

sexy

bodies

*the*

*strange*

*carnalities*

*of feminism*

*edited by*

Elizabeth Grosz  
and Elspeth Probyn



## SEXY BODIES



# SEXY BODIES

The strange carnalities  
of feminism

*Edited by  
Elizabeth Grosz  
and Elspeth Probyn*



London and New York

First published 1995  
by Routledge  
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2002.

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada  
by Routledge  
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

© 1995 Elizabeth Grosz and Elspeth Probyn  
Individual contributions © individual contributors

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data*  
Sexy Bodies: the strange carnalities of feminism/edited by  
Elizabeth Grosz and Elspeth Probyn

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Sex 2. Homosexuality. 3. Lesbianism.

4. Lesbian feminists. I. Grosz, E. A. (Elizabeth A.)

II. Probyn, Elspeth, 1958–

HQ16.S49 1995

306.76'63–dc20 94–36929

ISBN 0-415-09802-5 (hbk)  
ISBN 0-415-09803-3 (pbk)  
ISBN 0-203-14782-0 Master e-book ISBN  
ISBN 0-203-22080-3 (Glassbook Format)

# CONTENTS

	<i>Notes on contributors</i>	vii
	<i>Introduction</i>	ix
	<i>Editors' acknowledgements</i>	xvi
1	QUEER BELONGINGS: THE POLITICS OF DEPARTURE <i>Elspeth Probyn</i>	1
2	THE 'CUNNING LINGUA' OF DESIRE: BODIES- LANGUAGE AND PERVERSE PERFORMATIVITY <i>Dianne Chisholm</i>	19
3	SEXTEC: EXCERPT FROM <i>WORKING HOT</i> <i>Mary Fallon</i>	42
4	LESBIAN BODIES: TRIBADES, TOMBOYS AND TARTS <i>Barbara Creed</i>	86
5	TELEDILDONICS: VIRTUAL LESBIANS IN THE FICTION OF JEANETTE WINTERSON <i>Lisa Moore</i>	104
6	GREEN NIGHT OF LABYRINTH PARK: LA NUIT VERTE DU PARC LABYRINTHE <i>Nicole Brassard</i>	128
7	ACTS OF CREATION: THE BRAINCHILDREN OF CERTAIN PSYCHOANALYTIC FICTIONS <i>Anna Gibbs</i>	137
8	'I EMBRACE THE DIFFERENCE': ELIZABETH TAYLOR AND THE CLOSET <i>Melissa Jane Hardie</i>	155
9	PARIAH BODIES <i>Sue Golding</i>	172
10	SEXUALIZING SPACE <i>Sue Best</i>	181

11	THE JEWELS IN THE CROTCH: THE IMPERIAL EROTIC IN <i>THE RAJ QUARTET</i> <i>Sabina Sawhney</i>	195
12	GIRLS ON A WIRED SCREEN: CAVANI'S CINEMA AND LESBIAN S/M <i>Chantal Nadeau</i>	211
13	I USED TO BE YOUR SWEET MAMA: IDEOLOGY, SEXUALITY AND DOMESTICITY IN THE BLUES OF GERTRUDE 'MA' RAINEY AND BESSIE SMITH <i>Angela Y. Davis</i>	231
14	DESTRUCTION: BOUNDARY EROTICS AND REFIGURATIONS OF THE HETEROSEXUAL MALE BODY <i>Catherine Waldby</i>	266
15	ANIMAL SEX: LIBIDO AS DESIRE AND DEATH <i>Elizabeth Grosz</i> <i>Index</i>	278 300

# NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

**Sue Best** teaches in the Department of Art History, University of Western Sydney, Nepean.

**Nicole Brossard** is a poet, novelist and essay writer. More than thirty titles of her work are internationally renowned for the originality of their feminist intervention and include such books as *Mauve Desert*, *The Aerial Letter* and *Picture Theory*.

**Dianne Chisholm** is Associate Professor of English at the University of Alberta. She is author of *H.D.'s Freudian Poetics: Psychoanalysis in Translation* (Cornell University Press, 1992) and consultant editor to *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary* (Blackwell, 1992), edited by Elizabeth Wright. She is currently at work on three book projects: *Queer Avant-Gardes*, *Pornopoeia: The Last/Lost Art of Modernism* and *Violent Femmes: Violence in Contemporary Writing by Canadian Women*.

**Barbara Creed** lectures in Cinema Studies at La Trobe University, Melbourne. She has published widely in the areas of film, feminist theory and cultural studies. Her most recent book is *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis* (Routledge, 1993).

**Angela Y. Davis** is a Professor of History of Consciousness at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Her articles and essays have been published in numerous journals and anthologies, both scholarly and popular. She is the author of five books, including *Angela Davis: An Autobiography*, *Women, Race, and Class* and the forthcoming *Ma Rainey, Bessie Smith and Billie Holiday: Black Women's Music and Social Consciousness*. She is currently conducting research on incarcerated women and alternatives to imprisonment, which will be the subject of her next book.

**Mary Fallon** is currently writing a two-act play *Angels Bellowing* on motherhood, foster motherhood and interracial relations in Australia, and *Con/struction Site*, an 'opera' for eight women performers about the construction of female subjectivity, sexuality and language. Her novel-in-progress *The Staff of Life* (about that which sustains us) is in progress and sustains her.

**Anna Gibbs** teaches creative writing and textual theory at the University of Western Sydney, Nepean. Her most recent theoretical work has been on writing and death, and on Gertrude Stein as a ghost-writer. She also publishes fiction, and is currently writing for collaborative projects with visual artists.



## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

**Sue Golding** is a writer and director of avant-garde work. She is also a Senior Lecturer in Political Philosophy at Greenwich University, London. Her fiction and non-fiction work centres on radical democratic theory, sexualities/techné, and nomadic curiosities. Her first book (*Gramsci's Democratic Theory*, 1992) is being followed by a new work which steps into the virtual realities of a Nietzschean/ Wittgensteinian/Foucauldian blend to explore, as it is entitled, *The Cunning of Democracy* (forthcoming from Verso).

**Elizabeth Grosz** is the Director of the Institute of Critical and Cultural Studies at Monash University, Australia. Her most recent book is *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Indiana University Press).

**Melissa Jane Hardie** is a Lecturer in Cultural Studies and English at the University of Wollongong. She wrote her Ph.D. on Djuna Barnes and Modernism. Her recent work for a book about camp and femininity includes studies of Dolly Parton, country music and the novels of Jacqueline Susann.

**Lisa Moore** is Assistant Professor of English at the University of Texas at Austin. She is currently completing a manuscript entitled *Dangerous Intimacies*, which examines the representation of love between women in the eighteenth-century English novel. Her articles on feminist theory and early modern constructions of gender and sexuality have appeared in *Textual Practice*, *Diacritics* and *Feminist Studies*.

**Chantal Nadeau** is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies, Concordia University. Until recently, she was Visiting Scholar in the Department of English, University of Pittsburgh, pursuing her research on the representations of lesbians in cinema and the politicization of the sexual other in the social. She has published and given talks and lectures on women's cinema, popular culture, feminist epistemology and lesbian and gay representations in the context of national identities. She is currently working on lesbian sexual practices and the regulation of subversion in Canada.

**Elspeth Probyn** is Associate Professor of Sociology at the Université de Montréal. Her work includes *Sexing the Self. Gendered Positions in Cultural Studies* (Routledge, 1993), *By Choice. Feminism, Desire and Subjectification* (University of Minnesota Press, forthcoming 1996) and *Outside Belonging(s), The Singularities of Sex* (forthcoming).

