro-

gramme to all participants. They also presented either a two hour workshop on some aspect of her or his research work focusing on practical methodological issues, or a seminar based around selected key readings. The same workshops / seminars were presented three times allowing participants (in smaller groups) to rotate through them over the course of the Institute. In addition to these sessions each participant had an individual tutorial with an appointed senior scholar to discuss some work in progress or future research directions. Gregory Herek (University of California, Davis) joined the Institute via video link for a colloquia session (Beyond "homophobia": Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma). An extended lunchtime session involved lawyers from the American Civil Liberties Union.

The workshop participants were 15 'young' faculty, 3 postdoctoral researchers, and 34 graduate students in various fields of psychology. Most of these were from 19 States within the US and Puerto Rico, but also included attendees from Canada, the UK and Ireland, Germany, Israel, the Philippines, and New Zealand. Sponsorship from The John D. Evans Foundation, the University of Michigan College of Literature, Science and the Arts, Rackham School of Graduate Studies, Psychology and Women's Studies Departments, and Institute for Research on Women and Gender, meant that the accommodation at a local hotel and the bulk of travel costs were met for each participant.

The Institute schedule was demanding, requiring attendance from 8:30 to 4:30, plus times outside of these for the individual tutorial sessions and the video link. Before the Institute reading material comprising 52 articles/book chapters was circulated and required to be read. Despite this energy levels remained high throughout the week, with discussions continuing during the breaks and into the evening.

With the number of sessions offered, it is of course not possible to review each one. In-

stead, to review the Institute I address the reasons contained in my letter of application outlining why I wanted to attend. In applying for the Institute, I was hopeful that three things might be achieved. The first of these was to gain access to academic leadership in the field of LGBT psychology, something that is unfortunately missing in New Zealand. While I enjoy a high quality academic environment, my supervisors do not identify as gay, and while they have experience in undertaking, and supporting students with gay-focused projects, this is not their main research area (Braun, 2004; McCreanor, 1996, 2004). The Institute provided ready access to 10 senior scholars who as well as discussing specific aspects of their research also provided valuable insights into developing and managing a LGBT psychology research programme.

A second reason was to gain an insight into the type of work being undertaken elsewhere in LGBT psychology. My observation during the week was that much of the LGBT psychology within the US (as represented by the participants) is 'mainstream' in orientation, with a lot of it concerned with addressing issues of stigma and homophobia. More critical takes on psychology appeared to be more prominent in participants from outside of the US – something which seems to be broadly consistent with previous observations (see e.g., Clarke & Peel, 2005, 2007; D'Augelli, 2002).

The third reason was to expose myself to a wider range of research on LBT research – something that my (somewhat narrow) focus on gay has not enabled me to fully consider. In this respect, through the pre-Institute reading, as well as the formal presentations and informal discussions I was encouraged to consider issues related to a range of topics concerning LBT. In summary, all three of my pre-Institute goals were amply met.

All aspects of the Institute were incredibly well managed by Abigail Stewart (University of Michigan), along with Peter Hegarty (University of Surrey) and Nicola Curtin (graduate student, University of Michigan). It

is obvious that care was taken in the structure of the programme. The rotating workshops offered the opportunity to interact with each of the senior scholars – unlike traditional conferences where you are often forced to make choices and invariably miss something you are interested in. Another strength was a good mix of those new to academic faculty positions and those undertaking postgraduate research. The willingness of these groups to mix and share ideas meant that more than one participant commented that it was never obvious who was a student and who was faculty. The one on one tutorial sessions provided an opportunity to discuss aspects of the participants' research in some depth with a senior scholar who brought fresh perspectives to the conversation.

Attending conferences and similar meetings also has a number of key 'informal' benefits, many of which appear off programme (Morse, 2008). One of the key features of the Institute was the senior tutors' presence for the entire five days. This meant lunch and other breaks were quite likely to be spent discussing with Charlotte Patterson the vibrant nature of research on LGBT families being undertaken within Australia, or chatting with Oliva Espin about takatāpui (a term she had just come across), or interrogating Leonore Teifer's provocative claim that "Psychology is part of the problem, no matter what the problem is." The Institute also provided opportunities for collaborations to develop as groups of like minded researchers met at breaks to discuss ways of maintaining on-going contacts and possibly undertaking joint research. A networking website was established by one of the participants to facilitate this. A further benefit was being able to 'put faces' to names previously only encountered in texts. Housing the majority of the participants together also ensured that these bonds were strengthened over breakfast and dinner times at the hotel.

