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ABSTRACT

This thesis begins with an examination of the construction of knowledge within tourism studies. I argue that tourism studies, like most social sciences, has been built on a mind/body dualism. The mind has been privileged and linked to rationality, heterosexuality and masculinity, while the body has been Othered and associated with irrationality, homosexuality and femininity. I critique tourism studies’ literature, specifically hallmark tourism, postmodern tourism, ethnic tourism, sex tourism and gender and tourism, to argue that the body has been denied, desired and Othered by tourism studies’ academics. Tourism studies, as academic discourse, tends to produce hegemonic, disembodied and masculinist knowledges.

Against this theoretical backdrop, I examine an explicitly gendered/sexed and sexualised tourist event. I conduct a study of gay pride parades: Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand’s HERO Parade and the Sydney, Australia Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Parade. I use qualitative methods of data collection, specifically, participant observations, in-depth and semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews, questionnaires and newspapers, photographs, video recordings, television and radio discourses.

There are three points to my discussion. I argue first, that the place of the parade becomes a contested site. Debates over the parade site derive from constructions of ‘queer’ bodies as deviant, dangerous and abject. Hence, ‘gay’ bodies become inappropriate bodies to inhabit (public) central business districts. Parade sites in ‘gay’ (read private) neighbourhoods, however, are perceived as less ‘threatening’ by city council officials. Second, I argue that rigid borders are maintained at the parade site between the queer bodies on parade (the ‘hosts’) and the watching, ‘heterosexual’ tourists. These tourists Other the queer bodies on parade. Heterosexual tourists occupy a dominant, unmarked position which is maintained through discourses of liberalism. Parading bodies which are less visibly ‘gay’, however, disrupt this unmarked position and trouble the binary between Self/Other, tourist/host, and straight/gay, and hence explicitly embody tourists. Third, I disrupt binary notions of masculine/feminine bodies in gay pride parades by focusing on the ways marching boys’ bodies can be read as ‘fluid’: both hyper-masculine and feminine.

This study offers an example of new possibilities for tourism studies. Explicit inclusion of gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies in tourism research problematises the mind/body dualism, thereby subverting the masculinism of tourism discourse.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Gay Pride parades have become commonplace in western cities since the New York Stonewall riots began on the night of 27 June 1969 when police raided a gay bar, called the Stonewall Inn, in Greenwich Village, New York City, USA. Three days of rioting became an emblem of defiance of compulsory heterosexuality and established the beginning of the gay liberation movement. Born out of these riots, gay pride parades made public the previously private bodies of gays and lesbians. Under the public gaze, certain urban, cultural and social geographies emerged.

In this research I focus on two specific gay pride parades: the Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand\(^1\) \(\text{HERO}\)\(^2\), Parade and the Sydney, Australian Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Parade.\(^3\) These parades can be understood as tourist sites that gender/sex\(^4\) and sexualise\(^5\) bodies. A focus on gay pride

---

1 Aotearoa is a Māori term for what is commonly known as New Zealand. In 1987 the Māori Language Act was passed making Māori an official language. I use the term Aotearoa/New Zealand to highlight the contestatory process of naming places.

2 The HERO parade is part of the HERO project. The project was initially run to help raise funds for gay men living with HIV/AIDS. The name ‘HERO’ validates the courage people have while living with HIV/AIDS. The name also incorporates both male and female genders (Halliday 1991).

3 The abbreviated title, the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade, is used from this point in the thesis.
parades as tourist events provides a theoretical window through which to examine bodies and studies of tourism.

MINDING TOURISM STUDIES

Academic discourses of tourism studies are underpinned by a mind/body dualism that is gendered/sexed and sexualised. This dualism constructs knowledge in a way that privileges the mind and eclipses the body. The mind is associated with reason, rationality, heterosexuality and masculinity, while the body is associated with emotion, irrationality, homosexuality and femininity, and subsequently devalued (Gatens 1988, 1992, 1996; Grosz 1988, 1993, 1994; Lloyd 1993). The mind/body dualism has been examined in geography (Duncan 1996; Johnson 1989; Longhurst 1995, 1996a, 1997; Rose 1993). However, there has currently been no sustained critique of the mind/body dualism in tourism studies (for one exception see Veijola and Jokinen 1994). Rather, tourism studies' academics often uncritically reinforce and uphold a mind/body dualism. I suggest that discourses in tourism studies maintain this border between mind and body in complex and disparate ways. The mind, in tourism studies' discourses, is associated with reason, rationality, masculinity, and

---

4 I use the terms gender and sex to maintain a tension between what tends to be understood as socially constructed (gender) and essentialised (sex). It is not clear "how one can eliminate the effects of (social) gender to see the contributions of (biological) sex" (Grosz 1994, 18). Academics in tourism studies tend to reinforce the gender/sex distinction by privileging gender as a social construction. I discuss this further in Chapter 2.

5 The term sexualise, in this research, has two mutually constitutive meanings. Bodies are inscribed with sexual identities and with sexual desires.

6 The field known as Tourism Studies is currently being rapidly institutionalised within much of the academy. In this thesis I concentrate on research which could be situated in the academic field of Tourism Studies. I also refer to 'tourism studies' or 'studies of tourism' which originate in disciplines such as geography, anthropology, sociology and so forth. I am reluctant to fix tourism studies to any one academic field or discipline, therefore, I use lower case to indicate the disparate nature of tourism studies. I elaborate on the construction of tourism studies' knowledge in Chapter 2.
heterosexuality, while the body is associated with emotion, irrationality, femininity and homosexuality.

In western knowledge, heterosexual men tend to be conceived of as rational, reasonable, and disembodied. Women and/or homosexuals, conversely, are constructed as irrational, emotional, and powerless in the face of the 'intrinsic' processes and passions of their bodies. This does not mean that heterosexual men do not have 'real' bodies, but tourism studies, as well as other social sciences, have tended to render all those 'masculine' bodies that are associated with the mind as "able to speak universal knowledge, unencumbered by the limitations of a body placed in a particular time and place" (Longhurst 1997, 491).

I argue that what constitutes knowledge in tourism studies is that which appears to be visual, rational, reasonable, heterosexual, public, productive, masculine and of the mind. Tourism studies attempts to exclude from its economic, scientific, empiricist and positivist frameworks that which is thought to be sensual, unknowable, irrational, unreasonable, homosexual, private, reproductive, feminine and of the body.

The lack of critical attention to embodiment in tourism studies stems, in part, from its epistemological foundations. Tourism studies has no formal disciplinary boundaries within the academy. Different perspectives have arisen from disparate and wide ranging discourses. I suggest that there are costs and benefits to this academic 'placelessness'.

---

7 Throughout this research I use various categories such as: homosexual, gay, queer, lesbian, gay male, and transgender, to indicate that there is no one universal sexualised Other. Identity categories “tend to be instruments of regulatory regimes” (Butler 1993a, 308). I am reluctant to let go of these categories, however, as they provide the political ground for problematising heterosexism.
Furthermore, the study of tourism can be understood to be a ‘risky’ business for academics because field work in tourism is often associated with fun, leisure, holidays and hence not ‘real work’ (see Crick 1989). Gaining legitimacy in the academy, for tourism studies, has therefore been based on the privileging of rationality, objectivity, masculinity. In the urge for a legitimate academic place, tourism studies has tried to exclude, devalue and demean all subjects which are associated with the body, for example, women and homosexuals.

In tourism studies, the mind/body dualism is always held in tension. The border between mind and body constantly moves, becomes realigned, and contested. There is a fear - as well as a desire - to know the body in the corpus of tourism studies’ writing. The fear and desire of the body in tourism studies becomes discursively constructed through the dualism between the tourist and hosts. The tourist has been constructed as singular, disembodied, masculine, heterosexual and dependent on ‘his’ binary opposite, the hosts. Hosts become associated with the feminine, and fettered to their bodies. They become the body. Tourists have their bodily needs met by hosts. Hence, the dualism between tourists and hosts is inextricably linked to that of another dualism in tourism studies, that of gazers and the gazed at.

It is this dualism - the gazer/the gazed at - that is related to the construction of hegemonic tourism studies’ knowledge. Being ‘a tourist’ is widely understood as a quintessential visual enterprise. This ‘imagining’ of knowledge - that which ‘sees’ and marginalises all that is

---

8 Of course there is not just one tourist, there are multiple and diverse tourists. I have deliberately used the singular ‘tourist’ to exaggerate the ways in which tourism studies academics tend to universalise and reduce the multiple and shifting positions of tourists into one - singular, masculine, disembodied - subject.
associated with the feminine, the homosexual, the body - positions the knower as masculine. To look, in western discourse, is to know. Tourism studies occupies a masculinist position and claims to be exhaustive, therefore, no ‘Others’ can add to its knowledge. Masculinist rationality, therefore, “is a form of knowledge that assumes a knower who believes he can separate himself from his body, emotions, values, past and so on, so that he and his thought are autonomous, context-free and objective” (Rose 1993, 7).

This masculinist position can be seen to work in myriad ways. Masculinist discourses are evident in, for example, the universalism of knowledge claims, the choice of topics made by tourism academics, and a focus on the conceptual rather than on the corporeal. Soile Veijola and Eeva Jokinen (1994) argue that the tourist and, similarly, the tourism studies’ analyst, lacks a body. Viejola and Jokenin (1994) argue that it is only the tourists’ and tourism studies academics’ minds, free from bodily distractions, that are at work in the field. The all-seeing tourism studies’ academic, like the tourist, makes no connection between the world that they see, and the position and subjectivity of the viewer. The truth of what is seen is claimed by the tourism researcher to be objective and, therefore, not tainted by the particular body and the particular place from whence it came. Hence, the border between mind and body, Self and Other, is maintained through discourses of rational objectivity.

Dualisms such as tourist/hosts, gazer/gazed at, need to be deconstructed in order to divulge the masculinism of tourism studies’ knowledge. To substantiate my assertion that academic discourses of tourism studies rest on a mind/body dualism and produces masculinist and disembodied hegemonic knowledge, I examine the literature of five sub-areas of tourism studies: hallmark tourism, postmodern tourism, ethnic tourism,
sex tourism and gender and tourism. Within each of these sub-areas the mind/body dualism works in different ways. The body is not absent or excluded (while the mind present) in each of these sub-areas, but rather the body is treated as Other\(^9\) to the mind.

Hallmark tourist events - sometimes called special event or festival tourism - are temporal and spatial constructions of urban tourist sites based on the staging of an annual, or unique, event. I have focused on hallmark tourism events because it is in this area of tourism studies that a study of gay pride parades might be situated. There are many studies of street parades and festivals but these accounts of hallmark tourist events are dominated by an emphasis on economic impacts. Furthermore, because of a mind/body dualism constructing tourism studies' knowledge as disembodied, hallmark tourist events which do focus on social impacts continue to Other all those associated with the body. A recent development in the analysis of hallmark tourist events is the adoption of postmodern theorising.

Postmodernism and tourism is another sub-area of tourism studies in which I searched for evidence of a mind/body dualism. There are two ways in which postmodern theorising has affected studies of tourism. Studies of the phenomenon of tourism have identified links between the

---

\(^9\) Jacques Lacan's (1981) concept of the Other does not have a single meaning:

[it] allows for more than one meaning and must be rigorously distinguished from the concept of other - with a small 'o' - which designates the relation to the specular other, the other who resembles the self, an imaginary relation with originates in what LACAN in 1936 called 'the mirror stage', and which describes the relation of the child to his image (Marie-Clare Boons-Grafa in Wright 1992, 296, capital in original).

Lacan proposed the Symbolic Other which paired with the Subject. Lacan (1981, 309 cited in Wright 1992, 298) defined the Other in 1955 as “the place where is constituted the I who speaks with the one who hears.” Lacan linked this notion of Other to ‘lack’. (See Elizabeth Wright's 1992 dictionary *Feminism and Psychoanalysis*, for a fuller definition of Other.)
multiple, displaced subject (tourist) and simulated (tourist centred) environments. Attention to postmodern ‘tourist’ environments, such as Disneyland, has the potential to break down binary distinctions between real/representation, and nature/culture, but these studies also reassert binaries. Second, the mind/body dualism can be found at work in the literature on the postmodern tourist gaze. The gaze tends to exist without attachment to gendered/sexed or sexualised bodies. There is a tendency to construct metaphors based on the tourist as a postmodern figure - for example, the nomad, the flâner - at loose in the world. This, I argue, is another example of how the abstract is valued over the corporeal.

Another sub-area I critique in tourism studies’ literature, is ethnic tourism. Ethnic tourism studies has the potential to be explicit about the power relations involved in the relationships between tourist and hosts. There have been some discussions on the ways in which ethnicities become constructed through acts of tourism. These studies tend to be underpinned by theories of postcolonialism (see Hollinshead 1998). Studies of ethnic tourism have been described as “the quintessential business of ‘difference projection’ and the interpretative vehicle of ‘othering’ par excellence” (Hollinshead 1998, 121). Rather than confronting and challenging the binary divisions which are still present in ethnic tourism accounts of the Other, such dichotomies are generally ignored. Studies on ethnic tourism (especially under the discipline of anthropology) would appear to present opportunities for the exploration of intersections between power, knowledge, subjectivity and emancipatory notions of difference. Embodying the ‘ethnic’ tourist experience is as difficult, it would seem, as embodying the metaphorical postmodern flâner or festival tourist.
One other area of tourism studies, sex tourism, also seems to be a useful starting place from which to theorise sexed embodiment and sexuality. It could be argued that bodies in tourism sex industries are explicitly gendered/sexed and sexualised through the acts of buying, selling and exploiting sexual services. What appears to be upheld in the literature on sex tourism, however, is a distinction between the researching tourism studies’ academic (mind) and the those ‘Others’ involved in sex tourism (bodies). An ‘orientalist’ discourse is also evident in many studies on sex tourism. Frequently there is a simple assertion of western oppressor (tourist) over non-western victim (sex worker). This dualism perpetuates the western assumption that non-western peoples are objects upon which western masculinist projects are inscribed.

Finally, I discuss the literature that addresses gender and tourism. This is a relatively new area of study within the field of tourism studies. Academics working in this area tend to ‘add gender’ (for the most part, ‘women’) to the dominant masculine discourses which have excluded discussions on gender and tourism. While it could be argued that adding gender or sexuality is a good starting point, the inevitable consequence is a reassertion of the mind/body dualism. Academics focusing on the social construction of gender, omit the body as a vital element in the construction of tourism phenomena and tourism studies’ knowledge.

In all of these areas, the body is treated as the Other to the mind. The Othering of the body in tourism studies - and in social sciences in general - serves to vindicate all those who are ‘thought’ to be able to think without their bodies. So, for example, the bodies of white heterosexual men are viewed as little more than mere containers for the purer consciousness held inside, while “this was not allowed for women,
blacks, homosexuals, people with disabilities, the elderly, children and so on” (Longhurst 1997, 491).

While feminism is hardly ‘new’ in philosophical social theory, it is new to tourism studies. There are feminist theorists who have written extensively about the body and its association with the feminine and homosexual, for example, Judith Butler (1990, 1993a, 1993b), Moria Gatens (1988), and Elizabeth Grosz (1993, 1995). There are also feminist geographers (Johnson 1989; Longhurst 1997; Rose 1993) who challenge the masculinism of geography. Geographers working in the area of sexuality also offer challenges to the disembodiment and heterosexism of geography (see Bell and Valentine 1995; Binnie 1997; Johnson 1994) and I draw on this work in my thesis. Suspicion of, and squeamishness around, explicitly gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies continues to exist in academic discourses. “It is precisely the mention of embodiment of sexuality that creates anxiety” (Binnie 1997, 225). This is one of the reasons why I do not just ‘add’ gender and sexuality to the discourses of tourism studies, but rather, make explicit the injury that has been inflicted on Others from tourism studies’ academics. This Othering in tourism studies serves to marginalise gay men, lesbians, and other sexual dissidents who are “thought to be tied to their bodies” (Longhurst 1996a, 5) and cannot think straight. Consequently, the examination of the mind/body dualism is crucial to my research. My central aim is to expose the border between mind and body, not in a way that privileges the mind over the body, or the body over the mind. I adopt Louise Johnson’s (1989) assertion that there is unity between mind and body. I wish to mind the body, and embody the mind.

This is the first objective of the research and forms the basis of Chapter 2. I critique the epistemological connections between the mind, masculinity,
heterosexuality and tourism studies and argue that bodies are Othered by a mind/body dualism. The work of feminist, poststructuralist theorists who have established potent links between rationality and masculinity through the rejection of the body is essential to my critique of the masculinist and disembodied knowledge of tourism studies. Robyn Longhurst (1997, 493) argues that there are several “costs” for geographical knowledge when academics ignore the body, or privilege the mind over the body. I, too, want to examine the costs of masculinist rationality through a critique of several sub-areas of tourism studies.

**SEXING THE SUBJECT OF TOURISM STUDIES**

My second objective is subversive. I present some recent literature that sexually embodies tourism studies’ knowledges. In other words, this literature recognises ‘human’ bodies as usually either male or female (Gatens 1991a). I also draw on work that recognises bodies as sexualised (see Binnie 1997). I am interested in the ways in which studies of embodiment act to challenge hegemonic constructions of tourism studies’ knowledge. Work in tourism studies that speaks of material bodies (bodies that are gendered/sexed and sexualised) calls into question the mind/body dualism that underlies tourism studies.

By arguing against the separation of the mind and body, I resist the disembodied and masculinist hegemony of tourism studies as it is currently understood. My strategies of resistance include making the gendered/sexed and sexualised body explicit, and this has epistemological implications for tourism studies. The mind/body dualism is brought into

---

10 I draw on Genevieve Lloyd’s (1993) interpretation of the work of seventeenth century philosopher Benedictus Spinoza, who used the word ‘embodied’ to refer to the mind as an ‘idea’ of the body rather than separate from it.
question through sexually embodying knowledge. My strategic choice of tourist events to demarcate the potential of sexually embodied tourism studies are gay pride parades. I focus on HERO, the largest annual gay pride parade in Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand, 1994-1998. The 1996 HERO Parade is analysed in depth. I argue that this event has been discursively produced for tourists. The Sydney Mardi Gay Parade in Australia, is also examined as it is an event that influences the HERO Parade. By studying the specific corporealities of gay pride parade participants and the tourists I offer possibilities for disrupting the masculinism of tourism studies. The dichotomy - and separation - of parading bodies and watching tourists effectively illustrates the ways explicitly gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies are Othered by dominant and hegemonic constructions of the Self or Same. While the parading bodies and watching tourists can effectively illustrate Self/Other, mind/body, tourist/hosts dichotomies, there is also potential to subvert and upset these dichotomies. Some parading bodies use parody and performance to represent the Self in the Other.

I also examine some of the debates that surround the site of the parade in Auckland (see Figure 1.1). When gay pride parades are held in the central business districts of cities, their queer bodies strategically displace

11 Aotearoa/New Zealand hosts other parades, such as ‘Devotion’ in Wellington. HERO is the largest, with approximately 40 float entries in 1996 and 60 float entries in 1997.

12 Tourist sites are often discussed in terms of tourist sights (see Urry 1990a, 199b). I insist on an examination of the place (site), as well as an examination of the tourist gaze (sight). In Chapter 4 I discuss tourist sites. In Chapter 6 I ‘place’ and problematise the tourist gaze by a focus on tourist sites/sights.

13 I am ambivalent about the use of maps to establish the location of queer bodies. It has been argued that “Mapping operates in hegemonic discourses as a form of mimetic representation - it textually represents the gaze through transparent space” (Blunt and Rose 1994, 8). Mapping is a “spatial image that directly addresses the politics of representation as they are bound into the politics of location” (Blunt and Rose 1994, 8). I do not claim that gay bodies are represented and bounded only to these locations.
Figure 1.1 Map showing the Location of Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand

Source: Max Oulton, Cartographer, Department of Geography, University of Waikato
dualistic presumptions and the conflation of public space with heterosexuality. When gay pride parades occupy ‘gay neighbourhoods’, dominant discourses define queer bodies as private therefore less threatening to city council officials (see Figure 1.2). Such an examination of gay pride parades, in public and private spaces, exposes the hierarchical nature of dichotomous thinking.

The HERO Parade, while recognised as Auckland’s parade, tends to dominate the gay pride parade imagination in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Gearing 1997). One reason for this domination may be the size of Auckland and the concomitant size of Auckland’s gay population. “The usual resident population of Auckland now exceeds the one million mark, with 1,068,645 people” (Census of Population and Dwelling 1996, 13). Auckland is situated in the north of the North Island and is Aotearoa/New Zealand’s largest city. It is recognised that some suburbs in Auckland (such as Ponsonby and Grey Lynn) are identified as ‘gay neighbourhoods’. Gay owned businesses, businesses run by openly gay, lesbian and transgendered people, and community services for bisexuals, gays, lesbians and transgendered people tend to establish these neighbourhoods as gay (see Chapter 4). The relationship between Sydney, Australia and Auckland (see Figure 1.3) is also significant for the construction of Auckland’s HERO Parade as a tourist spectacle, both in terms of physical locations and cultural connections. The cultural specificity of these two ‘downunder’ parades stand in marked contrast to northern hemisphere parades (see Chapter 4). This is one of the reasons why the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade became an important backdrop for my
Figure 1.2 Street Map Showing the Location of Auckland’s Central Business District and Auckland’s Ponsonby Suburb

Source: Max Oulton, Cartographer, Department of Geography, University of Waikato
Figure 1.3 Map showing the location of Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand in relation to Sydney, Australia

Source: Max Oulton, Cartographer, Department of Geography, University of Waikato
initial understandings of the HERO Parade. Northern hemisphere parades in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and recently ‘Europride’ (a parade which is held annually in different cities and countries throughout the European Union), have been centred around the commemoration of the Stone Wall Riots of June 1969 in New York City.

My case studies of the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade require a complex understanding of the categories that define embodied identities. In my analysis of the paraders and tourists the understanding that bodies are both socially constructed and ‘real’ matter is of particular importance. The bodies in gay pride parades are controversially and blatantly positioned at the intersection of essentialist and socially constructionist readings of bodies. The interaction and engagement of the natural with the cultural is under consideration in this thesis. Gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies are not fixed by nature, nor are they completely culturally constructed. In order that this thesis speaks of my own body, I make my gendered/sexed and sexualised subject position explicit. My challenges to the masculinism of tourism studies, therefore, is twofold. I offer an example of sexually embodied participants and I offer my own subjective and embodied experience as a partial and positioned ‘knower’. Other geographers, working in the field of sexualised embodiment, have noted that “talking about the body is easier than actually embodying our work” (Binnie 1997, 228). I recognise there are risks involved in embodying my work and it is certain that some sexual subjectivities are easier to materialise in the academy than others. Yet I believe there are enormous possibilities in writing my embodied self into my thesis. Longhurst (1996a, 12-13) states:
Perhaps if knowledge could only be produced within the context of the specific corporeality of the knower (and the known) then the rational, objective, gaze upon the landscape could no longer exist. If the body of the knower (and known) were not erased then perhaps the specificity of the production of geographical knowledge would have to be recognised.

Rather than just writing myself into my thesis, I attempt to be reflexive about my (incomplete and partial) sense of the places and people I have come into contact with throughout the research process.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

In this introductory chapter so far, I have established my objectives. The first objective is to demonstrate that the mind/body dualism is central to the production of knowledge in tourism studies and that this dualism has lead to the Othering of the body. All those subjects who ‘cannot think straight’ as a consequence of their specific embodiment are marginalised in the academic discourses of tourism studies. The second objective is to argue that one possible way to subvert the masculinism of tourism studies is to write the discursive and material gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies (both research subjects and researchers) into the academy. Hence my aims are to make definitive connections between hegemonic masculinity, the mind and tourism studies’ knowledge, and also to create a sexually embodied study of tourism.

Chapter 2 elaborates on the connection between knowledge, hegemonic masculinity and the marginalisation of all those who ‘cannot think straight’ and are associated with the body, the feminine and/or the homosexual. I examine the mind/body dualism and detail the way that dualistic thinking Others bodies in tourism studies. I focus on the five sub-areas identified in the introduction - hallmark tourism, postmodern tourism, ethnic tourism, sex tourism and gender and tourism - and argue
that the mind/body dualism works to Other the body in relation to the mind in each of these fields in different ways. Chapter 2, therefore, establishes the hegemonic masculinism of tourism studies.

Method(ologies) are the focus of Chapter 3. I used multiple methods in order to collect qualitative data. I reflect on the ways in which research was carried out using participant observations, in-depth and semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews, questionnaires and other textual discourses such as newspapers, photographs, video recordings, television and radio. Methods of analysing this data are discussed. I critically reflect on my desire to understand and represent the structures that locate and shape gay pride parades. I also attempt to problematise my own positions and roles as a sexually embodied geographer, social science researcher and gazer at bodies.

Chapter 4 begins with a focus on the politically contested site of the HERO Parade. The site of the parade is subject to political contestation. In this chapter I draw on data to verify the relationship between the mind/body dualism and the private/public dualism. I elaborate on the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade as socially constructed tourist sites which ‘queer’ the streets. Not only do the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade ‘queer’ the streets, but they also foreground the problematic position of ‘private’ bodies in public places. The parade site debate clearly articulates the ways in which western hierarchical dualisms are inscribed on bodies and places.

Specific corporealities of the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade are the topic of Chapter 5. Some bodies on parade, for example, bodies involved in bondage and sadomasochism (s/m) performances, bodies living with HIV/AIDS, and bodies which contest the
gendered/sexed corporeal borders, can be partially explained using Iris Young’s (1990) notion of cultural imperialism. These bodies are constructed as ‘freaks’, ‘ugly’, ‘dirty’ and are further Othered by watching tourists. Julia Kristeva’s (1982) notion of ‘abjection’ is used to understand tourists’ reactions. There is a fear that some bodies in the parade are too risqué and therefore can not be trusted in the public streets of Auckland or Sydney. I draw on heterosexual tourists’ responses to a questionnaire in order to argue that the dominant, unmarked position of the tourist is maintained through discourses of liberalism. There is potential, however, to disrupt this unmarked position and question the binary between Self/Other, tourist/host, and straight/gay by examining specific parade entries, such as Gaily Normal, Rainbow Youth and the Gay Auckland Business Association (GABA). These groups perform and parody some of the norms of heterosexuality and hence have potential to destabilise dominant meanings of both homosexuality and heterosexuality.

Contradictory discourses which construct parading bodies as both masculine and feminine are the focus of Chapter 6. Using data from the male marching boys teams of the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade I argue that these bodies can be read three ways. First, they can be read as hyper-masculine, or ‘all-man’. Second, the marching boys’ bodies can be read as feminine. Third, the marching boys’ bodies can be read as both masculine and feminine, or fluid and permeable. The idea that gendered/sexed bodies are made and remade depending upon their particular context has epistemological implications.

I conclude, in Chapter 7, with a summary of the discourses that have constructed gay pride paraders’ bodies and the bodies of tourists. I suggest that public homophobic exclusions are partially effected by the structure of western thought which tries to establish some groups with reason and
the mind and other groups with emotion and the body. The places of the parades also construct the bodies involved in these particular tourist events. Borders between paraders and tourists are made and broken in the streets of the parades.

I reinforce the argument introduced in Chapter 2, that the mind and body have been conceptualised as separate despite being integral to each other. In this epistemological hierarchy, the body tends to be Othered in tourism studies. I return also to the second objective of the research, that is, that it is possible to create a sexually embodied study of tourism.
2 (DIS)EMBODIED TOURISM STUDIES

Bodies tend to be taken for granted and seldom made explicit in tourism studies. Tourist activities and experiences are, however, directly mediated through bodies. Sociologists Soile Veijola and Eeva Jokinen (1994, 149) emphasise that there is an "absence of the body" in tourism studies and they pose the question of whether it is: "possible to thematize the embodiment, radical Otherness, multiplicity of differences, sex and sexuality in tourism?" (Veijola and Jokinen 1994, 129).

I argue that the body, both present and absent, is crucial to the production of knowledge in tourism studies as it is currently constituted. The body exists as the Other in order to establish tourism studies' knowledge as rational, masculinist and of the mind.

In this chapter I examine and compare literatures on embodiment from feminist studies, geography and tourism studies. I consider three related methods of enquiry. First, drawing on feminist theorising to contextualise the ways the mind/body dualism has been gendered/sexed and sexualised, I ask whether the production of tourism studies' knowledge is predicated on a Cartesian dualism between mind and body, and if so, what evidence exists in the literature to suggest this? Second, I consider whether the dualism between mind and body entails specific epistemological and ontological costs for tourism studies. Third, I
examine whether tourism discourses can be reconceptualised in a way that ensures that sexually embodied subjects are necessary to tourism studies.

THE MIND/BODY DUALISM

Dualistic thinking has been present throughout the history of western philosophy and has been the focus of many philosophers since Socrates (see, for example, Derrida 1976, 1981; Foucault 1970; and Nietzsche 1967, 1969).

From the beginnings of philosophical thought, femaleness was symbolically associated with what Reason supposedly left behind ... maleness remained associated with a clear, determinate mode of thought, femaleness with the vague and indeterminate (Lloyd 1993, 2-3).

The determinate, rational world was aligned, in Plato’s universe, with ‘form’, that is, the knowability of the objective world. The indeterminate was aligned with unknowable ‘matter’ or nature. In early Greek philosophy, then, a bond between knowledge and rationality was established. This bond persists.

According to Grosz (1989) dualisms are part of a continuous spectrum that has been divided into self-contained elements which exist in opposition to each other. Grosz (1989, vxi) suggests that: “When the system of boundaries or divisions operates by means of the construction of binaries or pairs of opposed terms, these terms are not only mutually exclusive, but also mutually exhaustive.” It is important to highlight here that the two sides of the dualism are not unrelated. If one side is represented by ‘A’, then its opposite will not be something from a different set of category relationships, say ‘B’, but rather will be a conceptualisation of what ‘A’ is not, say ‘A-’. The sides of the dualism, therefore, have an epistemological
relation. This is a mode of knowing in which A has a positive status and only exists in relation to its other: “the other term is purely negatively defined, and has no contours of its own; its limiting boundaries are those which define the positive term” (Grosz 1989, xvi). In other words, ‘A’ becomes the positive identity in which ‘not-A’ is measured. The classic examples, for my research, are that the terms ‘Man’ and ‘heterosexual’ have positive identities, while ‘Woman’ (or not-Man) and ‘homosexuals’ (or not-heterosexual) have negative identities.

There has been a substantial intervention by feminist theorists into understanding the mind/body dualism as gendered (for example, Bordo 1986; Grosz 1989; Jay 1981; Le Doeuff 1987, 1991; Lloyd 1993). Genevieve Lloyd’s work is notable in that she has engaged in the works of various philosophers (for example Plato, Aristotle, Bacon, Philo, Augustine, Aquinas, Descartes, Hume, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Satre and de Beauvoir) in order to trace the connections between ideals of human reason and ideals of masculinity. Longhurst (1997, 490) states that “one of the main points Lloyd makes is that a form/matter or mind/body distinction operated, although in different ways at different times, in Greek (and subsequent) theories of knowledge.”

Other feminists have commented on the mind/body dualism, especially those feminists working in the area of embodiment. Grosz (1989, xiv) argues that the mind has been traditionally associated with positive terms such as “reason, subject, consciousness, interiority and masculinism.” The body, however, has been negatively associated with “passion, object, consciousness, exteriority, and feminism” (Grosz 1989, xiv). The body has been seen as reason’s “underside”, its “negative, inverted double” (Grosz 1989, xiv). Moria Gatens (1988, 61) argues that “not only have mind and body been conceptualised as distinct in western knowledges but also the
divisions have been conceptually and historically sexualised." Gatens (1991b, 1) elaborates by insisting that: "culture, the mind and reason, social production, the state and society ... are understood to have a dynamic and developmental character" and are associated with Man. Conversely, she notes that: "the body and its passions, reproductions, the family and the individual are often conceived as timeless and unvarying aspects of nature" and are associated with Woman (Gatens 1991b, 1).

Another feminist theorist working the area of embodiment, Vicky Kirby (1992, 12-13) makes more of the connection between Woman and the body to declare that Woman is the body.

Although it is granted that Man has a body, it is merely an object that he grasps, penetrates, comprehends and ultimately transcends. As his companion and compliment, Woman is the body. She remains stuck in the primeval ooze of Nature's sticky immanence, a victim of vagaries of her emotions, a creature who can't think straight as a consequence (emphasis in original).

The 'Others', who cannot transcend their particular embodiment (that is, those bodies other than white, heterosexual, 'able' bodied men), are women, blacks, homosexuals, people with disabilities, the old, children and so forth. This type of separation, that which privileges the mind as dominant over the body, is closely entwined with the position of the knower in western culture. Herein lies the parody and irony of the 'gay' tee shirt which states: 'I can't even think straight'. Such a slogan on clothing displayed inapublic place, not only 'queers' the body of the wearer, the street in which it is worn, but also 'queers' the presumption of western knowledge.

Geographic knowledge has been constructed through dualistic thinking. Debates which question the construction of knowledge and discourse in geography have elaborated on the existing critique of western scientific

To my knowledge, Veijola and Jokinen (1994) are the only academics who have begun a critical engagement with the gendered nature of the mind/body dualism within tourism studies and I discuss their work in detail later in this chapter. Veijola and Jokinen (1994, 125) claim:

    we know, for example, that, until now, Western philosophical discussion has been characterized by a rigid emphasis on the Mind at the expense of the Body. The purer, Cartesian mind has remained an onlooker who sees how things are (emphasis in original).

THE MIND AND MASCULINITY IN TOURISM STUDIES

Tourism studies' academics whose work engages in dualistic Othering of the mind over the body through masculinist rationality are the focus of this section. I identify existing definitions of tourism and critical binaries that are deployed in tourism studies' literature generally. Tourism studies' sub-areas, in particular, hallmark, postmodern, ethnic, sex tourism and gender and tourism are each discussed in terms of their binary logic. My analysis of this tourism studies' literature brings me to a position where I can assess the costs of devaluing the body in tourism studies.

*The Dictionary of Travel, Tourism and Hospitality* (Harris and Howard 1996) offers a definition of tourism as a field of study:
Tourism is the study of man away from his usual habitat, of the industry which responds to his needs, and of the impacts that both he and the industry have on the host's socio-cultural, economic and physical environments (Jafari 1977, cited in Harris and Howard 1996, 154).

The first point I would like to make about this definition is (most obviously) the use of sexist/masculinist language. The editors, Robert Harris and Joy Howard, compiled the dictionary in 1996. The failure to either find a gender neutral or gender inclusive definition of tourism as a field of study, or to highlight the use of sexist language, reasserts a masculinist discourse.

One might assume, then, that Jafar Jafari's 1977 definition is acceptable to tourism studies' academics since it appears unproblematically in a 1996 dictionary of tourism. There are, however, several assumptions built into this definition. By failing to identify the potential for the tourist to be a man, or a woman, or a transgendered person, I can believe that the tourist Jafari (1977) is referring to, is masculine and inhabits a man's body. This masculinist language has also been used in humanistic geography. Longhurst (1996a, 39) explains: "The use of Man in humanistic geography makes men the base-line against which Woman's embodied difference is spoken." Gillian Rose (1993, 53) also notes that "the authority of humanistic geography is masculinist because it falsely assumes that the experiences of men can represent all experiences."