**Sabina Sawhney** teaches English at Daemen College and has published articles on feminism and post-colonial literature. She is currently working on *The Other Colonialists: Imperial Margins of Victorian Literature*, which deals with the impact of colonialism on the narrative structure of nineteenth-century British novels.

**Catherine Waldby** has worked in various areas of feminist research since 1984. She has published in a number of journals and anthologies on questions of sexuality, biomedical representations of HIV/AIDS and feminist and social theory. She is currently completing a Ph.D. thesis on AIDS and the idea of the body politic in the Women's Studies programme at Murdoch University.

# INTRODUCTION

It is by now commonplace to introduce an anthology by announcing the aims of the collection, describing its contents, presenting the collection as a more or less unified, coherent entity and marketing it as a desirable commodity which promises multiple perspectives or viewpoints on a limited number of 'objects'. It is thus not surprising that there are many, many collections on the body, although in the past they tended to converge on an unmarked, unsexed and a definitely unsexy body, a neutered and supposedly neutral object that was to explain the workings of another unmarked entity: society. More recently, critical attention has turned to sexuality, and especially women's sexualities, producing a small avalanche of books which claim to explore pleasure, desire, lust, love, from a variety of angles, seeking to elucidate the intricacies, details, indeed the 'secrets' that compose this apparently ever-fascinating topic, to probe the tiniest details of sexuality, the intimate passions of desire so as to provide a better understanding of sexuality as a glistening, evasive yet circumscribable object.

This collection is different. For a start, it does not assume that there is a clear-cut and predefined thing called sexuality which we need to carefully describe and explain. Nor are the authors interested in pinning down the body or in tracking it in order to arrive at the threshold of sexuality, a threshold that would miraculously open upon the inner workings of subjectivity, power and knowledge, finally appearing translucent before the researcher's detached vision. Rather, the writers take a risk and renounce any claims that their texts, bodies and sexualities may want to have on identity, they do not need to know in advance, to contain sexual desire, pleasure or any associated terms. Rather, the project that unites the disparate subjects of these essays is the *production* of sexualities, not their description; the wager is to constitute activities as sexual – the sexualization of activities – rather than merely to reflect on a pre-established and already valorized notion of sexuality and its attendant support, the body.

This book was conceived and produced in the spirit of conceptual and political exploration and experimentation: its brief was to rethink, to reconceptualize, explore, disentangle or recomplicate sexual bodies, considered in their broadest and loosest terms, and to analyse sexualities in transition, in movement. Its goal is to ask rather

## INTRODUCTION

than presume what sex, sexuality or sexiness are. And significantly, if this was the brief to the contributors, the result of their various labours has led to a quite wild and disconcerting idea: that perhaps sex, and for that matter queer, could function as *verbs* rather than as *nouns* or adjectives. Conjugated, they could be fully conceived as activities and processes, rather than objects or impulses, as movements rather than identities, as lines more than locations, as motions of making rather than as forms of expression. If, as the Chinese artist Li Shan says, ‘if we make “rouge” a verb, to wish “to rouge” something away, this is not so much a matter of will and method as a question of attitude’,<sup>1</sup> then *to sex*, *to queer* can never obey the dictates of previously defined methods and disciplinary wills to know. To think sex, sexiness, otherwise – alongside, beyond the received understandings of the master discourses of sexuality (psychoanalysis, Foucault, Deleuze and their various landings within feminist theory); but also beyond heterosexism and phallogentrism (even – especially – in those essays which deal explicitly with heterosexuality); and even, in some cases, beyond the great unities posed and promised by the concepts of subjectivity and signification (as articulated within the discourses of ideology, social construction and representation correlative with psychoanalysis). What these essays seem to do is to think the sexiness of bodies in movement, the encounters of one surface with another, one body, body-part or body-activity with another (person or thing), seeing the relations between the human and the non-human, between one sex and another, one element and another, in terms of movements, productions, transitions, modes of transportation or metamorphosis. Simply put, to think in terms of becoming. However, if this phrase is commonly bandied about of late, it is less evident to write of pleasures pleasurably, to write not just of sex but *as sex*. In writing, to become, to bump (and sometimes grind) against surfaces, to realize the sensations of elements finding (un)common elements. These emerged as unexpected possibilities from the essays that follow.

Our title, *Sexy Bodies*, may beg questions, but these are questions requiring careful and continuous re-posing. These essays proceed without an a priori sexy body as they challenge established notions, producing bodies as sexy in ways that were never considered before (as in Melissa Jane Hardie’s telling of Elizabeth Taylor’s celebrated body). Moreover, it turned out that many of the contributors discuss forms of sex and sexuality which do not usually count as sex (even if like the praying mantis they have functioned as titillatingly sexy): counter-sexes, sub-sexes, anti-sexes, a-sexes, component sexes, which can and do work as autonomous obsessions and pleasures. The pleasures or the sexualization of memory, of departures and dislocations, of writing and collaboration, of urban movement, of skin and surfaces, of silken ties, of mouthing words, of singing, of eating, obsessively collecting, of conquering and imaging. Petty sexualities somehow considered below or outside the threshold of ‘proper’ or ‘real’ sex, the threshold that designates

## INTRODUCTION

certain forms of sex as the proper, the property of certain bodies, knowledges and things. Consequently, this is not simply a book *on* lesbian or queer sexualities, celebrating what is marginalized, reversing moral values, as is the wont of several recent lesbian and queer anthologies. Instead, it explores what runs underneath and within *all* sexualities, the inherent production of all sexualities as perverse, whether they conform to the norms and ideals of culturally valorized models or not (and concomitantly, the possibility that what is now heralded as culturally perverse may instead be in the midst of becoming normative). This is not just a book on queer sexualities, it is about making queer all sexualities, about what is fundamentally weird and strange about all bodies, all carnalities.

This collection is 'about' establishing new alliances, new connections between and among bodies, desires, pleasures, powers, cruising the borders of the obscene, the pleasurable, the desirable, the mundane and the hitherto unspoken. In one way or another, every essay presented here, at some level, acknowledges the disquieting effect of sexuality as it spills the boundaries of its proper containment, the unease of bodies breaking and flowing over their limits. For instance, Sue Golding discusses the 'unquantifiable strangeness' of queer desire as it refuses to be bowed in the face of death, refuses to be ranged in the face of disciplinary dressage; Melissa Jane Hardie finds a celebrity body that is carried along within the 'travelling sideshow of sexuality'; Barbara Creed talks of a 'body that's going places'; Elspeth Probyn of an unpossessable, dispossessed body transported by 'the singularities of desire'; Mary Fallen of the 'ludicrous overexposure' of sexual desire. While desire is figured as the carnal lesbian centre of the green night for Nicole Brossard, for Sue Best, the female body lies in the 'precariousness of its boundedness'; and while Chantal Nadeau rehearses the binding of bodies and desires in Cavani's scenes of s/m, Angela Davis discusses the movement of desire in the blues, that music which functioned to represent sexuality, sexual pleasure and social and individual freedom for Black Americans.