There is very little I would offer in criticism of the Institute. I do believe that it would be strengthened if more international participants were able to be involved in all roles – senior and junior scholars and graduate students. I would have also have found it useful to have someone make a brave attempt to survey the origins and state of international LGBT psychology. Such a review would have helped to develop a shared history and common understanding of the basis of this 'developing' area within psychology. For my interest I would have liked to have more emphasis on 'critical' approaches to psychology. These are however minor matters. It should be obvious I would recommend that anyone interested in LGBT psychology would benefit from attending a future Institute should it be held.

Author Note

References

Aspin, C., & Hutchings, J. (2006). Maori sexuality. In M. Mulholland (Ed.), *State of the Maori nation: Twenty-first-century issues in Aotearoa* (pp. 227-235). Auckland: Reed.

Braun, V. (2004). Assumptions, assumptions and yet more assumptions: Identity in sexuality research and teaching. *Lesbian & Gay Psychology Review, 5*(2), 55-58.

Clarke, V., & Peel, E. (2005). LGBT psychology and feminist psychology: Bridging the divide. *The Psychology of Women Section Review, 7*(2), 4-10.

Clarke, V., & Peel, E. (2007). LGBT psychological theory and practice in the UK: A review

of key contributions and current develop-ments. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psycho-therapy, 11*(1/2), 7-25.

D'Augelli, A. (2002). Foreword: The cutting edges of lesbian and gay psychology. In A. Coyle & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology* (pp. xiii-xvi). Oxford: BPS Blackwell.

Fenaughty, J., Braun, V., Gavey, N., Aspin, C., Reynolds, P., & Schmidt, J. (2006). *Sexual coercion among gay and bisexual men in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Auckland: Depart-ment of Psychology, The University of Auckland.

McCreanor, T. (1996). "Why strengthen the city wall when the enemy has poisoned the well?" An assay of anti-homosexual dis-course in New Zealand. *Journal of Homo-sexuality, 31*(4), 75-105.

McCreanor, T. (2004). The city wall: Intersec-tions of heterosexism and racism in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Lesbian & Gay Psy-chology Review, 5*(2), 59-63.

Morse, J. M. (2008). The side effects of con-ferences. *Qualitative Health Research, 18* (9), 1159-1160.

BOOK REVIEW

IBRAHIM ABRAHAM

Gay Travels in the Muslim World. Edited by Michael T. Luongo. Bighamton, NY: Harrington Park Press, 2007, 200 pp., ISBN: 978-1-56023 -340-4

I approached this book with some trepidation. A collection of gay travel narratives from the 'Muslim world', post-September 11, 2001, could be a recipe for one of the political disasters of our age, liberal imperialism – possibly of a rather naked variety. Reassuringly, however, the editor and the author of the preface, Afdhere Jama, had much the same thought. "It has been the practice of Western (*sic*) travel writers to somehow always make exotic whatever other people they wrote about, and certainly very few would argue that any other people have been more victimized by this practice than Muslims" (ix), Jama writes. This trepidation was not least the result of Haworth/Harrington Park Press's previous collection, *Sexuality and Eroticism Among Males in Moslem Societies* (Schmitt & Sofer 1992) that mixed eclectic scholarship with such sex tourist narratives as 'The Persian Boy Today'. Fortunately, Luogo and his eighteen contributors are well aware of their positions as (largely) affluent non-Muslim Europeans and North Americans of European background, writing about politically sensitive parts of the world – stretching from Bangladesh to Mauritania, with the odd excursion into Arab diasporas in Paris and Los Angeles – and that rather slippery subject, human desire.

However, whilst the post-September 11, 2001 political and cultural environment may have drawn out issues of power, difference and representation, it also contributed to a polarising, essentialising and fetishising of that thick cultural category, religion. Accordingly, whilst

the title *Gay Travels in the Muslim World* hits just the right notes of exoticism, potential danger, and liberal decency for those who want to be reassured that we are all the same colour on the inside or that in every casbah and refugee camp there is a Carson Kressley waiting to be discovered, it fundamentally misjudges the coordinates of the issue. Whilst the book abidingly deals with the Muslim *majority* world, the essentialising error committed here – much like other anthologies on the broad topic (e.g. Murray & Roscoe 1997) – is to offer Islam a totalising place in the Muslim majority world, such that abiding cultural differences between *here* and *there* are ultimately explained (away) through (vague) reference to Islam and all aspects of life in Muslim majority countries, not merely the explicitly religious aspects, become sacrilised.