There are several other points I would like to make about this definition. Jafari's (1977, cited in Harris and Howard 1996) explanation of tourism sets up a surprising number of explicit binaries other than that of man/woman. He calls up binaries of: usual/unusual, industry/pleasure, needs/wants, tourist/hosts. Implicitly, he identifies the crucial binaries of mind/body and masculine/feminine, but also the idea of active/passive.
The definition defines the tourist as acting on the hosts and the hosts as passive, as acted upon by the tourist. The hosts are represented as stuck in their ‘natural’ (exotic, unusual) environments. Jafari’s (1977, cited in Harris and Howard 1996) definition also personifies ‘industry’ as if it has autonomous agency and is separated out from people. In my discussion on the tourism of gay pride parades I return to destabilise many of these binaries.

There are, of course, many definitions of tourism. In Chapter 1, I suggested that the study of tourism cuts across many disciplinary boundaries. As such, definitions from each discipline vary and are contradictory. John Tribe (1997, 638-657) in an article called “The indiscipline of tourism” outlines the disparate epistemology of tourism. He begins: “Conscious of its youthfulness and thus its potential lack of intellectual credibility, tourism studies has sought to define itself in ways which would give it academic weight.” Academic weight, in the construction of tourism studies’ knowledge, has been “underpinned by scientific method” and a “rigorous approach” (Tribe 1997, 638). Tribe (1997) bases his critique of tourism studies’ knowledge on what might be defined as legitimate (rational?) knowledge. The study of tourism could be conceived of as a science.

Scientific method does provide systematic check, but can only provide systematic check of parts of the tourism phenomenon which allow systematic checking. Thus, in proposing scientific method as the method of tourism analysis, one would necessarily exclude large parts of the phenomenal world of tourism which are not scientifically quantifiable and are not indeed scientific puzzles (Tribe 1997, 646, emphasis in original).

Tribe does not question ‘science’ as a way of knowing, but suggests that tourism studies needs a wider epistemological base as there are “many significant moral and aesthetic questions facing tourism” (Tribe 1997, 646).
The study of tourism could be conceived of as a field of study (Tribe 1997). As a field, rather than a discipline, the phenomena of tourism are foregrounded, and a number of disciplines are called upon as the background. Jafari and Ritchie (1981) modelled this approach to illustrate the multidisciplinary nature of tourism studies. For example, they link the sociology of tourism with sociology; economic impacts of tourism with economics; tourism hospitality with hotel and restaurant administration; tourist motivation with psychology; host/guest relationships with anthropology; ‘world without borders’ with political science; geography of tourism with geography and so on (Jafari and Ritchie 1981). It is not surprising that a study of gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies and tourism does not fit into this prescriptive and rigid model, although one could, add feminist theorising of tourism into the study of gender and tourism.

Tribe (1997) suggests that tourism studies can be separated into two distinct fields of study. One field of study is that which can be categorised with multipdisciplinary approaches, or the “world of thought” and the other approach is that which can be categorised with extradisciplinary approaches from the “world of practice” (Tribe 1997, 653). Such an analysis is very revealing and can be linked to the dichotomous relationship of theory/practice. Tribe’s lack of engagement with the epistemological politics of tourism studies might suggest that the “crisis of reason” (Grosz 1993, 187) has not reached the field of tourism studies.

Feminists have long been aware of this theory/practice binary (see Evans 1982; Fildes 1983; Hartsock 1979; Kaluzynska 1980). Liz Stanley and Sue Wise (1983) have linked theoretical activities to masculinist thought. Geographer, Lawrence Berg (1994), argued that in Aotearoa/New Zealand ‘theory’ is feminised and ‘empirical investigation’ is masculinised.
In general, tourism phenomena are often constructed through notions of difference, exoticism, recreation and displacement (Urry 1990a). John Urry (1990a, 11) argues: “[t]ourism results from a basic binary division between the ordinary-everyday and the extraordinary.” As I have already stated, the study of tourism is frequently defined through a range of hierarchical oppositions such as Self/Other, tourist/host, same/different, work/play. These opposing terms, however, are never neutral. In Urry’s (1990a) example, the positive term ‘extraordinary’ is valued over the negative term, ‘ordinary’, or ‘everyday’. In this manoeuvre, tourism studies becomes a discourse privileged to give regard to positive terms.

There is much potential to examine the gendered/sexed and sexualised nature of these dichotomies. Dominant discourses have tended to construct a masculine view of tourism as a product of waged labour classes in (post)industrial societies (Craik 1997). There are several assumptions built into this view. The most obvious example is that tourism research frequently leaves the differences of women’s and men’s experiences as tourists unexamined. The non-sexed ‘tourist’, therefore, becomes masculine by default. If sexed bodies are made explicit then the “illusion that they [tourists] represent humanity in general is destroyed” (Jokinen and Veijola 1997, 36).

In this research, I use the term ‘tourist’, but understand this category to be intensely problematic. Tourism studies’ academics tend to rely on ‘tourist’ categories assigned by the World Tourism Organisation.¹⁵ The problem

---

¹⁵ The World Tourism Organisation (1997, cited in Mowforth and Munt 1998, 329) has established the following ‘standard definitions’ for tourists:

“Visitor: Any person who travels to a country other than that in which s/he has his/her usual environment for a period not exceeding twelve months and whose main purpose of visit is other than the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the country visited.”
with these categories is that they are based on economic factors and do not provide any embodied sense of the significance of the experience to tourists. I argue that these categories or identities cannot be fixed, rather, I deconstruct¹⁶ the ‘tourist’ by an investigation into the changing subject positions of heterosexuals and homosexuals at gay pride parades. ‘Tourists’, in this research, are predominately understood to be heterosexual. This does not, however, preclude gay tourists. The dichotomy of tourist/host, heterosexual/homosexual is mobile and subject to change.

Given the wide ranging and disparate nature of studies of tourism, I have decided to examine specific sub-areas of tourism more critically. This closer examination of sub-areas allows me to acknowledge the differences within studies of tourism and allows me to highlight the mobility of the mind/body dualism in each new context. I focus on five sub-areas of the study of tourism - hallmark, or special event tourism, postmodern tourism, ethnic tourism, sex tourism, and gender and tourism.

I have chosen to review literature in these areas because they are the most likely areas where one might find some analyses of the body, and/or gay pride parades as tourist events. In all these areas, however, the body remains Othered.

---

¹⁶ Deconstruction is Jacque Derrida's (1976) method of destablising truth claims. Deconstruction is an attempt to undo claims of truth by “uncovering the incoherences within texts and tracking the traces of oppositional elements in each other” (Johnston, Gregory and Smith 1994, 468).
Hallmark tourism

Hallmark tourist events, that is festivals, major fairs, and cultural and sporting events are defined on the basis of the timing of their appearance, either as held at a regular time or appearing as one-off events (Hall 1992a). Some of this research concerns street festivals and parades and this is an area where my research on gay pride parades could be included and where I see potential for discussion on the corporeal effects of event and festival tourism.

Tourism analysts are beginning to engage with the social effects on host communities of festivals, or hallmark events (see Hall 1992a; Olds 1988; Roche 1990, 1991). "'Everybody loves a parade': the social dimension of Hallmark Events" is the title of a chapter in which Michael Hall (1992a, 66) teases out some of the social implications to the hosts of hallmark events. The social impacts he identifies, however, tend to be focused on employment, housing, infrastructural changes and community identity. Although such studies have the potential to bring the Other - the body - into tourism research, they are more likely to reconstitute the hierarchical relationships of dominant discourses in the discussion of material effects. Hall (1992a, 66) argues that:

an examination of the social dimension of hosting hallmark tourist events is essential not only from the perspective of the affected community but also because without it, the successful hosting of the hallmark events will be extremely difficult.

The emphasis is placed on the marketing, managing and planning of such events so that negative social impacts can be minimised. 'Successful hosting' can also be interpreted as promoting the positive, economic impact hallmark tourist events have for host communities. The study of hallmark tourist events is frequently signified by economic and
marketing prospectives (Perdue, Couglin, and Valerius, 1988). I argue that the consequences for the empirical and theoretical development of tourism studies derives from this economism. Most obviously, practice or empiricism becomes privileged, valorised and masculinised over theory which becomes, in opposition, denied, Othered and feminised.

The Sydney Mardi Gras has been classified by Hall (1992a, 22) as a cultural hallmark tourist event. Both the Sydney Mardi Gras and HERO can be conceived of as festivals or special events. Donald Getz (1991, 39) states: “Event tourism is concerned with the roles that festivals and special events can play in destination development and the maximization of an event’s attractiveness to tourists.” This definition places emphasis on destination development and attractiveness to tourists. It takes bodies out of the events and, at the same time, produces the event or festival as a mere vector for tourism development. The mind/body dualism at work here is one which is common in tourism literature: the tourist equates with the mind. The rational, thinking, planning, tourist is emphasised. The development and attractiveness of the tourism site is for tourists’ (mindful) pleasure. The host equates with the body. The host is the vehicle for the tourists’ pleasure and is absent from the discourse. The essentialised host ‘body’ is represented as the embodiment of collective value:

Both the social function and the symbolic meaning of the festival are closely related to a series of overt values that the community recognizes as essential to its ideology and worldview, to its social identity, its historical continuity, and its physical survival (Falassi 1987, 2).

Here the host community is represented unproblematically as a singular entity with collective values. The complexities of how a hallmark tourist
event constitutes the identity of the community involved is not represented.

Analyses of negative impacts of hallmark events on the host community tend to discursively construct host bodies as abnormal. Knowledge is constructed by the tourism researcher in a way that imprisons the hosts in their bodies, some of which are marked out as deviant. Hall (1992a) discusses prostitution and crime as undesirable ‘side effects’ of special events. In a section entitled “Prostitution and the America’s Cup” Hall (1992a, 80) draws on research (Selwood and Hall 1988) that asserts that the America’s Cup in Western Australia attracted large numbers of prostitutes, and encouraged local females and males to enter the sex industry. After the cup was lost, “a renewed concern for public morality emerged, leading to a crack down on hotel strip-tease and see-through barmaids [sic]” (Hall 1992a, 81).

Referring to another special event, Hall (1992a) also discusses the ‘hoon effect’ of the Adelaide Grand Prix. The ‘hoon effect’ is: “reckless, irresponsible driv[ing] … which may or may not have been encouraged by the staging of the Grand Prix” (Fisher, Hatch and Paix 1986, 152, cited in Hall 1992a, 78). It is important to note here that the driver, not surprisingly, remains unsexed. If attention is paid to the masculinism of the hoon effect, then there is opportunity to make dominant discourses of masculine-as-aggressive/feminine-as-passive explicit. The marking out and Othering of particular ‘host’ bodies in these tourism studies’ texts stands in contrast to the (usually) disembodied ‘gazing’ tourist.

Hall (1992a, 84) does give some attention to the politics of hallmark tourist events, arguing that:
hallmark tourist events are both explicitly and implicitly political occasions. The image building that accompanies such events creates a situation in which the personal and institutional interests receive a high degree of visibility.

The image of a city can be staged through spectacular hallmark events and spectacles in return for commercial gain. The imaging of a city through the creation of new urban spectacles is “a mechanism for attracting capital and people (of the ‘right’ sort)” (Hall, 1992a, 87). (The right sort of bodies here are not described.)

Some spectacular events sit at the margins of acceptability. The Sydney Mardi Gras and Auckland HERO parades are examples of such marginal spectacles. These events, although they do attract capital, also attract the ‘wrong’ bodies. Hallmark tourism literature does not address such spectacles and does not address the constitutive relationship between the places and bodies of such hallmark events.

Hallmark events that are explicitly politicised are sometimes analysed by tourism studies’ academics using the concept of carnival (Hall 1992a). Carnival has been attributed with providing an opportunity for self-expression among marginalised groups, as can be seen in the Notting Hill Carnival in London (Cohen 1980, 1982; Manning 1989), and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade (Waite 1991). It is in the discipline of geography, rather than tourism studies, that there is some discussion the construction of gender and race at carnival events (see Jackson 1988, 1992, Lewis and Pile 1996, and Spooner 1996).

Accounts of carnival in tourism studies do not discuss the (gendered/sexed, sexualised, coloured and so on) bodies that constitute the space as transgressive, rather, they focus on the creation of transgressive space, as if the space creates itself. The actual bodies are left
out of the tourism studies' discourses in discussions of carnival. The idea of carnival as reversal establishes the dominant social order as something which is static and is 'allowed' to be temporarily punctured. Carnival is understood as "a licensed affair in every sense, a permissible rupture of hegemony, a contained popular blow-off as disturbing and relatively ineffectual as a revolutionary work of art" (Eagleton 1981, 148, emphasis in original).

Carnival, therefore, can be seen as a form of ritualistic value display which redefines the meaning of urban spaces. These displays have often been discussed in terms of urban economic gain versus possible civic disruption.

City governments have traditionally been in a double bind. On the one hand they are interested in events that make the city attractive to a large number of people, as money spent at events indirectly feeds the tax. On the other hand, they perceive events as a threat to the establishment because they are often spatially unstructured and involve large groups in playful activities (Bonnemaison 1990, 25, cited in Hall 1992a, 91).

The representation of carnival as the reverse of static, everyday normality has been an important starting point and focus on the spectacular. It has, however, Othered and denied the body. The complexities of the bodies are lost in tourism studies' academic descriptions of carnival. Attention needs to paid to multiple readings of carnival bodies as constituted by and with the contested space in which the event takes place.

I do not conceptualise the Sydney Mardi Gras and HERO parades as 'carnivals', the purposes of my thesis. The Sydney Mardi Gras and HERO parades' are not just street parades or carnivals. Their meanings are constructed from a month-long festival of events which involve complex
consumption patterns, arts, cultures, politics, social reform, health programmes, performance and 'spectacle'.

In sum, the knowledge produced on hallmark tourist events reveals a controlling and objective distance from the spectacular which is maintained by the tourism researcher. The knower distances and dominates the Other, as well as invokes the Other through a desire for knowledge and intimacy. Rose (1993, 77) argues that this is "central to social science masculinity."

It is this notion of the spectacle, however, that has been the topic of an epistemological turn in tourism studies, which has been called postmodern tourism.

**Postmodern tourism**

Recent studies of tourism phenomena have suggested that tourism must be seen as part of a postmodern valorisation of surface (see for example Cohen 1995; MacCannell 1992; Roszak 1986; and Selwyn 1990, 1996). Hence, tourism destinations are being theorised as fragmented collages of facts, clichés, 'nature', and history intertwined with entertainments of spectacle and carnival (Cloke and Perkins 1998).

Academic work on postmodernism and tourism has tended to use the phenomenon of tourism as a way of validating and celebrating difference and liminality. Tourism is being discussed in terms of creating marginal places and these 'liminal' places are being privileged as sites of radical possibilities, away from the oppressive spaces/places of modernity. Places on the margins, however, can also be spaces of powerlessness where, once again, the place becomes more central than the bodies which exist in that place. Rob Shields' (1991) *Places on the Margin: Alternative Geographies*
of Modernity is one such example, which celebrates marginal places and Others the body in the process. Shields (1991, 73-116) discusses the British sea-side resort of Brighton in a chapter entitled "Ritual pleasures of a seaside resort: Liminality, carnivalesque, and dirty weekends." For Shields (1991, 73), Brighton is a "place on the margin" because of its reputation as a place for the (heterosexual) 'dirty weekend'. Jon Binnie (1997), however, has charged Shields with being unaware that Brighton is also a particular liminal space for gay men, lesbians; and queerbashers. Binnie (1997, 226) points out that:

Shields makes little mention of Brighton's history of a safe haven for sexual dissidents - a retreat for lesbians and gay men (documented in Daring Hearts a collection of lesbian and gay life stories from Brighton in the 1950s and 1960s (Brighton Ourstory Project 1992)). Shields does however quote from tabloid newspapers describing the town as the 'AIDS Capital of Britain'.

As Binnie (1997) points out, gay men are constructed as passive victims in Shields’ narrative and inextricably linked to AIDS, thus rendering gay males deviant. Gay men’s bodies become mere containers or vectors for HIV/AIDS (see also Brown 1995). Clearly then, at work in Shields’ (1991) postmodern liminal spaces of Brighton is the marginality and invisibility of the Other: gay male and lesbian bodies. The notion of liminal postmodern spaces has been taken up by other tourism writers.

There are a number of sociological authors who discuss postmodern tourism (especially Urry 1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1992), and others who have theorised post-tourism and post-tourists (Feifer 1985). The hyperreal world of the French semiotician, Jean Baudrillard (1988), inspired by his travels to North America (see also Eco 1986), has established "the quintessential postmodern tourism experience" (Munt 1994, 101).
Cultural meanings of shopping malls, theme parks, Disneyland, dockland regeneration and World Fairs have been theorised as fundamental to the restructuring of 'capitalism' and postmodern cultural shifts (see Featherstone 1991; Harvey 1989; Levine 1987; Shields 1988; Urry 1990a; Walker 1991). Ironically, the simulated environment of Disneyland is now being viewed as an essentialised and authentic 'American' cultural product. Erik Cohen (1995, 16) notes:

Although created for commercial touristic purposes, Disneyland over time became an American cultural landmark. Despite its 'contrived' origins, it acquired a measure of 'authenticity' ... The analysis of the structure and the symbolism of Disneyland has disclosed its deep structural meaning in American culture.

In other words, the contrived postmodern landscape of Disneyland has acquired recognisable and dominant meanings which can be read by tourists.

The common thread in these writings on postmodern tourism is that of simulated environments. Sharon Zukin (1991) and Ed Soja (1992) are geographers working with 'hyperreal' spaces and interestingly, Derek Gregory (1994) has critiqued their texts for being disembodied. Gregory (1994, 157-59) argues that: “in odysseys through postmodern spaces and over postmodern landscapes they [Zukin and Soja] have also - and less accountably - lost sight of Lefebve's defiant insistence on the body as the site of resistance.” This is another example of a focus on place and the denial of bodies.

Hall (1992a) draws on David Harvey's (1987, 275-6) postmodernist perspective of festival and spectacle:

the modernist penchant for monumentality ... has been challenged by an 'official' post-modernist style that explores the architecture of festival and spectacle, with its
sense of the ephemeral, of display, and of transitory but participatory pleasure. The display of the commodity became a central part of the spectacle, as crowds flocked to gaze at them and at each other in intimate and secure places like Baltimore's Harbor Place, Boston's Faneuil Hall and a host of enclosed shopping malls that sprung up all over America. Even whole built environments became centrepieces of urban spectacle and display.

Of significance here is the focus on the disembodied gazing tourists in simulated landscapes. Postmodern analyses of the gaze in studies of tourism continue to render tourists as disembodied watchers (see Urry 1990a). In such analyses, the gazing tourist is constructed as disembodied and reliant on 'his' binary opposite, the embodied and feminised, exotic Other (or object) (Veijola and Jokinen 1994).

There are important epistemological and ontological connections between the tourist gaze, and the privileging of the visual and gendered/sexed embodiment. Urry (1990a) connected the representation of particular places - for the most part United Kingdom tourists' experiences of heritage sites - with the changing cultural practices of tourism to suggest a 'gazing' process. Urry's (1990a) work on the 'tourist gaze', which relied on Michel Foucault (1976a), suggests that tour companies try to discipline the gaze of the tourist, much as doctors discipline the gaze of the sick. Discourses about the places to be visited are constructed to maximise an essential customer pleasure. Tourism, argued Urry (1990a), may be understood as a cultural practice in which tourists are provided with a range of images and representations of what a place is like. Tourists begin to understand a place through the imaginary construction of reality contained within the advertising texts. According to Urry (1990a) the organisation of contemporary tourism reflects a changing cultural landscape. With this, I undoubtedly agree. But what of the role of tourism in changing bodies? This question is not addressed by
Urry (1990a). Rather, the gazing tourist is reconstructed as active and the cultural landscape of tourism is acted upon. This one-way relationship has limitations, but is the dominant view held by tourism studies' academics.

Tourists do so much more than just gaze, however, in my analyses of tourists at HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras I put flesh to the tourist gaze and make the power relations involved in the pleasure of the look explicit.

Another element of postmodern tourism analysis involves deconstruction. Chris Rojek and John Urry (1997, 5) begin the task of deconstructing notions of tourism by asserting that “issues of time and space are central to contemporary cultural analysis.” They attempt to understand touristic activities through a sensual analysis of place (what Rodoway (1994) would term a sensuous geography). While this could be read as an attempt to understand the embodied experiences of tourism, Rojek and Urry (1997) fail to recognise the bodies as gendered/sexed and sexualised.

Paul Cloke and Harvey Perkins (1998, 189) challenge Urry’s construction of the tourist gaze and set out to deconstruct “the limitations of the gaze metaphor.” They chose adventure tourism because it is “fundamentally about active recreational participation, and that it demands new metaphors based more on ‘being, doing, touching and seeing’ rather than just ‘seeing’” (Cloke and Perkins 1998, 189, emphasis in original). Moreover, they claim to extend Veijola and Jokinens’ (1994) observation that the body is absent from the corpus of studies on tourism. Cloke and Perkins (1998), rather than engage with how knowledge is (hegemonically) constructed through the privileging of vision, have
reasserted gazing tourists as disembodied. From the outset Cloke and Perkins (1998) invoke a hierarchical binary of active (adventure tourism) versus passive (heritage tourism). Specifically they discuss:

adventure tourism attractions and the ways in which adventure tourists are placed to get ‘in touch’ with their own selves by actively and physically enduring some element of controlled danger in order to overcome the challenge of nature (Cloke and Perkins 1998, 189).

The second dichotomy they reassert is that of culture/nature. Nature is the challenge - something that needs to be overcome, or conquered - and is seen as separate from the tourist. The masculinism of this theorising escapes Cloke and Perkins (1998) despite the rich material they uncover through an examination of adventure tourism texts. They note that promotional claims for adventure tourism suggest that it:

- involves exploration of uncharted territory; experiencing the danger and adrenaline rush of past explorers;
- travelling the untravelable, seeing the unseeable, generally pitting adventurousness, personal bravery, and technological expertise against natural barriers - and winning (Cloke and Perkins 1998, 204).

Although the ‘mastery’ of culture over nature, and the conflation of woman (and hence the body) with nature has been theorised in geography (Fitzsimmons 1989; Rose 1992), Cloke and Perkins (1998) do not discuss the feminisation of nature. They simply (re)establish woman with nature through the use of three topoi of ‘freshness’: spectacle, youthfulness and eager experimentation. They mention gender in passing:

Interestingly, the representations are not overtly gendered, with considerable care being taken to demonstrate a balance of women and men participants and indeed professionals (guides, pilots, drivers, instructors, etc.). Observation of these attractions suggests that there is a reasonably well-balanced gender participation, although a significant majority of
professional roles were undertaken by men (Cloke and Perkins 1998, 210).

The superficial identification of ‘gender issues’ precludes any analysis of a gendered sub-text. The only Other of adventure tourism, assert Cloke and Perkins (1998), is the aged. Cloke and Perkins (1998) reassert a mind/body dualism (as well as masculine/feminine, culture/nature dualisms) and, by not engaging in any critical social theory on embodiment, fail to challenge the role of gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies. A mind/body dualism operates at the individual level in adventure tourism. With the eagerness to penetrate and dominate nature, the tourist does actively engage and perform - bodily - in ‘nature’. The risks, however, of participating in adventure tourism tend to maintain a mind/body dualism. In other words, I argue that, in adventure tourism a disembodied/embodied activity dualism operates. Extreme physical risks are undertaken by adventure tourists as if their bodies are invincible. Discourses such as ‘mind over matter’ are commonly used when encouraging reluctant tourists who hesitate to ‘take the leap’, or ‘make the plunge’. There is much potential in this work on adventure tourism alone for identifying the ways in which hegemonic discourses operate to construct bodies in tourism studies.

Postmodern tourism studies ranges through discourses on the carnivalesque, the hyperreal, and adventure wilderness. Tourism studies’ academics have paid attention to the gaze, the deconstruction of the gaze, and some dualistic representations. Despite all this, however, the world of tourist bodies remains virtually untouched.

The type of tourism activity which specifically seeks out the exotic ‘touchable’ Other is perhaps most explicit in ethnic tourism. There have
been some attempts to discuss the power relations involved in this quest for the Other.

**Ethnic tourism**

It has been argued that any tourism can be viewed as a form of ethnic relations (van den Berghe 1994). Ethnic tourism, however, becomes explicit when the tourist actively seeks ethnic exoticism. Research on ethnic tourism provides some insight into the ways tourists seek out Others, and how this has been represented in the academy. I have chosen to review some work in ethnic tourism because it presents a useful starting place from which to begin theorising embodiment, that is bodies as exotic Others.

Betty Weiler and Michael Hall (1992, 84) define ethnic tourism as “travel motivated primarily by the search for the first hand, authentic and sometimes intimate contact with people whose ethnic and/or cultural background is different from the tourist’s.” The key reason for ethnic tourism, therefore, is best understood as a dichotomous relation between Self/Other, or mind/body. It is this difference that becomes - in tourism studies’ academic discourse and in the imperial processes of tourism - constructed as hegemonic binary logic.

Discussions of tourism could be understood as a process of imperialism (Nash 1989). Dennison Nash (1989, 45) uses the term ‘stranger’ to refer to the tourist.

Not only do strangers and hosts treat each other as types but also as objects. Where disparities of power are great, as in the early stages of colonialism, this can lead to prejudices and discrimination by the colonizers (Fanon 1968). People who treat each other as objects are less likely to be controlled by the constraints of personal involvement and will be freer to act in terms of their own self-interest (Nash 1989, 45).
Nash (1989) addresses the power of colonialism but builds his argument on the liberal tenets of humanism (especially the privileging of the human, the individual, consciousness, agency, knowledge and experience (see Pile and Thrift 1995)). He does not, however, stretch the power of colonialism to the oppressions of “sexism, racism, heterosexism, ageism and ableism” (Young 1990, 125). These group oppressions, as outlined by Iris Young (1990), are crucial to my discussions of cultural imperialism at HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras. I return to Young’s (1990) theory in Chapter 5.

It is widely accepted by anthropologists of tourism that much of contemporary tourism is founded upon the “Quest for the Other” (van den Berghe 1994). Many texts on ethnic tourism elaborate on the tourism process of Othering. Recognising the Other may be a good starting place for theorising the body of the Other, but it also tends to be a sticking place. One such example is Pierre van den Berghe’s (1994) study of ethnic tourism in San Cristobal, Mexico. This work focuses on the tourist’s desire for the Other and hence “his” impact on San Cristobal. Van den Berghe (1994, 148) states:

> the irony, evident to most ethnic tourists themselves, is that they are often the principal source of the ‘spoilage’, along with other forms of ‘modernization’. Hence the dilemma: consciously develop ethnic tourism by building a large infrastructure of luxurious accommodations and the resultant quick and easy access may kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Van den Berghe’s (1994, 148) answer to this is “a sensitive type of development strategy and one antithetical to the main thrust of the Mexican government’s emphasis on intensive modernization of hotel facilities to provide deluxe services.” This response has several implications and can be theorised in terms of the fear and desire of the
Other, and those who embody the Other. First, the Other of San Cristobal are constructed as a pristine, intact, and bounded community which needs to be saved from the ‘developed’ world. Thus, locals (natives) become the traditional object of desire, and are readily positioned as exotic, primitive, and immutable objects. They are also frequently called upon to preserve and display a purity that never existed (Lanfant, Allcock, and Bruner 1995). Second, van den Berghe (1994) has constructed tourism as unyielding in its demands. The locals, in turn, become straitjacketed and dominated populations, and I would argue, tied to their bodies. Van den Berghe (1994) offers a fixed and myopic economic vision.

Some have argued that the quest for the Other is also a quest for the “authentic Self” (Brown 1996, 33). David Brown (1996) asserts that the Other derives from an imagined world that is pre-modern, pre-commoditised and part of a benign whole, recaptured in the imagination of the tourist. Brown (1996, 39) argues that: “the quest for the authentic Other and for the authentic Self push in opposite directions, in other words, in a tension that informs all tourism.” Brown (1996) also uses the concept of ‘shame’ to make the connection between touristic experience and the study of this experience.

The structure of the tourist experience involves a paradoxical relation at once to the cultural or ontological Other and to others of the same (tourist) culture. It is tourism itself that destroys (in the very process by which it constructs) the authenticity of the tourist object: and every tourist thus at some level denies belonging to the class of the tourist. Hence a certain fantasized dislocation from the Others, from the rituals of tourism, is built into almost every discourse and almost every practice of tourism. This is the phenomenon of touristic shame, a ‘rhetoric of moral superiority’, which accompanies both the snobbish and the most politically radical critiques of tourism (Frow 1991, 146, cited in Brown 1996, 43).
For Brown (1996), the tension between the twin quests by the tourist for the authentic Other and for the authentic Self, forms part of the dynamic underlying tourism. While I find these arguments convincing, I am still left wondering where the body has gone. This form of analysis of ethnic tourism tends to rest on the meta-narratives of the postmodern tourist ‘subject’. By this I mean that the ‘subject’ in Brown’s text does not have skin that is a particular colour. Nor is the subject sexed, or sexualised. By default the subject becomes constructed as male and rational with a carefully contained autonomous body. Understanding the postmodern subject as lacking a material body reasserts the mind/body dichotomy.

I am interested in the ways in which the Self and the Other are materialised and embodied in tourist sites. I have engaged, therefore, in poststructural readings of bodies (subjects) at gay pride parades, but, I have been reluctant to let go of ‘real’ weighty bodies. Keeping these dichotomies - the represented and the real, the mind and the body - in tension provides possibilities for challenging the hegemonic relations between tourists (as Self) and hosts (as Other).

Engaging with the Other has become the task of some social scientists involved in ethnic tourism. Jon Goss (1993, 672) uses tourism advertising of Hawai‘i to discuss the ways in which tourists reconstitute dichotomous relationships of “nature and the environment, modernity and tradition, mind and body, and the Self and Other.” Goss (1993), however, does not link the mind/body dichotomy to masculine thought in tourism studies. He does recognise that the Other in this tourism research embodies the fears and desires of the tourist. Studying the fears and desires of the tourist could be an entry point into an examination of the bodily implications of this reaction. Goss (1993) concludes by arguing that tourism systematically provides a reconstructed ethnicity. Goss’ analysis
of tourism advertising disrupts western dualisms of nature/culture and real/representational and the hierarchical powers involved in tourism processes become explicit.

The study of ethnic tourism has some connections to the way sex tourism has been analysed by tourism studies’ academics. The Other in this literature is explicitly sexed/sexualised and exoticised.

**Sex tourism**

The sex tourist travels to get sexual satisfaction from women and girls (and in some instances but to a lesser extent, men and boys) of another ethnicity. Purchasing sexual services from people of Other ethnicities and in other places is a means of avoiding the social and moral consequences of non-marital, bought sex that he would be exposed to in his own culture. Some sex tourists return to the same places, the same ethnic communities, many times. For some, however, other places beckon (Jokinen and Veijola 1997). The relationship between tourism and prostitution has come to be regarded as particularly strong in the ‘third world’ countries (Lea 1988; Shaw and Williams 1994; Wood 1993).

Sex tourism is often analysed as one of the unanticipated impacts of tourism. Louis Turner and John Ash (1975, 229-42), drawing on notions of centre and periphery, argue that the citizens of pleasure peripheries: “come into contact with western lifestyles that are characterised by conspicuous consumption, spectacular leisure activities and a hedonistic attitude” (Dahles 1997, 45).

In a review of sex tourism, Alister Mathieson and Geoffrey Wall (1982, 149) chart four hypotheses. One is locational, and suggests that tourism development creates environments that attract prostitutes. The second is
societal and suggests that sex tourism enabled the breaking of ‘normal’
behaviour by tourists when away from home. The third is related to
economic and employment opportunities for women and the fourth is
that tourism could be understood as a scapegoat for a general decline in
moral standards. In all of these hypotheses, there is a tendency to
universalise the place, the prostitutes, the product or the problems. This
type of universalising has several implications. The focus on the places of
sex tourism and the sex workers, tends to leave the sex tourist as an
unmarked and unaccountable subject. The sex tourist (mind) becomes
rendered as the powerful actor and the sex worker (body) becomes
rendered as the passive victim.

One of the attractions of ‘third world’ countries is the low cost exoticism
and eroticism that exists for tourists (Hall 1992b). Michael Hall (1994)
argues that it is difficult to study sex tourism because many tourism
researchers are unwilling to acknowledge the links between sex and the
tourism industry, or that sex is often a motivating factor for travel. Hall
(1994) also states that doing research on sex tourism is difficult because it
is a ‘criminal activity’ and information is consequently hard to access and
frequently unreliable. There has been no ‘systematic’ (read scientific and
rational) research on sex tourism.

Jokinen and Veijola (1997) begin to theorise the hegemonic constructions
of sex tourism. Claiming that tourism studies has hidden the
gendered/sexed body of the sex tourist, they assert that:

the sex tourist is, by definition, a man. (By definition but
not by term, which, not surprisingly, masks the sexual
division implied by the phenomenon.) If international
tourism had to do (only and mainly) with women’s
economy of desire, there would, most probably, be no
such institution (even if there are individual women
and groups of women out there practising sex tourism)
(Jokinen and Veijola 1997, 47).
Jokinen and Veijola (1997) argue, metaphorically and materially, that the sex tourist's language is the master language: "home and abroad he speaks it from a singular position of interlocution" without providing a position for an equal sexual partner. They add: "By speaking his own language in new places he turns continents, cities, neighbourhoods and women into the 'body-matter' of prostitution. The printed version of his body-matter, is, then, called (the 'universal' language of) pornography" (Jokinen and Veijola 1997, 47). I would argue that the cultural and ethnic practices of sex tourists need closer examination. Defining male sex tourists as one universal group fails to acknowledge the specificity of the tourists.

Marc Askew (1997, 396), undertaking a review of literature that addresses sex tourism, has argued that tourist-oriented prostitution: "has been studied primarily from the macro-level, from the safe heights of dependency theory and its various economic and feminist labour-theory derivatives." He continues:

The nature of the encounters taking place between women and their foreign clients/lovers, the cultural understandings and misunderstandings that mediate these relations, and the attitudes and values of these women in the context of their lives, have been surprisingly understudied by scholars, particularly anthropologists and those of ethnographic ilk (Askew 1997, 396).

Askew's (1997) review suggests that the full and complex dimensions of women sex workers' lived experiences are constructed by the tourism studies' academic as victims, or as economic actors only.

It may be argued that HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras are sites for sex tourism too. On-site sex venues, for example, offer places for anonymous sexual encounters between (usually) gay men (see Binnie 1995). This has not been the focus of my research. There is a need for studies, however,
which embrace not only heterosexual prostitution but also massage parlours, child pornography, rent boys, sex shows and so forth. Such a focus would demand a reconceptualising of the sex tourist and the sex worker as they have been currently constituted in tourism studies.

There are other binary divisions emerging in tourism studies that work to produce disembodied knowledge, for example, the division between gender and sex.

**Gender and tourism**

Gender and tourism is an emerging area of study in tourism studies. Before I draw on some of this literature, I wish to give some historic background to the notion of gender. The concept of ‘gender’ was developed in contrast to the term ‘sex’, to depict that which is socially constructed as opposed to biologically given. Gender and sex were understood to be distinct (Nicholson 1990). In 1968, psychologist Robert Stoller published a book called *Sex and Gender*, in which he argued that a person’s gender identity is primarily the result of psychological influences. The biological sex of a person signifies, but does not determine, the appropriate gender identity for that person.