Bound up though they are in thinking about cultural practices, be they cinematic, literary or the so-called paraliterary, concerned with the everyday practices that strive to fix bodies into gendered and sexed categories, be they colonial, therapeutic, historical or contemporary, the essays gathered in this book nonetheless transgress normative analyses of bodies as either resistant or compliant. Working over disciplinary modes of fixating on certain bodies, the intellectual project that moves the bodies in this text is situated at the interstices of many disciplines. They work within and across the conventional disciplinary frameworks of literature, cinema studies, cultural studies, critical theory, post-colonial and anti-racist studies, history, ficto-criticism, queer theory and feminist theory (to name but a few). Each essay contests, in its own way, the boundaries dividing disciplines, refusing to be contained within existing disciplinary territories. While attempting to think sexuality as a

## INTRODUCTION

truly interdisciplinary production, the authors nonetheless manage to avoid the historical, geographical, material and intellectual *nowhereness* that tends to pervade much contemporary writing on sexuality; writing that produces sexuality as either unliveable, abstract and decidedly stolid, or as unliveable, as caught up in the autobiographical minuteness of a particular practice. As a kind of a dare, we asked the contributors to have some fun with the topic of 'Sexy Bodies' and while many responded that the actual writing was at times hellish, the results are indeed fun (as long as you have a slightly strange sense of humour). As important as fun, is the sensibility that emerges across these essays: that sensuality does not undermine seriousness and rigour – indeed, it obliges a certain exactitude; that it is possible to engage a delight in thinking, writing, theorizing, punning; that a delight in sexuality can engage others, other modes of engaging, touching and connecting. In short, a politics of tangibility, or at the very least the necessity of putting tangibility, touch and lucidity back into politics and critical theory.

A variety of approaches to sexuality, broadly conceived, are brought together here, approaches and tangents that explore the (strange) subjects of pleasures, the (at times bizarre) objects of pleasure and the particular connections and conjunctions between them as they entice and produce each other. These include approaches that take up and off from psychoanalysis, Foucault and Deleuze, but in each case and in contradistinction to disciplinarian readings, when these master discourses are evoked it is an oblique, refractory and wanton line that emerges. Where, for example, psychoanalysis provides a framework for understanding sexuality (as in Anna Gibbs' essay), it is not the Oedipalized discourses of lack and castration that form the basis of the argument, and it is not simply genital (hetero- or homo-) sexuality that is the presumed outcome. Instead, the sexuality under discussion is the eros of writing (both theory and fiction), the 'pleasure of the text', the slide of 'the grain of the voice' (as in Barthes' charming phrases) where the explanatory framework relies on the affective and not simply the verbal relations between analyst and analysand. And while several writers invoke a Deleuzian and/or Foucauldian framework, it is again more in the spirit of seeing where, how far, how fast one can run with their insights rather than a detailed pinning down of the Author, the painful mimicry of the disciple. Be it in regard to lesbian fiction (Dianne Chisholm), Cavani's use of s/m within a policed *ménage à trois* (Chantal Nadeau), the manifestation and movement of the desire to belong within geo-sexual locations (Elspeth Probyn), it is a mode of undermining or stretching these frameworks, forcing them beyond themselves, taking bits, leaving others, in order to push the ideas to places that Foucault and Deleuze would never visit, using them in the service of that which they could never contain: perverse desire speaking (as) itself. Desire bubbling up hot in between the lines as in Grosz' seemingly proper philosophical exposition of Alphonso Lingis and Roger Callois. A rangy, curvaceous

## INTRODUCTION

mode of thinking that takes models that may have been developed elsewhere, as does Angela Davis when she studies the ideologies and emancipatory self-representations in the music of the legendary blueswomen, Bessie Smith and Ma Rainey; or as Catherine Waldby does in her analysis of the subversive possibilities inherent in rethinking male and female body-imagos in non-binarized heterosexual relations, dressing them in new tasks for alternative projects.

Although very present in tone, several of the essays are solidly grounded in rethinking the legacies of colonialist modes of yoking women's sexualities to imperial projects, be it in the forced marriage that England tried to perform on India (which Sabina Sawhney analyses) or the ways in which western philosophy historically used women's bodies in order to figure space and equally to evacuate actual women from it (as Sue Best argues). But again the tenor of these arguments, as exemplified in the historical reworking that Barbara Creed performs on the tribade, refuses a stance on the sideline of history with its comforting position of purity away from the messy, brutal, sometimes pleasurable, often dirty and deadly processes in which bodies, sexualities, knowledges and powers come into being, battle, commingle and collude. As in Lisa Moore's essay, this is the virtual space of sexualities now, the criss-crossing of practices and activities that for the moment refuse to be named.

These are not self-congratulatory essays, they are not defensive justifications of one's own sexual pleasures and desires in politically validated terms, nor are they self-enclosed writings produced as forms of defence against hostile criticism, reactive in form. Refusing to be fenced in, refusing the security of a marginal space, refusing to reify difference, these are nevertheless celebratory essays, celebrating the very movement of essaying out against the known and the reassuring and into the unknown – the unknown of pleasures and desires yet to be known, of transformations yet to be considered.

Yet while there is a theoretical bent to stray, all of the essays in one way or another carry with them a clear sense of their individual points of departure, of where they are writing from and why. While quite located, they refuse the enticements of humanism that haunt much writing on sexuality. For instance, many of the contributors write about and out of lesbian and queer sexualities (Probyn, Creed, Chisholm, Fallon, Golding, Moore, Brossard), but it is not to eulogize but to problematize. Then, a number of essays also focus on the excess latent, but usually unexplored, in heterosexuality (Hardie, Waldby, Davis), while others project sexuality out beyond the human altogether, either into megahuman-constituting cities (Best), continents and empires (Sawhney), language (Gibbs) or into the subhuman (Grosz). While we hope that the essays gathered together here contribute to ongoing discussions, debates and analyses in the arena(s) of lesbian, gay and queer studies, we also hope to encourage by example exchange between feminism

## INTRODUCTION

and queer studies (instead of simple merger in which feminism tends to disappear). We are also pleased that one of the major domains of discomfort (indeed, one of the remaining unspoken topics) within feminist politics, that of the relations between feminism and heterosexuality and more precisely, the implications of feminism in hetero-culture, is also opened up for discussion. In the theoretical spirit, and in the political and personal necessity, of refusing the marginalized status of 'other' outside of the heterosexual norm (be it as dyke, bi, transgender, transracial sex, as well as any number of other compositions), it is also crucial that heterosexuality be explored and interrogated from within, revealing the insecurities, anxieties, uncertainties and possibilities for transformation.

While as editors we must assume responsibilities for the numerous lacunae inevitable in any anthology, we were first and foremost committed to making this project as accessible, as readable and as free in range, scope and attitude as possible. We did not proceed from a shopping list of subjects, rather we started with a vague but deeply held desire to produce a volume that moved away from an overly scholarly mode where naive empiricism meets with theoretical polemic in a supposed gesture of covering the politically correct catalogue that motivates much writing on identity-politics. Instead of covering a 'correct' sexuality (be it in celebrating being a bad-girl for bad-girl's sake or in conversely condemning whatever sexual practice you don't like), instead of obeying the 'oughts' and 'shoulds' demanded by the insecure, we wanted to explore sexualities not as neatly categorized objects but as that passion which fires the imagination, that defies moral imperatives and regulatory decrees. This is not simply to invoke a wild and free space, a deterritorialized flow, a sexuality that would be free of restraint; rather, beyond such atopic musings we want to encourage a sexuality that may disrupt what is expected, that is fully within the social, that functions hence as political (if not correct).