In fact, Islam is far from the most prominent issue in these stories. Indeed, religion plays quite a vague role in the narratives, sometimes as an imagined motivation on the part of the author, such as in the chapter by Richard Ammon, one of the books lowlights, in which he switches between something akin to frontier psychiatry and moral handwringing around what he calls "star-crossed haters" (95); heterosexual Moroccan men engaging in sex with 'Western' gay men. Other times Islam emerges in an ironic role, such as in Joe Ambrose' wonderful chapter, 'Tenth Story Love Song', also set in Morocco (and named for a Stone Roses song), in which he is given an English translation of the *Qur'an* by a hustler, who received it from a client some years earlier. "The mind boggled; some guy got a hand job from a teenager and gave the kid to holiest text in his religion as a thank-you" (54).

Rather than being a book about religion and sexuality, this is actually a book about the effects of global capitalism on sexuality. Globalisation looms large in its various incarnations throughout the book, and the better chapters acknowledge this. Martin Foreman's chapter, for example, although set in the most conservatively religiously area of Bangladesh, documents the changing nature of male sex work in the region, particularly noting the impact of foreign pornography on sexual practices and the lives of male sex workers, within the complex networks of immigration in one of the world's many car-wash economies. Similarly, Rahal X's chapter, 'Full Moon in Al Ain' illustrates the process of globalisation in the United Arab Emirates, with the author meeting tourists from North America and workers from South Asia and the Middle East in a religiously conservative despotic desert kingdom-cum-tourist playground and financier to the world, perfectly illustrating the contradictions late capitalism. On the other hand, the experiences of Ramy Eletreby, a queer Egyptian Muslim, born in the USA, illustrates globalisation from the other side, with Egypt as a place he returns to as a cultural and religious tourist, whilst bemoaning the expectations that "every Egyptian Muslim… is expected to go to college to become a doctor, engineer, or Islamic scholar and be married by the time they are in their mid-twenties" (175-176).

As Luongo writes in his introduction, "I expect that you will not agree with all the works in this volume" (xxiii), and several of the authors certainly demonstrate the chauvanism that one might expect to encounter in such a volume – although it is goes down better with the properly postmodern senses of irony which abound, notably in the self-loathing tourist petulence of Don Bapst's chapter on Cairo. One could also add to the problematic column, David C. Miller's chapter on an Israeli soldier on furlough, 'The Galilee', with its colonalist sexual violence. Ultimately, then, this book tells us both more and less than it thinks it does. Diverse forms of same-sex activity are detailed and often situated in evocative cultural portraits, or the melancholy nature of travel. However, the chapters rarely get to the crux of cultural and sexual difference, however redundant it may seem to accuse a book of mostly lurid tourist tales of being a little too superficial. However one approaches this book, or whatever one takes away from it, it remains the case that the issue of sexuality in the Muslim majority world, and amongst Muslim communities throughout the world, will require far more than, as Parvez Sharma, director of the recent queer Muslim documentary *In the Name of Allah*, suggests, "only a little math – with the help of Mr. Kinsey – to determine the fabulously diverse numbers of faggots, dykes, and all those in between that we are dealing with in the Muslim world" (103).

Author note

Ibrahim Abraham is a PhD student in the sociology department at the University of Bristol, and can be contacted at soiba@bristol.ac.uk

References

Murray, S. O. & Roscoe, W. (Eds.) (1997). *Islamic homosexualities: Culture, history, and literature*. New York: New York University Press.

Schmitt, A. & Sofer, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Sexuality and eroticism among males in Moslem societies*. New York: Haworth Press.

BOOK REVIEW

COLIN LONGWORTH

A Gay Man's Guide to Prostate Cancer. Edited by Gerald Perlman and Jack Drescher. Binghampton: NY, Haworth Medical Press, 2005, 183 pp., ISBN-10: 1560235527, ISBN-13: 978-1560235521

My initial contact with "*A Gay Man's Guide to Prostate Cancer*" was the result of occasional online browsing through the catalogue of the Haworth Press. Then, over a period of about eighteen months or so, I had five gay male friends and acquaintances diagnosed and or treated for prostate cancer. I'd suggested to a few of them that the book might be of interest to them. Although I hadn't read it myself, from what I'd seen in the online catalogue it looked quite worthwhile, in that it did not deal so much with the medical aspects of the condition (which can be constantly changing, but for which an overview is provided) but rather it deals primarily with the psychological and social aspects.