In the 1970s, feminists began to use the gender/sex distinction to gain political ground. Women began to argue persuasively that gender was a culturally constructed notion that varied across time and place. The introduction of the gender/sex distinction was seen as a political attempt to intervene into western epistemologies that declared women as ‘different’ because of their biology, their sex. It held out the “promise of enabling an analysis of male privilege as the product of historically and culturally constituted systems of gender inequality, not as the natural outcome of biological differences between males and females”
(Yanagisako and Collier 1990, 131). The gender/sex distinction is murky and this, I believe, creates political opportunities for destabilising the mind/body dualism.

Some feminist theorists in tourism studies have argued that dualisms such as private/public and home/abroad are gendered (Enloe 1989; Morris 1988a, 1989b; Wolff 1995). There has been discussion of the body images that are frequently used to sell holidays, tourist destinations and tourist events. Travel brochures ironically represent prospective holiday makers in idealised settings: the sun and sea is golden, the sky is blue and the tourists semi-naked, bronzed, and relaxed (Marshment 1997). Bodies of scantily clad ‘natives’ are suggestive of exotic places and people. Cynthia Enloe (1989, 28) argues that the desire to know another place is conflated, in the tourist imagination, with women “as the quintessence of the exotic … something to be experienced.” The dominant position of spectatorship has been a masculine one\(^{17}\) (see Mulvey 1975, and Doane 1990), irrespective of the gender of the spectator. The tourist imagination could be understood as reinforcing the connections between the feminine and the body. For example:

Predominant tourism brochure representations of men [are] associated with action, power, and ownership, while women are associated with passivity, availability, and being owned. From this perspective, uses of women, sexual imagery, and exotic markers in the tourism industry to market destinations are seen to often reinforce stereotypes and hierarchical divisions of labour. Host societies differentiated by race/ethnicity, colonial past, or social position from the consumer societies are sold feminised images (Swain 1995, 249).

What is missing in this description is the connection to masculinity as mind and femininity as body.

\(^{17}\) I discuss the masculine position of the tourist spectator in Chapter 5.
Gender in tourism studies is gaining wider readership, in for example, the *Annals of Tourism Research: A Social Sciences Journal* (1995) which devoted a special issue to gender in tourism. Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall (1994) use the term gender as an understood and undefined category. What is notable about these works is their concentration on the social construction of gender, in ways which reinforce a division between sex and gender. Margaret Swain (1995, 247) in her introduction to the “Gender in Tourism” issue, strengthens this dichotomy when she argues: “gender is, therefore, quite distinct from biological differences between the sexes, and is the basis of both women’s subordination and potential change toward equality between women and men.” Swain (1995) does refer to Veijola and Jokinens’ (1994) work on the body and tourism but reasserts the gender/sex dichotomy when she states:

> Their culturally constructed socially contained femininity raises the questions they pose to their fictionalized companions on a Finnish style vacation to Mallorca. For Veijola and Jokinen, ‘the body’ is emblematic of what is missing in universalizing social sciences theories in general and in tourism studies specifically (Swain 1995, 258).

By relegating the material body to a representation (emblem), Swain (1995) omits the flesh and reasserts gender as a social construction. Swain (1995, 258-259) instead focuses on matter-free “ideologies of masculinity and femininity in host and guest populations; and the social divisions of labor, power and sexuality.” While this work is an important starting point, it rarely challenges the foundations of tourism studies. It is no longer adequate to simply add women to an unexamined and unaltered foundation. These efforts in tourism studies have unwittingly repeated the privileging of the mind over the body thereby raising other problems.

Swain (1995, 258) argues that:
the notion of social sexuality, drawn from the work of Connell (1987), moved to the forefront as an issue both in gender studies and in the study of tourism. Framing social sexuality as a primary variable in gender relations is a useful way to develop an understanding of the dynamics of gender in tourism.

Although Swain (1995) does not specify this, I take from her work that social sexuality refers to heterosexuality. Homosexuality, gay or queer bodies, have largely been excluded from tourism studies’ discourse. Much of what has been written tends to define gay tourism through economic possibilities (the pink pound/dollar), thus further Othering and denying queer bodies (Holcomb and Luongo 1996; Torres-Kitamura 1997; and Time Magazine 1995). Elsewhere, ‘homosexuals’ appear unproblematically in the sex tourism and HIV/AIDS literature (Cohen 1988). There has been some attention to gay (male) identity and the spaces of tourism (see Hughes 1997a, 1997b).

Annette Pritchard, Nigel Morgan, Diane Sedgely and Andrew Jenkins (1998, 273-282) have identified a ‘gay gap’ in tourism literature and published an article entitled “Reaching out to the gay tourist: Opportunities and threats in an emerging market segment.” They attempt to raise “some issues surrounding gay tourism, gay destinations and gay space” (Pritchard, Morgan, Sedgely and Jenkins 1998, 280). The authors acknowledge the heterosexuality of public spaces but tend to essentialise ‘gay’ identity as a singular and static subjectivity. Their article is directed at the ‘tourist industry’ and mainly focuses on economic factors, for instance:

It seems likely that more and more marketers will seek to court the gay consumer. Whilst actively targeting the gay market as potential customers may not be relevant or sensible for all in the tourism industry, it will become increasingly important for it to avoid negative stereotypes and unwitting offensiveness. As more and more gay people come out, the average consumer is
increasingly likely to know a gay man or lesbian woman (Pritchard, Morgan, Sedgely and Jenkins 1998, 280).

There are several hegemonic assumptions in this advise for tourism marketers. The average consumer here is constructed as heterosexual. A 'gay man' or a 'lesbian woman', however, is marked as the Other. The binary between hetero/homo remains fixed. The authors have not theorised embodiment, sexuality or identity despite drawing on recent geographical work on sexualities published in *BodySpace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexualities* (in particular, Chouinard and Grant 1996; Duncan 1996; Myslik 1996; Valentine 1996). If tourism studies' academics wish to 'materialise' gay and lesbian tourism, it must be balanced by a critical reflection on what the identities 'gay and lesbian' mean, especially in particular places.

Tourism studies has privileged gender as a social construction, opposed to sex, as biologically fixed. This implies: "the omission of the body as a vital element in the constitution of masculine and feminine identity and the consignment of those who argue for a corporeal feminism ... into the nether world of biological essentialism" (Johnson 1990, 18). The sexed body becomes denied and Othered in tourism studies' accounts of gender.

Much work has been carried out that is based on the body as gendered/sexed, sexualised and changing. Some feminist geographers have engaged in examining biology as a social construct rather than leaving the body as an untouchable natural given (for example Cream 1992, 1995a, 1995b; Johnson 1989; Johnston 1996; Longhurst 1995, 1996a, 1997; Rose 1991, 1993). Using poststructural and feminist politics of bodies, I examine the interaction and engagement of the natural with the cultural in this research. Sexed and sexualised bodies are not fixed by nature, nor completely culturally constructed. An analysis of gay pride
parades cannot ignore the ‘real’ and exposed flesh which is explicitly sexed and sexualised. In this respect there must be room for reconceptualising culture/nature and real/representation dichotomies.

I have discussed hallmark tourism, postmodern tourism, ethnic tourism, sex tourism and gender and tourism because these areas may be good starting places to consider gendered/sexed and sexualised embodiment. They are areas of tourism studies that are, however, based on a mind/body split and thus continue to Other the body in relation to the mind. I continue with my argument that tourism studies’ academics produce knowledge that is underpinned by a mind/body dualism. I now ask: what are the costs for tourism studies and for tourism studies’ academics who privilege the mind over the body?

THE COSTS OF A MIND/BODY DUALISM

I have established that the mind/body dualism underpins academic discourses of tourism studies. The costs of this are that certain bodies - women, homosexuals, disabled, coloured and so forth - are Othered. The tourist is (mis)represented as unmarked but is implicitly white, bourgeois, masculine and heterosexual.

Longhurst (1997, 493-494) states that there are several costs for geographers who ignore the body. The first cost is that “many themes, topics and approaches are deemed inappropriate or illegitimate by the hegemons in ‘the discipline’” (Longhurst 1997, 493). This is also the case for tourism studies’ knowledge.

The second cost of ignoring the body and privileging the mind over the body is that:

only some people can count as bearers of geographical knowledge. In other words, more is at stake than what
counts as legitimate knowledge in geography; it is also vital to consider who counts as a bearer of legitimate knowledge (Longhurst 1997, 494).

I have already mentioned the disparate nature of tourism studies as an area of study within the academy. The study of tourism has rested on a privileging of economic, scientific and positivistic frameworks and tourism studies' academics have adopted rigorous methodological methods of scientific enquiry. Utilising such frameworks means that rational knowledge is based on who has the ability to know.

Bodies which 'can not think straight' have been traced back to the late eighteenth century, when "a certain form of rationality became identified with, and in turn identified, masculinity" (Rose 1993, 7). Rose (1993, 7) draws on the works of feminists (such as Bordo 1986; Gatens 1991a; Grosz 1993) to claim that what "theorists of rationality after Descartes saw as defining rational knowledge was its independence from the social position of the knower." Rose (1993, 7) claims that "masculinist rationality is a form of knowledge which assumes a knower who believes he can separate himself from his body, emotions, values, past experiences and so on." Here is the connection between the position of the knower as value free, objective, autonomous, universal, and "mess and matter-free" (Longhurst 1997, 491). Moreover: "the subject is conceived as disembodied, rational, sexually indifferent subject - a mind unlocated in space, time or constitutive relations with others (a status normally only attributed to angels!)" (Irigaray 1984, cited in Grosz 1986, 199).

Rose (1993, 6) links masculinist rationality to what Donna Haraway (1991, 183-201) calls the "master subject", the subject which is white, bourgeois heterosexual and masculine. There is a particular manner in which the master subject:
perceives other people who are not like him. From his position of power he tends to see them only in relation to himself. He understands femininity, for example, only in terms of its difference from masculinity. He sees other identities only in terms of his own perception; he sees them as what I shall term his Other (Rose 1993, 6).

The master subject is also understood in terms of the Same (Rose 1993). "He cannot recognise difference from himself in terms which do not refer to himself. The master subject understands his supposed disembodied rationality to be the norm, the Same, the unmarked category" (Longhurst 1997, 492). Those embodied Others, such as women, homosexuals, blacks and so on, represent the difference from the norm and are marked categories.

The tourism studies' analyst becomes the master subject (in other words, the dominant subject constituted as white, bourgeois, masculine and heterosexual) who is nowhere to be found in tourism studies' texts or the 'field'. This absence tends to be supported by one of tourism studies' most prestigious journals, the *Annals of Tourism Research: A Social Science Journal*. The guidelines insist that papers submitted for publication must be written in the third person. Writing in the third person can, in some ways, remove the 'author' from 'her' research. It becomes difficult to provide personal voice or embodied experience if one cannot write in the first person.

Veijola and Jokinen (1994, 149) argue that in tourism studies:

judged by the *discursive postures* given to the *writing subject* of most analyses, the analyst himself has, likewise, lacked a body. Only the pure mind, free from bodily and social subjectivity, is presented as being at work when analysing field experiences, which has taken place from the distance required by the so-called *scientific objectivity*, from the position-in-general (emphasis in original).
Veijola and Jokinen (1994) do not discuss the risks involved when academics take steps to write their own bodies and sexuality into their work. Dominant discourses that construct ‘legitimate’ knowers as rational, masculine and heterosexual, silence those knowers who may not be, for example, heterosexual (see Binnie 1997). In the evaluation of her feminist geography knowledges, Louise Johnson (1994, 110) asks:

I have agonised for years about the consequences - professional and otherwise - of ‘coming-out’ in print, declaring my own sexuality and building a feminist geography upon my lesbianism. But basically I have seen the risks as too great, the stakes too high in a homophobic culture and discipline. Just as seriously, I see a danger in the fixing of identity around one component - be it sexuality or race or ethnicity - whose naming I may have control, but whose meanings and implications I have no power, over.

There are material risks in coming-out for academics. The costs for academic fields, such as tourism studies, is that most academics remain distant from their work, or rely on frameworks of objectivity and continue to privilege the mind at the expense of the body. I want to challenge the mind/body distinction upheld in tourism studies by examining the literature that takes the risk and sexually embodies tourism studies.

SEXUALLY EMBODYING TOURISM

In the last ten years a number of geographers have begun to reconsider bodies in their work (see Cream 1992, 1995a, 1995b; Dorn and Laws 1994; Duncan 1996; Dyck 1995; Johnson 1989; Johnston 1995, 1996; Kearns 1993; Longhurst 1994, 1995, 1996a, 1997; Nast and Pile 1998; Pile 1996; Rose 1991, 1993). The epistemological implication of this is are that geographers are rethinking ‘the body’ as a natural given. A further development is required, however. Attention needs to be directed towards the theorising
of bodies as ‘made’ and ‘remade’ in specific contexts of place and time. This is not new to geography but has only recently been addressed in tourism studies.

Kirby (1997, 2-4) accepts that the matter of the body is universally taken-for-granted in western knowledge, and so begins a series of what she calls “dumb questions” about what the body might be. Kirby (1997) uses the Hindu ritual festival of *thaipusam* to illustrate that the matter of the body is not straightforward. Tourists at this ritual become astonished voyeurs at the spectacle of a man’s body, grotesquely impaled on elaborate metal spokes which are driven into the skin and organs of his body. His hands, face, lips and neck are also skewered with long spikes. Kirby (1997, 3) notes, that:

> this man does not bleed, nor does he scar ... However, this cultural/ritual in-corporation is not generalizable, for it does not extend to the bodies of tourists, or even other members of the devotee’s own community who might witness the festival.

Kirby (1997, 3) suggests that the cultural context that surrounds a body can also come to inhabit it. At gay pride parades, the paraders are impaled, in a sense, by the tourist’s gaze. Unlike the religious rituals of Kirby’s (1997) example, a pride parade has the purpose of secular display. It may not, however, be any more accessible to the watching tourists than an extreme religious ritual. The cultural context of ‘queerness’ surrounds and arguably inhabits the paraders, but to some extent, as I argue later, the success of the parade depends on the parade rituals not extending to the bodies of the watching tourists.

Despite Kirby’s (1997) claim that ritual incorporation is not generalisable, bodies involved in the tourism process do undergo change. Quetzil Castaneda (1991, 216 cited in Veijola and Jokinen 1994, 147) argues that:
the tourist attempts to redefine their body in contrast to
the Other’s Body and to redefine it in order to attach it
with the category of Self that is being upheld and which
can only be seen through the reflexive play of the Other,
as a category and as Body.

Veijola and Jokinen (1994) argue for the inclusion of the body in tourism
studies. They critique various tourism theoreticians as producers of
disembodied tourism studies’ knowledge. (For example, Kippendorf 1987;
MacCannell 1989; Rojek 1993; and Urry 1990a.) Veijola and Jokinen (1994,
149) argue that: “the tourist has lacked a body because the analyses have
tended to concentrate on the gaze and/or structures and dynamics of
waged labour societies.” They argue that context, or place, is critical to the
embodied knowledge of what it means to be a tourist:

When you hear, smell, sense and taste, you are in
context, connected. Thoughts may wander around and
emotions might vary, but a person has become a part of
the unity, become a participant. You can even be critical
about the actual events taking place, but if you don’t
question the configuration itself you are part of it. You’re
not a tourist (Veijola and Jokinen 1994, 140).

They draw on feminist poststructuralists such as Ann Game (1991) and
Judith Butler (1990) to identify the importance of gendered/sexed
embodiment to the study of tourism. Veijola and Jokenin (1994) also
bring into tension the gender/sex and social constructionism
/essentialism dichotomies by beginning with the ‘real’ body. For example,
at one point in their tourist journey at the beach they remark:

At that moment, a wet and gritty ball lands in the middle
of us, followed by fluent international apologies. I turn
around, annoyed, to inform the intruder about the
unwritten rules on public beaches, but fall silent again
when facing a naked man - or to be precise, his sex, which
is not socially constructed (Veijola and Jokinen 1994, 140,
emphasis in original).

This explicit attention to gendered/sexed embodiment offers many
possibilities for tourism studies. Veijola and Jokinen (1994) also write
themselves/their bodies into their research. They claim that: “instead of counter-arguing and looking from above, we have been *mumbling* to ourselves aloud about some texts, and *floating* along with others (Veijola and Jokinen 1994, 149, emphasis in original).

Jokinen and Veijola (1997, 24) have also introduced French feminist Luce Irigaray (see Whitford 1991) into their tourism texts. They aim: “to explore the morphologies of sceneries and landscapes which theoretical texts produce, in order to see how gendered/sexed subjects are able to move about them.” Jokinen and Veijola (1997, 4) use the concepts of the “male imaginary” and the “male imaginary morphology” to refer to Irigaray’s thesis that:

> the economy of the male imaginary supports the Western symbolic order: scientific theories, among other visible works of imagination, are based on images, fantasies and identifications whose roots in male experience remain unconscious (Jokinen and Veijola 1997, 4).

Therefore, according to Margaret Whitford’s (1991, 150) reading of Irigaray, the imaginary always bears the marks of either the female or the male body. In sum, Jokinen and Veijola (1997, 50) see many possibilities for the use of psychoanalytic theory in the study of tourism and tourists, in particular “when conceptualising the imaginary, symbolic and bodily existence of both sexes.”

There are some tourism studies’ academics who are beginning to engage in the body in their conference papers. For instance, geographers Peter Hughes and Vivian Kinnaird, delivered a paper entitled ‘Nature/gender/tourism: Watching dolphins in the Moray Firth, Scotland’, at the ‘Gender/Tourism/Fun?’ conference at the University of California, Davis in October 1997. They drew on feminist arguments to
deconstruct the nature/culture binary. They also provided some way into thinking through the tourists' and scientists' bodily experiences of dolphin watching.

Although, social, cultural and feminist geographers seem reluctant to address issues of tourism in their work, it is in the discipline of geography where there has been a proliferation of work on the themes of sexuality and space. (See, for example, Adler and Brenner 1992; Bell 1991; Bell and Valentine 1995; Binnie 1997; Hodge 1995; Jackson 1991, 1994; Knopp 1990a, 1990b, 1992; Namaste 1996).

There has been a great deal of work published in the last decade in the area known as lesbian and gay studies (see, for example, contributions to Abelove, Barale, and Halperin 1993). Much of this work analyses questions about the structures of social power, sexuality, and the processes involved in the production of an identity. In these articles, discussions of a series of polarised positions - essentialism versus constructionism, coalition politics versus separatism, alignments of lesbians with feminists versus their alignments with gay male activists, and the complexities of 'alternative' sexual practices (such as lesbian s/m and what might be understood as lesbian or sexual ethics). These tensions have also been thoroughly discussed in feminist and lesbian feminist literature (see, for example, Butler 1990, 1993a, 1993b; de Lauretis 1991, 1994; and Fuss 1989, 1991). These arguments also appear in the context of gay pride parades, and are useful for examining not only the discursive struggles surrounding identity and Othering strategies, but also the social production of the gay pride parade terrains.

I have argued, thus far, that one of the epistemological consequences of Cartesian logic in western knowledge is that the body is separated from
the mind. In the field of tourism studies, this has specific consequences. The ways in which knowledge about tourists, the objects of tourist interest, and the specific sites at which tourism takes place are all inflected by this dualistic thinking in complex, and often contradictory ways. Tourism studies' academics, therefore, have tended to render the bodies and places of the tourist gaze as exotic Others.

Tourism studies' research which includes the Other (that is those people defined as homosexual, poor, black, diseased, working class and so on) is an important starting point for sexually embodying tourism studies. The next step, however, is for tourism studies' research to focus on an unsettling of the dominant/subordinate structure between mind and body, and between heterosexual and homosexual, thereby challenging the masculinism of tourism studies. Focusing attention on the gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies of gay pride parades can prompt new understandings of power, knowledge and social relationships between people and tourism processes.

What follows, an exploration of the lived and socio-political dimensions of the sexually differentiated bodies in pride parades, is premised on my own perspectives, contradictions and ironies encountered are those of myself - a Pākehā lesbian woman - raising issues about sexual specifities.

---

18 Pākehā refers to Aotearoa/New Zealand born people of 'European' decent. The term Pākehā is a highly contested term in Aotearoa/New Zealand, however, it is used as a standard term of classification of ethnicity in the New Zealand Census.
In this chapter I raise some questions about the construction of knowledge in tourism studies. Tourism studies’ researchers often attempt to remain distinct from the research process and the researched. Tourism research tends to be presented as objective, methodologically precise, statistically impeccable and otherwise disembodied. Debates concerning the construction of tourism studies’ knowledge, therefore, have asserted the importance of “methodological sophistication” and “meta-analysis” (Dann, Nash and Pearce 1988, 1).

Given the lack of feminist and postmodern attention to methodology in tourism studies, I have drawn on a number of feminist geographers and geographers working on sexuality and space who question constructions of knowledge and discourse in geography. This questioning demands greater reflection by the researcher and a recognition of the power relations at work and provides a framework for discussing the methods of enquiry at tourist events. *The Professional Geographer* devoted a section to critical feminist methodologies and theoretical perspectives (England 1994; Gilbert 1994; Katz 1994; Kobayashi 1994; Nast 1994; Staeheli and Lawson 1994). Longhurst (1996b, 143, emphasis in original) states:
The epistemological questions raised by feminist, postmodernist, poststructuralist and postcolonialist theorists in the critical examination of the social construction of knowledges, have in the last few years, helped to bring about a growth of interest in what we do as human geographers ... and how we do it.

I propose to give an embodied account of the research process and thereby resist hegemonic constructions of knowledge as 'objective'. An embodied account of the research process in some ways challenges the reconstitution of 'masculinised' knowledges.

I discuss my multiple positions as lesbian gazer, spectator, geographer, social scientist and volunteer worker. Techniques used and problems encountered in the fieldwork are used as a starting point. Discussion of these techniques and problems is underpinned by feminist and poststructuralist theories.

Qualitative research methods have been used extensively in geography. These methods and their applications have been reviewed in depth (see Dane 1990; Eyles and Smith 1988; McDowell 1992a, 1992b; McDowell 1997; Moss 1993; Pile 1991). Human geographers, however, have been reluctant to unpack social processes and relations of power inherent in the use of qualitative research techniques.

Feminist poststructuralists (Atmore 1991; Lather 1991) suggest making these processes and relations of power explicit, not simply because this is 'better' scholarship but because, in emphasising how we put together our accounts, we are less likely to universalise on the behalf of all places or all people. Instead, the idea is to stress that the knowledge of each person, including and especially the narrator, is only partial and is a product of their particular location (Haraway 1988; Rich 1986). No text is the last word on the matter but each creates and leaves space for other voices.
Feminist poststructuralists try to decentre themselves as narrators and be explicit about their own positioning and assumptions in constructing the text. In relation to positioning, Wendy Larner (1995, 187) argues:

working with an understanding of positionality as not only theoretical and ideological positioning, but also positioning in the politics of place, means recognising that inevitably there will be multiple situated knowledges in any particular context.

Larner's (1995) research is useful but the task of locating myself is still problematic. What are the appropriate methods for including my own embodied account of the research process? What information should I leave out? These are some of the questions I address in this chapter. I also suggest, following Rose (1997, 319), that:

a research project is understood not entirely [as] a consequence of the relationship between researcher and researched. To assume otherwise is, once again, to resist the proliferation of power/knowledges that by asserting the unassailable authority of academic analysis.

I have combined theoretical frameworks with methods of data collecting. I suggest that it is not the methods that enable feminist inquiry but rather the theoretical orientation that guides the conceptual framing of research.

CRITIQUES OF CONVENTIONAL METHOD/OLOGIES

Tourism studies has been criticised as having an "unfortunate tendency to gloss over questions of theory and method and a concomitant failure to acknowledge their interrelatedness" (Dann, Nash and Pearce 1988, 10). Graham Dann, Dennison Nash and Philip Pearce (1988, 4) claim that in tourism studies:

"Research" often falls into one of the following three categories: theoretical discourse without empirical foundation; descriptive essays which assemble a series of impressionistic and anecdotal material; and data analyses devoid of any theoretical content.
I agree that theory and method are interrelated (implicitly and explicitly) but I am wary of this description offered by Dann, Nash, and Pearce (1988). Their theoretical base for the study of tourism is a masculine and disembodied one. By this I mean that with ‘methodological sophistication’ all tourism processes and people can become knowable, measurable and understood.

Tourism studies’ methods tend to reflect their particular disciplinary backgrounds.

Much tourism scholarship, working within such a cross-disciplinary context, reflects this bias in favor of rigorous, quantitative, and scientific methods ... the truism of the scientific method asserts that the phenomenon under consideration must be empirically viable and observable by both the researcher and the larger scientific community (Walle 1997, 524).

Alf Walle (1997) believes that the ‘humanistic’ investigation should be part of tourism studies’ methodologies and advocates a science/human binary as a way forward for studies of tourism. Such a position reasserts an adherence to researcher/researched (Self/Other) dichotomy. One clear way to enforce a distinction between researcher and researched is to advocate a scientific approach to methodology. Dennison Nash (1996, 25) discusses the lack of methodological rigour in tourism studies and advocates “hard-nosed methodological procedures.” Nash (1996) calls for a sophistication of methodological operations and debates the scientific versus humanistic/interpretive approaches to research. Nash (1996, 25) concedes that “the process of understanding others is fraught with many difficulties that scientific pretentions ought to give way to an ‘interpretivist’ approach in the humanistic tradition.” These approaches to methodological procedures, however, “can only contribute informed hypotheses ... which have to be, in the end, scientific” (Nash 1996, 25).
Tony Veal (1992) also discusses the positivist/interpretative dichotomy and claims it is related to the empirical/nonempirical dichotomy. He does not, however, link these dichotomies to questions of power and the construction of knowledge in tourism studies. Researchers working in tourism studies have been slow to analyse the power processes of researching the 'Other'. It was this absence which led me to reflect critically on my role in researching tourist events.

In this research, I used qualitative methods of data collection: including, participant observations, in-depth and semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews, and questionnaires. I also collected a variety of media text - newspapers, photographs, video recordings, television and radio - for analysis. Where possible, I used an introductory letter and consent form (see Appendix A and B). Two parades were central to my study; the Auckland 1996 HERO Parade (17 February 1996), and the Sydney Mardi Gras (2 March 1996). As itemised in the method's schedule (see Figure 3.1), a further five parades provided a context for this study.

**METHODS USED**

An emerging postulate for feminist research is using a variety of methods in order to generate multifaceted information (Klein 1986, 16).

I chose a research strategy that enabled me to collect multifaceted data and allowed for the possibilities of linking past and present (Eichler 1980; Kessler and McKenna 1978; Reinharz 1992). Drawing on a multitude of research methods also enabled me to gather diverse data from different sources. I found some of my participants responded more openly in the focus group, others seemed to prefer individual interviews, and still others were more comfortable chatting to me whilst making pom pom balls for the HERO Marching Boys' parade entry. Using a variety of
FIGURE 3.1 Methods Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>WHAT AND WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Observations</td>
<td>Coming Out Day Parade: 3 December 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marching Boys training: 13 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996 HERO Parade: 17 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997 HERO Parade: 22 February 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Interviews</td>
<td>HERO Project Director: 22 September 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton Travel Agent: 23 November 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Travel Agent: 24 January 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HERO Parade Artist Jay: 2 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HERO Parade Artist Lorraine: 7 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HERO Parade Assistant, Robert: 7 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Mai FM HERO Marching Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malcolm: 13 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad: 13 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwayne: 13 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Interviews</td>
<td>Rainbow Youth: 14 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TransPride: 15 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>1996 HERO Parade: 17 February 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio and television transcripts: Feb. 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Recordings: 1995-1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
methods allowed me to be flexible and responsive towards the people I studied. For example, I planned to conduct a focus group with the Mai FM\textsuperscript{19} HERO Marching Boys, however, their tight training schedule and the large number of people involved meant that only impromptu individual interviews were possible.

It is generally agreed that there is no one set of methods or techniques, nor even a broad category of types of method, that should be seen as distinctly feminist. Liz Stanley (1990, 12) advocates feminists “should use any and every means available.” Rose (1997, 31), however, reminds feminist geographers that even with ‘feminist’ methods:

> we cannot know everything, nor can we survey power as if we can fully understand, control or redistribute it. What we may be able to do is something rather more modest but, perhaps more radical: to inscribe into our research practices the absences and fallibilities while recognising that the significance of these does not rest entirely in our own hands.

I began my doctorate with the aim of becoming involved in the operations of the HERO project, and specifically the parades. By being ‘inside’ the workings of the parade, I believed I would have access to participants and be able to gain in-depth participant observation data. In the process of my HERO Parade ‘fieldwork’ several problems emerged. These problems involved various power relations between myself and another HERO Parade worker. I outline the ethical conflicts that necessarily arise in participant observation and fieldwork reportage, and I question the manner in which anger routinely disqualifies writing from academic status. I suggest that writing about anger, as an embodied

\textsuperscript{19} Mai FM is an Auckland radio station that sponsors the HERO Marching Boys. Mai FM provides the music to accompany the dance routine in the parades.
response to the problems of fieldwork, is often deemed by the academy to be irrational, feminine and of little value.

I begin the discussion of my methods with the technique of participant observation. I used participant observation extensively throughout my research.

**Participant observation**

There were two main areas in my research where I conducted participant observation: the HERO Parade workshop (15 January - 19 February 1996), and at the five parades I attended: the Auckland 1995 Coming Out Day Parade, the HERO 1996-1998 Parades, as well as the 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras Parade.

In December 1995 the position of HERO Parade Assistant was advertised in *express; new zealand’s gay newspaper*. I applied for this position in the hope that as an assistant I would be able to gain an intimate knowledge of the production of the parade. I was not successful in my application, but my application prompted the Parade Director to telephone me and ask if I was interested in a volunteer position in return for the opportunity of collecting data for my research. I accepted. Being a volunteer enabled me to be in close contact with the participants employed in the parade project, including the HERO Project Director, HERO Parade Director, Parade Assistant and Parade Artists.

The HERO Parade and HERO party teams worked in a film studio in Grey Lynn, a suburb of Auckland. There was some office space as well as a huge open plan area for constructing large film props. I had desk space in the

---

20 From this point in the thesis, I use the shorten title *express*. 
office and also worked in the construction area helping create floats for
the parade. I had direct and daily access to, and interaction with, the
majority of parade entries. (For a full list of the parade entries see
Appendix C.)

My position of volunteer included many tasks. These tasks can be divided
into three main categories: public relations, personnel, and workshop
duties. Public relations involved running errands around Ponsonby and
wider Auckland, meeting with local businesses in Ponsonby, gaining
sponsorship from businesses, delivering parade notices and posters to all
businesses along Ponsonby Road, supplying information to the public via
phone calls, delivering notices to approximately 400 Ponsonby residents,
photocopying, contacting truck companies and truck drivers, taking truck
drivers to lunch, liaising with media, the Auckland City Council and
transport authorities and organising security for the parade. Personnel
duties included: contacting parade participants, organising/timetabling of
other parade workers and contacting community groups to obtain more
volunteers. Workshop duties were: designing, sourcing, buying and
collecting materials for floats, helping construct and assemble floats on
trucks; organisation of workshop space for parade entrants, security of
workshop, artistic and creative input, and meetings with parade entrants
(see Figure 3.2).

My days began at 7.30 a.m. and many times I worked through until 8, 9 or
10 p.m. People working for the parade became frustrated at times with the
HERO Parade Director. I was identified as a person to whom other
workers could come in order to air their grievances. Participant
observation at the HERO Parade workshop helped me build a better
picture of the construction of HERO Parade. Throughout the six weeks at
the HERO Parade workshop I gained an understanding of some of the
politics, motivations and diverse gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies involved in the HERO Parade. My participant observations provided data, which in turn, framed and directed my research. It was not until I had completed my fieldwork that I began to question whether my research role within the HERO Parade could be classified as ethnographic. On reflection, this was not the case.

As I worked with other people involved in the parade, I often discussed my research. During this process I was changing the ‘what’s there’, or the empirical ‘reality’ through my questions and participant observation. This proved helpful later when, in individual interviews, I could bring the previous conversations into the interview process.

I wrote up my field notes for the day after most people had left the studio workshop (and I was on security watch for the night) or when I had returned home. This became more usual as the parade date approached. The demands of the parade project meant my time to collect and record data was considerably compressed. While this worked to increase my personal stress levels (I continually felt I would never get enough data) it was also productive. I was forced to act. It is useful to reflect on my roles as participant observer and the ‘inside/outside’ positions of research. Mel Evans (1988) raises questions about his social position as a geography researcher using participant observation and explicitly locates himself as a

21 Historically, ethnography has its origins in cultural anthropology and traditionally drew upon symbolic interactionism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, linguistic philosophy and ethnomethodology (Donovan 1988). Ethnographic approaches stress the importance of understanding the perspectives of the people being studied (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983). Ethnography is based on participant observation work, un- or semi-structured interviewing, and/or by the researcher becoming part of the social group under study. Joyceen Boyle (1994, 182) explains that ‘most ethnographies are written in a narrative format and are broad, holistic, and naturalistic in content’. This is not the case for my research. The knowledge gained from my fieldwork is partial, situated, contextual and mediated through my own embodiment.
Figure 3.2 Building the Structure of the Remembrance Float

Source: Photograph by Rachel Green, 2 February 1996.
male insider studying his own community. (See also Jorgensen 1989 for a general discussion on participant observation in the social sciences.) For the majority of workers at the HERO workshop, I was a volunteer. It was not always possible to reveal my researcher identity to all HERO workers as the number of people in the workshop varied daily. This may have sometimes meant that my identity was mistaken but this was never done with deliberate intent (Keith 1992).

At the parade workshop I often wrote my notes at the end of each day. These notes proved to be useful as a way to gather data and to process the information I was collecting during my six weeks at the workshop. For example, in my notes for 2 February 1996, I recall a lunch-time conversation with three other project workers:

Great discussion at lunch time with Jay and Robert about body piercing etc. Debbie - the heavily tattooed messenger runner - listened in and only interacted once when she asked Robert 'did he have - or think of getting - pierced genitals?' He said that he had thought about it but didn't know if you could still wear a condom with a piercing. I joked and said it couldn't be a spiky earring. He talked about how painful it was to get his nipple pierced and that it was a real nuisance to have his belly button pierced. Jay told me that Cathy has had her clitoris pierced. I said how that would scare me - what if some sensations were lost? Jay said it was supposed to heighten sensation but if you take it out you can go numb. We both squirmed in our seats (participant observation notes, 2 February 1996).

In this exchange Jay and Robert were both aware that I was conducting research as well as being a volunteer in the workshop. Debbie, however, did not. This exchange bought the need for ethical reflection into sharp relief. I needed to consider my role as a voyeur and my roles in the differential power relations.
During the six weeks at the HERO Parade studio, I often felt I was not getting enough research done. I also felt I was a representative of the University of Waikato, and that my actions would be judged as such.