Rather than outline and summarize the essays that follow, we prefer for them to be read for themselves, on their own terms, for what each says in its own specificity and of its own sexual intensities. The order in which they are presented here is of course arbitrary; it is clear that they could and will be read in quite other ways with equally powerful, though perhaps different, effects. What, if anything, integrates them are kaleidoscopic, shifting sets of images and speculations which produce strange angles and unexpected configurations, unaccustomed patterns refocusing sexuality, producing images of its own rather than reflecting reproductive forms of heterosexuality or moralizing lesbian and gay identities. Hopefully, what we have produced here is a text that shamelessly and guiltlessly enjoys, takes pleasure in thinking, writing, problematizing sexuality, that produces bodies that unabashedly revel in being sexy as they explode normative notions, provoking other considerations about the sexiness of sexuality.

*E.G. and E.P.*

## INTRODUCTION

### NOTE

- 1 From the 'Mao goes Pop: China Post-1989' exhibition, Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney, 2 June–15 August 1993.



# EDITORS' ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to acknowledge the support of our institutions which provided the resources and funds to render possible such a collaboration between two hemispheres and covering many countries and much territory in between. Our thanks to the Département de sociologie, at the Université de Montréal, Québec and to the Critical Theory program at Monash University, Victoria. We also thank Valerie Hazel for her wonderful job of indexing and Katarina Soukup for the dreary job of standardizing the references of the texts. Elizabeth Grosz would like to thank the staff of Critical Theory and the Philosophy Department, Monash University, and especially Gail Ward, whose clarity and firm common sense have been an ongoing inspiration. Elspeth Probyn gratefully acknowledges funding from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and from FCAR-Subvention aux Nouveaux Chercheurs (Québec) which provided a course release, and thanks Professor Val Hartouni and the Women's Studies Program at the University of California, San Diego, for inviting her as a visiting professor during the winter of 1994, thus providing a warmer climate in which to consider the questions raised by this book.

# QUEER BELONGINGS

## The politics of departure

*Elspeth Probyn*

When we are sitting on the bank of a river, the flowing of water, the gliding of a boat or the flight of a bird, the uninterrupted murmur of our deep life, are for us three different things or a single one, at will.

(Henri Bergson; cited in Deleuze 1991: 80)

### UP ON THE ROOF

It is the winter of 1994 when all of the east of North America froze and here I am in San Diego with strains of T.S. Eliot going through my brain: 'A cold coming we had of it. . . . The very dead of winter' (1963: 109).<sup>1</sup> The very dead of winter and I'm up on the roof with the harbour in front of me and the airport to the side. Still not totally sure where I am, I sit on the roof and watch the planes slope by. They angle by the two weird trees on the close horizon, then from mere specks they emerge in all their awesome materiality over me; bellies swaggering, lights flashing, they descend and are gone. This happens over and over and over again; the frisson of slight excitement each time smoothed away. From where I am, all is descending, arriving, returning. The only hints of leaving are the invisible roars from the space-off.

This seems like a very apt place in which to think about belonging. This most southern of Californian cities is a strange place of movements. Across the flight path lies the port, dotted with yachts, criss-crossed with ocean cruisers, the site of cargo ships coming and going. I navigate San Diego on bike, my trips constantly interrupted by canyons, by signs declaring 'Danger', 'Peligro', 'Naval Property'. I ride along paths enjoying the feeling of self-locomotion, ignoring the refrains of friends who said 'you're crazy, you can't exist in southern California without a driver's licence'. Frequently I am stopped, caught in a net of highways, halted before concrete channels of movement, fascinated and appalled by a place that constructs highways as lethal barriers to aliens crossing borders. In short, this is an appropriately strange place in which to consider belonging, a space that cackles

with movement as people continually arrive, depart, are thrown out; some try to belong, some take their belonging for granted.

In turn, this reminds me that in common usages, the term belonging moves from 'being the property of someone, something' to the sense of 'fitting in socially', 'being a member', and that 'belongings' designates 'possessions' and 'baggage'. Belonging for me conjures up a deep insecurity about the possibility of really belonging, truly fitting in. But then, the term 'belongings' also forefronts the ways in which these yearnings to fit in will always be diverse: at times joyous, at times painful, at times destined to fail. Perhaps more immediately, belonging brings forth images of leaving, carting one's possessions and baggage from place to place. Thus, while belonging may make one think of arriving, it also always carries the scent of departure – it marks the interstices of being and going.

On another level, but bound up in belongings, as a term it causes me to consider points of departure, of where we say we're leaving from, and why. Depending on your tastes, it is either a lyrical or a maudlin way of saying that as theorists, we all have epistemological allegiances and baggages that we cart through our writing and thinking. And while much theory seems to be hell-bent on arriving somewhere, belonging to one clique or another, fitting in, being in, travelling under the sign of the latest buzz-words, there is some merit in a mode of theorizing that is careful of where it is leaving from.

Departing, getting going, going on, getting (it) on, getting by – these are necessary terms. They are also terms that I need to make rhyme with desire, a desire to keep on going, a desire to keep desire moving. I sit and watch the planes float in. I shut my eyes and feel the brightness burn holes in my memories. I wonder if I can ever fit in here. I sit and feel nebulously touched by belonging; a vague shifting of desire for a woman, a woman past and a woman present. These images of desire are not merely whimsical; rather, as concrete memories they queer me again and again as they embed themselves in the possibility of desire now. Images and fragments: meeting in a doorway, a handshake, a kiss, seeing my features rearranged as I smile back at her. Desire for me is not a metaphor, it is a method of doing things, of getting places. I want to think desire as singular, I want to make the singularities of desire the *modus operandi* of my queer theorizing.

## QUEER MEMORIES

A woman in a bar asks me what sign I am. Not a very original line, but a project of astral origins; I think that I give the wrong answer. (A past lover, a very rational type takes up astrology in her 50s, places me as an Aquarian and thus solves her problem of why I am what I am.) I should have been born under the sign of a plane: Delta, Southwestern, Air America. Wherever I am, people ask me where I come from and the answer is as evasive as my accent. I have a few stock answers: I'm an army brat; I

## QUEER BELONGINGS

grew up in Wales; I am from no one where. In fact, my family myth places us under the sign of the train, recounting, recanting the story of my Canadian mother meeting a slightly hung-over British army officer on the Canadian Pacific. The story goes that she was leaving the west to get a job in External Affairs; he was brought over to teach Canadian soldiers home from the war how to skydive out of silos – a Cold War sort of thing. As the great train rolled on and on and on through the prairies, and remember this was the days of great trains, my mother's companion told her to offer that young man a drop of whisky. Wham, bam, thank you mam, her dreams rolled off the edge of that endless scape, and three months later she was an army wife.

So you see, I was born departing, watching from the sidelines the ways in which children seem to know as if by intuition who belongs and who doesn't. The product of a childhood of moving, boxing up belongings, carting them along with my mother's injunction never to get married. Crossing seas, continents, innumerable borders which stop our movement with the fear of lost passports, of being turned back, of watching others who belong even less being stopped short at the frontiers of economic hope.

As I sit on the roof watching the planes descend, watching the lines of flight, I wonder if I've lost the knack of feigning belonging. Have I lost the desire to belong? Is that already a condition of the desire for belongings? I wonder where desire goes. This isn't a new thing, I often ponder this, normally at the end but recently at the beginning (a disastrous move as we all know). I try to remember a moment when I felt 'belonged', when I first felt desire, when I was first moved by it. The desire to remember familiar desiring bodies and bodies that desire. An image of horses and a girlfriend come to mind, inextricably wound up in each other, bound up with the motive of motion and emotions.