With prostate cancer becoming a more widely reported issue, and on hearing of the latest (to me) example, I thought I should get a copy myself, notwithstanding that I'm getting to an age where it is a potential health concern for me and my partner. (Not that it is limited to 'older' men, with one chapter describing the experiences of a 33 year old gay man.)

The book's Introduction notes that:

> Among gay men, the subject of prostate cancer is further complicated by the intersecting stigmata of both cancer and homosexuality. Most people do not want to talk about prostate cancer and most straight people do not want to talk about homosexuality. It is there-fore not surprising that the overwhelming majority of personal and professional publications about prostate cancer are written by, for and about heterosexual men and their female partners. If prostate cancer, in general, is off most people's radar screen, then gay men with prostate cancer are a truly invisible species. (p.2)

Although the book gives an overview of the sorts of issues, tests, and broad types of treatment options for the condition, its greatest strength is its examination of the psychological and related implications for gay men.

A common theme throughout the book is the need for honest open communication and professional relationships with medical personnel, and how this can be affected by the attitudes to homosexuality of both medical staff and patients, i.e. internalised heterosexism and willingness and comfort with being open about one's homosexuality (this being an area where psychologists can potentially assist clients). As the authors note, for gay men, above and beyond the 'usual' problems related to treatment for prostate cancer are the potential for reawakening old fears and insecurities related to their definitions of masculinity, and related issues of internalised heterosexism. Apart from the need to 'come out' again in the context of medical treatment, recuperation may be a time when the individual may well feel less inclined to do so. In addition, many of the gay men now presenting with prostate cancer will have grown up in less tolerant Pre-Stonewall times with the cancer potentially reawakening old issues about self-worth (as referred to earlier). There may also be issues around body image, scarring, HIV status, use of testosterone, relationship status, and a per-

ception of being 'damaged goods'.

One of the chapters describes the experience of a gay psychologist who is treated for prostate cancer and in between his own therapy, goes on to run a support group for gay men, notwithstanding the 18 month long roller-coaster ride of emotions.

Not having given the subject too much thought previously, reading through *Perlman and Drescher's* book I came to realise how the different testing and treatment alternatives can, for gay men, have different implications than the same treatment for our heterosexual counterparts. For example, the physical and psychological implications of a radical prostatectomy to a gay man who enjoys being a 'bottom' used to having his prostate massaged during sex will be quite different to the experience of a heterosexual male, used to heterosexual sex.

Overall, it would appear to me to be a good addition to the bookshelf of both gay men, and the psychologists and others who deal with them, as it deals with both medical and psychological treatment issues, both in the form of reports of the experience of various gay health professionals, (Urologist, Psychologists, Clinical Social Worker,) as well as the implications for gay men in various sub-categories of the gay male population. For example HIV+, single and coupled gay men, older and younger men, all dealing with this cancer that the *Prostate Cancer Foundation of Australia* say via their website, (http://www.prostate.org.au/) will develop in one in nine Australian men, in their lifetime.

Author note

Colin Longworth, is a Provisionally Registered Psychologist, and a student in Murdoch University's Postgraduate Diploma of Counselling, run via the School of Psychology. He has been a volunteer telephone counsellor with Gay and Lesbian Community Services of WA since 1981, and can be contacted via:
colinlongworth@yahoo.com.au

References

Prostate Cancer Foundation of Australia http://www.prostate.org.au/prostate-cancer-related-statistics.php [Retrieved 21st August 2008]

BOOK REVIEW

ASHLEY VAN HOUTEN

Sexual and gender diagnoses of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM). A reevaluation. Edited by Dan Karasic, MD and Jack Drescher, MD. New York: The Haworth Press, 2005, 160pp. ISBN: 0-7890-3214-7.

The book is a concise and comprehensive evaluation of the salient issues concerning Gender Identity Disorder and Sexual Disorders in relation to their classification in the DSM. The book critiques the diagnostic nosology of the DSM in relation to these diagnoses and offers compelling arguments in relation to their categorisation as mental disorders.

Of the ten chapters, seven are devoted to Gender Identity Disorder (four exclusively and another three chapters with related topics on the sexual disorders). Chapter two explores the controversial issue of the diagnosis of Gender Identity Disorder in children and adolescence. It contains important research findings that address the issues of childhood diagnosis and early intervention and treatments. The chapter explores themes on gender formation, cross gender exploration in children, gender constancy and gender distress found in both parents and children. The chapter concludes by raising the question of the validity of diagnosing gender identity disorder in children. Chapter three provides very interesting insights into the tendency for psychiatry to pathologise human diversity as deviant and abnormal. By placing Gender Identity Disorder in its historical developmental context the chapter critiques the inclusion of Gender Identity Disorder in the DSM. Chapter four examines the DSM criteria, offering an alternative diagnosis of 'gender dissonance' which addresses the distress experienced as a result of the gender incongruence between natal gender and expressed gender.