Participant observation raised more difficult questions. Ironically I was ‘observing’ behaviour, a sort of gazing at the subjects of my enquiry. Part of my research, however, is to question the privileging of the visual within geography and tourism studies. The pleasure in the ‘gaze’ for social scientists is often omitted from their accounts. Rose (1992, 1993) theorises the gaze of geographers using psychoanalytic techniques. Rose (1992, 1993) argues that geographers privilege the visual, the gaze. Looking in order to know, without expressing the involvement of the researcher, makes for what Rose calls masculinist knowledge. Building on my argument in Chapter 2, I believe that one of the reasons geographers and tourism studies’ academics privilege vision is precisely because of its supposed detachment.

I also recorded information that I gained from my other senses (see Rodoway 1994). For example, the workshop was full of different noises and conversations. I made notes on the types of music that seemed to be favoured by HERO workers. The workshop was a mix of smells, such as paint, glue, body odour and perfumes.

Each lunch time brought a unique gastronomic aroma provided by members of Body Positive (an HIV/AIDS support group). Being around people with HIV or AIDS made me reflect on my own ‘healthy’ body. It was possible that I was constructing people with HIV/AIDS as unhealthy and abject. The physical work of constructing floats exhausted me and I continually wondered about the physical state of other workers.
I also had opportunities to erotically gaze at HERO workers. I was interested in any 'gossip' in the workshop that might involve the workers. Several times I was invited to gay and lesbian functions where there were 'pick up' opportunities. Desire, erotic relationships and sexual encounters remain absent from most social scientists' accounts of their fieldwork (although see Kulick and Willson 1995). These emotions are often deemed self-indulgent (Pratt 1986). Academic accounts of sexual desire in the field, however, can call into question the boundaries of Self and Other, upset the researcher and researched relationship, blur the line between professional role and personal life and provoke further questions of power and possible exploitation. My participant observation also involved a continual shifting of power and exploitation dynamics between researched and researcher.

In a different context, the shifting power dynamics also lay between myself and another parade worker. In this case, power and prestige favoured the research subject and it was I, the researcher who became vulnerable and open to exploitation. Linda McDowell (1992b, 408) discusses this power reversal in an (unspoken) heterosexual context and asks:

Are we therefore permitted to use 'the tricks of the trade', including 'feminine' wiles to persuade our informants into confidences that they would prefer not to reveal? How, as women, do we appropriate particular versions of femininity in our presentation of self in different circumstances? And which masks of conventional femininity are most suitable for which circumstances? Is it ethical to be 'honest' with the relatively powerless women respondents that we study in certain circumstances, while disguising our purpose from others (powerful men) whom we know would refuse to speak to us if they could read our minds? In such cases, revealing our own values and judgements may make it less, rather than more, likely that our informants would trust us.
My fraught relationship was with another lesbian HERO Parade worker. We had an altercation over parade duties and as a result, working for the parade became very difficult just two weeks before the parade date. I was unable to separate my anger, as a volunteer worker, from my research role, and made the decision not to interview her. This meant that I missed out on what may have been an important interview. There were no 'masks of conventional femininity' that would have been appropriate in this instance. McDowell (1992b) equates men with power, but in my example, I was involved in a same-sex power relationship. I was also faced with the problem of representing this difficult relationship, the anger I felt, and how this shaped my data gathering. Academic protocols, which determine acceptable styles of academic texts, mean that the difficulty remains unresolved. It is less problematic to represent the anger of other parade workers. Michael Keith (1992, 561) offers an explanation:

Under conventional rules it would appear that anger as an emotional feature of the everyday world can surface in academic texts only as desiccated anecdote, an object of scrutiny that is a proclivity of the 'Other' that is studied but not of the disciplined self that represents the truth. Anger can only ever be the object of academic gaze, never the legitimate subject of academic style.

Opportunities to document power relations and the anger of others towards the one parade worker were frequent. Several parade workers were asked by a newspaper reporter to discuss the ways we were “treated as volunteers.” I declined because of my academic position. During my participant observation in the HERO Parade workshop I was involved in group meetings that often involved disagreements. Group meetings were with parade float entrants as well as those people working for the HERO project.
My central role in the parade process meant I was involved in all float and parade meetings. Attending group meetings was another form of participant observation. In these meetings I took notes for my own research. At one particular meeting we were discussing ideas for the Safe Sex Float and there was a disagreement over who would be on the float, and what the float should represent. The Safe Sex Float had the slogan ‘No Ifs, No Butts’. The organisers of this particular float wished to have gay men in lycra shorts dancing around a huge revolving, naked, male torso (from the waist to the knees) carved out of polystyrene. The ‘No Ifs, No Butts’ slogan would be in neon lights and attached to the butt of the torso. A problem arose when Doreen said there should be women on the float. The male organisers did not want to have lesbians on the float and a comment was made: “HERO is not about being politically correct.” The overall feeling was that the Safe Sex float should be targeted at gay men. This also seemed to be the understanding of many other gays and lesbians in the surrounding community. One lesbian friend I met at the gay and lesbian film festival said: “the HERO Parade, it’s really just a boys’ parade.” Historically the HERO project was initiated as a response to HIV/AIDS. It was a festival to raise money. This issue still underpins the project.

As a parade team we formally met to discuss ideas about what we wanted in the parade. Being involved in these small group gatherings enabled me to reflect on the power relations in the queer community of the HERO Parade. Being involved in these meetings and my participant observation in the workshop meant that, despite my earlier concerns of not gathering enough data, I had, in retrospect, gained extensive data. Participant observation was also a method I used at each parade.
I used the Auckland Coming Out Day Parade as a pilot ‘participant observation’ study. This helped me think through methodological issues in relation to the HERO Parade. Pilot studies are recommended as a research method to allow the researcher to focus on particular areas that may have been unclear previously (Jaysick 1994). I had never attended a gay pride parade before (although I had watched the televised parades) and I had several queries relating to data gathering in a large crowd and in a condensed period of time. “By including some time for the review of records and documents, the researcher may uncover some insight into the shape of the study that previously was not apparent” (Jaysick 1994, 213).

I attended the Auckland Coming Out Day Parade on 3 December 1995. I hired a camcorder and video recorded the parade as well as people who had arrived to watch the parade. The parade started with a welcome from a woman who explained that the parade was for everyone. Anyone walking the street could join in. Accompanying each float was music in a steady club beat. I walked with the parade, sometimes on the road in the parade itself, and sometimes on the footpath. In retrospect this Parade was very different from the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras. The boundaries of parade participants and watchers dissolved in the Coming Out Day Parade, whereas these boundaries were reinforced, and actively policed, in HERO and Mardi Gras. The Coming Out Day Parade seemed to be directed much more to the ‘gay community’, and had less corporate sponsorship. This Parade was held during the day and had market stalls and live music at the end.

The insights I gained by attending the Coming Out Day Parade were twofold. First, the Coming Out Day Parade was held along Ponsonby Road, which was also the site of the HERO Parades 1996 and 1997. I was,
therefore able to gauge some sense of what the HERO Parade would be like in this location. Second, I used the Coming Out Day Parade to engage in participant observation via videotaped recordings (VTR). Gay pride parades are usually short and I did not want to take fieldnotes on the spot. The distinctive character of parades meant moment by moment changes and I wanted time to reflect on and record these changes. By ‘testing’ the VTR method of data collection I had time to refine or change my methods for the 1996 HERO Parade. This decision prompted further methodological questions, for example, would there be ethical problems with these methods and how would I gain consent from those whom I visually recorded? These were difficult questions which arose during each parade that I could not provide any ‘right’ answers to.

It would be erroneous to assume that VTR can provide a complete record of the parades. However, two principal advantages of using VTR as a research resource are density and permanence (Grimshaw 1982). For me, the ‘density’ advantages of VTR over photography, at the gay pride parades, was the ability to collect more than just still visual images. The recordings include sounds of the parade participants and of those watching the parade. The moving visual images also show the tactile tendencies of the parade participants and the reactions of the crowd. The VTR also reveals my reactions and interactions with the parade. Further, the VTR seemed to highlight what I found most interesting in the parade, as structured by my research focus and/or by my erotic gaze.

The actual recording of the Coming Out Day Parade was easy. The weather was hot and sunny, and there were no lighting difficulties. I did not have to take precautions for filming in wet weather. The parade took about half an hour to reach the end of Ponsonby Road which meant I did not need a back up battery for the camera.
The permanence of VTR made it possible to review the parade as often as I needed to and in a variety of ways. I could stop at selected frames and proceed back or forward. There was an opportunity for reflection prior to making interpretative judgements. My data, and the analytical techniques, could also be demonstrated to others (Erickson 1992; Grimshaw 1982).

Joan Bottorff (1994) reviews the use of VTR in-depth. She claims VTR can be a rich source of data for qualitative research if there is an awareness of its limitations. These limitations are the absence of contextual data beyond what is recorded and the lack of opportunity to be an active participant in the scene (Erickson 1992). During my pilot study, these limitations became clear. I was ‘limited’ to being behind the camera and realised that I would also need other methods of collecting data at the 1996 HERO Parade.

I spent the day of the 1996 HERO Parade assisting groups with their final touches to floats and directing trucks in and around the workshop. I left the workshop to prepare for the evening parade. Several hours before the parade began, I distributed questionnaires to tourists who arrived to view the parade (and I discuss this later in the Chapter).

When the 1996 HERO Parade started, I was at the beginning with media, such as Television New Zealand and Television Three. I had hired a camcorder and recorded tourists and the start of the parade. I had not intentionally set out to deceive subjects, but I did look like the other television camera operators. William Bainbridge (1992) refers to complete participant observation, where the researcher deceives subjects by pretending to be one of them. This ‘status’ allowed me certain privileges, such as remaining in front of the crowd and walking with the moving
parade. About half way through the parade, my camera battery ran out. I spent the second half of the parade watching the performances, without videoing them. I experienced an enormous sense of pride and ownership of the 1996 HERO Parade and I attributed this, retrospectively, to my input into making the Parade happen. This was the only gay pride parade at which I felt ‘pride’. I was familiar with all the parade entries and people who had worked on the floats. My attention was so absorbed that I did not focus on the reactions of others around me. At subsequent parades, however, the reactions of tourists became paramount.

I attended both the 1997 and 1998 HERO parades. It was at the 1997 HERO Parade when I realised my unease at being part of the large, mostly heterosexual, crowd. My partner and I were squashed between the road barricades and other tourists. This provided the opportunity to collect comments which were made by those people around me. It was impossible to write these comments down at the time. After the parade was over and I had returned home, I wrote remembered comments in my participant observation notebook. I decided not to video record these two parades as they were to be televised on national television. Instead, I took my camera to take photographs both at the parades’ assembly area and during the parades.

Participant observation was used, as previously discussed, at the 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras. It could be argued that I was a ‘real’ tourist, as well as a tourism researcher, as I had ‘travelled’ to attend the tourist event. I was not ‘emotionally attached’ to the 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras in the way that I had been involved in the production of the 1996 HERO Parade. I was overwhelmed by the size of the Parade and the build-up to the Parade. Conducting participant observation at the Sydney Mardi Gras was much more difficult than at the HERO parades. To begin with, I was unfamiliar
with the street layout. Choosing the best 'viewing' spot was aided by local gay guides to the parade. Once in position to watch the parade, I could not move because of the layers of people behind me. As part of such a large crowd, I could not move independently. Road barriers were constantly surveyed so I could not walk out onto the street to take photographs. Limited mobility and space was one of the reasons why I had decided not to video record the 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras. Another reason was that I could purchase an Australian Broadcast Corporation (ABC) video production of the parade.

In the next section I discuss the interviews I conducted at the HERO workshop and with those people associated with the parade.

**Interviews**

I conducted six in-depth, semi-structured interviews, which ranged from one to two hours long. These interviews were with the HERO Project Director, two HERO Parade Artists, the HERO Parade Assistant, and two Travel Agents. They were loosely structured, yet controlled and they provided opportunities to discuss further issues that were raised in the workshop area. They were a source of rich material. For example, I worked on several floats with other HERO Parade workers. We referred back to these floats in our interviews and the political and performance purposes behind each one. I also conducted another three unstructured interviews which ranged from five minutes to twenty minutes. These interviews were in response to my failed attempt to conduct a focus group with the Mai FM HERO Marching Boys. At their marching practise it was only possible to talk briefly to individuals.

My first interview was with the HERO Project Director, in his Auckland office, on 22 September 1995. He was the only year round, full time
employee for the HERO project and identifies as a Pākehā gay male, aged thirty six. This interview proved to be very useful, both in terms of information gathered and personal contact made. It was from this initial interview that I gained access to the HERO Parade workshop area and project workers. He also provided me with an enormous amount of material in the form of correspondence and media releases concerning the Auckland City Council and the parade (see the section on text collecting). We talked at length about the conflict between some Councillors and the risqué focus of the parade.

The Project Director offered me the Parade Director’s position. I declined but had thought about the advantages that I might gain if I had been in that position of Parade Director. In retrospect, however, as Parade Director I would have been the person completely responsible for the parade. In this position it may have been extremely difficult to conduct my research. Being so actively involved may have left little time for reflection. In hindsight, my position as volunteer meant I had less responsibility and more time to work on my research.

The travel agency, Harvey World Travel of Ponsonby, advertises as serving the gay community’s travel needs. It was for this reason that I approached the owner/operator and asked for an interview. He provided an international tourism focus for this research. As a travel agent, he was able to comment on the international travel needs and desires of gays and lesbians that use his service. At this interview I was also given a range of travel brochures that advertise directly to gay and lesbian tourists. We discussed the pressures he faces as a travel agent, as the HERO Parade becomes larger and more commodified. As a small sponsor of HERO he is being overshadowed by the larger sponsors who can offer more. Large sponsors include liquor companies which sell products such as Heinekin,
Absolut Vodka, and Deutz. We discussed the tension between HERO, as a political event for the visibility of the gay community, versus HERO as a large commercial operation involving substantial amounts of money going to non-gay companies. This travel agent is also a member of the Gay Auckland Business Association (GABA) and was a past president. He identified as a Pākehā gay male, and was 45 years old. I conducted a pilot interview with a travel agent in Hamilton prior to this Auckland interview. This pilot gave me the opportunity to set parameters around questions of difference in travel and tourism for heterosexuals and non-heterosexuals.

In the HERO Parade workshop I worked very closely with Robert\(^{22}\) (employed as a parade assistant), and Jay and Lorraine (both employed as parade artists). By the time I interviewed each of them (separately) we already had established a “rapport” (Reinharz 1992, 67) through working together on a number of contentious issues. For example, Jay had been assigned the job of creating a huge replica of Auckland’s Sky Tower. The aim was to emphasise the phallic representation of the building. She made this in the workshop area next to many other people working on HERO floats. In the interview\(^{23}\) I asked:

\(^{22}\) Pseudonyms have been used for research participants.

\(^{23}\) I have used the following transcription codes, (see Longhurst 1996, 96 - 97):

- \(/ /\) starts of overlap in talk are marked by a double oblique;
- \(\ldots\) pauses in talk were not timed but simply marked with one dot;
- \(\ldots\) denotes omitted material;
- underlining words or particles said with emphasis;
- [inaudible] has been used when the conversation could not be heard and transcribed;
- comments in square brackets such as [laughter], have been used to include the non-verbal communication and events that help to give context to the conversation;
- speech ‘errors’ and particles (for example, er, ummm) which are not full words have been included;
Lynda: What do you think about, we’ve talked a little bit about this, the sky tower, the phallic sky tower thing, the send up of Auckland’s biggest erection, in terms of, um, kind of that phallic imagery?

Jay: Of the actual sky tower itself or, or what we’ll be doing with it?

Lynda: Oh, both really.

Jay: Um, well I’ve never really thought too much about the sky tower. I just thought it was a, I mean, Auckland’s biggest erection. Oh - here we go again [laughs] you know, build something bigger and sharper and longer and taller and what’s next [both laughing]? And it’s just um, to me it’s never really really bothered me. It’s just kind of been one of those ugly things that’s going to be in our sky line. And I kind of think is a little bit unnecessary but,

Lynda: So do you think it’s a good we’re sending it up in the parade?

Jay: Yeah, yeah, I think it’s great.

Lynda: Mmm, make it explicit. Um, does it, is there any conflict between, like have you ever had to be commissioned to fashion a huge polystyrene penis before? [Both laugh.]

Jay: No.

Lynda: Have you ever had to do this in your art life before? [laughing]

Jay: No I haven’t. But, that doesn’t worry me, I actually think it’s quite a farce (Yeah). A lot of, I’ve had some really strange, very bizarre looks [laughs] as if I’m some kinky woman or something I’m just not, it’s been fun.

Lynda: Who’s been giving you funny looks?

Jay: Just people that, you know coming past and go, ‘ooer what’s that, ooooh? Oh yeah’ [laughs] No, um, no I actually enjoy it. To me it’s just a sculpture and I don’t really stand back and think oh, a penis. I probably will when I finish, but right
now I’m just sculpturing it (individual interview, 2 February 1996, emphasis in original).

Jay requested that she take home my questions that guided our interview. She felt that she was not able to think clearly in the interview and wanted “another go.” Her response to my questions concerning the phallic sky tower shifted slightly, when she wrote:

Those people down there are building a big dick reaching up to the sky. I think it is fucking ugly. I don’t want to have to look at it everyday. Would you ever see a group of women building a huge clitoris? Maybe we should (written response, post-interview, 7 February 1996).

My flexible approach to data gathering enabled Jay to supply me with several responses. Also, my own politics and our working relationship meant that I had influenced her thinking to some extent. I was not looking for the ‘true’ response, rather responses which reflected contradictions as well as patterns. In our interview, Jay identified as a 23 year old Pākehā woman, who had this to say about her sexuality:

Jay: Um, I guess right now I’m still sort of experimenting. I’ve had relationships with both men and women ... But actually, I’m on equal levels right now [both laugh]. Two women, two men, so I don’t know, I like all. Um, I guess if you want to label it, bisexual, I suppose. But um, I don’t have a choice (individual interview, 2 February 1996).

After Jay had reflected on this interview, she wrote the following:

I guess up until now I have been experimenting with my sexuality. I have had relations with both men and women. A couple of years ago I would have called myself bisexual, but deep down I think I am a closet heterosexual. I am in full support of people expressing their sexuality in what ever way (written response, post-interview, February 7 1996).

Like Jay, Lorraine was interviewed after we had established a working relationship in the parade studio. Lorraine identified as a Pākehā woman, aged 25. Again, the sexuality question highlights the fluid and contested
nature of sexualised identities. Lorraine said she “wasn’t sure”, she is thinking about it. Later she told me “I had better identify as straight ‘cause I felt uncomfortable stating anything else” (participant observation notes, 29 January 1996). The unease surrounding a particular sexualised identity (that is straight) may be due, in part, to the environment. Lorraine and Jay were working on a gay pride parade in a workshop full of lesbians, gay men, transgenders, bisexuals and very few heterosexuals. If they felt their sexuality was not strongly heterosexual, then the multiply sexualised site of the workshop would be an ideal environment to express this. Both Jay and Lorraine were interviewed in a quiet store room at the studio.

Robert agreed to be interviewed while he worked in the main area of the studio. I held the recorder as he glued sequins to plastic roses. The roses were made into head wreaths and were worn by men on the Safe Sex float. People were working on floats all around us and we had to shout over a skill saw (which also made transcribing the interview very difficult). Robert identified (non-problematically) as a Pākehā gay male, aged 24.

An interview that I had planned, but failed to carry out, was with the Parade Director. On one hand, this would have been a most important interview for my research. On the other hand, I worked so closely with her, prepared media releases for her etc., that I felt I had heard most her opinions regarding the parade, bodies, gender/sex, sexuality and tourism. Doreen identified as a Pākehā (although was born in England) lesbian, aged 31.

Three impromptu interviews were conducted with the HERO Marching Boys on the grounds of an Auckland high school. I obtained permission from the marching boys’ coordinator to attend the practice sessions. I
prepared some questions for a focus group but it was impossible to stop the practice session. The marching boys were very serious about their practise sessions and there were no rest breaks where I could intervene to conduct a focus group. I approached individuals for interviews. Some of these interviews were interrupted by other marching boys. I gained recorded 'conversations', as well as individual interviews.

I aimed to conduct several focus groups. Being involved in group meetings was useful, however, I wanted to have more control over the facilitation and topics of the meetings. This was one of the reasons I chose to use the method of focus groups.

Focus groups

The use of the focus group can be traced back to the early 1940s. Since then it has been used infrequently in the social sciences. The earliest published work was by a group led by Robert Merton (Merton and Kendall 1946; Merton et al. 1956) who used focus groups to examine the persuasiveness of wartime propaganda efforts. I referred to three sociology publications to define my particular use of this method (Morgan 1988; Morgan and Spanish 1984; and Krueger 1988). All suggest the use of a facilitator (usually, but not always the researcher) and a small number of questions running from general to specific, to initiate a discussion. Geographers Jacqueline Burgess, Melanie Limb and Carolyn Harrison (1988a, 1988b) have used the small group method for qualitative empirical research. They explored environmental values by conducting in-depth small group sessions. Their method and interpretation included the use of group-analytic psychotherapy.

Recently, Longhurst (1993, 1996b) has also appropriated the focus group method for doctoral research on the geographical experiences of pregnant
women in Hamilton, New Zealand. *Area* (1996) published a collection of articles which reflect on the possibilities and limitations of the focus group method for geographers. The group of articles illustrate that the method of focus groups is extremely flexible.

Focus groups have been used more extensively in marketing research than in social science research. The Betty Crocker company used focus group research in marketing its dried cake mix. A group of women (all housewives) were brought together to give their opinions on the 'add water and bake', product available in the box. Their discussion revealed a 'sense of something missing'.

She [a focus group participant] didn't feel as if she was nourishing her family - there is no goodness in water ... Therefore when the mix was marketed Betty Crocker left out the dried egg component and allowed women to add their own good and nourishing egg as well as water (Macdonald 1992, 11).

This example of a focus group used for consumer marketing research highlights the interactive process of participants. When a 'group' with some commonality is brought together, the semi-structured discussion between participants provides interactive material for analysis.

My focus groups were already pre-formed as HERO Parade entries. The groups had clear objectives for their parade floats and the impact they wished to make in the parade, and already had a commonality and shared motivation.

I conducted two focus groups. The first one was with the TransPride, a float representing transgenders, and the second one was with Rainbow Youth, a gay youth group. Both were conducted in the workshop area. TransPride actually downed tools from their float making to have a break and talk with me. The focus group consisted of five people. They responded very positively to my request for a group interview. Rainbow
Youth also responded positively to my request for an interview. They continued to paint their banner as we talked together. There were five people involved in this interview.

I approached Te Waka Awhina Takataapui, a gay Māori group, twice but was unsuccessful in gaining an interview. I talked to the person who was directing the float and left my introductory letter which explained my research intentions with him. I also set up a time for a focus group with Lassoo, the lesbian parade entry. Only one person, however, appeared in the workshop to construct their float. My interview was not prioritised over her other duties (such as paid work, child care and so forth).

The language of each focus group had a particular meaning for the participants. The following dialogue from the TransPride focus group highlights some hegemonic discourses surrounding transgendered people. Using a focus group interview in this instance was beneficial. Their discussions on each topic I raised were lengthy. For example, I asked the TransPride group about the theme of their float. This question prompted a discussion of notions of femininity. The group discussed their float decorations, which lead to a discussion and critique of concepts of transgendered people:

Aroha: And there is an awful lot of talent within the transgendered community. Especially the transsexuals, they tend to know how to sew and all the essentials of costume making.

Janet: Because they keep a home, and keep a man happy and look after kids and all these sorts of things.

Aroha: It’s probably because we try that little bit harder, don’t we?

Janet: We have learnt that as an illusion for so long now that it’s true.

Aroha: And we uphold the mystique of woman which a lot of people don’t have any more (focus group, 15 February 1996).
Janet has the support of Aroha when she confirms some hegemonic notions of femininity. Another important aspect to recognise from this interaction is that it was initiated after I had finished my specific questions (see Appendix D). Patricia Maguire (1987, 103) states that by making “research participants visible to each other” the people can validate each others experiences and problem-solve together. The above example shows that the group dynamics were such that further discussion arose on a topic that I had not thought to ask about.

There are advantages and potential disadvantages in the use of the focus group method. One of the advantages is that it allowed the participants’ attitudes to emerge. Interpretation of the discussion arising from this focus group shows the sometimes contradictory language and attitudes of the participants. The focus group discussion took place in the workshop. The advantage of this was that it allowed those taking part to feel relaxed. It was uncomplicated because I did not need to gather the groups together in other locations.

Despite these advantages, I was hesitant to use focus groups because of the possibility of some ‘uncomfortable’ group dynamics. What if there were interpersonal tensions currently running through the groups? This anxiety proved unfounded. A supportive and encouraging response amongst the participants was apparent.

My role may have imposed limitations on each group member’s interaction. One strategy for avoiding this potential problem would be for the group to facilitate and record their own discussion after being given the initial guidelines. I preferred, however, to play the role of the facilitator in this instance, as I wanted to observe all the different aspects of the method.
The focus group data, together with the semi-structured in-depth interviews, and notes from participant observation in the shared workshop area, combined to provide a rich source of material. I also needed to obtain data from those people who attended the parade at the roadside. I decided the best way to gain information from the tourists on the night of the parade was to conduct a questionnaire.

Questionnaire

In this research I argue that tourism studies is masculinist and tends to render watching tourists as disembodied gazers. I faced the challenge of trying to upset this representation of tourists. My pilot study at the Coming Out Day Parade had already alerted me to the difficulties of gathering data during a parade. Therefore, I decided to use a very short qualitative questionnaire (see Appendix E). The questionnaire contained three open questions, followed by some profile or identity questions. The first question was: Do you think this is a tourist event? Yes/No? Why? This question was designed to prompt the respondent into thinking about the parade in the context of being a major tourist attraction. My second question was: What do you think the parade does for Auckland's image? This question was designed to contextualise the event within the city. The third question was: Why have you come to the parade tonight? These questions were purposely broad and left room for immediate responses.

Profile questions were important to embody the respondents. I did not want to continue the masculinist tradition of disembodied tourist gazers, rather, I was interested in the respondent's subjectivity and how that may impact on their reactions to the parades. In my analysis I wanted to establish some connections and/or contradictions between the answers to the first three questions and the age, sex, ethnicity, occupation and
sexuality of each respondent. A tick-the-box system was used for ease of answering, however, I left the sexuality question open (with the following list to choose from: heterosexual, bisexual, gay male, lesbian, transgendered). One hundred and eighteen questionnaires were completed during the hour and a half before the parade began. I had three pairs of 'helpers' distributing questionnaires as well as myself. I preferred 'pairs' to individuals for safety reasons. I felt that there may be some danger in approaching people at a parade, especially if those approached were drinking alcohol and/or taking drugs. (I discuss an example of this in the next paragraph on the Sydney Mardi Gras.) People were approached, told about my doctoral research, and then asked if they would be willing to fill in a questionnaire. This approach worked extremely well when talking to groups of people. Up to six or seven questionnaires could be distributed in one group. The respondents completed the form then handed them back after two to four minutes.

I also employed this method at the Sydney Mardi Gras on the 3 March 1996. I adjusted my questionnaire so that it reflected questions on and about the Mardi Gras and Sydney (see Appendix F), but the concepts were the same as for the HERO questionnaire. My partner agreed to help me distribute questionnaires before the parade began. She had, however, an unsafe experience with the first man she approached. The man was either under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs. We decided that she would follow me as I distributed the questionnaires. Twenty six questionnaires were completed in the two hours before the parade began. The huge crowd (approximately 650,000 people) meant that moving around to distribute questionnaires was very difficult. We decided to prioritise obtaining a good standing position to view the parade from, rather than
continue eliciting responses. Squashed against the barriers, I then took photographs of parade entries.

**Text collection**

Since beginning this research I have been collecting newspaper texts which directly address the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras. These texts take the form of articles, pictures, illustrations, comic strips and letters to editors. I pasted each text item onto A4 paper and completely filled a large ring binder. The majority of texts are published in *express: new zealand’s newspaper of gay expression*, previously known as *Man To Man: New Zealand’s National Gay Community Newspaper*. I also obtained gay travel and tourism brochures and advertising from travel agents in Auckland. Information from internet sites which target gay tourism and travel provided other texts for analysis.

Videos, such as my own recordings of the Coming Out Day Parade and the 1996 HERO Parade have provided data. In 1997 national television in Aotearoa/New Zealand began televising the HERO Parade. This gave me the opportunity to analyse professional video recordings of the parades. Other videos I have drawn on are 1995 and 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras productions from the ABC.

Throughout this research I made extensive use of photography. Using my own camera at the parades and at the HERO workshop provided another (visual) way to represent the research. Mike Crang (1997, 359-373), drawing on work from Rose (1992), has provided some insight into the uses of photography and video recording by social scientists and tourists. He suggests that:

> if geography is to move to look at the ways observation and technologies of seeing are embedded, reflexive social practices, then it seems that these approaches [of film]
offer some steps forward (Chalfren 1987; Cook and Crang 1995). What needs to be ensured is that this works to embed a popular practice of seeing in time and space and does not resurrect some surveillant academic gaze floating over social science (Crang 1996, 370).

I have covered all the areas of my data collection and have commented throughout on my own and the participants’ experiences of some of the power relations involved in the research process. I have attempted to ‘situate myself’ in each method of data collection and offer an embodied and partial experience of the research process. I now discuss the processes used in analysing this data.

DATA ANALYSIS

The methods I used to analyse my data followed the framework of Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman (1994, 10) who suggest that there are three components of data analysis: data reduction, data displays and conclusion drawing and verification. I shall explain each of these steps separately and relate them to my qualitative data.24

Data reduction

The process of data reduction began with the onset of the research project. Miles and Huberman (1994, 10) state that:

\[
\text{data reduction occurs continuously throughout the life of any qualitative oriented project. Even before the data are actually collected ... anticipatory data reduction is occurring as the researcher decides (often without full awareness) which conceptual framework, which cases, which research questions, and which data collection approaches to choose.}
\]

\[24\] The majority of data that I collected and analysed were qualitative. The data generated from the parade questionnaires, however, required some quantitative analysis. I do not discuss quantitative analysis since only basic counting operations were used.
Before my project began I had anticipated I would gather the bulk of my data from the Sydney Mardi Gras. This decision was based on a doctoral scholarship offer by an Australian university. Part of my decision to undertake the research in Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and forgo the Australian scholarship, was that I was already familiar with the HERO Parade and some gay communities and queer politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The HERO parades I gathered data from were much smaller than the Sydney Mardi Gras and hence, my focus was on gaining smaller, but in-depth, data units at the HERO parades.

I also reduced data during collection. For example, I was prepared to take photographs at each parade I attended. At the 1998 HERO Parade it poured with rain. I decided not to take photographs of the paraders or tourists, as I anticipated the images would not be clear enough for reproduction in the thesis.

Video recording was another method of data gathering that I reduced. I had intended to use video recording at each parade, but the bulk of the equipment and the immobility imposed by being a tourist and not a parader meant that it was impossible to continue recording each parade. I relied, instead, on the professionally produced televised texts.

I tried to anticipate the data I would collect before I began the collection. This was particularly pertinent for my interviews. I did not end up with 'unnecessary' data and I transcribed the interviews and focus groups in full. At the end of each transcription I summarised the dialogue and attempted to identify any patterns and any disjunctions that were emerging.

I did not fully transcribe my video recordings, or the television recordings of the parades, or the videos I purchased from ABC. Rather, when I
watched the videos I made notes on particular scenes that I wanted to view again. For example, the theme on gay men’s sexual specificity emerged from watching the videos and I returned to view the various marching boys’ in each video. I then transcribed the exact section I wanted to use in writing up the research.

I made extensive participant observation notes, both in the form of relying what ‘actually’ happened (in the workshop, at the parades) and in the form of my reaction to these notes. This is also a method of data reduction and analysing. By being reflexive on my own participant observation notes I was also establishing data patterns. Reducing, summarising and analysing events produced themes and patterns from the data.

Data displays

Miles and Huberman (1994, 11) define display as “an organised, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action.” I had multiple sets of data and I displayed them in various ways.

I had approximately 60 pages of hand written participant observation notes and 200 pages of ‘typed’ transcripts from interviews and focus groups. I also had radio and television interview transcripts, which the HERO Project Director had given to me, along with copies of HERO project correspondence. It is not unusual to have such “extended text” (Miles and Huberman 1994, 11) as the display for qualitative data. I chose to transcribe the interviews myself, rather than employ a person, as analysis of the data occurs during this process.

After I had transcribed the interviews and focus groups I listened to the tapes for a second time whilst reading the transcription. This enabled me
to make corrections to the original transcript. After I had made changes I printed the transcripts and placed them in a ring binder. Each interview was separated with cardboard dividers. By displaying the interview data in one large ring binder I could read the interviews individually and sometimes collectively. For instance, if I suspected a pattern to be emerging from one participant I could easily move to another transcript to identify whether the same pattern emerged for another participant. This was the case for many participant’s reactions to Auckland’s City Councillors stance on the HERO Parade being held in Queen Street, the central business district (CBD) of Auckland. This theme emerged strongly in other data I had obtained from the HERO Project.

The radio and television transcripts and HERO Project correspondence I displayed in another large ring binder. I was able to regroup the transcripts into the patterns that emerged from my interview transcripts, and vice versa.

These transcripts and participation notes represented the bulk of my data. I also analysed other forms of qualitative data. I compiled another large ring binder of newspaper clipping and magazine articles. The bulk of this data, articles, letters to the editor, photographs and cartoons, were from express. I returned to the newspaper clippings repeatedly and these became the foundation for Chapter 4 where I argue that the debate over the siting of the HERO Parade is contingent on dualistic constructions of straight/gay, public/private and mind/body.

I displayed my questionnaires in a ring binder. Initially, I had intentions to use a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), such as NUD•IST (Non-numerical, Unstructured Data. Indexing, Searching and Theorising). I loaded the 1996 HERO Parade questionnaire
data into the programme but then decided against pursuing this form of data analysis. This decision was based partly on the relatively small number of questionnaires and the diverse forms of other data that I had collected and with which I was already familiar with. Although NUD*IST is capable of tracking off-line records, the cost-benefit analysis, in terms of my time, made the costs of learning a new technology interface outweigh the potential benefits.

Robin Peace (1998, 382-385) provided critical insights through her reflection on using CAQDAS/NUD*IST. In a postmodern critique of the method, she claimed: “there is a binary juxtaposition between heterodox and orthodox tendencies in qualitative research ... [and] that CAQDAS systems, such as NUD*IST, represent an impetus towards that orthodoxy.”

Conclusion drawing and verification

Reaching conclusions and verifications in qualitative research tends to happen from the onset of data collection. Miles and Huberman (1994, 11) claim:

what things mean - is noting regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows, and propositions. The competent researcher holds these conclusions lightly, maintaining openness and scepticism, but the conclusions are still there, inchoate and vague at first, then increasingly explicit and grounded.

In this research I was wary of asserting grounded ‘truths’ through ‘orthodox’ modern methods of analysis. I did, however, wish to draw themes and patterns from the data in order to substantiate my research objectives. These themes were ‘verified’ when I searched my data for particular phrases and key words.
My search, for instance, for repeated words used during the debate over the 1994 and 1995 HERO Parade site, and its subsequent relocation, revealed a number of themes. The themes I thought were emerging were: 1) queer bodies were not ‘appropriate’ bodies to inhabit the CBD of Auckland; 2) queer bodies were frequently represented as deviant and dangerous bodies; and 3) gay neighbourhoods are the ‘appropriate’ places for gay pride parades. I searched for words and phrases such as public, private, heroes, main street, appropriate, inappropriate, sexual displays, and nudity.