Horses, planes and trains . . . strange points of departure. As objects, they seem so impossibly phallic. I remember what Raymond Bellour said of the horse in *Marnie*: that 'Marnie's fetishistic love for Forio . . . typically takes the place of a man and children' (1977: 84). In turn, Bellour doubly takes away Marnie's pleasure with her horse ("“Oh Forio, if you want to bite someone, bite *me*”") when he posits that, on the one hand, it is merely the 'pleasure of the signified . . . the horse, animality, the phallic substitute'. And on the other, this image is 'the condition necessary to the constitution of [Hitchcock's] phantasy' (ibid.: 85–6). In this scenario, the image of the horse impales desire as the desire for the phallus, for the family. It cannot be Marnie's desire; it always-already displaces hers as the condition of another's desire.

Not a very promising point of departure, I think you will agree. However, as stilted and dated as Bellour's reading may seem, it is hard to escape psychoanalytic interpretations of desire. Indeed, one could speculate that modern conceptions of desire were spawned with the birth of psychoanalysis. So it is not surprising that, with notable exceptions, psychoanalytic assumptions inform the basis from which

to consider questions of queer desire. On this front and as a theoretical point of departure, psychoanalysis is implicitly and outrageously caught up in belonging. It may well be one of the theoretical ‘homes’ that demands the most investment, that has the steepest dues to be paid before you belong. As a ‘possession’ it is hard won through the years that it takes to master its complex machinery. Although, for many reasons, I have not taken the time necessary to fit in with feminist psychoanalytic theory, I am impressed by those who have. To be truthful (in that my own point of departure is Foucault), I am more impressed by those who have possessed this machine, who made it belong to them and for them, only to depart from it. They also tend to be rare. However, a few years ago, after years of brilliant slogging through Lacan, Elizabeth Grosz departed from her point of departure and ‘left’ psychoanalysis. The reason seems to be simple, even if the logistics of leaving probably were not:

I don’t want to talk about lesbian psychologies, about the psychical genesis of lesbian desire. . . . I am much less interested in where lesbian desire comes from, how it emerges, and the ways in which it develops than where it is going to, its possibilities, its open-ended future.

(1994: 68–9)<sup>2</sup>

In that essay, Grosz rigorously and elegantly moves on from psychoanalysis. But to stop for a moment, and to be crude, one can say that, in one form or another, desire still lurks as lack within much of contemporary cultural theory. Even in Judith Butler’s reworking of Lacan, the movement of desire is ‘impelled, thwarted by the impossible fantasy of recovering a full pleasure before the advent of the law’ (Butler 1993: 99). Butler does, of course, reposition Lacanian and Freudian origins. Thus, like the judge who enacts the law by citing it but does not originate it, she argues that ‘the law [of sex] is no longer given in a fixed form *prior* to its citation’ (ibid.: 15). However, if Butler does an admirable job of dislodging sex as origin, she does not quite manage to shift desire from its Lacanian position as that which circles endlessly and compulsively around its constituted object. Here, desire ‘misses’ its object, as in the French, *son objet lui manque*; it misses and lacks its originary object.

Of course, desire as lack goes beyond the texts of Freud and Lacan, or, rather, Freud as cultural phenomenon has gone beyond himself. Thus, the OED first defines desire as ‘unsatisfied longing or wish; or an expression of this’, only to finally remind us of the Latin root, ‘*desidero*: to long for’. While it is, as I mentioned earlier, beyond my interest to engage in a rigorous critique of the role of desire within psychoanalysis, what I will do is suggest ways in which desire may be put to work as method within queer theory. To replay that, let me state that desire is my point of departure and my guide. This in turn involves reconceptualizing desire as well as the idea of departure in theory. In a nutshell, as a problematic, desire compels

## QUEER BELONGINGS

me to work along the lines set up between and among longing, leaving, being, bodies, images, movement; in short, it causes me to depart from any strict and stationary origin.

This problematic that I am calling queer belonging is essentially about the movement between bodies and points of departure in theory. It is fundamentally about *milieux* not origins (to take up Deleuze and Guattari's distinction). As Deleuze describes it,

a milieu is made of qualities, substances, forces and events: for example, the street with its matter like paving-stones, its noises like the cry of the merchants, its animals like the horses yoked, its dramas (a horse slips, a horse falls, a horse is beaten. . . ).

(1993: 81)

Indeed, Deleuze's essay about Freud's 'Little Hans' ('Ce que disent les enfants') is a marvel of movement and a refutation of origins. In fact, Deleuze takes up 'Little Hans' and rescues him from his location as evidence for Freud's theory of Oedipal beginning. In other words, Deleuze frees 'Little Hans' from his position as belonging to Freud and to the history of psychoanalysis: this 'rage of possessiveness and of the personal [in which psychoanalytic] interpretation consists in finding the person and his possessions' (ibid.: 86). He looses 'Little Hans' from the grip of Freudian principles and lets him once again wander the streets, exploring his desire to get out of his family's building, his desire to meet up with the rich little girl taking him by the horses' stable. It is this meandering that Freud reduces 'to the father-mother: bizarrely enough, the wish to explore the building strikes Freud as the desire to sleep with the mother' (ibid.: 81).

Thus instead of origins (bizarre or normalized), Deleuze proposes that we follow a cartographic logic whereby 'maps superimpose . . . it is not a question of looking for an origin, but rather of evaluating *displacements*' (ibid.: 83–4, emphasis in original). This is movement that we can only catch and recreate through images; images, in turn, that with desire move through bodies. Each of these terms must take flight. Take, for instance, the body: the body as hallowed within feminist theory; the body as cairn. All those pages read and written about the body as location seem now to ring with a nostalgia of lost origins. Even Adrienne Rich's (1986) birth scene, that most cited of citations about the body, grounds the body – alright, *her* body – in a place of origins: the hospital. And while I have been inspired by Rich's use of her body, the strategy of naming the institutional markings (white, lesbian, Jewish) only takes us so far. It is a project of differentiating bodies on account of their locations; a project that speaks of where bodies belong but that can't quite write out of the desire for other belongings. Important as it is, it tends to slow the body down.

So instead of the body as location, let's take the body as *loca*-motion (to borrow from Anzaldúa's (1991) use of '*loca porque*'). Belonging set in motion which skewers as it remembers the marks of difference; motion that queers those necessary moments and memories of originary belonging. This body, these bodies, can only be understood as images. In Bergson's terms (1990: 168–9), the body as image 'is then the *place of passage* of the movements received and thrown back, a hyphen, a connecting link between things which act upon me and the things upon which I act' (cited in Massumi 1992: 185; emphasis in original).

## TO QUEER THE OBJECT

The problematic of belonging that I propose thus foregrounds the body as a place of passage, moved through by desire and being moved in return. Images of past and present belongings, of necessity, pass through and on. But, of course, images of 'belonging' conjoin with images of leaving: points of departure. In turn, this causes me to reconsider where we start from when we do this relatively new thing called queer theory. And as Eric Alliez points out, 'the singularity of the point of departure . . . is to make of beginnings a problem so determinant that in the end we make the question of beginnings meet up with the problem of philosophy' (1993: 17). In other words, it matters where we begin from and how we formulate our beginnings.

While this essay makes no pretension to solve 'the problem of philosophy', I am concerned with how we formulate points of departure in theorizing queerness. As a matter of common sense, where we start from greatly influences where we end up. As Deleuze argues in *Bergsonism*, 'the problem always has the solution it deserves, in terms of the ways in which it is stated (i.e. the conditions under which it is determined as problem) and of the means and terms at our disposal for stating it' (1991: 16). For very evident reasons, much of gay and lesbian theory has been preoccupied by the need to distinguish homosexual<sup>3</sup> (gay and lesbian) desire from the overwhelming manifestations of compulsory heterosexual desire. While in many cases the emphasis has been on difference *from* the straight norm, the present history contains accounts that differ greatly: take, for instance, the difference between Adrienne Rich's (1986) continuum and Monique Wittig's (1992) complex argument that places lesbians outside of the straight mind.