The evidence presented is comprehensively researched, covering all the main areas of research in Gender Identity Disorder. The references are reliable and representative of the most published researchers in the area. The forward to the book is written by Eli Coleman who commissioned the book's two editors. Eli Coleman is an ex president of the World Professional Association of Transgender Health and is well published himself.

The greatest strength of the book is its concise presentation of salient and contentious issues, its wealth of up-to-date referencing and its balanced presentation of the arguments.

The weakness of the book is that the paraphilias and the sexual disorders were not given as much coverage as the title may suggest.

The book makes a valuable contribution to knowledge in Gender Identity Disorder and Sexual Disorders for its genre. It would be useful for clinicians, academics and mental health professionals. The book provides a comprehensive overview of the topic.

The comprehensive references used give a useful guide for anyone who wishes to conduct more in-depth study. The book is a short, quick read. A great deal has been put into a very compact format. While informative and intellectually challenging the book is also a very interesting read.

Author Note

Ashley van Houten is a Clinical Psychologist currently in private practice and a PhD candidate at Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland, and may be contacted on: a.vanhouten@griffith.edu.au

Preparation, submission and publication guidelines

Types of articles that we typically consider:

A)

Empirical articles (6000 word max)
Theoretical pieces
Commentary on LGBTI issues and psychology

Research in brief: Reviews of a favourite or trouble-some article/book chapter that you have read and would like to comment on

B)

Conference reports/conference abstracts
Practitioner's reports/field notes
Political/media style reports of relevant issues

Book reviews (please contact the Editor for a list of books available & review guidelines)
Promotional material for LGBT relevant issues

The Review also welcomes proposals for special issues and guest Editors.

Each submission in section A should be prepared for blind peer-review if the author wishes. If not, submissions will still be reviewed, but the identity of the author may be known to the reviewer. Submissions for blind review should contain a title page that has all of the author(s) information, along with the title of the submission, a short author note (50 words or less), a word count and up to 5 key words. The remainder of the submission should not identify the author in any way, and should start on a new page with the submission title followed by an abstract and then the body of the text. Authors who do not require blind review should submit papers as per the above instructions, the difference being that the body text may start directly after the key words.

Each submission in section B should contain the author(s) information, title of submission (if relevant), a short author note (50 words or less) and a word count, but need not be prepared for blind review.

All submissions must adhere to the rules set out in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (fifth edition), and contributors are encouraged to contact the Editor should they have any concerns with this format as it relates to their submission. Spelling should be Australian (e.g., 'ise') rather than American ('ize'), and submissions should be accompanied with a letter stating any conflicts of interest in regards to publication or competing interests. Footnotes should be kept to a minimum. References should be listed alphabetically by author at the end of the paper. For example:

Journal Articles: Riggs, D.W. (2004). The politics of scientific knowledge: Constructions of sexuality and ethics in the conversion therapy literature. *Lesbian & Gay Psychology Review*, 5, 16-24.
Books: Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism.* London: Sage.
Edited Books: Coyle, A. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.) (2002). *Lesbian & gay psychology*. Oxford: BPS Blackwell.
Book Chapters: MacBride-Stewart, S. (2004). Dental dams: A parody of straight expectations in the promotion of 'safer' lesbian sex. In D.W. Riggs & G.A. Walker (Eds.), *Out in the antipodes: Australian and New Zealand perspectives on gay and lesbian issue in psychology* (pp.393-416). Perth: Brightfire Press.

References within the text should be listed in alphabetical order separated by a semi-colon, page numbers following year. For example:

(Clarke, 2001; Peel, 2001; Riggs & Walker, 2004)
(Clarke, 2002a; b) (MacBride-Stewart, 2004, p. 398)

Authors should avoid the use of *sexist, racist* and *heterosexist language.* Authors should follow the guidelines for the use of non-sexist language provided by the American Psychological Society.

Papers should be submitted in Word format: title bold 14 points all caps left aligned, author 12 points all caps left aligned, abstract 10 points italics justified , article text 10 points justified, footnotes 9 points justified.

All submissions should be sent to the Editor, either via email (preferred): damien.riggs@adelaide.edu.au, or via post: School of Psychology, The University of Adelaide, South Australia, 5005.