In my analysis of questionnaires, I spent many hours rereading particular answers to questions and began lists of the same words and phrases that kept occurring. For example, words such as tolerant, liberal, and open-minded appeared to be used frequently by heterosexually identified tourists. I tried looking for words such as celebration, pride, and protest but they did not feature in questionnaires completed by heterosexual tourists. These words were common, however, in the responses of gay men, lesbians and bisexual tourists.

In summary, my methods of data collection, reduction, displays, conclusion drawing and verification, followed Miles and Hubermans’ (1994) framework. I also attempted to retain the integrity of my research participants while engaging in my own reading of their narratives. Isabel Dyck (1993, 56) claims that: “the end result of interpretive analysis is a presentation of the researcher’s conceptualisations, which, at the same time, retains the logic of the subjects’ lives and maintains their views.”

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have outlined my methods of data collecting - participant observations, individual semi-structured interviews, focus groups,
questionnaire, and a focus on other textual data - and I have described my method of data analysis. I have argued that the lack of critical reflection on research processes in tourism studies and geography adds to the masculinisation of knowledge. My aim is to challenge this masculinisation of knowledge by offering an embodied account of the research process. Disembodied objectivity has been dominant within the discourses of geography and in tourism studies. Since I am both the researcher and researched, I have been explicit about my positioning. Haraway (1991, 190) argues against various forms of unlocatable, and irresponsible, knowledge claims and she suggests the researcher “situate her knowledges.”

I have found qualitative research in the context of feminist and poststructuralist analysis enables a move away from the universalising ideal of research which seeks a single truth. I have also attempted to situate myself in the research process. My sexuality was (eventually) known at the parade workshop and hence I was studying a world of which I am part, with all the emotional involvement and subjectivity that this creates. The environment of the parade workshop, however, was completely new to me. I had previously been involved in organising all women, and all lesbian events, but had never been part of a production with, and for, gay men and transgendered people. This ‘queer environment’ is often idealised as the ultimate place where ‘any sexuality goes’. My experience shows there are still hierarchical power relations present in ‘queer space’. I was both insider and outsider.

I have discussed the powers at work in the researcher's roles through which ‘difference’ (sexual, racial, age and so on) is constructed. As the observer I became caught up in, and constituted by, a set of power
relations which produced discursive constructs of gendered/sexed and sexualised embodiment.

The sexualised subjects of gay pride parades - HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras - are the topic the next chapter. I focus on the bodies involved in the parades as they are constructed through the places of the parades.
Most tourist sites rely on visually spectacular distinctions which demarcate them as extraordinary places. In this chapter I focus on the ways tourist sites are constructed through embodied presence. The site of the HERO Parade and the site of the Sydney Mardi Gras are not just urban streets, they are streets which derive their tourist meaning from the gay bodies that parade them. It has been argued that spectacular tourist sites are those which “interfere with ordinary collective life-routines by focusing consciousness on a documented external event” (Rojek 1997, 64). The use of idea of ‘ordinary’ and ‘everyday’ is commonly and unproblematically used in literature on tourist events. This taken-for-granted notion of the ‘everyday’ obscures the hegemonic investments in ‘everyday’ meanings. In my research on gay pride parades, I identify that the ‘everyday’ is socially constructed heterosexuality. Gay pride parades attempt to construct, spatially and temporally, an attractive and unique performance in opposition to the ‘everyday’, heteronormative spaces of city streets.

My objectives for this chapter are as follows. First, under the heading Tourist Sites, I document the ways some tourism studies’ academics have identified tourist sites. I focus on particular tourist studies literature that
may provide an entry into understanding the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras as tourist sites.

Second, I examine the sites of gay pride parades and argue that they are tourist sites which ‘queer’ the streets. In my argument sexualising the streets, I focus on the contestatory politics of ‘queer’ bodies in ‘straight’ streets. I establish that these spatial and body politics produce and reinforce a dichotomous relationship between ‘gay’ bodies on parade and gazing ‘straight’ tourists. To conclude this section, I identify the extent to which the Auckland HERO Parade is included in the international gay tourist circuits.

Third, I outline debates about the site of the HERO Parade in Auckland. I argue that gay bodies on parade are perceived to be inappropriate bodies to inhabit public places such as the CBD of Auckland. Queen Street, the main business street of Auckland, is analogous to the ‘mind’: the site of rational decision making. The subsequent shift of the parade site to Ponsonby (see Figure 1.2), a ‘gay’ suburb of Auckland, reinscribes both the site and the bodies as private and queer. Ponsonby Road is analogous to the ‘body’: the site of consumption, appetite, desire and domestic repose.

The HERO Project employs marketing strategies to create a local gay environment and a local gay identity. The debate over the site of the HERO Parade demonstrates the hegemonic representations of particular streets and particular bodies in Auckland. Hence, ironically, my argument rests on the dichotomous relationships between public/private and heterosexual/homosexual, at the same time that I problematise these dichotomies.

Finally, I focus on the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade site. Sydney’s parade is held along a well-defined and visible gay (male) commercial and
residential district in and around Oxford Street (see Figure 4.1). This site may be read as already transgressive of the unarticulated ‘everyday’ norms of heterosexuality in the streets of Sydney, but may also be read as reconfirming gay bodies as private and belonging to the (already) queer streets. Such bodies are not to be trusted in ‘public-heterosexual’ streets that are away from the parade site.

Throughout this chapter I account for the way in which the construction of tourist sites reflects and reinforces various hegemonic power relations. By examining the HERO Parade site and the Sydney Mardi Gras site I highlight the powerful ways in which these specific sites reflect particular and partial western discourses of embodiment and place. In the tourism literature there has been some identification of tourist sites as constructed places. There is a tendency, however, to concentrate on the economic constructions of tourist sites. Such a perspective privileges discourses of masculinist rationality, and consequently under-emphasises the idea that tourist sites are not so much ‘rational’ places as ‘body’ places.

TOURIST SITES

There are distinct places, and means of organising places, associated with tourist sites. “Certain places and sites (with their landscapes, social practices, buildings, residents, symbols and meaning) achieve the status of tourist sights because of their physical, social, cultural - and commercial - attributes” (Britton 1991, 462). There are clear links between the physical, social, cultural and commercial attributes at gay pride parade tourist sites. Steve Britton’s (1991) focus, however, does not discuss the ‘physical’ bodies of such tourist sites. Nor does he give attention to the political ways tourist sites become gendered/sexed and sexualised.
Figure 4.1 The Sydney Mardi Gras Map

Source: Gay Maps Australia
Tourism studies’ academics rarely discuss the ways gender and place are mutually constituted. Tim Edensor and Uma Kothari (1994) are an exception. They studied the place packaging of heritage attractions at Stirling, Scotland. They focused on the Bannockburn Heritage Centre, the Wallace Monument, and the Regimental Museum of the Argyll, and Sutherland Highlanders at Stirling Castle. They confirmed that these tourist sites: “articulate masculinised notions of place and identity, and male dominated versions of the past which privilege white, male, heterosexual experience and activity” (Edensor and Kothari 1994, 65). Edensor and Kothari (1994) provide some insight into the particular material and representational practices and processes which influence the construction of the tourist sites. This applies as much to the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade as tourist sites, as to material castles. For example, the advertising of the pride parades focuses on the sexualisation of place (see the explicitly sexualised map and guide of the activities and parade route for the Sydney Mardi Gras, Figure 4.1). Edensor and Kothari (1994, 165) argue that, through the advertising of place-images and the generation of symbolic metaphors, representational practices continually “(re)inforce, (re)configure and (re)present local identities.” Edensor and Kothari (1994) are referring to the local identities of the hosts and their representation in tourist site advertising.

In other words, both the representations and material ‘reality’ of the gendered/sexed and sexualised hosts’ bodies and place are central to the construction of HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras as tourist sites. I come back to this point later in this chapter.

Building on Edensor and Kothari’s (1994, 165) argument, I claim that “local identities” and the parade site are mutually constituted through the embodied representations and ‘realities’ of the parade. The economic
significance of tourism is also associated with particular representations of the HERO Parade. Economic practices include the investment of capital into the tourist site and infrastructure of Ponsonby Road. Alcohol companies, restaurants and retail businesses target both the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras sites and help reconstruct these places through their advertising. Some alcohol companies build their campaigns around political issues of gay and lesbian identities. For example, two ‘beverage’ billboards feature photographs of an ‘everyday’ looking baby girl and boy accompanied by the slogans: “Filthy Faggot: Your son might be gay. Don’t discriminate” and “Dirty Dyke: Your daughter may be gay. Don’t discriminate” (see Figure 4.2). A complex interweaving of politics, bodies, ‘everyday’ representations, consumption and economics establishes the parade routes as tourist sites.

In the next section I focus on the ‘queering’ of the streets through gay pride parades. While bearing in mind the various stances of tourism studies’ literature on the production of tourism sites, I look for evidence that the Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand and the Sydney, Australian pride parades do provide purchase for some of these perspectives on tourism sites. Such spectacles become sexualised tourist sites because they attract large numbers of people (a break in their ‘ordinary’ and ‘everyday’ life routine) to watch an extraordinary performance in the streets of cities.

QUEERING THE STREETS

Gay pride parades do not simply (and uncontestedly) inscribe streets as queer, they actively produce queer streets (Bell and Valentine 1995). Parades can be read as deconstructive spatial tactics, a queering of the street. Nancy Duncan (1996, 139) states: “Gay Pride parades, public protests,
Figure 4.2 Billboard campaign for Powerdrinks

Source: Metro (Crawshaw 1998, 32).
performance art and street theatre as well as overtly homosexual behaviour such as kissing in public” upset unarticulated norms. According to Sally Munt (1995, 124, emphasis in original, cited in Duncan 1996), such behaviours produce a “politics of dislocation”. Duncan (1996) believes that lesbian and gay practices - if they are made explicit - have the potential to denaturalise the heterosexuality of public places. The spatial tactics of gay pride parades are also “crisis points in the normal functioning of ‘everyday’ experiences” (Cresswell 1996, cited in Duncan 1996, 139). Normative heterosexual geographies become explicit only when homosexual geographies become explicit. Gill Valentine (1996, 152) argues that: “Pride marches also achieve much more than just visibility, they also challenge the production of everyday spaces as heterosexual.”

The queered streets of HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras also become recognised as (domestic and international) sites of gay and lesbian tourism. The focus on queer or gay and lesbian tourism has received scant attention in geography (although see Bravmann 1994; Binnie 1995). Bravmann (1994) discusses the places of Lesbos and Greece in gay and lesbian tourism imaginations, while Binnie (1995) examines the importance of Amsterdam as a gay mecca for international gay tourists. In this section, I run two arguments that are inextricably linked. I argue that not only do HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades queer the streets, but also these parades are actively produced and consumed as tourist sites. The _queerer_ the streets the more popular the tourist attraction for gays, lesbians, but also, and more significantly, for heterosexual tourists.

Discussions of the vitality and controversy of pride parades do not usually highlight the fact that such controversial displays in public space attract heterosexual tourists. Some, for example, David Bell and Gill Valentine
(1995) and Kim Namastes' (1992) accounts of the Montreal parade record the disruptive potential of the parade and implicitly endorse their role as spectacles.

**Queering streets in Montreal**

Bell and Valentine (1995) refer to queer activism at the Montreal gay pride parade. Bell and Valentine (1995) provide an example of ambiguous and ironic relationships between gay pride parades and hegemonic culture, claiming it is possible to read the 1991 and 1992 Montreal Pride parades to "illustrate a number of contemporary debates in sexual politics" (Bell and Valentine 1995, 20).

In 1991 Montreal’s queer activists rejected the 'official' route that ran only through the city’s gay district. A march through Montreal’s gay neighbourhoods would have, it was argued, affirmed and empowered Montreal’s sexual dissidents “without being challenging or confrontational to the city’s heteronormative culture” (Bell and Valentine 1995, 18). Queer activists from Queer Nation (QN) and ACT UP\(^{25}\) chose to march through downtown Montreal.

The following year also attracted alternative actions of pride marches by queer activists. In 1992, the Montreal parade organising committee set rules and regulations for the queer bodies in the parade, stipulating that:

> there is to be no cross-dressing, no exposure of breasts or buttocks, no displays deemed too ‘vulgar’ or ‘erotic’ and no flags ... As if the outlawing of extravagant fashion weren’t enough, it was suggested that the preferred attire

\(^{25}\) ACT UP was a New York gay activist organisation and was created in 1987. ACT UP staged demonstrations and created civil disobedience, for example, they blocked rush hour traffic in Wall Street, New York City. ACT UP inspired the creation of Queer Nation (QN) in 1990. Both organisations are not currently active, however, see: http://welcomehome.org/rainbow/lists.html (Lavine 1995).
Reactions to the organisers’ rules and regulations were dramatic. “Across the city, sewing machines ran all night and stores ran out of sequins, fishnet and eye liner . . . Montreal’s sexual outlaws and perverts dressed to kill” (Bell and Valentine 1995, 14-15). There was also a mobilisation around QN’s famous slogan “If you’re in clothes, you’re in drag” (Bell and Valentine 1995, 15). As a consequence “irreverent combinations of identities proliferated, included fags posing as dykes, dykes dressed as clone fags, and bisexuals pretending to be fags pretending to be lipstick lesbians” (Namaste 1992, 9, cited in Bell and Valentine 1995, 15). Drag queens provided homoerotic entertainment for tourists, against the wishes of the organisers.

This contradiction - that drag is simultaneously disavowed and permitted - is perhaps best understood in terms of its situation and context. That is, drag queens are permitted in certain spaces, among certain people, at certain times . . . [The parade organisers] want their type of drag, in the spaces they designate . . . Clearly, the activist focus on the idea that drag is everywhere threatens precisely the border, boundaries and limits [of acceptability] (Namaste 1992, 9, cited in Bell and Valentine 1995, 15).

I have detailed this Montreal example because it provides opportunities to highlight the processes of power and control at work in Auckland’s HERO Parade site and the Sydney Mardi Gras site. These parades all have similar elements of border, boundaries and limits which are, however, specific to each parade site.

The notion that queering the streets upsets heteronormative behaviour is both a convincing and a disturbing argument for situating the politics of gay pride parades for tourists. Activities that upset the ‘everyday’ or the ‘ordinary’ have the potential to become spectacles. People seek out the
queerness - the extraordinariness - of the parades, to gaze at the queer bodies and to confirm the queer presence of the parade participants through the act of watching them. This production of paraders and tourists has the potential to upset the ‘ordinary’ and ‘everyday’ notions of public spaces. The focus on the ‘ordinary’ and ‘everyday’ has not been attended to in tourism studies.

Gay pride parades are not just spectacles, however, they reassert mind/body and heterosexual/homosexual dichotomies in both public and private spaces. Gay bodies on (public) parade are discursively and materially constructed as deviant, and hence, create the space for parades to become tourist events. I return to this irony later in the chapter.

Heterosexual tourists’ participation in the parades not only successfully Others the gay pride paraders, but calls the borders of corporeal acceptability into question. This is the subject of the next section. I turn my focus towards the construction of the HERO Parade and the public debate that ensued over the specific place and bodies of the parade in Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Look who’s watching

Parades which ‘queer’ the streets and the city attract more ‘heterosexual’ tourists than ‘gay’ tourists. Bell and Valentine (1995, 26, emphasis in original) claim:

It seems that the construction of Pride marches for a straight [tourist] spectator audience is becoming a very important issue for marches in the US and, judging by some footage of Mardi Gras shown on British TV recently, in Australia too (look at who’s watching the parade).

---

26 Bell and Valentine (1995, 26).
The inaugural HERO Parade was held on Queen Street, in the ‘heart’ of Auckland’s CBD, on the night of 19 February 1994. The timing was important because it was less than one year after human rights legislation was passed in Aotearoa/New Zealand which made it illegal to discriminate against homosexuals (Gearing 1997). It could be argued that the HERO Parade began as a sort of protest and celebration of the human rights legislation, but the parade has developed over several years in a way that it now has multiple and competing meanings.

I asked the Director of the HERO Project to explain the differences between the HERO Parade and other gay pride parades. First, he responded that: “HERO came out of HIV promotion and health programmes” (individual interview, 22 September 1995). I replied:

Lynda: Right. I have been surfing through the internet looking up all the pride parades in the world and a lot of them do focus on protest to mark the Stonewall riots, but it seems to give them quite a specific focus.

Project Director: It does. I mean London Pride is all about walking on the streets and blowing whistles, it’s a, it’s just a protest, protest slash pride statement. And I think the emphasis is more on protest than on pride. I went on the Washington [District of Columbia, U.S.A] march and that was just about protest and pride. There is very little about performance when Mardi Gras and HERO parades is a lot about performance.

Lynda: Yeah.

Project Director: Being out there, if you want to be out there, or what ever, uh, and there is very little, actually there is very little about protest in our parade (individual interview, 22 September 1995).

Previous to the 1986 Homosexual Law Reform Act homosexuality was illegal in Aotearoa/New Zealand and punishable by up to two years’ imprisonment. In 1993, amendments were made to the Human Rights Bill. The Bill, which was passed as a whole in 28th July 1993, brought together all existing laws against discrimination and added new grounds for protection against discrimination in the areas of sexuality, disability, age, political opinion, employment status and family status (http://nz.com/NZ/Government/GayLaw.html) (20 May 1998).
Ideas around performance, HIV health promotion and entertainment are more favoured by the HERO project than ideas about a march of protest for gay rights and arguably this is true for the Sydney Mardi Gras. The constructions of the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras are culturally distinct from parades held in the northern hemisphere. The most obvious difference is the attention and regulation of parade entries (see Appendix C for a list of 1996 HERO Parade entries) to ensure that the parade is a tourist centred event and that tourists will have a spectacular night of entertainment.

The focus of the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade is on performance and the audience is, for the most part, the heterosexual public who are understood to be tourist spectators. The HERO Parade has become an extremely popular event and attracts many tourists. The New Zealand Herald (Moore 1996a, 3) reported that “Police estimated up to 200,000 onlookers packed both sides of the street ... double the number who watched last year’s Queen St parade.” HERO, according to the HERO Project Director, has always been constructed for the 'straight' tourist spectator.

Project Director: Well the parade is basically put on for the straight community when it comes down to it. Like a hundred thousand people there, I don't know, 5000 would be gay?

Lynda: Mmm.

Project Director: Ten thousand? So you are talking about 80, 90 percent of the spectators being straight, and that's just great. I think that it's very good, cos it's about this sort of thing ... It's about saying 'come along, this is who we are', in a performance sense, there is a little bit of a trick in that, a lot of people will think (/ /)

Lynda: [Is it] real?

Project Director: Yeah, people in parades don't look like that during the day (Yeah). Um, but it is performance for them
and we enjoy doing it. Like, I was in the parade, in the Marching Boys, and it’s just really great fun. The fun was like all the rehearsals with my gay friends. And then going out and performing in front of nearly, about 100,000 people. It’s a performance (Yeah) ... Ah, so it’s for straights and that’s fine. I don’t think we should have a problem with that at all. We should encourage it (individual interview, 22 September 1995, emphasis in original).

The encouragement ensures a queer spectacle that straight tourists will want to watch from the street-side. The dominance of the heterosexual gaze became obvious from my completed questionnaires. From the 114 random questionnaires that elicited a response to the question on sexuality, on the night of the 1996 HERO Parade, 90 (76 percent) people identified themselves as heterosexual.28

Another indicator of the construction of HERO for the ‘straight’ public is that in 1997 and 1998 the full parade was presented in ‘prime-time’ on national television. The HERO Parade as public ‘product’ is now sold to television production companies and can be purchased as a video cassette. The Sydney Mardi Gras is also televised in Australia and marketed in video cassette form. Such products are advertised as tourist souvenirs in Sydney, along with tee shirts, tea towels, key rings and so forth.

International events

It would be erroneous of me to focus solely on a straight/gay, tourist/host binary. There are a number of international (and some domestic) gay tourists who come to Auckland for the HERO Parade and associated activities such as the HERO Party and Festival. The Director of the HERO Project ‘sells’ HERO on an international scale:

28 Of the remaining responses: 18 (15 percent) identified as gay male, 3 (2.5 percent) identified as lesbian, 3 (2.5) percent identified as bisexual and 4 (3 percent) did not specify their sexuality.
Project Director: We’ve definitely, I’m definitely selling the project. (Yeah) But I’m not altering the project to accommodate any product for tourism.

Lynda: Right.

Project Director: You know, but the product, mainly the festival and parade and party, and I’m going out and selling that. And we are doing quite a bit of that. I’m working with a company called ‘Men on Vacation’ which is the biggest wholesale in California. It’s gay men travel ... They wholesale about 500 people to Mardi Gras. But we are working with them. And I have managed to get a full page in the Out magazine, which is a commercial ... and it will have information on HERO. So we are promoting it in a sense.

Lynda: Right.

Project Director: And HERO is tied in two weeks always before Mardi Gras, so they are combined (individual interview, 22 September 1995).

The international tour company, Men on Vacation, advertises tours from the United States to New Zealand and Australia which take in both the HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras celebrations. For example, their web site (http://www.electriciti.com/tvlexprs/pages/menvac.htm) offers:

New Zealand pre-Mardi Gras Tour: February 15th to 27th
- The Heroes Party and The North & South Island. Join Men On Vacation for our best pre-Mardi Gras tour ever!
We’ll arrive in Auckland, the city of sails, just in time for The Heroes Party, Mardi Gras New Zealand style! After a day to relax, we’ll explore the North Island from the Coromandel Peninsula to Rotorua. We’ll then fly to Queenstown, where many adventures await, and travel up the west coast and over Arthur’s pass to Christchurch. Plan now on joining Men On Vacation.

Men on Vacation is one of many travel agencies that specifically serve gay travellers. Another company that offer tours to Auckland’s HERO and to the Sydney Mardi Gras celebrations is Above and Beyond Tours. They advertise The Wonder Downunder Tour (Above and Beyond 1996, see Figure 4.3). In this advertising, too, the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade is
Figure 4.3 Wonder Downunder Tours

Source: Above and Beyond Tours (1996)
constructed and represented as a tourist event and marketed as part of a tourist package product.

Australia is a land of astonishing scenic beauty and intriguing cultural diversity. Here gay and lesbian communities are vibrant, creative, eclectic. But don't just take our word for it! We invite you to come visit us; to discover the wonder, the pleasures, the sights and the sensations yourself ... Every February, Australia's midsummer, the effervescent mood of Sydney's gay community erupts into a joyous, month-long celebration - the legendary Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras. Billed as the largest gay and lesbian festival in the world, the Mardi Gras is a month of culture and fun. Its climax is a dazzling evening parade through the streets of Sydney (Above and Beyond Tours 1996).

This type of tourist site representation articulates gendered/sexed and sexualised notions of place and identity (Edensor and Kothari 1994). It also has the potential to guide sex tourists from around the globe (Binnie 1995).

An Auckland travel agent, who caters to the gay tourist market, explained that:

There are gay people who spend their life partying and they go to HERO and then they go to Mardi Gras, and then they might go up to something in the States. And that's quite normal to do that, and just party all year. You know, go away and basically go to parties on holiday, but the party is the attraction (individual interview, 24 January 1996).

This tourist operator confirms that the majority of international tourists to HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras would be gay. The majority of domestic tourists, however, are straight, as also explained by the tourist operator:

People will say to you that “no one can put a party on like a poofer.” So, you know, straight people love gay parties. They, they love HERO. And they love Mardi Gras. And
generally most people I would send to Mardi Gras would be gay ... But there are straight people that go over with their gay friends and have a good time over there. A lot of people go over to Mardi Gras to the parade, and the excitement, and the events and the shows, and theatre and everything else associated with it. Um, there are certainly party animals in the straight community who are very attracted to gay parties because they're always well done (individual interview, 24 January 1996, emphasis in original).

Gay pride parades and parties - therefore - have a reputation of 'being well done' or, in other words, well organised, well performed and risqué. Such a reputation reinforces and spectacularises the HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades.

To summarise my discussion so far, gay pride parades have the potential to queer the 'everyday' or 'ordinary' streets of cities. They also tend to be caught up in dominant discourses that construct queer bodies as Other, and parade watchers as tourists. The spectacle of the HERO Parade is constituted through binaries of tourist/host, and straight/gay. Queer tourists watching the parade, however, disrupt the binary between straight/gay and tourist/host and I return to this in the next section which discusses the debate over the site of the HERO Parade and suggest this debate is contingent upon private and public notions of bodies and places.

**PLACING HERO IN MIND/BODY SITES**

The limits to, and possibilities for, contestatory queer politics become evident in the debate over the site of the HERO Parade. There was both support for, and opposition to, the parade being held in Queen Street, in

---

29 Parts of this section of the thesis have been published in Johnston (1997).
Ponsonby Road, or at all. This debate can be understood as contingent on the mind/body dualism.

The specific site of the HERO Parade articulates gendered/sexed and sexualised notions of embodiment. The site of the parade is an important focus of this research as it is the contested and constructed terrain which tourists are drawn to. The site of the HERO Parade both confirms and disrupts mind/body, public/private and tourist/né hosts binaries. Prior to 1996, the HERO parades had been along Queen Street and through the CBD of Auckland. In 1996 the parade was reassigned to Ponsonby Road, a key commercial street in a suburb, which is often described as Auckland’s gay ghetto.

I argue that Queen Street represents the public and straight ‘mind’ of Auckland, while Ponsonby has become Auckland’s private gay ‘body’. I draw on newspaper articles, letters to newspaper editors, radio and television transcripts and interviews to support this claim. The public debate over the HERO Parade site served to reinforce binary and hegemonic representations of bodies as either straight or gay.

**Queen Street**

The first two Queen Street HERO parades of 1994 and 1995 were hotly contested and troubled events. Approximately four hundred people participated in the 1994 parade and the crowd watching the parade was estimated at 100,000 (Gearing 1997). There were only seven floats in the first HERO Parade; they included three drag queen acts, an s/m safe sex float and two lesbian floats (Gearing 1997).
Auckland City Councillor and Deputy Mayor, David Hay (quoted in *Sunday Star Times*, 10 April 1994, A5), described some of the ‘inappropriate’ bodies of the first 1994 Queen Street HERO Parade.

A whole lot of men that had G-strings on and nothing much else, and bare-topped women, and just a lot of sights that I don’t think are suitable for Auckland.

In a television news programme (*Eyewitness News*, 1994) David Hay elaborated on this claim:

Presenter: And so Councillor Hay decided to record the event on his own home video. Councillor, this is a very public place, the middle of Queen Street. Is this what you are objecting to here?

Hay: Yes, I am. Queen Street has always been a place for our parades of our heroes - our Olympic team ... the All Blacks have been up Queen Street, the Whitbread parades up Queen Street ... I don’t think it’s an appropriate place for bare-breasted women and nudity in our Queen Street. I spoke to a number of people that had been offended, had been caught unawares. They weren’t aware that it was on. They’d been to visit the Whitbread boats and, in fact, one couple thought that the parade was for the heroes of the Whitbread yachts.

Of significance here is the appropriation of the word ‘hero’. Heroes are, according to Deputy Major Hay, New Zealand’s international sporting representatives. In particular, New Zealand heroes are from celebrity male sporting events, such as New Zealand’s representative rugby team, the All Blacks, and the New Zealand Whitbread yachting team. These New Zealand heroes are the ‘right’ bodies to parade in Queen Street because they exist in the dominant national imagination as the ‘real’ heroes of New Zealand (see for example Phillips 1996, and James and Saville-Smith 1994, for accounts of hegemonic masculinity and nationalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand). In other words, these sporting ‘heroes’ can be trusted in public places because they do not publicly
identify or perform as homosexual, they are not effeminate or feminised in any way, and they usually remain fully clothed.30

Further complaints against the HERO Parade in Queen Street dominated the letter to editors of Auckland newspapers. One began with “Horrible Heroes” and stated:

I PROTEST at the city council funding [sic] and allowing the ‘Heroes’ parade though our city. Admittedly the law allows for no discrimination regarding colour, race, sex, etc., but until homosexual people were allowed ‘their right’ to ‘come out of the cupboard’ we never had these kinds of brazen sexual parades. They do nothing to restore decent moral standards at a time of excessive violence and crime and for the council to support this activity is deplorable. We are proud to salute our national and sporting heroes in parades up Queen St but it is a travesty of the word ‘hero’ to have a parade of this nature. Are these the sort of ‘heroes’ we want our young New Zealanders to identify with? (Fraser cited in Sunday Star Times, 6 March 1994, 4, capitals in original).

The writer of this letter assumes that the city of Auckland and Queen Street, in particular, belongs, not to homosexuals, but to heterosexuals. He is also offended by the use of the term ‘hero’. Heroes are, once again, referred to as ‘our’ national and sporting heroes. Only these sporting heroes should be allowed to parade in Queen Street, Auckland.

The contradiction, that parades are simultaneously allowed and disavowed, is best understood in terms of public and private. Parades of ‘New Zealand’s Heroes’ are permitted in Auckland’s most public and prominent business centre - Queen Street - when they do not transgress hegemonic notions of sexualised embodiment. A Queen Street HERO Parade is challenged by the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and some other

30 There have been occasions, however, when extremely muscular Aotearoa/New Zealand All Black rugby players have unexpectedly taken their shirts (not pants) off in public to both ‘thrill’ their spectators and raise money for charities (not HIV/AIDS).
Councillors (the ‘city fathers’) because such a parade endorses the acceptance of ‘private’ bodies coming out in public places. Public places, it would seem, are for ‘proper’ heterosexual bodies. In other words, Queen Street can be understood to be Auckland’s sanitised ‘centrepiece’, which promotes a ‘clean’ metropolitan identity. Queer HERO bodies can be understood as ‘dirty’, with the potential to mess-up Queen Street.

An Auckland popular magazine *Metro* (Legat 1994), ran a story entitled ‘Hay Fever’ that neatly summarised the parade site debate. Nicola Legat (1994, 88) reported: “When David Hay speaks of moral outrage, he always begins with a little old lady. Little old ladies, the meek, self-effacing grandmothers of the land, are the guardians of middle New Zealand’s family values.” Hay’s use of the ‘little old lady’ is designed to focus attention on the appropriate, upright, moral corporeality of aged femininity and propriety.

Hay also ran a campaign to remove the HERO festival magazine from libraries in Auckland, so that the delicate sensibilities of “little old ladies and their innocent daughters” would be protected (Legat 1994, 88). Legat (1994, 89) sarcastically wrote that Hay:

> was concerned about what was being paid for with the help of his rates. Men displaying their posteriors in the city’s main street … How ghastly it must have been! How disturbing! But he had to go on filming, and he had to give the tape to Channel 2 [Television] for screening on ‘Eyewitness’ the next week so that all New Zealand should know the depths of depravity to which the Hero parade had sunk.

This debate between the Deputy Mayor and HERO raged for several months. Hay reiterated his stance against the HERO Parade in Queen Street during a national Radio New Zealand interview (Hill 1994a):

> Kim Hill: Let’s be specific. What was it you found offensive?
David Hay: I don’t think it’s appropriate to have women and transvestites with bare breasts in Queen Street. I don’t believe it’s appropriate to have simulated sex in Queen Street on the back of a float … I believe it’s offensive to have bare buttocks walking up and down Queen Street.

This debate also caught the attention of another prominent radio talkshow host, Leighton Smith of Auckland’s 1ZB. Smith discussed his views on the Queen Street HERO Parade:

I believe that most people in this country still find the sort of behaviour that gays get up to abhorrent, undesirable and a number of other adjectives I could use. That’s the way that most people still think and I believe that it’s probably the way most people will always think. However, we have become a tolerant society of any number of attitudes, including this particular one. And the thing about the gay community is this, that having gained a sort of acceptance in society where they can do what they want and they can behave in a manner that they please behind closed doors, they are not satisfied with that. They want to take it further, they want equal rights and in many cases they want extra special rights. Personally I believe David Hay is right. Unfortunately what has happened is this: there is a wedge being driven in society so that those who are of a tolerant nature are being forced to take a stand on issues that they find unacceptable, but some people want to push. That’s the bottom line, unfortunately (Smith 1994).

In this lengthy quotation, Smith identifies that gays and lesbians are ‘abhorrent and undesirable’ and are not the types of bodies to be trusted in public places. This radio host thought gays and lesbians should be behind (private) closed doors (the closet). The universality of Smith’s claim rings hollow when put alongside another comment by Deputy Mayor Hay to a different Auckland 1ZB radio announcer. Hay claimed that he had received many phone calls from outraged citizens in support of his campaign against the HERO Parade in Queen Street. When questioned by another radio host, Paul Holmes, on Auckland’s 1ZB radio station, he admitted to receiving only six calls (Holmes 1994).
Not only did the queer bodies in the parade challenge hegemonic notions of heterosexuality, but also their very presence in the main street of Auckland was a challenge. How did the paraders act in Queen Street? The first HERO Parade did have a couple simulating sex in a large transparent balloon. There were men dressed in leather jock straps which showed their bare buttocks. Men had whips and chains on the ‘Demon’ float which was also the safe sex float. Their banner read: ‘Fuck Safe, Party Hard’ (Legat 1994). These floats were in a minority. Other floats and parade entries included gays and lesbians in Greek attire, The HERO Marching Boys, a Priscilla Queen of the Desert bus, HIV positive groups, Gaily Normal and a float containing ‘lesbian mothers.’

In 1996, at the HERO Parade workshop, I met one of the men from the ‘Demon Float’ and interviewed him about his involvement in the first HERO Parade in Queen Street. Robert said that the ‘Clamp Club’ had organised the Demon Float. Robert and other members of the Clamp Club had not intended to cause such controversy. Their float represented their belief that s/m practices were part of ‘everyday’ and ‘ordinary’ life:

Robert: But we were just representing part of the community that was, you know, basically that way, and we’d been doing, (.) I mean, people had been doing that [s/m] for ages and we just thought it was fine. It was the first parade and nobody knew what to expect, or what sort of reaction they would get from the public, anyway (individual interview, 7 February 1996).

Robert was shocked by the reaction and subsequent national fame he encountered for being part of the Demon float.

Robert: So, we just went about what we normally did for, for the Clamp Club itself (yeah) and the shows we’d normally do. So we told HERO what we were going to do and then all of a sudden David Hay went ape shit.

Lynda: Fantastic.
Robert: And even, even worse than that, I mean, I was, I ended up on television and they put my image on television and stuff like that and I ended up in *Metro* magazine and I kind of thought, well this is a bit [makes a disgusted face]. And I actually saw David Hay there filming everything and I just thought, well this is interesting. Why is this going on?

Lynda: He’s getting evidence?

Robert: I just couldn’t figure it out. I just thought it was a sleazy old man going round with a video camera trying to tape films, you know, so he could go home and masturbate but, um it was um, David Hay just trying to get evidence and saying how disgusting and horrible we were (individual interview, 7 February 1996, emphasis in original).

Robert could not understand the extraordinary reaction to the Demon float. He explained to me what they were wearing and what they were ‘exposing’.