Given the diversity of approaches, it would be false to posit a homogeneous set of methodologies within gay and lesbian studies. However, I will tentatively generalize horribly and state that we can discern a very rough common point of departure – a sort of shared set of theoretical belongings. Simply put, it seems to me that this common thread is expressed explicitly or implicitly in the figure of the choice of object desired. In other words, it is desire embodied in an object that is the condition for belonging as gay or lesbian. In making this broad statement I am not ignoring the different epistemologies that have been employed in the different

## QUEER BELONGINGS

strands of gay, lesbian, queer studies. Generalizations notwithstanding, we have a long tradition of seeking out the homosexuality of historical subjects, the proof being founded in part through the excavation of their loved object. As an example of this, a recent essay finds the homosexuality, the lesbian desire, of Rosa Bonheur first and foremost in her 'companions' Nathalie Micas and Anna Klumpke and only secondly, and more intriguingly, in her paintings of horses (Saslow 1992).

Of course, the condensing of homosexual desire into and onto an object desired has a long history and a specific point of emergence. As Jeffrey Weeks, among others, points out, it is in the late nineteenth century 'that homosexuality represents a specific individual "condition" deriving from tainted heredity or a corrupting environment' (1993: 24). But the conditions for individualizing desire, for founding it in the individual perverse or inverse body, have continued apace throughout the twentieth century. Again, expressions of this homogenizing move are heterogeneous, but they turn around the individual body as source of homosexual desire or as the place where it is incarnated.<sup>4</sup>

Without denying the importance of previous work in gay and lesbian studies, I will suggest that the singularity of queer theory can only reside in the way in which it puts desire to work. I want to work against the tendency to fix desire. In part, this desire to always already fix desire may be due to a lack of precision about queer theory's point of departure. In other words, we excitedly leave our original disciplinary formations to 'do' queer studies without really thinking about what the common object of study may be. In part, this is the difficulty encountered in any truly interdisciplinary work (of which there is, in fact, very little): the object is posed as evident (it's 'about' sexuality) but there is scant consideration about how we get from 'here' (our training as literary critics, sociologists, etc.) to 'there' (the object of study). As Roland Barthes argued many years ago, truly interdisciplinary work changes the object, it changes the point of departure so that instead of 'founding' the object we follow it: it '*is experienced only in an activity of production*. . . it cannot stop . . . its constitutive movement is that of a cutting across' (1977: 157; emphasis in original). We need, therefore, to follow desire as we consider the aptness (*la justesse*) of our disciplinary belongings.

One of the compelling but problematic things about doing queer theory is that the boundaries are eminently porous. To put this crudely, different orders of questions tend to jostle together: is queer theory about real life (my life)? Do you have to be queer to do queer theory? Is it about politics? About representation? In short, questions revolve around the central and organizing one of 'what should the object of queer theory be?' – who or what is the object? In turn, these questions are pronounced in different ways: from Larry Kramer's chastising of Edmund White's decision to write a biography of Jean Genet instead of writing on AIDS to the entanglements of outing.<sup>5</sup> It's as if we don't quite know what to do about the force of longing, of desire, so we proceed to incarnate it, to represent it in the body of a real



person. As Gloria Anzaldua succinctly puts it, ‘there is a hunger for legitimacy in queers who are always trying to “discover” gay movie stars and great writers’ (1991: 256).<sup>6</sup>

An example that raises the more diverse movements of desire could be seen in the supposed lesbian moment on *LA Law*, a moment structured for lesbian longing. All those dykes all over the place desiring C.J., and I, along with many, would have liked her to have become a regular dyke character (and with someone more fun than the wimpy Abby). However, the emotion on the part of the lesbian audience seems to me to have little to do with whether Amanda Donahue is or is not a lesbian. A more recent example concerns ABC’s proposal to can an episode of *Roseanne* which features Rosie in a gay bar, kissing a dyke. Again, while there should be outrage at ABC’s timidity before the moral busybodies of this country, the issue is one of the politics of prime-time representation, not that *Roseanne Arnold* is or represents lesbians, or that she represents lesbian desire (although many may desire her). In other words, to conceptualize all of our perverse and persevering movements of desire as merely a longing for one individual-object is to severely curtail the idea of longing. Or, yet in other terms, is our longing and belonging as gay or lesbian getting mixed up with our theoretical belongings? Who or what is the object here?<sup>7</sup>

On another level, at a recent queer conference, I was struck by an example of a more ludic policing of the desired object, desire objectified. The conference finished with a simulation of a talk show hosted by Scott Thompson (the only out gay in the thoroughly queer TV show *Kids in the Hall*). One of the first demands that Thompson posed to the stars on stage was to confess whether or when they had last slept with a member of the opposite sex.<sup>8</sup> A straight answer would have effectively cancelled belonging to this ‘hip’ performance (as indeed was the case). A thoroughly queer response was from one dyke who fucked with a man with her girlfriend watching. Here, at least, desire is freed from one object – good or bad – and returned to lines of movement that presumably moved from the lover watching the lover who may have been watching her in return. (I know I’ve left out the guy but his actual presence – as opposed to his virtual and structured being in this scenario – really does seem to be superfluous.)

Banal and problematic as these examples may be, in various forms, desire has been and will continue to be stalled as a point of departure in gay, lesbian and queer theories as long as that desire is defined as desire located in an object. What I am interested in is proposing another mode of desire outside of the connected formulations of desire as lack and/or as inscribed in an individualized object. In other words, conceptualizing desire as lack, as the longing for an impossible object, is the condition of possibility for constructing desire as encapsulated within an object. Both seem to me to dead end: on the one hand, placing the origins of desire in lack implodes it as mere *érrance*, and, on the other, placing it within an impossible object removes it from the realm of

## QUEER BELONGINGS

real, actualized desire. Desire in these terms is halted by what Deleuze and Guattari call the ‘three errors’ of lack, law and signifier:

From the moment lack is reintroduced into desire, all desiring production is crushed, reduced to being no more than the production of fantasy; but the sign does not produce fantasy, it is a production of the real and a position of desire within reality.

(cited in Grossberg 1992: 40–50)

As an apparently simple proposition, I want to follow on from what Michael Moon argues in his introduction to Hocquenghem’s *Homosexual Desire*; namely ‘that the object of a given desire does not determine the “nature” of that desire’ (1993: 17). More suggestively, and in the words of Hocquenghem himself, at the same time that one cannot locate homosexual desire in its supposed object, nonetheless, ‘the homosexual image . . . expresses something – some aspect of desire – which appears nowhere else, and that something is not merely the accomplishment of the sexual act with a person of the same sex’ (1993: 50). While Hocquenghem is concerned with the specificity of homosexual desire, his argument can be made to meet up with an argument for the singularity of queer desire as theory.