Robert: People were wearing leather G-strings and showing their breasts and stuff. There was no exposure, well yeah, there were bare butts, but there was no exposed genitalia. Why would people say that bare bottoms and bare breasts are not acceptable? They should see the parades overseas. There are a lot more um, sexual parades, especially the heterosexual ones.

Lynda: Like?


According to Robert, it is not the type of behaviour that David Hay and his supporters objected to, rather it was the type of queer body that was objectionable. Sexualised displays and nudity in internationally famous parades are acceptable for ‘the public’ if they are within the realms of ‘heterosexual performances’. Robert’s point about international heterosexual parades might be difficult to sustain in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Much of the general public, city officials, and concerned Christian groups may not have had the opportunity to view highly (hetero)sexualised parades such as the Mardi Gras in New Orleans or the
Rio Carnival in Rio de Janeiro. The kinds of parades that are acceptable in Aotearoa/New Zealand are the sporting heroes, Santa parades, Centennial parades, and seasonal parades such as the winter festival, blossom festival, or romance festival. These festival parades are marketed as ‘family’ events and are listed as tourist events on the Aotearoa/New Zealand Tourism Board’s web site: Passport to New Zealand, New Zealand Arts and Culture Events on-line (New Zealand Tourism Board 1998). What is often the central focus of these parades, however, is the nubile virginal ‘festival queen’ dressed as if for pre-nuptial sacrifice in the white wedding gown. The acceptability of this sexist and heterosexual image is that sex can be imagined to be what happens after the parade.

Legat (1994) attempted to tease out the ‘facts’ of the HERO Parade. She lists that:

- It was adult behaviour
- It took place after 10 at night when children and young people are not in Queen Street
- Anyone who thought they might be offended could choose to avoid it by not being in Queen Street
- You can’t preach safe sex without talking about sex itself
- It was no worse than anything you’d see on television at the same time of night
- They do it at the Sydney Mardi Gras and the local authorities endorse it unreservedly
- It’s an entertainment. It’s meant to be slightly risqué, like the carnivals in Rio and New Orleans (Legat 1994, 94).

Such reflection was not part of the Mayor or Deputy Mayors’ assessment of the parade. For two months after the night of the parade the dispute continued and moved far beyond a discussion of whether or not some of the parade floats (s/m and safe sex performance) were acceptable. The argument centred on the demand, by the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor of Auckland, that gays and lesbians “behave in public according to certain standards” (Legat 1994, 89). Clearly, this desire (and fear) of the Mayor and
Deputy Mayor of Auckland is centred on a public/private dichotomy. Inappropriate bodies and inappropriate bodily behaviour should not be allowed in public, especially not in the main street of Auckland.

A full Council meeting was called to address ‘the public’ objections over the HERO Parade. A demonstration was held outside the City Town Hall during the council meeting. People of Christian faith protested and held placards which asserted: ‘Say no to nudity’. Children were carrying banners that said: ‘We don’t need another Hero’ (Gearing 1997). During the Council meeting, Deputy Mayor, David Hay, provided the video he had personally made of the parade to substantiate his objections.

Legat (1994, 91) claims that:

what was really debated at the April Council meeting was not behaviour at the Hero parade but homosexuality itself. The persistent questions on condoms, on anal sex and on whether or not homosexuality is a choice [as opposed to a biologically given] made that very clear.

Legat (1994) described several of the people and the concerns which they raised the council meeting. The issues centred on the bodies of the gay men. She noted that:

Julian Batchelor of Operation Jerusalem, a cross-denominational evangelist movement ... launched into his testimony: ‘I was there! I saw a group of men in G-strings and bare buttocks looking as though they were inviting penile insertion. I saw men in a plastic dome wearing G-strings and oiled all over, writhing in a suggestive and provocative way’ (Legat 1994, 91).

Behaviour and gay bodies seemed to be inseparable for the protesters against the HERO Parade. “None of this confrontation would be taking place if the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and certain Councillors did not object to homosexuality” argued a gay activist in response to the furore (Legat 1994, 95). Calls by Councillors to homosexuals to ‘clean it up’ for the next 1995
parade, were disingenuous. Deputy Mayor Hay continually returned to his contention that homosexuality is a choice and Julian Batchelor continued to hold placards that read: “Homosexuality is a thing God hates” (Legat 1994, 96).

The Mayor of Auckland also took issue with the HERO Parade. He wrote a letter to the editor of the *Sunday Star Times* (3 April 1994, 3) outlining his stance:

> I am not prepared to personally encourage homosexuality or support homosexuality as a lifestyle as an individual or by the Auckland City Council from city rates. I did support the council resolution to write off $5000 from the costs of city services related to the Hero Festival in recognition of its stated intention to raise funds for AIDS prevention and related works. I do not endorse or accept some of the behaviour I viewed on a video of the parade and I am passing letters I am receiving which contain requests for action on to the police as the only organisation which can appropriately handle specific complaints (Mills cited by Keith 1994, 3).

There were 40 complaints about the Parade made to Auckland City Police. Only two of the complaints had actually attended the parade. “The other 38 had merely read about it, heard about it, or seen a bum or tit or two on the telly. The police will take no further action” (Keith 1994, 3).

Deputy Mayor Hay was interviewed again and claimed he had support for his opposition to the HERO Parade in Queen Street:

> I just got a letter this morning on my desk signed by a family to say, you know, both Thomas and Mark were separately passing through the city centre. They came across the parade and they were both offended by nudity, simulated copulation, etc. on our main street. Now that’s straight from a letter signed by a family and those people are upset, along with thousands of others, over this sort of thing in our street (Hill 1994b).
In this instance, 'family' becomes synonymous with heterosexuality. 'Our' street is again identified as a heterosexual street.

Some 'mainstream' Aotearoa/New Zealand newspapers also reported positive comments regarding the 1994 HERO Parade. For example, one headline read "Heroes on parade fill city with music" (*New Zealand Herald*, 21 February 1994, 10). The report noted that one spectator said "she thought it 'brilliant' that homosexuals were showing themselves to the community" (*New Zealand Herald*, 21 February 1994, 10). Similarly, there were letters of support for the HERO Parade and criticisms of the Deputy Mayor, printed in newspapers. One person wrote:

> It is predictable that Deputy Mayor David Hay is concerned at the flashing of flesh and suggestive gyrations at the Hero parade. I watched the parade and found little difference in the costuming (or lack of it) between the participants and a large number of the parade spectators. Does Mr Hay want to ban the parade or the citizens who inhabit Queen St. on a usual Saturday night? (Burford, cited in *New Zealand Herald*, 2 March 1994, 2).

This letter highlights a blurring of the boundaries between paraders and tourists watching from the side of Queen Street. When the boundaries are dissolved between watchers and paraders, the foundation for complaint shifts. It is less likely that complaints will be made by people who are participating in the entertainment.

Members of Auckland's gay and lesbian communities ran their own campaign against the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Auckland. They distributed a flier which featured quotations from various media (see Figure 4.4). The flier urged people to write to the Auckland City Council stating they supported the HERO Parade and that they objected to Hay's attempts to impose his personal views on Auckland City Council politics.
DEPUTY MAYOR OF AUCKLAND CITY, MR DAVID HAY, ON THE GAY AND LESBIAN COMMUNITY AND THE HERO PARADE.

"I think it's totally unacceptable to use public money to fund exhibitionism really. The fundraising was for the AID Foundation. I find it rather ironical that they'd promote promiscuity and things that cause AIDS as a way of fundraising."

TV 2 Eyewitness News - 2/9/94

* The NZ AIDS Foundation was one of many HIV/AIDS organisations in Auckland that received money from Auckland.

Deputy Mayor Hay removes gay magazine from library

* It's a question of decency*

Sunday Star - 6/9/94

The Deputy Mayor of Auckland, Mr David Hay took his video camera to the city's gay pride HERO Parade to record what he described as "downright disgusting" behaviour.

Mr Hay said he had been gathering evidence to wield in future arguments about the annual event.

Herald

The Auckland City Council has approved grants of $20,000 to brass and pipe bands and refused to spend $11,000 on groups helping battered women, homosexuals and the unemployed.

The decisions - made by the council grants committee yesterday - prompted an Alliance councillor, Jennie Walker, to accuse the council's dominant Citizens and Ratepayers' group of "sheer bigotry, prejudice and hatred".

Herald - 9/2/94

ACT NOW - WRITE IMMEDIATELY TO

The Mayor and Councillors
Auckland City Council
Private Bag 92516
Wellesley Street
Auckland

Make it clear that you would like the City Council to continue to support the parade, and strongly object to David Hay's attempts to impose his personal views on Auckland City Council politics.

Thank you for your support

David Hay is using his position as Deputy Mayor to force his personal religious views onto the people of Auckland City.

The "Mt Roskill Moral Right" has already mobilized a full scale letter writing campaign to the Mayor and Councillors asking that the HERO Parade be banned next year.

Letters are running five to one against the parade at present.

It's now time for people who support HERO to have their say.

At a November city promotions committee, David Hay cast the sole vote against a motion to support financially the HERO Festival…Hay strongly disagrees: "I think there comes a time when you only want a certain type of economic activity, and if you're going to get economic activity by filling Auckland up with brothels, then I don't want it, gay or whatever". He's entirely open about his discomfort with gay and lesbian lifestyles: "I don't think it's good for the community".

Metro Magazine
In 1995 the second, and somewhat sanitised, HERO Parade was held in Queen Street. The HERO project requested $10,000 funding from a city festival grant but the Council voted against this, and offered a waiver of the $5,000 service fee for the Council cost of cleaning of streets after the parade instead (Legat 1994). The HERO banner, which the Council agreed could be hung across Queen Street to promote the parade, appeared without any reference to safe sex, without the words lesbian or gay and without the Auckland City logo (Legat 1994). The Mayor of Auckland, Les Mills, was invited to take part in the 1995 HERO Parade. He declined. A supporter of the parade wrote a letter to the *North Shore Times Advertiser* stating:

The 1995 Hero Parade was judged by many (including the police) as being far from immoral, and the comment about the Mayor of Auckland declining to participate does not make him a better man, but proves his unsuitability to be mayor of such a fine city. Hopefully he will soon be replaced (Shaw cited in *North Shore Advertiser*, 10 August 1995, 7)

The HERO Parade, despite being very popular and attracting thousands of tourists, was an event that Auckland’s ‘city fathers’ were still not proud of.

**Moving from the mind site**

This opposition to the parade from Auckland’s Mayor, Deputy Mayor and some Christian Councillors and Christian groups was, in part, behind the decision to shift the HERO Parade from the main ‘straight’ street of Auckland to ‘gay’ suburban Ponsonby. This decision prompted another public debate which was tracked by local newspapers. “Keep the queens in Queen Street’ is the rallying cry of a group of gays and lesbians who object
to the announced change of route for next year's Hero Parade" (Sanders 1995, 3).

A petition was organised to retain Queen Street as the HERO Parade route. The petition co-ordinator expressed her displeasure at the plans to re-route the HERO Parade away from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road by stating, "every major parade in the country heads down Queen Street and if it's good enough for the America's Cup, it's good enough for us!" (Cameron 1995, 3). The group believed Queen Street to be the "bastion of heterosexuality" and having the parade in Ponsonby Road would "detract from the symbolism and visibility of the parade" (Sanders 1995, 3).

Letters to the editor of express debated the decision to move the parade from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road at length. These letters could be seen to represent sectors of the gay community. In an express letter entitled "Back to the closet", M. Stevens (1995, 2) favoured Queen Street over Ponsonby Road for the HERO Parade, saying:

It was with a mixture of bewilderment and outrage that I learned of the decision to move the Hero parade from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road. Ponsonby Road is not the 'heart of gay Auckland' as some would claim. It has some gay-owned businesses and a gay bar on it. So what? I would say that for most gay Aucklanders, Ponsonby does not figure in their lives. If you are a middle-class white gay who can afford the high prices, then maybe, but that only describes a minority of us.

This express reader raises some interesting issues of class and 'race', as well as sexuality (and I suspect masculinity). He claims that Ponsonby has a gay element, but that it is an expensive suburb which caters only to those who can afford the entertainment (usually Pākehā, middle class, gay men). He continues:

Even if Ponsonby Road were like Castro [San Francisco], the parade should remain on Queen Street. We deserve
it, and should not bow to the pressure from the homophobic city council. Last year's [1995] parade was an outstanding success and helped make us a more visible part of the city, heads held high and proud. The logic of the parade organisers now appears to be 'back to the would-be ghetto and let's not offend anyone'. Back to the closet (Stevens in express, 1995, 2).

Here the express reader identifies Ponsonby Road as a gay ghetto, or the (private) closet, and conversely Queen Street is constructed as a non-gay public street. Stevens continues with a further attack on the 1996 HERO Parade organisers:

In my opinion, these people would have been handing out pink triangles with instructions on how to sew them on and then guiding us to the cattle cars if this were Nazi Germany. Anything to avoid a nasty scene. We deserve a huge riotous parade in the heart of the city, on Queen Street where every one else has their parades. Anything less is a victory for David Hay and his cohorts and a betrayal for all of us (Stevens in express, 1995, 2).

Queen Street is again evoked as the most prominent place for parades of celebration and gay visibility.

Another letter reminded express readers that the parade was a political and contested event:

It is a political event. We do not have a Parade merely to show ourselves how wonderful we are - we know that already. We do not have a parade merely to publicise ourselves to ourselves - we know we are here. What we need to do is remind the wider community of our presence as well as to celebrate our presence ... What better statement is there than to have the HERO Parade down Queen Street, the main street of the city[?] (Christie 1995, 2).

Another criticism from people opposed to the Parade's move from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road reported in express was that "Ponsonby Road was less well lit and less accessible to the general public, both in terms of transport and space for the general public" (Caldwell 1995, 3). Clearly, this
letter to the editor of *express* wished the HERO Parade to go on attracting large numbers of the general public (read: heterosexual tourists).

A telephone poll was organised by *express* to help identify the preferred site (see Figure 4.5). *express* (1995, 10), however, warned its readers that: “this is a very unscientific poll ... it reflects only the views of those people who chose to ring *express* Voteline.” The results from the Voteline revealed a 49/51 split in favour of Queen Street (see Figure 4.6). This telephone poll was an indicator of the high level of interest and discussion that occurred over the site of the parade.

The previous political struggles over the 1994 Queen Street parade between Auckland City Councillors and the HERO Parade supporters prompted further discussion by Dennis Brimble (1995, 2):

Shock, outrage, anger; the superlative with which to describe how I feel over the HERO organisation’s decision to move the 1996 parade to Ponsonby eludes me. The ‘Community’ fought long and hard writing letters,
They're good!

95% of those who chose to call in believed the big gay dance party events are good for the community. Only 5% thought they were no good.

Celebrate! Be visible!

33% thought celebrating gay sexuality was the most important aspect of these events. 21% chose visibility. Having a good time, making a political statement, and supporting safe sex came in at 13% with raising community funds last at 5%

It's a toss up!

49% thought the Hero Parade should travel down Ponsonby Road, 51% chose Queen Street!

(Remember, this is a very unscientific poll... it reflects only the views of those people who chose to ring express Voteline.)

Source: express, 23 November, 1995, 2.
attending meetings and a million other ways to ensure that we could ‘claim our place in the sun’. Is all that effort going to merely be a ‘moral’ victory? Surely the adage ‘Justice must not only be done, but seen to be done’ must carry some weight.

Brimble (1995, 2) clearly links sexualised embodiment and Ponsonby Road when he remarks:

I’m sure that the HERO Parade would be stunning as ever no matter where it was held but, to hold it on ‘our own turf’ so to speak would smack of masturbation and also only ghettoise the parade in that situation. What is the point of swapping one closet for another?

“Our own turf” is a reference to Ponsonby Road, recognised by many *express* readers as Auckland’s gay(est) suburb. The reference to masturbation reinforces Ponsonby as the place for sexualised, private, homosexual acts.

If Ponsonby is “our own turf” for homosexuals, then it is a ‘private’ space. If this ‘private’ space is linked to a sexualised bodily act then it becomes a taboo private space - a space where only initiates might go - a ghettoised space. The string of connections, between ‘body’, ‘private’, and ‘appropriate space’ that appear in the media debates over the siting of the 1996 HERO Parade, confirmed the positioning of HERO on the feminised side of the mind/body binary. The flipside of these binaries, the public masculinised place of the CBD is confirmed as the hegemonic, mindful site of ‘ordinary’ and ‘everyday’ heterosexuality.

The telephone poll, the media commentary and letters to newspapers indicate that the sites of gay pride parades for homosexualised bodies are politicised and contested (see Figure 4.7).
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Coping with the change

Stick with Queen St

Shock, outrage, anger: the euphoria with which to describe how I feel over the HERO organization's decision to move the 1996 parade to Ponsonby fades me.

The "Community" fought long and hard writing letters, attending meetings and so on. But now I ensure that

by Frances Caldwell

Arguments about the re-routing of the Hero Parade continue, with a petition supporting the change to Karangahape and Porohou. It's the paradise.

By Peter Wally

Mrs. Rasmussen found her heart breaking over the unwarranted decision to shift the Hero parade; offensive and my opinions ignorant and famous—she is right. But I thank her. She was the point I was making.

Support for route will grow further

Hero addresses criticisms of the change of route for the next Hero Parade

Hero trustees believe Auckland gay and lesbians who wanted the Hero Parade in Queen St will nevertheless support it in Ponsonby.

"We understand concern in the community," says Ponsonby. "Hero will give everybody a different perspective on it."

Supporters of the original Queen St route are

Parading our pride in Ponsonby

New hero parade route

Auckland's Hero Parade will next year be released from Queen St to Karangahape and Ponsonby Roads.

Ponsonby Project Director, Scott Johnson says, "Local people are excited to have the parade return to Ponsonby Road."

This will increase our sense of ownership, pride and enjoyment of the parade..."

Johnson hopes the route, part of the city's gay culture and businesses, will be decorated with banners, posters and shopfront displays.

Petitions both ways

Back to the closet?

It was with a mixture of bewilderment and outrage that I learned of the decision to move the Hero parade from Queen to Ponsonby Street.

Ponsonby Road is not the "heart of gay Auckland" as some would claim. It has some gay-owned businesses and a gay bar on it. So what? I would say that most gay Aucklanders Ponsonby does not figure in their lives. If you are a middle-class white gay who can afford the high prices, then maybe, but that only describes a minority of us.

Even if Ponsonby Road were like the Caucus, the parade should remain on Queen Street. We deserve it, and should not bow to the pressure from the homophobic city council. Last year's parade was an outstanding success and helped us make us a more visible part of the city. I held up high and proud. That's why it continues now, I/tree.

Parade politics

I find it difficult to believe that the organizers of the HERO Parade would deliberately move the parade from Queen Street.

"To me, the moving of the Parade from Queen Street is a very real concern," The "This is not the moving of the Parade to Ponsonby Road, it's not the moving of the Parade to the "heart of gay Auckland" (a dubious concept in itself). Is it not the moving of the Parade to anywhere that I consider to be the concern. The concern is the moving of it from Queen Street.

THE HERO 6

Petition seeks to retain Queen St. parade route

I conducted a focus group interview with Rainbow Youth while they were painting their banner for their float in the 1996 HERO Parade, the first parade scheduled for Ponsonby Road. They felt their float would have more impact if the parade was to go down Queen Street again. Nick bought up the topic of Queen Street versus Ponsonby Road:

Nick: The other thing is like, if we were going down Queen Street it [the float] would have a lot more impact.

Lynda: Yeah, you think so?

Nick: Yeah. I personally think the move to Ponsonby Rd is a negative one (/ /)

Rachel: Yeah, Yeah

Lynda: Bit of a gay ghetto thing?

Frank: I think, yeah, it's becoming a bit inclusive when we have it in our own sort of district.

Rachel: Yeah.

Nick: Um, yeah and for us, for us it is not entirely a political move, I think any pride march at it's very essence is a political move. But what's the point of saying we're wonderful to ourselves? (/ /)

Lynda: Yes (/ /)

Nick: when we know we're wonderful and it's important to say we are wonderful to ourselves but, it is also important to say to the rest of the world that we are wonderful. That's what I think (Rainbow Youth focus group interview, 14 February 1996, emphasis in original).

Rainbow Youth’s float did make an impression in the Ponsonby Road HERO Parade and I discuss this in detail in Chapter 5. In the next section, I draw on data to explain the significance and impact of having the gay pride parade in Ponsonby Road. Ponsonby becomes constructed as home territory for gays and lesbians, thus the dichotomy of queer bodies in a straight (main) street is elided.
Ponsonby Road

The HERO Project Director was not supportive of the first petition which advocated keeping the parade in Queen Street. He believed that: “the petitioners are asking the community to forego the benefits of having the parade in Ponsonby Rd for the sake of a political statement” (Johnston cited in Caldwell 1995, 3). His stance may well have overlooked the core concern of the petitioners that the pride parade was believed to be, and designed to be, a political statement.

The petition to keep the HERO Parade in Queen Street was met with another petition to support holding the parade in Ponsonby Road. Arguments about the re-routing of the HERO Parade continued. Defending the new Ponsonby Road parade route, HERO Project Director argued that it would pass through Auckland’s gayest suburbs. “It’s the area we party, socialise and live in … This will increase our sense of ownership, pride and enjoyment of the parade” (Johnston cited in Caldwell 1995, 3).

Auckland City Council candidate and lesbian, Jo Crowley, was a supporter of the HERO Parade being held along Ponsonby Road. Crowley, standing in Western Bays ward which includes Ponsonby, argued that the lesbian and gay community has been treated “with hostility and unfriendliness by the council, and we can stand around and be insulted by them or put money back into our community” (Crowley cited by Caldwell 1995, 3). Crowley reinforced Ponsonby as a gay neighbourhood and Queen Street as a straight environment when she stated:

The council has abdicated its responsibility to diversity and vitality in the city. The only things that get tickertape parades in this city are the things that Les Mills likes. Western Bays is the capital of the gay community, so let’s
go where we are welcome until the council can open its doors again (Crowley cited by Caldwell 1995, 3).

It was also reported that an advantage of holding the parade on Ponsonby Road was that more money from HERO sponsorship, such as the alcohol company Dominion Brewery (DB), could be gained (Caldwell 1995, 3). The HERO Project Director stated: "DB will give us more money as it works better for them in Ponsonby Rd - they will be able to sell alcohol along the road during the festival and after the parade" (Johnston cited by Caldwell 1996, 3). He also believes that holding the parade on:

'home territory' will support the businesses who support the community, and will add to the festive feel of the area during Hero. The biggest problem with the parade is that it's under-funded. This way we will get a better parade (Johnston cited in Caldwell 1996, 3).

The metaphor of 'home' serves to connect gay bodies to gay neighbourhoods. When I interviewed the HERO Project Director about the parade route change, he talked of Ponsonby Road as a familiar friendly home.

Project Director: Primarily, I think the benefits of going Ponsonby Road is that it takes us back into our own homes, so to speak. It's a friendly atmosphere. It's an atmosphere and place that you know.

Lynda: Uh huh.

Project Director: A place that we live in and socialise in, all that sort of stuff.

Lynda: Sure, sure.

Project Director: It adds so much more to the festival for the whole monthly period. People can decorate their buildings more and it will give it a sense that the HERO Parade, the HERO festival has a heart, so it speak (individual interview, 22 September 1995).

Queen Street is represented as the binary opposite to Ponsonby Road:
Project Director: Um, and the disadvantages for me for Queen Street are that it is an uninviting, cold environment and it is the people who wish to have it down Queen Street that are coming from, purely from the perspective of a political statement. So what they are saying is that they are prepared to forsake all those other sort of community things for all that political visibility (individual interview, 22 September 1995).

'Cold' and 'uninviting' are attributes held in relation to the attributes of Ponsonby Road represented as the private 'friendly home' and the embodied 'heart' of the gay community.

The economic consequences of the HERO Parade travelling along Ponsonby Road, rather than Queen Street, are reiterated by the Project Director:

Project Director: There are financial advantages of going along Ponsonby Road. Our major alcohol sponsors will provide the rebate for outlets on Ponsonby Road ... The other side of it, probably the disadvantage of it, is that ... it won't make as bigger public statement as going down Queen Street. But it is not like either/or. It'll be, public statement going down Queen Street is that big [gestures wide with hands], and going down Ponsonby Road is that big [gestures smaller with hands]. It is still going to be a public statement.

Lynda: Sure.

Project Director: It is still going to be 100,000 maybe, a couple of hundred thousand people, so it will still be a statement, it will still get the proper coverage from the media (individual interview, 22 September 1995).

Johnston (cited in Caldwell 1995, 3) "hopes the route, past many of the city's gay venues and businesses, will be decorated with banners, posters and shop-front displays." The 1996 site of the HERO Parade, Ponsonby Road, was marked with rainbow flags and rainbow bunting, HERO posters in shop fronts and bill boards promoting safe sex along the roadside (see Figure 4.8).
Figure 4.8 HERO Parade's Safe Sex billboard

One of my duties as a volunteer for the HERO Parade in 1996 was to distribute an “Open Letter to all Ponsonby Businesses” written by the HERO Parade Director:

We are asking all businesses to support the parade in some way, however small (or large!) that support may be. Here are some suggestions of how your business can participate and support HERO:

1) Have a HERO window display
2) Display rainbow bunting for your cafe/store front
3) Offer a HERO day special to your clients.

This flier had an immediate effect. A floral business that I distributed this flier to wanted to sponsor the HERO Parade by offering spot prizes to the best dressed tourists on the night of the parade. Also, on the night of the parade, the floral business provided single flowers for sale with profits going to the New Zealand AIDS Foundation. These were the types of benefits that the HERO Project Director had hoped for when the decision was made to relocate the HERO Parade from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road.

Businesses did ‘dress’ their windows and shop fronts with HERO posters and rainbow colours. These visual indicators of the HERO Parade were also supported by various sound systems placed along Ponsonby Road as pre-parade entertainment. The letter to Ponsonby businesses stated: “The parade will generate a carnival atmosphere in Ponsonby that night and we hope that you both enjoy and benefit from the extra patronage on 17th February 1996.” This promise, of a particular prestigious place-image, encourages businesses to “site production within, and link their product with, a particular locality” (Edensor and Kothari 1994, 165). HERO sponsors, who produced alcohol products such as Heineken, Absolut
Vodka, Deutz and Delegats, stocked Ponsonby Road bars with their products. The public was exhorted to:

Purchase any of these brands: Absolut Vodka, Deutz, Delegats and Heineken at participating Ponsonby cafes, bars and restaurants during the HERO festival and a percentage of your purchase price will be donated to the HERO Parade (*HERO Magazine*, 1996, 3).

The Parade Director (quoted in *express*, 7 December, 1995, 6) reported: “We want to turn Ponsonby Rd into HERO Rd so that there’s no way anybody who comes to Ponsonby Rd in the month before doesn’t know that the parade is happening.” This is another way that the HERO Parade on Ponsonby Road becomes promoted as a tourist site.

When comparing the responses of businesses and residents of Ponsonby to the reaction of the HERO Parade in Queen Street, it became clear that a gay pride parade along Ponsonby Road became less of a political statement about gay rights and more about a night of entertainment. Queen Street was retrospectively constructed as a site of protest where queer bodies, out of place, had a political message to convey. Ponsonby Road became constructed as a site of performance where queer bodies were at ‘home’.

The tourist site of Ponsonby Road seemed to add further ‘authenticity’ for heterosexual tourists. They could now watch queer bodies in their ‘natural’ settings.

There remained, however, some controversy to the build up of the 1996 HERO Parade along Ponsonby Road. There were still some groups that resisted gay, lesbian, bisexual and transsexual bodies on parade in Ponsonby, despite Ponsonby being is a well known gay neighbourhood. A HERO Parade bill board, promoting safe sex, offended the Samoan church leaders of St John’s Methodist Church (see Figure 4.8) when it was placed in the garden next to the church. The billboard featured the bare buttocks
of a male body and the words 'No Ifs. No Butts. Use Condoms Everytime'.

Reverend Paulo Ieriko told a New Zealand Herald (Ely 1996, 2) reporter:

We live in a tolerant society and we are tolerant of other people's values and how they see their sexuality, but to impose it on others, that's where the church comes in ... I think it puts people off homosexuality instead of making them sympathetic to the cause.

The Ponsonby Plant Centre across the road from the billboard said some of their customers had found it offensive and one had suggested drawing a kilt on the naked body. Most believed, however, the "billboard was
worth it if it saved lives” (Ely 1996, 2). HERO Project Director said: “[w]hen promoting safe sex you have to talk about sex, just as when it’s drink driving you have to talk about driving and drinking beer” (Johnston cited in Ely 1996, 2).

Figure 4.9 shows the billboard with changes. The billboard was damaged by members of the Methodist Church on the Sunday before the HERO Parade, 11 February 1996. The billboard under-went repairs and a new message was added. An acrostic, using the words ‘embarrassment, homophobia, intolerance, bigotry, ignorance and discrimination’ appeared in its place. Following these changes, Auckland City Council also demanded that the billboard be removed from its position beside the church as the owner of the property had not obtained permission for the billboard. The billboard was placed in the All Saints Church across the road from the Methodist Church. An Anglican minister gave his blessing for the billboard, saying “It’s [the billboard] still on about safe sex but it now confronts other, deeper issues in our society” (Whtye cited in Moore 1996b, 1).

In this example, the Samoan church is a ‘relic’, in a sense, of the working class status of Ponsonby prior to the gay gentrification which displaced the poorer, many black, and Pacific Island communities, who lived in Ponsonby. There are still parts of Ponsonby that are ‘privately’ Pacific Island, rather than ‘privately’ gay. The Samoan church and billboard example cannot necessarily be entirely understood as predicated on public/private, straight/gay binaries, but as contingent upon historical, class, ‘racial’, and place politics.

In the last few days before the first Ponsonby Road parade the Police issued a press release. The headline read “Keep it seemly’ - Police”
The article stated that caution was needed on the night of the 1996 HERO Parade:

'Keep the Hero parade seemly even if it's in your back yard'... Inspector Derek Davison says the new Ponsonby route will make the parade more colourful than the 'austere' Queen Street area. Ponsonby is a 'warm area for the gay community: they feel comfortable there. It's almost a traditional area'. But, he said, media coverage means people all over the country will watch the parade and that means, caution is needed. 'If there are opportunities for people to chuck rocks at it, they'll take them. My view is ... let's make it an event which is a happy one, a careful one, but not to step over the bounds of community acceptability' (express, 15 February 1996, 7).

This newspaper article nicely sums up my assertions that the Ponsonby Road parade is considered, by controlling authorities, the correct place for gay bodies. The threat of television coverage, however, means that the parade will be in 'public' eyes and be judged by the 'community'. Hence gay bodies need to 'behave' and 'act appropriately'.

I have been arguing that relocating the HERO Parade to Ponsonby Road and away from Queen Street, restates the public/private dichotomy. A gay pride parade in Auckland's 'gay' suburb does not threaten or destabilise Auckland's 'straight' CBD. A gay pride parade further marks Ponsonby Road as other/different/exotic and more 'authentic' for tourists. The refusal to hold the parade in Queen Street reinforces the mind-straight/body-gay dichotomy.

In summary, the HERO Parade sites and debates surrounding the relocation of the parade from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road, foregrounds the problematic position of private bodies in public places. The newspaper articles and letters to newspaper editors clearly identify the specific ways western hierarchical dualisms are articulated and inscribed on bodies and places. The discourses that emerged from debate
over the parade site can be structured into the following dichotomous relationships.

**Queen Street - Ponsonby Road**
- Central Business District - Home
- Uninviting - Friendly
- Protest - Performance
- Heterosexual - Gay
- Business - Pleasure
- Everyday - Exotic
- Public - Private
- Cold - Warm
- Clean - Dirty

**Mind - Body**

The economic link between place and tourism was just one facet of the decision to relocate the HERO Parade from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road. Parade organisers believed that holding a parade in Auckland’s gay suburb would create a warmer and more festive environment for the gay community. The Parade became more a form of entertainment than being about gay rights, or a celebration of gay pride. Queen Street became conceptually aligned with the ‘mind’ and Ponsonby Road with the ‘body’. Moving the site of the Parade helped established the HERO Parade as a tourist event.

The Sydney Mardi Gras provides another example of the links between gay pride parades, sexed and sexualised bodies and sexed and sexualised places and emphasises some of the links between tourism and queer bodies.
THE SYDNEY MARDI GRAS

The Sydney Mardi Gras Parade has a reputation as being the most popular gay and lesbian event in the world (Carbery 1995). Its popularity rests on its representation as a highly sexualised tourist site. One travel advertisement read: "A pilgrimage to mecca - Sydney and Sleaze" (express, 26 October 1995, 17).

Sydney has become successful in managing the production of "celebratory spectacles, now as often for non-gay-identified consumption as gay-identified consumption" (Knopp 1998, 106). Geographer Lawrence Knopp, (1998) is referring to the popularity of the Sydney Mardi Gras as a tourist site for heterosexuals. Sydney also has well-defined and visibly ‘gay’ areas such as Oxford Street and the neighbouring suburbs of Darlinghurst, Paddington, Surry Hills, Glebe and Newtown (Leese 1993; Witherspoon 1991, cited in Knopp 1998). These gay neighbourhoods are mapped for tourists attending the festival events (see Figure 4.1).

Knopp (1998, 107) discusses gay male identity politics in several English-speaking countries (including Sydney) and he observes that:

in terms of urbanization, then, Sydney features an articulation with this particular form of identity politics that is surprisingly democratic. Only in few other places might one find such a highly sexualized and politically successful gay male culture in an urban environment - perhaps Amsterdam, Copenhagen, or San Francisco.

The success of gay male culture, and ‘Other’ sexualised identities in Sydney was evident when I visited in 1996. Many gay, lesbian and transgender events are organised in the month that precedes the parade and party. Drag Queen performances such as ‘Frocks on the Rocks’ (see Figure 4.10) were held, Oxford Street businesses participated in an event called ‘Shop yourself stupid’, there were queer cabaret, films, bands and
choirs, comedian acts, art shows, Mardi Gras costumes displays in Sydney's Power House Museum, and sporting events, all of which acted to queer significant parts of Sydney during Mardi Gras month. Oxford Street, and its neighbouring streets, are decorated in Mardi Gras colours and images (see Figure 4.11). The extent to which the Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras has become institutionalised, that is, almost part of the 'ordinary' and 'everyday', became obvious when a person passed me in Oxford Street and said to me 'Happy Mardi Gras'. Mardi Gras has become a sanctioned celebration with its own 'salutation'. One person responded to my Sydney questionnaire that: "Mardi Gras is for queers what Xmas is for heterosexuals."

While the Sydney Mardi Gras festival, and in particular, the parade, acts to queer the streets of Sydney, it also acts to reaffirm homosexual bodies as Other to, and deviant from, the heterosexual norm. This happens in two ways. First, because the site of the parade is in 'gay' neighbourhoods, the parade reestablishes the constitutive relationship between gay bodies in gay neighbourhoods. This is similar to the HERO Parade being sited in Ponsonby Road. The parade site is in an (already) sexualised suburb. Second, unlike gay pride parades that travel through 'main' streets of cities (Montreal and the Queen Street HERO parades), the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade site does not challenge the 'ordinary' and 'everyday' heterocentricity of 'straight' streets. The Mardi Gras has become an entertaining and celebratory tourist event, rather than a purely protest event, which challenges heterosexualised streets. The parade was born out of political protest on 24 June 1978 (Carbery 1995). Two gay Sydney activists had received a letter from the San Francisco Gay Freedom Committee urging gay communities around the world to organise events in the last week of June to coincide with the 1969 Stonewall riots of New
Figure 4.10 Frocks on the Rocks

Source: Photographs by Lynda Johnston, 4 March 1996.
Figure 4.11 Mardi Gras Mania, Oxford Street

Source: Photographs by Lynda Johnston, 4 March 1996.
York City. Many people were arrested at the first Sydney International Gay Solidarity Day celebrations and protests were held in the weeks that followed the first march (Carbery 1995). It was not until 1981 that the Parade date moved to summer (March) and the Sydney Mardi Gras began to build its celebrations around known gay streets and neighbourhoods (Carbery 1995).

Another geographer concerned with the construction of gay (male) space in Sydney is Kim Seebohm (1993). He discusses the underlying themes and meanings of the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade. Seebohm (1993, 194) suggests the "paradescape" is spatially, politically and symbolically inscribed on the landscape. Seebohm (1993) indicates, however, that the hegemonic culture exerts a high level of social control over the gay community and Mardi Gras. Mardi Gras, it could be argued, is also resilient and resistant "to the web of signification spun by dominant elites" (Ley and Olds 1988, 191). Seebohm (1993) also uses Eco's (1984, 6) carnival concept of "authorised transgression" to claim that gay public rituals reinforce the political and social mechanisms of control that hegemonic culture exerts on minority groups.

As a significant spatial event, Mardi Gras has played the major role in the spatial construction of gay space in inner-city Sydney, creating a territorial and symbolic centre for the gay community in Sydney. This construction should not be viewed as the gay community concentrating itself into inner-city space for its own protection. Alternatively, it acts as a statement of popular culture acknowledging and tolerating the gay community in spatial terms (Seebohm 1993, 205).

I tend to agree with Seebohm (1993) that there are hegemonic controls over such a popular event. I want to add that the construction of gay space in Sydney has helped to attract tourists. The HERO Parade in Ponsonby became a more popular event for tourists as it was constructed and held
in an ‘authentic’, exotic, gay location. The site of the Sydney Mardi Gras is also in gay neighbourhoods. This spectacularises the event and provides an environment which invites the heterosexual gaze.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have identified approaches to discourses of tourist sites that are commonly found in tourism literatures. I have also argued that gay pride parades have the potential to ‘queer’ the streets. Queering of streets creates a spectacle of queer bodies which many heterosexual tourists are drawn to.

More substantively, I argued that the debate over the HERO Parade Queen Street site of 1994 provides evidence that queer bodies cannot be trusted in the main (CBD) streets of Auckland. Bodies of gays, lesbians and transgenders are not considered by some to be ‘appropriate’ bodies to inhabit public streets. Queen Street, as a consequence, can be conceived of as representing the ‘mind’. Streets of Auckland that can be conceived of as representing the ‘body’ are those streets in the gay neighbourhood of Ponsonby. Both hegemonic and transgressive notions of sexuality and sex, which are effects or results of political investment in the regulation of bodies, are at work at HERO Parade sites. In order to avoid the construction of a hegemonic, reified and static sense of HERO as a tourist site, recognition of localities that are “replete with internal differences and conflicts” (Massey 1993, 67) is needed.

In addition, I have discussed the gendered/sexed and sexualised site of the Sydney Mardi Gras. This parade also has a history of political struggle which helped queer the streets. The Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Parade has become, however, a very popular event for tourists. The popularity is due to the conceptualising and representations of the parade
tourist site as sexually embodied, exotic, ‘authentic’ and Other to heterosexual tourists.

By recognising and destabilising western dualistic thinking, I have highlighted the ways in which power struggles helps to decentre static concepts of ‘ordinary’ and ‘everyday’ places. My account of the HERO Parade site and the Sydney Mardi Gras site works to consciously manipulate notions of gendered/sexed and sexualised embodiments in order to subvert hegemonic ways of ‘seeing’ sites without imposing a universal alternative.
In the HERO Parade, and the Sydney Mardi Gras, material and conceptual borders between paraders and tourists watching are constructed. These borders are both 'real' and discursive. Real borders between paraders and tourists take the form of physical barriers, which spatially separate paraders from tourists. Discursive borders, that align parade participants with the body and tourists with the mind, also exist. Although I have separated these 'borders' in a concrete/abstract binary, I argue that these two types of borders are mutually constitutive. One border is reliant upon the other.

To support my argument that borders between paraders and tourists are erected and maintained, I draw on Iris Young's (1990, 58) concept of "cultural imperialism" and group oppression. Cultural imperialism works to keep a group invisible at the same time as it is marked out and stereotyped. Young's (1990) concept of cultural imperialism helps to explain the reactions of the tourists to the bodies on parade. I argue that gay pride parades are popular tourist events because tourists (who can be read as cultural imperialists) maintain their dominant group position behind the borders.
I also utilise Young’s (1990, 145) idea that specific bodies become culturally inscribed as “ugly.” Young draws on the work of Julia Kristeva, particularly *Powers of Horror* (1982), to examine the notion of abjection and group oppression. The concept of abjection helps to explain why gay parade spectacles both attract and repel tourists. The construction of the HERO Parade as a tourist spectacle allows tourists - who are safely positioned behind physical borders - to gaze at the abject Other.

The border between paraders and tourists reasserts the distinction between tourists (straight) and parade participants (gay). There is, however, potential to disrupt this distinction between tourists and paraders. In this chapter I deconstruct the binary of heterosexual and homosexual bodies and hence the power relations between tourists as Self and of ‘the mind’, and gay bodies as Other and of ‘the body’. I examine the interactions between the tourists and three specific floats in order to identify these disruptions. The Rainbow Youth, Gaily Normal, and the Gay Auckland Business Association (GABA) floats all serve to undermine binary categories of mind/body, Self/Other, straight/gay and tourist/host in different ways. I maintain that these subject positions are mobile and multiple, rather than fixed and static. HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras are tourist events which exemplify the Other for tourist consumption, as well as being events which enable a destabilising of the tourist as the Self, or the cultural imperialist.

**CULTURAL IMPERIALISM**

Young (1990, 122-155) discusses bodies and oppressions in a chapter entitled ‘The scaling of bodies and the politics of identity’. She notes that: “Racism, as well as other group oppressions, should be thought of not as a single structure, but in terms of several forms of oppression” (Young
1990, 122). She uses the concept of cultural imperialism to explain general forms of group oppression and violence:

Culturally imperialist groups project their own values, experience, and perspective as normative and universal. Victims of cultural imperialism are thereby rendered invisible as subjects, as persons with their own perspective and group-specific experience and interests. At the same time they are marked out, frozen into a being marked as Other, deviant in relation to the dominant norm. The dominant groups need not notice their own group being at all; they occupy an unmarked, neutral, apparently universal position. But victims of cultural imperialism cannot forget their group identity because the behavior and reactions of others call them back to it (Young 1990, 123).

Young’s (1990) concept of cultural imperialism is useful in facilitating an understanding of tourists’ reactions to HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras. Tourists, as cultural imperialists, become the unmarked and dominant group. They do not notice their own identity, nor their unified position as gazers on queer bodies, and, one could add here, nor do they notice their own bodies. The bodies on parade, however, are constructed as deviant and as Other.

When gay bodies are on parade they are clearly marked as ‘different’. Their bodies constitute an ‘extraordinary’ tourist attraction. Urry (1990a, 11) argues that: “tourism results from a basic binary division between the ordinary-everyday and the extraordinary.” The dichotomies of tourists and hosts, or Self and Other, however, are not simply “basic binary” divisions. They are produced when bodies become gendered/sexed and sexualised at gay pride parades. Away from the parade, the tourist event, queer bodies may seem ‘ordinary’, ‘everyday’, and even ‘normal’. During parades, however, the border or binary division, becomes visible. This may serve to lessen the ‘threat’ of queer bodies to the dominant culture.
Young (1990) argues that Others who are highly visible and can be clearly marked out as different and deviant from the dominant subject, for example, women, blacks, disabled people, are not as frightening to the dominant group. One way that homosexuals are marked out as different and less threatening is through the placing of borders at the HERO and Sydney Mardi Gras parades.

**PLACING PHYSICAL BORDERS**

One of the reasons that the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras are so popular amongst 'straight' tourists, is because tourists are physically separated from the gay bodies on parade. When a spatial segregation is maintained, there can be no confusion between heterosexual and homosexual bodies. In the case of the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade, a clearly marked border between paraders and tourists is maintained at the roadside through the use of road markings, road barriers or barricades, parade 'officials' and police, as well as self-policing\(^{31}\) by tourists. The threat to cultural imperialists is, at one level, controlled. The dominant group (heterosexual tourists) can keep their distance from the Other.

At the parades that I attended road barriers were erected along the sides of the streets. The barriers created a wide space in the middle of the streets which tourists could not access. At the 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras the barriers were extensive and formidable (see Figure 5.1). Metal frame crowd control barriers, which were approximately 1.4 metres high, stretched the entire length of the parade route. The barriers were supplied

---

\(^{31}\) I am referring to general social control and regulation of communities which is carried out by all of its members. Individuals also engage in self-surveillance, self-control and self-disciplining regimes (see Foucault 1976a).
Figure 5.1 Road Barriers at the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade

Source: Photographs by Lynda Johnston, 5 March 1996.
by the Sydney City Council and were fixed into place several hours before the parade started. Streets were closed to traffic from approximately 3.00 p.m. The Sydney Star Observer's (1996, 5) guide to the Mardi Gras festival, parade and party, reported that:

The Parade begins at around 8 pm at the corner of Liverpool and Elizabeth Street, moves up to Oxford Street, turns right into Flinders Street and then left into Moore Park Road. As vantage points in Oxford Street are usually the first taken, try Flinders Street or Moore Park Road. Remember that after 7 pm it gets very difficult to get a good possie anywhere.

The attention paid to parade crowds and to places from which to view the parades became imbued with discourses of safety.

Safety first

Guides to parade watching, or getting a "good possie", are couched in terms of safety and crowd control. The numbers attending the Sydney Mardi Gras have increased dramatically since the parade's beginnings. The Sydney Star Observer (1996, 5) reports on some of the historical changes:

But how things have changed! From 1981 ... Sydney summer and Mardi Gras energy have seen crowd numbers and float numbers grow. Some of us remember when there were no barricades between the crowd and the Parade and you could jump in and out of the marching thong at will. Don't try that now. It's - after all - safety before spontaneity these days. Crowds in 1994 topped 600,000. They were slightly down last year due to rain but should be at full strength again this year if the weather is kind. The float count should be well over 100, there'll be several thousand participants, and more than 800 officials of various kinds.

The 800 officials of various kinds are usually volunteers. Volunteers wear a uniform that distinguishes them from spectators and paraders. The parade officials carry radio telephones, hand-held megaphones and
whistles. I waited for three hours behind the barriers at Oxford Street before the parade began. During this time, I noted several things in relation to safety procedures. If tourists wished to cross the street they had to ask the officials to let them through the barricades and over the street. During the parade there were no opportunities to step out from behind the barricades and cross the street. If spectators attempted this, they were stopped and encouraged to remain behind the barricades.

Similarly, at the HERO Parade on Ponsonby Road the crowd was encouraged to stay behind the erected street barriers. Auckland crowds were disciplined before and during the parade. One of my duties, when I worked at the HERO Parade workshop in January and February 1996, was to find 30 volunteers who could be placed on streets that intersected with Ponsonby Road. Each volunteer had a ‘marshal’ tee shirt, reflector vest and distress flares. In addition to these marshals, each parade entry had to provide two of their own marshals to walk beside their float and to maintain an ‘appropriate’ distance between paraders and tourists where there were gaps in the road barriers. Marshals were briefed at a pre-parade safety meeting with the organisers and with Police. The use of road barriers at the HERO Parade has increased each year with the size of the attending crowd.

The 1997 and 1998 HERO Parade organisers made use of the Auckland City Council’s road barriers. These are large plastic ‘container type’ barricades which, once in place, were filled with water (see Figure 5.2). These barricades were wide and approximately waist height. Marshals and Police kept the crowd behind the barricades. Tourists’ bodies, for the most part, become disciplined, controlled and carefully separated from the homosexual bodies on parade. By extension, paraders’ bodies were also disciplined, controlled and contained within the barricades.
Figure 5.2 Barricades, tourists and a HERO Parader

There are several implications of this attention to ‘crowd’ safety. In making the parade site ‘safe’ and controlled, a distinction is created between paraders as spectacle and heterosexual tourists as watchers. When safety is well publicised and borders are erected and maintained by barricades, marshals, and Police, more people are attracted to the parade site.

The majority of tourists at HERO and at the Sydney Mardi Gras are, as I have already explained, heterosexual. There are, however, also gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered tourists behind the barriers.

At the 1996 HERO Parade, I was elated to see the final parade ‘product’, which I had helped to create. I was also video recording the parade and hence did not form part of the main crowd at the side of the road. I walked with the parade at times. Carrying a video recording camera marked me as different from the other spectators. At 1997 HERO Parade, however, as a lesbian tourist, surrounded by mostly heterosexual tourists, I felt uneasy. I observed the 1997 HERO Parade from behind the barricades. I was physically ‘trapped’ and I became caught up in the feelings of those around me. In my participant observation notes, after the parade, I reflected on my feelings of being a tourist at the 1997 HERO Parade and I documented some of the comments that were made while I watched:

One woman said to the man who was watching the parade with her: “There are some normal people in the parade, there are some normal people in the parade, you know, straight people. It’s not all gay.”

“Oh - what? - that’s sexually dysfunctional” (said a man as he watched a float containing a lesbian s/m performance) (participant observation notes, 22 February 1997, emphasis in original).
These comments can be interpreted as (heterosexual) tourists’ attempts to reconstruct gay bodies as deviant and Other. At the same time, the tourists establish themselves as ‘normal’ or as heterosexual: the unmarked Self. Despite the physical barriers that maintained some distance between parading bodies and tourists, some heterosexuals employed other measures to preserve the border between Self and Other. I was aware of the ‘coupling’ of heterosexuals at both HERO and Sydney Mardi Gras. Men draped their arms around ‘their’ female partners. Women and men held hands and, even more provocatively, some engaged in kissing and other sexual behaviour in the street. Stereotypical jokes were made by heterosexual men about ‘keeping their backs to the wall’. I asked a self-identified heterosexual male, New Zealand European/Pākehā: “Why did you come to the parade tonight?” He responded: “Because cute women hang out with gay boys.” Such a response serves to maintain distance between the Self and the Other, the tourists and the hosts.

Gay enclaves

At the 1996 HERO Parade I was aware that the spaces occupied by gay tourists were quite different from the spaces occupied by heterosexual tourists. I began distributing questionnaires several hours before the parade was due to start (that is, around seven o’clock that evening). People began to gather in groups in particular areas. Ponsonby Road has many restaurants and bars (many of these are gay owned and operated businesses) and they were filled with customers. I stopped at many of the restaurant tables that lined Ponsonby Road. As I did this, I became aware that many of the people eating at the restaurants were gay. They were very willing to fill in my questionnaire, talk to me about my research, and openly identify as gay (the majority were gay men). They had positioned
themselves in the restaurant seats by the road, as well as upstairs in
restaurant and bar windows. They had come to watch the parade and
engage in associated activities ("find a man", "check out talent", "watch
the 'girls'"). In these particular areas, gay tourists maintained spatial
enclaves away from the large number of heterosexual tourists. Gay guides
to viewing the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade suggested that people could hire
rooms in hotels, guest houses and restaurants from which to view the
parade (Sydney Star Observer, 1996, 6).

The pleasure obtained by these gay tourists provokes a
reconceptualisation of the definition 'tourist'. On the one hand, gay
tourists can be positioned as hosts and part of the gay pride parade
spectacle for heterosexual tourists. Gays and lesbians watching the parade,
eating at restaurants, drinking at gay bars, and 'picking up' partners on
Ponsonby Road are in their 'authentic' or home location. On the other
hand, some gay tourists position themselves as 'normal' or 'ordinary and
everyday' (Self), and position the gay paraders as exotic and extraordinary
(Other). These binaries of Self/Other, straight/gay and tourist/host are
subject to contestation and never remain stable or static.

Tiered seating behind a fenced off area created another bordered area at
the 1998 HERO Parade. This was a pre-sold ticket fundraising initiative by
HIV/AIDS organisations. The tickets were $45 which could be considered
expensive given that many spectators are attracted to the parade because it
is free. I decided to buy a seat in the stands for the 1998 parade. The fenced
off zone contained seats for from which it was possible to view the
parade. There was also a bar where drinks could be bought and there were
toilets. The majority of people in the tiered seat section were queer.
Couples could visibly 'be' together, hold hands and so forth. I could not
hear any comments that may have been made by heterosexual tourists which Othered and degraded the bodies on parade.

I had thought this space would be a ‘gay spectator enclave’, however, it also contained a complex mix of ‘VIPs’ such as the Prime Minister of Aotearoa/New Zealand (accompanied by her husband), other (Opposition) politicians and media representatives. The VIPs were in an area demarcated with a white picket fence. Gay tourists sat on the tiered seats beyond the white picket fence. The white picket fence seemed to act like a sanitised border which kept the ‘important’ people and the ‘ordinary’ queers separated. I saw a spare table in the VIP area so I sat with the VIPs. In this area ‘we’ - gays, straight and gay politicians, queer entertainers and television celebrities - became another part of the tourist entertainment. Television cameras focused on the Prime Minister’s reaction to each float. People from outside of the area watched us. I found myself watching for the Prime Minister’s reactions as floats passed by her. Behind ‘us’, in the tiered seating, gay men made sexual comments about the Prime Minister’s husband. Discursive and material borders between straight/gay, Self/Other, tourist/host shifted constantly.

The physical, or material, borders that operate at HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras are predicated on discursive borders between paraders and tourists. In the next section I argue that tourists can be understood as representing the mind or Self, and that paraders can be understood as representing the body or Other.

**DISCURSIVE BORDERS**

In Chapter 4, I argued that certain groups in Auckland, including some Christian City Councillors, Othered the bodies of paraders at HERO. They identified that queer bodies are inappropriate bodies to inhabit public
places. I now examine the reactions of tourists, most of whom, by their large and dominant presence at HERO and at the Sydney Mardi Gras, appear to endorse and accept queer bodies in public. Within the discourses of acceptance, however, there is still a tendency to Other the bodies on parade and reinforce conceptual borders between homosexual and heterosexual, mind and body, tourists and hosts.

Pride parades are frequently and predominantly understood as protests for equal rights, or equality. Geographer David Smith (1994, 49) argues: "inequality can be thought of as a particular type of difference between people, about which moral questions arise. Social justice is concerned with this sort of difference." Smith (1994) refers to a specific, socially constructed conception of normal and acceptable behaviour. Young (1990, 134) adds weight to this argument when she states:

> when public morality is committed to principles of equal treatment and equal worth for all persons, public morality requires that judgements about the superiority or inferiority of persons be made on an individual basis according to individual competence.

In many societies there are broad commitments to equal rights and equal treatment for all persons, whatever their group identification. Young (1990) identifies this as a discursive commitment to equality. She states that:

> racism, sexism, homophobia, ageism, and ableism ... have not disappeared with that commitment, but have gone underground, dwelling in everyday habits and cultural meanings of which people are for the most part unaware (Young 1990, 124).

Overt group oppression has, in many western societies that are committed to equal rights, resurfaced as liberal humanism (Young 1990). Liberal humanism treats each person as an individual, ostensibly
ignoring differences of race, ethnicity, sex, religion, and sexuality. Structural patterns of group oppression remain and are often unidentified in the rhetoric of equality that liberalism sustains (Young 1990). Liberal humanism means that the construction of the dominant culture as the norm remains unchanged.

Liberal humanism, or commitments to equal rights, were evident in the questionnaire responses. Many people at the HERO Parade and at the Sydney Mardi Gras stated that they thought gay pride parades made Auckland and Sydney 'liberal, contemporary and tolerant' cities. First, I situate these comments within Young's (1990) theory that dominant discourses of equality and liberality create blindness to difference. Second, I argue that within the parade context, heterosexual tourists are positioned as the dominant cultural imperialist group, that is, as unified, unmarked and neutral.

**Tolerant, liberal and open-minded**

At the HERO Parade I asked parade watchers: "What do you think the parade does for Auckland's image?" (see questionnaire in Appendix E). At the Sydney Mardi Gras I asked parade watchers the same question in relation to Sydney. Tourists, who identified themselves as heterosexual, responded with words and phrases such as tolerant, liberal and open-minded. Some of these responses are included in Figure 5.3. These responses are underpinned by a liberal humanist notion that society is composed of individuals who have commitments to their own autonomy, the general idea of liberty, and to the notion that this liberty constitutes the primary social good. Group difference and the lack of liberty for certain group memberships, nevertheless continues to exist.
Figure 5.3 Discourses of Liberalism

Auckland:

"General acceptance/tolerance"
"Increases tolerance and awareness"
"Open-minded city"
"Cosmopolitan, open-minded, liberal"
"Gives a party/tolerant image"
"Shows broadness of mind"
"It shows that we are more liberal than other cities, progressive and modern"
"It shows that we are open-minded and tolerant city"
"Makes us more open to everyone"
"Makes us more enlightened, open-minded"
"It tells other cities how liberal we are"
"Makes us open to all walks of life"
"Great - shows how open-minded people in Auckland are"
"Shocks people, but encourages open-mindedness"
"Positive - makes people open their minds"
"Shows that Auckland has a liberal population"
"Positive, lively, diverse, tolerant, fun"
"It makes it funnier, it seems more open-minded than other cities"
"The people of Auckland are hopefully more tolerant of others"
"Shows a tolerant attitude towards gays and sexuality"

Sydney:\(^{32}\)

"It definitely portrays it as a liberal (in terms of American liberals) city"
"Promotes Sydney as a friendly city and show that gays and lesbians can definitely fit into Hetro [sic] society"

---

^{32} Liberal discourses were not necessarily any less pervasive in Sydney (represented here by only two comments), but, I distributed 118 questionnaires in Auckland, compared to 25 in Sydney.
Certain dominant groups are privileged and other groups have their liberty consequently compromised (Young 1990). Insisting that all people are equal entails ignoring difference, which has oppressive consequences.

Blindness to difference disadvantages groups whose experience, culture and socialized capacities differ from those privileged groups ... The strategy of assimilation aims to bring formerly excluded groups into the mainstream (Young 1990, 164).

The ideal of a universal humanity without group differences allows privileged groups to ignore their own group specificity.

The 'heterosexual' responses of tolerance, liberalness, and open-mindedness, however, mark the bodies on parade as different and as Other from the dominant norm. The dominant norm, the heterosexual tourists, seem to have to constantly remind themselves to be 'tolerant' and 'open-minded' in relation to the Other.

*The Compact Oxford English Dictionary* (1991, 2075) defines tolerance as:

The action of allowing; licence permission granted by an authority ... The action or practice of tolerating; toleration; the disposition to be patient with or indulgent to the opinion of others; freedom from bigotry or undue severity in judging the conduct of others; forbearance; catholicity of spirit.

Being tolerant, therefore, relies on there being an Other, without any examination of the Self as the dominant group. The dominant group remains the norm.

The responses also show that there is an unstated 'us'. In Figure 5.3, the final comment is: "gays and lesbians can definitely fit into Hetro [sic] society." This comment attests to Young's (1990) notion of assimilation. The "strategy of assimilation always implies coming to the game after it has already begun, after the rules and standards have already been set, and
having to prove oneself according to which all will be measured” (Young 1990, 164). At the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras, heterosexual tourists can be identified as the ‘game starters’. As cultural imperialists they have the rules and standards by which gays and lesbians are judged. Such judgement rests on the idea that queers have to ‘fit’ into heterosexual society.

The (un)marked tourist

I have been arguing that the bodies on parade become the marked Other and are deviant from the dominant imperialist group, the tourists. There were several indicators on questionnaires that highlighted heterosexuals’ privileged position as ‘natural’ and ‘normal’. One indicator may be found in the propensity of many respondents to misspell ‘heterosexual’. The questionnaire had several categories of sexuality to choose from. Of those respondents claiming heterosexual status, the majority circled the heterosexual category. Of the 45 people who did not circle heterosexual, but wrote the word instead, 18 wrote either ‘Hetro’, or ‘Hetrosexual’33. Heterosexuals, it could be assumed, are not often asked to think about their sexuality, state their sexuality, or spell their category of sexuality. It could be argued that the status of heterosexuality is a taken for granted norm.

The unmarked tourist appeared in Sydney also. The confusion was not so much over the spelling of heterosexual (although this happened also), but centred on the categorisation of ethnicity. In my questionnaire for the HERO Parade, I relied on categorisation for ethnic groups used in the Aotearoa/New Zealand census. In Australia, the census does not require

33 Another explanation for the misspelling of ‘heterosexual’ could be found in an examination of Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australian accents.
its citizens to distinguish their ethnicity, but citizens are asked in which country they were born, and if they are Aboriginal. I left the ethnicity question open (please state). Many 'white' Australians did not understand the question. Two people, whilst reading their questionnaires asked each other: "What's ethnicity"? The other one looked puzzled and then replied: "Oh, she means 'authenticity'." People who wrote "Chinese", "Asian (Indonesian)", Italian", or "Indian", did not seem to be troubled by this question. 'White' people, however, wrote "Australian", "Aussi" or even "New South Wales."

When the dominant group represses its sexuality, then moral codes of respectability and order are invoked as the norm. Young (1990, 136) adds:

> Respectability consists in conforming to norms that repress sexuality, bodily functions, and emotional expression. It is linked to an idea of order: the respectable person is chaste, modest, does not express lustful desires, passion, spontaneity, or exuberance, is frugal, clean, gently spoken, and well mannered. The orderliness of respectability means things are under control, everything in its place, not crossing borders.

To maintain bodily order, heterosexual tourists must try to distinguish themselves as pure and the hosts as defiled and abject. The abject, however, is something that is both horrifying and fascinating.

Young (1990) argues that all those who are marked as Other become conceptually imprisoned in their bodies. Being imprisoned in one's body, or tied to one's body, reasserts a discursive border between mind and body. The implications of this are that at tourist events such as the HERO Parade or the Sydney Mardi Gras, the hosts are tied to their bodies and heterosexual tourists gain pleasure through their mind(ful) gazes. I explore this mind/body, tourist/host hierarchical relationship by drawing on the notion of abjection.
ABJECTION

Kristeva (1982) develops the notion of abjection in *Powers of Horror* (1982). The feeling of abjection is one of disgust, often evoking nausea. Abjection:

is an extremely strong feeling which is at once somatic and symbolic, and which is above all a revolt of the person against an external menace from which one has the impression that it is not only an external menace but that it may menace us from the inside. So it is a desire for separation, for becoming autonomous and also the feeling of impossibility of doing so (Kristeva 1982, 135).

That which is abject is something so repulsive that it both attracts and repels. It is both fascinating and disgusting. The abject exists on the border, but does not respect the border. It is "ambiguous", "inbetween", "composite" (Kristeva 1982, 4). The abject is what threatens identity. It is neither good nor evil, subject nor object, but something that threatens the distinctions themselves. Kelly Oliver (1993, 56) claims: "Every society is founded on the abject - constructing boundaries and jettisoning the antisocial - every society may have its own abject." Kristeva (1982) maintains that the impure can never be completely removed. Abjection's ambiguity means that while releasing a hold, it does not radically cut off the subject from what threatens it - on the contrary, abjection acknowledges it to be in perpetual danger.

Geographer David Sibley (1995, 8) adopts Kristeva's (1982) notion of abjection to argue that:

the urge to make separations, between clean and dirty, ordered and disordered, 'us' and 'them', that is, to expel the abject, is encouraged in western cultures, creating feelings of anxiety because such separations can never be finally achieved.
The urge to maintain ‘us-tourists’ and ‘them-gays’ at the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras can be understood as abjection. The discursive separation between tourists and hosts, Self and Other, mind and body can never be achieved.

Kristeva (1982) argues that there are three broad categories of abjection. Grosz (1994, 193) understands these to be “abjection towards food and thus toward bodily incorporation; abjection toward bodily waste, which reaches its extreme in the horror of the corpse; and abjection towards signs of sexual difference.”

It is be possible to connect various floats in the HERO Parade with all of these categories. The first category, abjection towards food and bodily incorporation, can be linked to paraders who reject the notions that:

A slim, fit body is for some a source of pride to be paraded in public places, spelling discipline, success and conformity, whereas fat is seen as a sign of moral and physical decay. Fat people are stereotyped as undisciplined, self-indulgent, unhealthy, lazy, untrustworthy, unwilling and non-conforming ... Unlike the disciplined slim body the fat body is not welcome in everyday places (Bell and Valentine 1997, 35-36).

Few lesbian bodies on parade represent existing norms of ‘feeding regimes’. Many of the lesbian bodies on display are large. Paraders, such as Dykes on Bikes, Marching Girls, and the lesbian float called Lassoo, tend to ignore disciplinary regimes that aim at making a slim body. Instead there is often pride associated with being large (see Chapter 6 where I discuss the HERO Marching Girls in more detail). Tourists’ abject reactions to large lesbians are evident in some of their comments. For example, two men comment on a large Dyke on a Bike:
"Oh, God, did you see her? She's huge (.) nice bike
though" (participant observation notes, 23 February 1997,
emphasis in original).

Many of the male bodies on parade are very ‘trim’ (see Chapter 6 ‘Making
Men’). Body image, or a specific disregard of conventional body images,
may represent heteronormativity in a corporeal sense. There is potential
for more research (following Bell and Valentine 1997) into the perception
of abject, ugly bodies in relation to food.

The second category of abjection, bodily waste and horror of the corpse, is
integral to many floats at the HERO Parade and Mardi Gras. Both parades
are organised to raise funds for HIV/AIDS organisations. Pride parades
which rest on gay male bodies, also rest on the notion of abjection.
“Sexuality has become reinvested with notions of contagion and death, of
danger and purity, as a consequence of the AIDS crisis” (Grosz 1994, 193).
Gay male sex is understood (by ‘straight’ society) to be predicated on oral
penetration and faecal contamination and this carries an unspeakable
connection to excremental pollution. Kristeva (1982, 71) argues:
“Excrement and its equivalents (decay, infection, disease, corpse, etc.)
stand for the danger to identity that which comes from without: the ego
threatened by the non-ego, society threatened by its outside, life by death.”

Several floats in the HERO Parade can be connected to this understanding
of abjection. Specifically, floats which represent HIV/AIDS organisations,
such as the Safe Sex float, Herne Bay House Float (residential care for
people living with HIV/AIDS), Body Positive Float, and the
Remembrance Float, intensify the abject thoughts of ‘straight’ tourists,
that disease is picked up off rectal walls and death follows from this
disease.

Gay pride parades are also significant sites for analyses of sexual
difference, the third category of abjection. There are many HERO floats
that fit this category. In particular, the following floats and paraders most obviously focused on sexual difference: Drag Queens, Te Waka Awhina, Mika, Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, TransPride (see Chapter 6 where I elaborate on this float), Lost Grannies and Surrender Dorothy. These paraders disrupted and subverted conventional and hegemonic notions of sexual difference.

Paraders’ bodies are not only perceived as disgusting, however, they are also perceived as attractive. Abjection invokes both attraction and repulsion.

**Pulses of attraction and revulsion**

Parade participants are defined by their particular embodiment. They are marked and inscribed as the visible Other. At the same time that paraders are Othered, they may also be understood as ‘attractive’. Oppression is structured by dynamics of desire, pulses of attraction and aversion (Young 1990).

While a certain cultural space is reserved for revering feminine beauty and desirability, in part that very cameo ideal renders most women drab, ugly, loathsome, or fearful bodies. Old people, gay men and lesbians, disabled people and fat people also occupy as groups the position of ugly, fearful, or loathsome bodies (Young 1990, 123-124).

Pulses of attraction and aversion structure the ways that tourists gaze at, and keep their distance from, bodies in the HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades. Tourists are both drawn to and fear the bodies on parade. One HERO Parade participant, Jay, described her desired ‘look’:

I kind of want to dress all sex kitten, cutesy and lollypop. I want to wear a pink rubber ‘70s style bikini with long false eyelashes, pink eyes, lips, and nails - all shiney and glittery. It will be gorgeous. I would like to show a bit of
flesh ... I just want to be all out sexy to everyone (Individual interview, 2 February, 1996).

Tourists might well find Jay's look attractive and appealing, but also rather frightening.

The most popular parade entry in the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras - the ones which powerfully attract a wide range of spectators - are the marching boys. These bodies tend to be the most popular with heterosexual women and gay men. The marching boys are young, tanned, and muscular. Weeks of preparation and discipline goes into the marching boys' routine, including weight training in gyms, skin tanning and body waxing. (See Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion on the desirability and attraction of the marching boys.)

In this research I have focused primarily on pulses of abhorrence rather than attraction since the sheer numbers of people who attend parades already speaks to their attractiveness.

Revulsion is evident in questionnaire responses to: 'Why have you come to the parade tonight? I have labelled these reactions as a desire to see a 'freak show'.

'Freaks'

At the roadside (behind the barrier) one respondent (self identified as a Heterosexual male, 36-45, New Zealand European/Pākehā, Self-employed) wrote on his questionnaire that he had come to the HERO Parade to "have a look". He defined the HERO Parade as a tourist event because: "It's strange, a freak show and a laugh if you're straight." This response can be read not only as an attempt to mark the parade participants as different from the dominant, heterosexual subject, but also as an attempt to mark the parade bodies as 'freaks'. Several responses from tourists
illustrated a desire to maintain a border between straight-tourist and gay-host. For example:

“Alternos deserve to have their lifestyles exposed a bit - makes us more comfortable” (Heterosexual male, 46-55, Other European/UK).

Clearly, this response exaggerates a dichotomy between heterosexuals (“us”) and homosexuals (“alternos”). The choice of words tends to normalise heterosexuals and to construct homosexuals as Other and as deviant. “Makes us more comfortable” can be read as the dominant (liberal and tolerant) heterosexual subjects granting permission for the parade to be held. The parades are, supposedly, a “comfortable” way to see gay bodies. Other responses indicate a voyeuristic fascination:

“To watch the strange people and to check out fashion” (Heterosexual male, 26-35, New Zealand Māori, Student).

“To perve” (Heterosexual female, 26-35, Technician).

“To have a look, entertainment” (Heterosexual male, 36-45, Manager, New Zealand European/Pākehā).

“Out of curiosity” (Heterosexual female, 46-55, New Zealand European/Pākehā, Credit Manager).

“To have a look, to see it first hand” (Heterosexual male, 26-35, New Zealand European/ Pākehā, Fireman).

Tourists’ stated expectations of gay pride parades illustrate their fascination with, and Othering of, queer bodies. Some of the tourists’ expectations and motivations to attend the Sydney Mardi Gras were similar:

“For fun and to see something different” (Heterosexual male, 36-45, Chinese, Student).

“Because I know it is a very good attraction and very interesting” (Heterosexual female, 15-25, Indonesian, Student).

“To see all the exciting people” (Straight female, 15-25, Australian, Clerk).
“For fun and to see something different” (Chinese male, 36-45, Student, sexuality not specified).

“Because I know it is a very good attraction and very interesting” (Heterosexual female, 15-25, Indonesian, Student).