As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick eloquently puts it, ‘Queer is a continuing movement, motive – recurrent, eddying, *troublant*. . . . Keenly, it is relational, and strange’ (1993: xii). Following queer desire turns us into readers who make strange, who render queer the relations between images and bodies. An example of this enactment of movement can be heard in a weird little exchange between Michel Foucault (who for me is very much a queer theorist) and Hélène Cixous (who usually isn’t). In it they queer images taken from Marguerite Duras’ *Moderato Cantabile*. Here the movement of an image of a breast brings Foucault to talk about the movement of *la drôlerie* (which may come closer to being a French translation of queer than would Sedgwick’s *troublant*, although the two are inevitably involved together). Cixous raises the image of the breast and defines it as ‘the image . . . a regard [a look] of such extreme intensity’ (Foucault and Cixous 1975: 10). For Foucault, the relation between the image and the gaze of the looker can be rendered ‘drôle . . . in the sense of something strange, avid, not quite graspable’ (ibid.). In this sense, through desire I queer images by rendering their relation strange; queer images that become avid for other relations.

Taking these statements as my point of departure compels me to wend my way through a number of interconnected issues. Freeing desire from its location, its epistemological stake, in the individual necessitates rethinking the role of images, images and motion. For the queer image does indeed express something. From this intuition, it then becomes a question of how to express the singularity of queer desire, of how to queer the movement of images in a singular way. Following Henri

Bergson's argument in *Matière et mémoire* (1990) and Deleuze's (1991) exposition of Bergson, the question becomes complex but simple to state: is this difference that the image expresses a difference in degree or rather a difference of kind? Can we make of desire a method so as to avoid the 'false problems' of departure that would place desire in an object?

### WOMEN ON WOMEN ON HORSES

In order to ease into these questions, or rather, to use Bergson's phrase, be introduced into them, 'like the passers-by that might be nudged in a dance' (cited in Deleuze 1991: 110), follow me back to the roof. I am sitting on the roof watching the sun render the sea into a dazzling line behind the buildings where the breeze makes the flags fly straight. Planes slide in. My longing for a woman past and present slips by me, latching on to images of summers of my childhood. The heat and the wind fan what is probably fantastical, or at least fanciful given the sodden norm of Welsh summers. Nonetheless, there it is, an image of girlfriends and me melded together by hot horse flesh; bodies strung together by the smell of elderflower branches slapping away the flies.

While I have always been fascinated by this connection of girls and girls and horses, body against body against body, I am far from alone in thinking that there is something wonderfully thrilling about the movement of women on women on horses. From *National Velvet* to *My Friend Flicka*, horses figure in any number of ways. And as far as I remember from the pony-club stories and experiences of my youth, it was always girls and girls and horses together, with nary a boy in sight (and if there were, they tended to be 'sissy boys' – but that's another story that requires another storyteller). Within popular culture this generalized coupling of girls and horses ('pony-mad') then operates in opposition to that of girls and boys ('boy-crazy'). Of course, equine associations vary – consider Jeanne Cordova's reaction to the onset of puberty:

The day I became a girl, my life was over. 'This is the stupidest thing I ever saw.' I flung the bra out of the window and screamed at my mother 'You can't expect me to wear that. It's meant for a horse.'

(Cordova 1992: 274)

Images of girls and girls and horses are, therefore, both common and individuated; present and fuelled by the past; virtual and actualized in cultural representations. To substantiate, let me offer some random equestrienne images. In *The Pure and the Impure*, Colette gives us a compelling description of some rather stylish *fin de siècle* Parisian butches:

## QUEER BELONGINGS

some of them wore a monocle, a white carnation in the button-hole, took the name of God in vain, and discussed horses competently. These mannish women I am calling to mind were, indeed, almost as fond of the horse, that warm, enigmatic, stubborn and sensitive creature, as they were of their young protégées.

(1971: 65)

Indeed, in Colette's terms, the horses were more worthy of love than the '*petites amies*': 'for these ladies in male attire had, by birth and from infancy, a taste for below-stairs accomplices and comrades-in-livery' (ibid.: 63). As Colette mourns the passing of what she calls 'the noble season of feminine passion' (ibid.: 91), she eulogizes their equestrienne, lesbienne existence: 'the dust of the bridle paths in the Bois still haloes, in countless memories, these equestriennes who did not need to ride astride to assert their ambiguity' (ibid.). From her description, we can hear a seamless articulation of horses, bodies and lesbian desire that allowed these women to move gracefully outside of heterosexual clumsiness. For, once 'mounted on the twin pedestal of a chestnut crupper . . . they were freed of the awkward, toed-out stance of the ballet dancer that marred their walk' (ibid.).

If in Colette's description, lesbian desire flows more freely once mounted, in *The Well of Loneliness*, Radclyffe Hall effectively transubstantiates the body of Stephen Gordon's first object of desire, Collins, the housemaid (again 'below-stairs'<sup>9</sup>), into that of her first horse: 'Laying her cheek against his firm neck, she said softly: "You're not *you* any more, you're Collins"' (1968: 42). As Hall puts it, 'Collins was comfortably transmigrated' (ibid.). In a later passage, horse and desire are folded upon themselves, as body upon body converse 'in a quiet language having very few words but many small sounds and many small movements, that meant much more than words' (cited in Whitlock 1987: 571). As Alison Hennegan aptly states, it is a 'description that can easily apply to satisfactory love-making' (cited in ibid.).

Now, given that Hall's championing of theories of inversion are well-known, some might be tempted to say that this equine transubstantiation of her lover for her horse translates as a psychological substitution of the lover for the horse and hence for the phallus. However, Hall's reading of Havelock Ellis also puts lesbian desire within the natural order. Of course, while it was in her nature to desire women, as Jean Radford argues, 'her inverted love is God-given, she is not, it seems, allowed to enjoy it' (1986: 107). She is, however, allowed to enjoy her love for Collins through her horse. In other words, we can consider the way in which the horse as image powerfully connected up with Hall's image of her body: her horsy outfits outed her as a 'masculine woman'. Moreover, the image of the horse meets up with the image of her lover. Drawn on by her desire, they are made to intersect at Hall's body.

These images of girls and girls and horses have no essence, no fixed reference; set off in tandem with my body, they may or may not meet up and touch off desire in yours. While they cannot be allowed to condense into categorized notions of being, they can, however, express longing; they do throw us forward into other relations of becoming and belonging. Nicole Brossard articulates this idea in a rather more elegant way when she states that

the image is a vital resource that forms complex propositions from simple and isolated elements. Each time an image relays desire, this image thinks, with unsuspected vitality, the drift of meaning. So it is that images penetrate the solid matter of our ideas without our knowledge.

(1991: 196)

For example, in a poem by Ruthann Robson, an image of a 'stampede of wild horses' throws the narrator forward into a realization 'that what you want is to become'. And what she wants to become is caught up in the image of 'two women without berets . . . two mares at the river' (1992: 110). Or again, in Anzaldua's story of a woman who finally realizes she can love her lover, the final image is one of how 'It would start here. She would eat horses, she would let horses eat her' (1990: 388).

The image, thus freed from its post within a structure of law, lack and signification, can begin to move all over the place. It then causes different ripples and affects, effects of desire and desirous affects. Turning away from the game of matching signifiers to signifieds, we can begin to focus on the movement of images as engendering 'relations of effectuation' (Colin Gordon, cited in Grosz 1994: 75); we can follow their effecting and affecting movement. As Grosz has argued, this is 'to look at lesbian relations and, if possible, all social relations in terms of bodies, energies, movements, inscriptions rather than in terms of ideologies, the inculcation of ideas, the transmission of systems of belief or representations' (1994: 77–8).

In this way, the image becomes that with which we think and feel our way from body to body, as vectors thrust forward by the energies created in their different relationships. And the critical mode that can capture this movement is one that I call, after Lee Lynch's description of 'cruising the libraries' (1990: 410), a project of cruising images. However, let me be clear that this is not about policing images for their content. As Brossard asks, 'in the very carnal night of solstice, is the image lesbian because in reproducing it I want it to be so?' (1991: 196). In other words, it is important to emphasize that images work not in relation to any supposed point of reference but in their movement, in the ways in which they set up lines of desire. The image is lesbian because of the way it moves me to desire and of the way in which my desire moves it. The image is queer because I queer its relation to other images and bodies. This is to replay in a different key Hocquenghem's argument for the singularity of homosexual desire. A movement that only occurs in and through the

## QUEER BELONGINGS

image, a movement that refuses to be policed at the same time that it says, come to me, feel in me the surge that is queer. As Brossard writes,

the image slips, surprising re/source that slips endlessly through meanings, seeking the angle of thoughts in the fine moment where the best of intentions guiding me, worn out by repetition, seem about to close in silently on themselves. [But] [t]he image persists. . . . It goes against chance, fervent relay.

(ibid.)

In Brossard's description we feel the full force of the image: the hope that it carries in its subjunctive fashion. That movement of desire when desire questions itself: Is she looking at me? Is she interested? Is she available? (or as a Swiss friend used to say, 'does she have the same life as us?'). The image teeters, skitters between despair and longing; it gathers force just when the conditions of its possibility seem to be about to close in on it.

## DESIRE'S METHOD

The madness of possibilities. But where is the method in all of this movement? Or again, you might say, why do we need a method, give, at best, the sociological drudgery, at worst, the pseudo-scientific pretensions, associated with such a term? In response to these motivated questions, I return you to the pervasiveness of images; the problem of realizing, interrupting, shifting, skewering their direction. For, if all matter is image, and the body as image compels and receives the movement of other images, all is not chaotic flux. As Bergson puts it, 'There is finality because life does not operate without directions' (cited in Deleuze 1991: 103). Simply put, and quite outside of any normative judgement, I need to be able to distinguish differences in kind from those of degree. For epistemological and political reasons, I want to avoid the false problems of departure that would either assimilate or reify queer desire. In short, I want a method for differentiation that refuses a logic of categorization; we need a non-taxonomic method. While taxonomic differentiation always rests on images of the past (it anchors itself in a certain conception of history), a different mode of differentiating desire requires other material relations of past to present. Here I think that we can usefully take from Bergson as he reworks the relation between past and present, virtual and actual, space and duration. As Deleuze explains, 'The subjective, or duration, is the *virtual*. . . it is the virtual insofar as it is actualized, in the course of being actualized, it is inseparable from the movement of its actualization' (1991: 42–3). Thus, we sense through intuition, sensibility or desire that some images move along and at a different rate than others.

This concept of duration which designates the relation between the movement of various images, allows me to return to the matter of how images can express queer desire as a desire that is different in kind rather than different in degree from other manifestations of desire. For the problem with desire is that it literally pops up all over the place. In the midst of all the banal fillips of desire, I want to avoid casting queer desire as a variation on ‘universal’ love (I’m sure that it’s only a matter of time before Hallmark cashes in on the GUMPIE market – gay upwardly mobile professionals). At the same time, I want to argue for this difference in kind at the expense of postulating gay and lesbian desire in terms of desire individualized (would the Hallmark text croon ‘from your boyfriend to my boyfriend’?). The problematic becomes not one of sorting out which are good manifestations of desire and which are bad, but rather how can we define queer desire in such a way that it is not condensed in an individualizing logic and measure.

Put another way, the question is how can we use desire so as to analyse it as a specific queer form of movement and mediation between individuals. Or, in yet other terms, I want to say that there is a difference in kind, a movement that cannot be founded, condensed in *a* lesbian body, *a* lesbian being, *a* lesbian experience or, even, *a* lesbian aesthetic. To clarify: recognizing at any moment that the movement between us is queer cannot be reduced to two individual elements: me as lesbian and possibly you. While, of course, the identification of and as lesbian is important, the movement does not stop there; or rather, that recognition is not automatically desire (in simple terms, all lesbians do not desire all lesbians). In this way we can recognize the ways in which desire points us not to a person, not to an individual, but to the movement of different body parts. Desire set off in commotion, in connection with the motion of the muscles of her neck. The performance artist, Suzanne Westenhoefer captures this perfectly in her monologue about her desire for Martina Navratilova, a desire not for the whole of Martina but as an overwhelming longing to lick the coursing vein that pops out on the inside of Martina’s forearm.

This image, in turn, may connect with others: her butchness, her accent, her skill, her physicality, her success. All these images conjoin on the body that we call so familiarly ‘Martina’. Thus, it should be clear that I am talking about images, not individuals. In fact, I’ll go further and state that the individual like all ‘matter is an ensemble of images’ (Bergson 1990: 1). In turn, this is to construct the image as having ‘a certain existence . . . situated half-way between the “thing” and the “representation”’ (ibid.). The productive force of desire can then be seen as it incessantly spins lines between the ‘thing’ and the ‘representation’. Desire then is the force that connects or disconnects images and things. Hijacking Bergson’s argument, we can say that it is desire as emotion, emotion as desire that ‘does not have, strictly speaking, an object, but merely an *essence* that spreads itself over various objects’ (Deleuze 1991: 110; emphasis in original).



## QUEER BELONGINGS

Given this postulate, it becomes possible ‘to now study, on bodies similar to my own, the configuration of this particular image that I call my body’ (Bergson 1990: 13). This is obviously not to return to relations of sameness as the point of departure. The similarity of bodies is a matter not of similar origins but rather is compelled by a similarity of desire to arrange one’s body, to queer oneself through movement. As I see the configuration of my body as image on her body, I also can feel the configuration of hers on mine. However, this is not a constant or immediate fact; it has to be made, to be configured through the desire to conjoin images. And it is here that we can glimpse in action the difference of kind that queer desire seeks to embody. Far from essentializing queer desire within some individuals, this is to argue that this desire is an essence that spreads itself over objects. As we catch our bodies configured on bodies, desire ‘communicates a kind of reminiscence, an excitement that allows him to follow’ (Deleuze 1991: 111).

This movement of reminiscence is crucial in figuring the velocity of queer desire. For part of the movement of belonging is that of nostalgia. Eliot returns: ‘There were times we regretted/The summer palaces on slopes, the terraces/And the silken girls bringing us sherbet’ (1963: 109). As I sit on the roof in the very dead of winter, as I sit with the roar of planes arriving, I remember that feeling that I increasingly have when I take off. A small movement in my belly, a feeling that I have forgotten something, someone: the movement of regret. In turn, the image of girls and horses that connects and moves the image that I call my body is motivated by past images of desire, horses and queer belongings: a regretting of the past and a remembering in the present. Images that throw me back to a past and that then turn around to be actualized in the present. These images thus communicate to me a certain reminiscence. They prod at me to regret the long years of denying desire, kept still in a closet at once so silent, at once so filled with echoes of what I wanted but felt that I couldn’t have: the belongings that always seemed to be just out of reach.

But while these images have a certain relation to reminiscence, they are not consumed by regret. Rather, regret and nostalgia form part of the movement of belonging; they regulate the speed with which images pass by. They slow down certain images so that I can grasp a fleeting sense of belonging. Memories of that long hard coming out settle in with other images that constitute my belonging. However, this nostalgia becomes productive only if it reminds me that belonging is always constituted in images, not in a golden past nor in a pristine future. The path is not teleological, there is no going home, there is only the temporary structuring of our various belongings.

It is in this way that we can constitute queer belongings; as milieux made up of actualized and virtual relations. Having displaced desire from its site and citing within a project of origins, we can return to another point: ‘from the point of