There were many floats that directly emphasised the threat that queerness poses to social order. The ‘Demon Float’ (see Chapter 4) and ‘Salon Kitty’, which is a bondage and s/m float described as ‘Rubber/Latex fetish: Dressing for pleasure’ (see Figure 5.4), both challenged the heteronormative notions of acceptable sexual desire and pleasure through their displays of sado-masochism. The ‘New Zealand Prostitutes Collective’ bought the bodies of illicit sex workers into public view. The TransPride float challenged the authenticity of rhetoric about two genders/sexes. ‘Miss Kitty and Friends’, which consisted of a six foot six tall drag queen with two men on dog leads dressed as poodles, provided an animated debate about sexuality, bestiality and gender/sex roles. The ‘Safe Sex: No Ifs, No Butts’ float consisting of a large revolving polystyrene penis and eight dancing men and two women whipping each other, not only challenged the sanctity of church lawns (see Chapter 4) but also exposed the penis/phallus in a public place. Finally, as already suggested, the ‘Body Positive’ (an HIV/AIDS organisation) and the Herne Bay House floats, brought defiled, diseased bodies into view.

These bodies do not constitute proper social bodies (Grosz 1994). They threaten to disrupt order and purity, but, and at the same time, they reinforce societal order by remaining in the parade and not spilling into the watching tourists. These parade entries, which tended to be perceived as some of the most risqué, tend to reinforce a dichotomy between heterosexual and homosexual, or hosts and tourists.
Figure 5.4 The Fetish Float

Many of the bodies on the aforementioned floats were constructed by tourists as ‘ugly’. The objectification and overt domination of despised and ugly bodies became evident when I talked to some groups who entered the 1996 HERO Parade.

‘Ugly bodies’

Young (1990, 123) argues that the experience of oppression entails existing as a group defined as having “ugly bodies and being feared, avoided, or hated on that account.”

I conducted a focus group with five people who constructed the Transpride float for the 1996 HERO Parade. The theme of their float was ‘Heavenly’ and their objective was to upset the construction of transgenders as “ugly bodies” (Young 1990, 123). Aroha began with a description of their float:

Aroha: All the, the costumes on the float, the majority on the float are pastel colours and gold.

Lynda: Great.

Aroha: We wanted to create a heavenly (/ /)

Chris: (/ /) yeah yeah.

Aroha: approach.

Janet: Cos we can be pure just like anybody else ... why are we, why are we suddenly, why are we suddenly, considered dirty? (Yeah) because we want to cross a borderline sexually. You know and um, why should we look like sluts when we don’t feel like sluts?

Chris: Yeah, get rid of the typecast.

Lynda: Yeah, take away the stereotype.

Janet: Most people think transgender is a mockery.

Aroha: They do.
Janet: You know sort of taking off something.
Aroha: But then when you look at it, a lot of it, public attention is focused on girls on the street (Mmm). They’re the ones they see, but it’s not always the case.

Lynda: No.

Janet: And a lot of the girls on the street are just making a living, there’s nothing else they can do.

Aroha: And there is an awful lot of talent within the transgendered community (focus group, 15 February 1996).

Aroha, Janet and Chris wanted to challenge the dominant discourses that degrade and debase transgenders as ‘dirty’, and as ‘sluts’. They wanted to do this by invoking the opposite of being defined as ugly, hence their float had a very ‘feminine’ and ‘pure’ theme. Their float was constructed around traditional markers of femininity in terms of colours (pastels and gold), costumes, and other props (see Figure 5.5), in an attempt to offer a transgendered subjectivity other than that of ‘working girls on the street’.

It could be argued that transgenders represent a type of intolerable sexual ambiguity (Kristeva 1980). The heterosexual (cultural imperialist) tourist constructs a conceptual limit of human subjectivity. Categorisations of subjects as ‘freaks’, ‘ugly’, and ‘dirty sluts’ are attempts to reposition the border between the Self and the Other.

Some 1996 HERO paraders reported intolerable behaviour by tourists when they spilt across the road and into the parade. Paraders said there were: “isolated incidents of groping and hoonish behaviour by spectators” (express, 23 January 1997, 4). Spectators that engaged in behaviour that debased the parade participants can be read in several ways. First, this behaviour intensified the separation between the paraders, and the tourists. Second, the paraders’ reaction to the tourists’ debasing behaviour can be understood as a reversal of the tourists Othering of the paraders. By this I mean the paraders ‘Other’ the defiling tourists when they complain
Figure 5.5 TransPride decorations

Source: Photographs by Lynda Johnston, 15 February 1996.
about their behaviour. The paraders are, in this instance, the ‘pure’ and the tourists are the ‘defiled’.

Young (1990, 146) reflexively argues that:

Today the Other is not so different from me as to be an object; discursive consciousness asserts that Blacks, women, homosexuals, and disabled people are like me. But at the level of practical consciousness they are effectively marked as different. In this situation, those in the despised group threaten to cross over the border of the subject’s identity because discursive consciousness will not name them as completely different (cf. Frye 1983, 114-15). The face to face presence of these others, who do not act as though they have their own ‘place’, a status to which they are confined, thus threatens aspects of my basic security system, my basis sense of identity, and I must turn away with disgust and revulsion.

Young claims that: “homophobia is one of the deepest fears of difference precisely because the border between gay and straight is constructed as the most permeable; anyone at all can become gay.” The border, therefore, is most threatening when the gay body cannot be told apart from the straight body. It becomes increasingly difficult to “assert any difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals except their choice of partner” (Young 1990, 146). Only when gay bodies are clearly marked as different, as in gay pride parades, does this border become visible and therefore less threatening to the dominant culture.

**DISRUPTING THE BORDER**

Responses that exemplified support and pride, especially from those tourists who identified as gay, disrupted Self/Other and mind/body dichotomies. By acknowledging the Other to be the Self, the discursive border is disrupted. These responses included:
"To celebrate gay pride and my own sexuality" (Gay male, 15-25, New Zealand/European Pākehā, Computer programmer).

"To grasp the wonderful atmosphere - to be a proud Australian - to be part of a great moment" (Lesbian female, 15-25, Australian, student).

"To celebrate what I am and to find a man. To have fun and be happy" (Gay male, 15-25, Australian, Box office manager).

"To support it and have a look and suss out talent" (Gay male, 36-45, New Zealand/European Pākehā, Health professional).

"Because Mardi Gras is for queers what Xmas is for heterosexuals" (Dirty Dyke!, female, 26-35, Anglo, Library assistant).

"To enjoy and support Auckland" (Gay male, 36-45, New Zealand/European Pākehā, Computer trainer).

"To celebrate my/our sexuality!" (Gay male, 36-45, New Zealand/European Pākehā, Civil servant).

I have grouped questionnaire responses from gay men, lesbians and bisexuals into Figure 5.6. The question was: 'What do you think the parade does for Auckland’s (and Sydney’s) image'? These respondents, rather than show an Othering of bodies in parades, tended to embrace and celebrate the parade as part of their identity.

In the next three sub-sections I discuss three particular floats of the 1996 HERO Parade and examine the ways in which each one discursively ‘disrupts borders’.

**Rainbow Youth**

One interesting example, which disrupts dichotomies, is the Rainbow Youth float. I conducted a focus group with Rainbow Youth at the HERO Parade workshop. They were painting a banner for their parade entry (see Figure 5.7). I began by asking about the organisation of Rainbow Youth.
Auckland:

"It makes them realise reality."
"Promotes Auckland as a gay oriented city."
"Improves it. Makes Auckland cosmopolitan. Shows that there are many different groups in New Zealand and they should all be represented. Many people are not Christian."
"To be part of some thing I am and that I don’t have to hide behind."
"Because I am gay and very supportive of the community I live and work in. Living and working in this gayest suburb is very important to me."
"Fun/diversity of inhabitants."
"Shows that we are a multi-sexual culture! It helps to show those against us that we are ‘normal’, from all walks of life and not necessarily stereotypically ‘queer’."
"It shows that all groups make up the city."
"To participate in the occasion, do my part to draw attention to our community, and of course, as a social event!"

Sydney:

"Well, well, well, it’s a happening fantastic place to be out and proud."
"It is an event where you can be yourself, express yourself - FREEDOM."
Rachel: Um, we are an organisation ... um that provides services for, um, gay and lesbian and bisexual people.

Lynda: Yes.

Rachel: And we do things like school workshops, um, run a social group, a women's one called 'Dykelets and Bykelets'

Lynda: Mmm.

Rachel: And a guy's one called 'Young Gays' and we do all the admin. support for Ice Breakers and we've got a 24 hour information line that just tells about the groups' activities that go on around Auckland and what else do we do? We do projects like, recently we took people down the Puhoe River in rafts with Wander Women, who took us.

Lynda: Oh, great.

Rachel: And we went on a confidence course out at 'X' High and that was through Wander Women as well (/ /)

Nick: (/ /) and we provide a regular newsletter (focus group, 14 February 1996).

I was interested in their work in high schools, so I questioned them further. I began with an assertion, that:

Lynda: Nobody wants to know queer people in their classrooms. Have you had any, like, backlash or? (/ /)

Rachel: (/ /) Not in a big way. That [name of School Principal] guy said there were no queer people in his school. And Simon is from his school [turn and look at Simon] [All laughing]

Lynda: And, and, who is this guy?

Nick: The Principal and an Auckland City Councillor.

Lynda: Oh no. He said there was no (/ /)

Rachel/Nick/Sam: Yes.

Nick: I might add that actually at that time, Sam was actually in one of our groups (focus group, 14 February 1996, emphasis in original).
Figure 5.7 Rainbow Youth Banner

Source: Photograph by Lynda Johnston, 14 February 1996.
I have included this exchange as it illustrates the way that some high school authorities (and Auckland City Councillors) try to deny the existence of young, gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. The only way the school Principal can defend his heterosexual identity is to turn away with irrational disgust. The Rainbow Youth parade entry built on this denial of their existence in a way that undermined and jeopardised dualistic thinking.

The Rainbow float contained young people dressed in various Auckland high school uniforms. Their banner read: 'We’re Here, We’re Queer, We’re in Your Classroom' (see Figure 5.7). Their school uniforms marked their bodies as Self, not as Other, as mind, not as body. Tourists at the HERO Parade, intent on consuming the Other, have this desire disrupted. Rainbow Youth discussed their parade objectives in a focus group interview.

Rachel: I think that’s why, it’s basically why I think it’s a good idea. We’re getting out there and part of our, our float is that we’re all dressed in school uniforms and our banners like ‘We’re Here, We’re Queer, We’re in Your Classroom’, kind of thing and it ... and it lets people know that, that we are in the classrooms and also for people who might be watching who are queer, it’s quite good to know that there are other people out there going through the same thing.

Lynda: Yeah. A lot of the people going in the parade dressed up to be really outrageous. So it’s quite ironic that you’re putting on, um, you know uniforms to be like regular life out there. It’s a really nice kind of twist to the whole parade.

Nick: The other thing is that the very fact that we are wearing uniforms is in its own way outrageous ... In some ways, um, the point, the point of our float is to shock people a little bit ... It’s to wake them up and say ‘we’re here’ and in that respect it is going to be quite outrageous ... Um, it’ll be interesting to see people’s reactions when they see their school uniform (focus group, 14 February 1996, emphasis added).
Nick's remark highlights the possible border anxiety of the Self/Other relationship between parade participants of the Rainbow Youth float and the roadside tourists. A float representing the Self, such as the Rainbow Youth float, upsets and disrupts this dichotomy. Tourists watching may recognise their own, or one of their children's, school uniforms. As a consequence, the border between straight/gay, mind/body and Self/Other becomes blurred. Heterosexual tourists are faced with a disruption of their 'normalised', unmarked identity.

There were other groups involved in the HERO Parade, directly and indirectly, that also destabilised the mind/body and Self/Other dualism. One such group was Gaily Normal.

**Gaily Normal**

The name Gaily Normal establishes the possibility for border anxiety. 'Normality' is usually equated with heterosexuality (this became evident in the questionnaire responses). Gaily Normal are a political gay group that attempt to construct themselves as Self, rather than as deviant Other. They object to all homosexuals being stereotyped as, for example, drag queens, marching boys, or as involved in s/m sexual practices.

The *New Zealand Listener* (Gearing 1994, 26-27) published an article, 'Hero V Homebody: a gay debate', in which Gaily Normal's objections to the HERO Parade were articulated.

Gaily Normal ... announce the sound of a new voice in the gay community, after a call by the large number of people who do not feel heard or represented under current circumstances. This has become particularly evident with the recent controversial issue of simulated sexual and violent explicitness in parts of the Hero parade. Many gay people are not willing any longer to be 'lumped in' under the always most visible umbrella of drag, S & M, and other generally explicit content. A large
proportion of the gay community live lives not
dissimilar from most 'straight' people.

Gaily Normal also added “It is time for gays to blend in with heteros” (quoted by Gearing 1994, 26). In this instance, Gaily Normal attempt to align themselves with the dominant discourse of heterosexuality, or the heterocentric mainstream. This caused a backlash from other members of Auckland’s gay community. A HERO Parade organiser (quoted by Gearing 1994, 27) reacted to Gaily Normal in the following way:

I am not prepared to have our community present a sterile version of itself to gain acceptance from the alter. If that was the thinking then we wouldn’t be this far down the track. There are Doctors and Lawyers on the floats, anyway. Do you want to see a float of two gay men reading the paper and drawing up a Foodtown list? Normal, but hardly exciting. Thank God that we have the edge that excites.

The HERO Director (quoted by Gearing 1994, 27) claimed that Gaily Normal were a symbol of self oppression by stating: “It is a trend in all minorities struggling for identity in a suffocating world ... Others in this minority, desperate to be part of the dominant culture, will do anything to maintain acceptance or normality.” This reaction to Gaily Normal, by the HERO project, further reinforces a straight/gay binary. Gaily Normal is constructed by the HERO project as politically ineffectual and as passively cohabiting with a hegemonic, heterosexual culture, which is oppressive to sexual dissidents.

Gaily Normal can also be read through Young’s (1990) argument about cultural imperialism. I have already stated that when the homosexual body cannot be told apart from the heterosexual body, then the border anxiety is greatest. Gaily Normal can be understood as part of ‘normal’ society and hence, more threatening to cultural imperialists.
Robert discussed with me the conflicts that emerged between Gaily Normal and his parade entry, the ‘Demon Float’.

Robert: Gaily normal were saying ‘we don’t want these freaks showing themselves in public, there are gay people who are normal’. We kind of got really pissed off with that because, I mean, for me there are, for me there is lot of difference within the gay community ... And why shouldn’t we represent the whole side of it ... The whole spectrum?

Lynda: Do you think that it stereotypes, that the HERO Parade stereotypes, some of the gay community?

Robert: Oh hideously, yeah. But then the gay community is very conservative in New Zealand anyway. It’s quite um, frightened of difference. It is actually quite conservative, that, that once you start to look different or stand out, you aren’t accepted as readily and you actually get a bit of a hard time.

Lynda: So there seems to be like a code of behaviour?


Robert’s analysis is indicative of several conflicting assumptions surrounding the HERO Parade. On one hand, the HERO Parade produces a proliferation of difference (there is a lot of difference in the gay community). On the other hand, the HERO Parade stereotypes bodies of the parade as the unified Other of the (mostly) heterosexual audience. In relation to Young’s (1990) argument, Gaily Normal can be read as very transgressive because they threaten to spill into the ordered society, almost unnoticed, and therefore, undetectable. There is, however, more at stake here. Elspeth Probyn (1993, 10) discusses some of the politics of group identity:

I was just recently agonizing over whether to go on a demonstration celebrating Gay Pride in Montréal and denouncing the police brutality towards the gay and lesbian community. Here was a space that desperately needs struggling over; however, while I know that marching is a very necessary form of struggle, it is not my favourite form of contestation; the ‘solidarity’ of large
crowds makes me feel slightly uncomfortable, if not claustrophobic. Eventually I did go because a visible presence of gays, lesbians and bisexuals peacefully walking along through the downtown centre is an effective way of combating homophobia and heterosexism. However, as we proceeded along our route, it became obvious that many of these marchers were from another generation - the ten years separating me from these proudly 'out' dykes in their early twenties meant that the 'we' somehow died in my throat along with the chant, 'We're here, we're queer, we're fabuulous'.

Gaily Normal provided an alternative representation of the 'gay community' and hence a disruption to the dichotomies of Self and Other, straight and gay. The Gay Auckland Business Association (GABA) also disrupted these binaries.

**Gay Auckland Business Association**

The Gay Auckland Business Association (GABA) entered a float in the 1996 HERO Parade. Their float was an 'office scene' with people dressed in business suits, working at computers and answering phones. It was representative of what one participant described as a 'professional' image.

Justin: GABA is more a business organisation that, um, it's there for networking purposes ... It has quite a low profile and that's the thing that we are trying to change with GABA because not very many people know of it, certainly a lot of gay people don't. So, as far as getting involved in gay marches or events or whatever, GABA has actually been very low key.

Lynda: Right.

Justin: Um, one, because a lot of gay professional people are quite reserved about being gay. They are not so out during the day or visibly [out]. And secondly we haven't had a lot of um, what's the words, support, flags, bunting whatever to say 'hey, here we are'. So the first one, really, that we were visible in, was the recent Coming Out Day Parade where we did have a float. That's the first one for quite a while.

Lynda: And you were giving out fliers as well.
Justin: Yes. So we had a float made up. It wasn’t spectacular by any means but it costs money and that’s basically where it all comes back to. The cost of putting a float in. And we simply ran that down Ponsonby Road and we had three or four of us handing out leaflets on GABA, letting people know because, again, to let people know is difficult (individual interview, 24 January 1996).

Justin claims that many gay professionals are quite reserved and that they are not ‘out’ during the day. One of the reasons for this, I believe, is that there are many risks involved in being an ‘out professional’. Once ‘out(ed)’ cultural imperialists may “turn away in disgust and revulsion” (Young 1990, 146). Being a professional also means occupying a position which is conceptually aligned with the mind. If the border between mind and body is crossed in a ‘mind’ job, then the fears of the dominant group are unleashed. Justin also invokes day/night and serious/fun binaries for professionals. A day time job is most likely to be understood as professional. A night time job is more likely to be conceptualised as deviant and aligned to the body.

A well known and outspoken Aotearoa/New Zealand journalist, Warwick Roger, who claims he is not homophobic, sums up this dichotomy:

> And I’m in two minds about gays who prance half-naked along Ponsonby Road on Saturday night in February and then expect to be taken seriously as doctors, lawyers, accountants and teachers the following Monday morning. But good luck to them, I say, if prancing makes them happy (Rogers 1998, 6).

Doctors, lawyers, accountants and teachers are all ‘professionals’ and, according to Rogers (1998), should not be both of ‘the body’ and of ‘the mind’. If a gay professional is not ‘out’ in the work place, then their sexuality is usually assumed to be heterosexual. In the HERO Parade, ‘out’ professionals upset this connection between heterosexuality and
proficiency. Rogers (1998) could be described as a ‘professional’ journalist. He attempts to distance himself from the ‘professional queer bodies’ because they threaten to split his identity as a member of the dominant heterosexual group.

CONCLUSIONS

The HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras provide important sites from which to discuss various power relations involved in tourism processes. At these parades borders are maintained between tourists and hosts. These borders are crucial to the success of the events. The physical or material borders keep the (largely heterosexual) crowd separated from the queer bodies on parade. For the watching heterosexual tourists, this physical separation takes some of the ‘threat’ out of homosexual bodies.

A conceptual border at the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras, separates those who are perceived to represent the body, from those who are perceived to represent the mind. This mind/body dichotomy becomes aligned with heterosexual tourists/homosexual hosts.

Young’s (1990) theory of cultural imperialism adds weight to my argument that queer bodies on parade become Othered by the heterosexual tourists. Straight tourists, or ‘cultural imperialists’, culturally inscribe homosexual bodies as deviant, freaks and as ugly. Heterosexual tourists are both attracted to and repelled by the bodies on parade. Kristeva’s notion of the abject, that which is both fascinating and disgusting, is useful in provoking greater understanding of the tourist events of HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras.

My discussion has involved theoretical and political tensions surrounding notions of liberalism, group identity and difference. I have
also inserted 'political struggle' into tourism studies. Gay pride parades
provide an opportunity to deconstruct acts of tourism, pleasure and
politics as these are lived through the bodies involved. This discussion of
the HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras, and relationships between
heterosexual tourists and gay hosts, shows that these tourist events are
both complicit with dualistic mechanisms of western thought, and, at the
same time, they contest hierarchical dualisms through a disruption of the
cultural imperialist position as 'normal' and neutral.
The following excerpt is from the ABC televised production of the 1995 Sydney Mardi Gras Parade. ABC television presenters Angela Catterns, David Marr and gay comedian Julian Clary, comment on the parade as it passes through the streets. Another ABC television presenter, Elle McFeast, mingles and talks with the paraders on the street:

Angela Catterns: Here are the Locker Room Boys. They’ve liberated the locker room. I’m sure Elle [McFeast] is going to find out what is under their towels.

Julian Clary: Explain this to me. I don’t understand being a foreigner. What is a locker room?

David Marr: It’s a changing room attached to a - by the looks of them - a gymnasium. They’re wearing their towels.

Julian Clary: I think it’s positively bizarre.

Angela Catterns: The idea is to take the locker room out of the gym and the sauna domain, Julian. They want to take it out and march it proudly along the street and have fun.

Julian Clary: But women go to the sauna, women go to the gym.

David Marr: They don’t go into the men’s changing room - even in this country ...

Julian Clary: Ohh, they have taken their towels off ... I shall have to cover my eyes in a minute.
On the street Elle McFeast interviews one of the Locker Room Boys:

Elle McFeast: Tell me - how important are gyms to the gay culture?

Locker Room Boy: We are the gay culture, we are the essence of the gay culture.

Elle McFeast: A lot of waxing has gone into preparations?

Locker Room Boy: Yes, we have gone to a lot of trouble, a lot of effort, a lot of pain, to make people happy (Sydney Mardi Gras Parade 1995, ABC Video).

I begin by discussing the Locker Room Boys from the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade because I am interested in the ways in which their bodies are gendered/sexed at gay pride parades. In particular, I have chosen to focus on one ‘type’ of parade entry - male ‘marching’ groups - because the bodies of these participants in the HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades disrupt binary notions of femininity and masculinity. The ‘matter’ of men’s muscled bodies provides the ground for both confirming and contesting hierarchical dualisms such as masculinity/femininity, culture/nature, and mind/body. Not only do male marching groups disrupt notions of the fixed biology of ‘the body’ but they also provide new spaces for ‘thinking through the body’ (Gallop 1988) in studies of tourism. Through a close examination of the bodies of the marching boys, I suggest a number of deconstructive readings of hegemonic notions of gender/sex and sexuality.

The HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade can be conceived of as heterosexualised tourist sites/sights which, ironically, confirm traditional notions of feminine and masculine stereotypes. The heterosexualised tourist sight/site, in part, constitutes the corporeality of the marching boys. Bodies on parade become invested with specific relations of power and domination.
In Chapter 4 I argued that queer bodies can queer the streets. In this chapter I argue that the streets as tourist sites/sights can ‘gender/sex’ the parading bodies. Bodies are gendered/sexed according to a particular place, time and tourist event (see Grosz 1992). The bodies of the marching boys, and the streets in which parades are held, are both politicised sites of change and are mutually constitutive. This constitutive relationship between bodies and tourist sites/sights provides a frame through which to examine contradictory and changing aspects of the performative corporeality of male marching groups in gay pride parades.

I am also aware that within these tourist sites/sights the marching boys’ bodies provide challenges to hegemonic notions of gender/sex and sexuality, but they also participate in the dominant discourses which shape masculine bodies. This chapter builds on my argument that HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades are tourist sites/sights at which both group (cultural imperialist) oppression (Young 1990) and celebration takes place.

The first objective for this chapter is to chart the ways in which the tourist sites/sights of the HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades constitute the gendered/sexed corporeality of the marching boys’ bodies, specifically the Locker Room Boys and the HERO Marching Boys. The second objective, is to ‘read’ the male marching bodies of the HERO and of the Sydney Mardi Gras parades in three contradictory ways. First, I argue that the marching boys’ bodies - muscular/bronzed/smooth/oiled - can be read as hyper-masculine, or ‘all-man’. As hyper-masculine bodies they become gendered/sexed within contradictory hegemonic discourses of ‘ideal’ or ‘dominant’ bodies versus Othered bodies. Second, marching boys’ bodies can be read as feminised or ‘disciplined’ bodies that become objectified by the tourist gaze. Third, marching boys’ bodies can be read as
sites of both femininity and masculinity, through the discourses of homosexuality and heterosexuality. The marching boys become borderline and abject figures that lurk at the margins of the masculinity/femininity, mind/body, nature/culture dualisms.

TOURIST SITES/SIGHTS THAT SEX BODIES

Julia Cream (1995a, 31) asks: “What is the sexed body?.” She argues that this question is rarely asked. Nor can this question be easily answered.

The sexed body is not simply there, ready and waiting, for us to examine. It is not something that can be broken down to its constituent parts. We don’t simply add sex to the body, and we definitely don’t add ‘the body’ to something called ‘sex’. What, then, is this thing we call the sexed body? (Cream 1995a, 31).

I have been puzzling over the ways in which the gendered/sexed bodies of the marching boys are made and remade at HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades. I have no definitive answers. It seems, however, that their bodies are gendered/sexed in a number of competing and contradicting ways.

Drawing on Grosz (1992) I argue that bodies and places are mutually constituted and hence bodies are gendered/sexed according to particular times and places. Space is bound into power/knowledge relationships and, therefore, the parades as tourists sites/sights are central to the subjectivity of the paraders. Rose (1995, 335) asserts that “particular imagined spatialities are constitutive of specific subjectivities. Identities are in part constituted by the kind of space through which they imagine themselves.”

Geographers David Bell, Jon Binnie, Julia Cream and Gill Valentine (1994, 31-48) discuss the ways sexual identity is performed in space. They
describe the hyper-masculine 'gay skinhead' and the hyper-feminine 'lipstick lesbian' and assess the effects of their performance in spaces which are actively constructed as heterosexual. Bell, Binnie, Cream and Valentine (1994) make important contributions that trouble gender and upset 'straight' spaces. They provide some points of connection and departure in my project for untangling the ways in which heterosexual tourists sites/sights construct the gendered/sexed bodies of the marching boys.

Grosz (1994, 142) pushes the constitutive relationship between bodies and environments further, arguing that:

it is crucial to note that these corporeal inscriptions do not simply adorn or add to a body that is basically given through biology; they help constitute the very biological organization of the subject - the subject's height, weight, coloring, even eye color, are constituted as such by a constitutive interweaving of genetic and environmental factors.

Bodies, therefore, do more than 'perform' or 'put on' a particular gender and sexuality. Bodies are gendered/sexed in a way that can challenge the very matter of bodies.

The body discipline needed for being part of the marching boys is intimately linked to power. Biopower is a useful concept for understanding:

the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capacities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility ... all of this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterized the disciplines: an anatomo-politics of the human body (Foucault 1976b, 139).

The marching boys are caught up in, and constituted by, other (institutional) biopower discourses relating to the gendered/sexed bodies
of gay pride parades. When these built bodies use power through the medium of their bodies, certain 'contradictions' emerge.

Before I discuss the ways in which marching boys' bodies can be read as hyper-masculine and feminine, I give some background to their performance in gay pride parades.

**Male marching groups**

Male marching groups are well known not only in Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand and Sydney, Australia, but also in San Francisco, USA. Judging by the response of the tourists watching the parades from the street-side, marching boys are the most popular entry in both parades. Male marching groups perform a synchronised choreographed march/dance routine to music. Their routines are similar to 'real' female marching teams that are popular in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia. Male marching groups at gay pride parades wear theme related 'uniforms'. For example, the Locker Room Boys at 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras wore gym towels because they wanted to affirm and celebrate 'gym' culture (a popular activity with some members of gay male communities). In 1997 the HERO Marching Boys wore sparkly shorts and narrow sun glasses as a way of adopting a futuristic 'outer space' theme (see Figure 6.1).

In the 1996 HERO Parade the Marching Boys wore a lifesaving outfit which incorporated swimming shorts, goggles and caps. Marching boys at the 1997 Sydney Mardi Gras Parade wore pink shorts with a heart shape

---

34 Teams of marching 'girls' and young women compete annually in national championships. They wear a military style uniform and usually wear very short skirts. The synchronisity of movement is vital to their performance.
cut-out in the buttocks. Many of the uniforms worn by the marching boys are scanty and expose lots of skin and muscles.

Male marching groups tend to have between 40 to 70 men. Their routines usually have moments when they are stationary and turn directly to face the tourists. They also march forward so as to advance along the parade route with the other parade entries. Routines tend to be performed to music that is significant for gay male communities. For instance, the Locker Room Boys have used overtly gay music, such as ‘YMCA’, from the group The Village People. The music of these parades may help to create ‘transgressive space’ (see Valentine 1995, for a discussion on the production of queer space through lesbian icon kd lang’s music). Music is also significant to the construction and performance of sexualised identities in gay pride parades (see Smith 1994, who challenges the visual bias of geographical knowledge by offering a study of soundscapes). The creation of transgressive space through music, bodies and performance in public becomes troubled at tourist sites/sights. The significant construction of HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades as tourist events exaggerates the processes by which bodies and places become gendered/sexed. At gay pride parades, heterosexual tourists expect to see bodies that defy normative assumptions of gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies, while, at the same time, they attempt to construct bodies as either masculine or feminine.

---

35 YMCA stands for the Young Men’s Christian Association and was one of the Village People’s most successful songs. One reason for its success is because of the subversive lyrics which encourage gay men to stay in male only Christian accommodation.
Figure 6.1 The HERO Marching Boys: ‘Marcho Men’

The (dis)embodied tourist gaze

In Chapter 2 I argued that tourism studies' academics who engage with 'the tourist gaze' tend to render gazing tourists as disembodied watchers. In this chapter I put flesh to the gaze in a way that unpacks the power relations that produce bodies and places as tourist sites/sights. I use the notion of 'tourist sites/sights' to cement the idea that the tourists who gaze at queer bodies on parade are always (already) in place.

In an attempt to understand the relationship between the straight tourist gaze and the paraders bodies at the HERO Parade and at the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade, I draw on Foucault's (1976a, 1980) notion of the panoptican, referring to Bentham's design for a prison that leaves prisoners perpetually exposed to a one way viewing tower, in order to illustrate the ways in which subjects often police themselves. Foucault (1980, 105) argues:

There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that s/he is her/his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over and against, her/himself. A superb formula: power exercised continuously and for what turns out to be at minimal cost.

The panoptican can act as an appropriate metaphor for heterosexism. The panoptican functions as "a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised ... it becomes a machine, no one owns it" (Foucault 1976b, 156). Heterosexism can function like a machine, with no apparent or recognisable origin. The panoptic gaze usually resides in heterosexual bodies (and internalised in homosexual bodies). Heterosexual tourists are subjects who police themselves and each other, and hence remain part of the dominant social
group (cultural imperialists). Gay pride parades - as sites of celebration - resist heterosexism. They are - as tourist sites/sights - always situated within heterosexism.

Rose (1993, 104) argues that: “the (hetero)sexuality of the active gaze is structured as masculine in phallocentric cultures and societies” and constructs hegemonic gendered/sexed and sexualised embodied difference. The construction of the active heterosexual gaze as masculine is intensely problematic but worth pursuing. Feminists (beginning with Laura Mulvey’s (1975) eminent work on the masculine gaze) have made compelling arguments about the power of the male gaze. If women obtain positions of power through the pleasures of the gaze, they are said to ‘masquerade’ as men in order to look (Doane 1990).

The power of such arguments are incontestable, they are also undeniably based within a heterosexual vision of the world - indeed their descriptive force is matched by the primacy of heterosexuality determining the actual form of social relations (Probyn 1995, 80).

The primacy of the heterosexual/masculine gaze means that paraders who can queer the streets also become resignified through the heterosexualised tourist gaze. The HERO Parade and the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade invite the visual, the public (heterosexual/masculine) gaze. The bodies on parade are signified as the object, the Other, of the gaze, as well as being a tourist sight/site of resistance.

Sally Munt (1995, 114-125), faced with the oppressive gaze of heterosexuality in Nottingham, rewrites herself as a lesbian flâner. Rewriting herself as a (lesbian) flâner challenges the disembodied and masculinist construction of flâner which is evident in postmodern accounts of ‘gazing tourists’ (see also Jokenin and Veijola 1997, 23-51, who offer subversive embodied constructions of the flâner). A city can
become inscribed with an intense heterosexual rigidity produced by the heterosexual gaze. Munt (1995, 115) notes: "As I became a victim to, rather than a perpetrator of, the gaze, my fantasies of lesbian mobility/eroticism return to haunt me." Munt (1995, 123) argues that in the urban landscape:

even the protected zones are folding, and yet there are pockets of resistance which pierce the city's metaphoric paralysis with parody: Gay Pride is one such representation, fifty thousand homosexuals parading through the city streets, of every type, presenting the Other of heterosexuality, from Gay Bankers to the Gay Men's Chorus singing 'It's Raining Men', a carnival image of space being permeated by its antithesis.

Gay pride parades, therefore, become sites/sights of freedom and oppression. Munt (1995) shows that the positions occupied by subjects are never completely fixed. The sexual politics of the look can involve other pleasures. This tension between violence and freedom from oppression is also the topic of Probyn's (1995) response to Bell, Binnie, Cream and Valentine's (1994) account of 'lipstick lesbians' in heterosexual space. Probyn (1995, 81) states that:

While one could argue that the sight of two women kissing cannot escape the strictures of heterosexual porn codes, we might also think about, include in our theorizing, the fact that making out in a straight place can be a turn-on.

Parading bodies cannot undo the historicity of the ways in which the masculine (heterosexualised) gaze produces a tourist site/sight as the place for the production of the Other. The fact that queer bodies materialise their same sex desire, however, can go some way towards rearticulating that tourist site/sight (Probyn 1995). It could be argued that the performance of queer desire for heterosexual tourists can be a turn-on. Lustful same sex displays in gay pride parades can be thought of as "a type of articulation of desire that bends and queers" (Probyn 1995, 81) a
masculine (heterosexual) gaze, allowing for a momentarily sexed queer space.

**Bending the masculine/heterosexual gaze**

The HERO Marching Boys are an extremely popular parade entry. When I spoke to the HERO Marching Boys, it became evident that their routine ‘worked’ because they played with, and seemed excited about, heterosexual tourists watching and constructing them as Other. The Marching Boys looked back at the spectators. They also directed sexually suggestive movements and expressions towards the spectators. Several HERO Marching Boys lead the routine and ‘turned up the crowd’:

Malcolm: We’re supposed to be the young, young dancing boys.

Brad: Sort of turns everybody on. We’re supposed to turn up the crowd (individual/group interview, 13 February 1996).

The performance of the HERO Marching Boys, in fact, relied on the heterosexual/masculinist tourist gaze, as well as the tourist flesh. Malcolm and Brad turned up the crowd, and each other, by dancing together and by breaking through the road barriers and dancing with spectators. In these body touching moments, spectators and Marching Boys disrupt, and hold in tension, heterosexual/homosexual, Self/Other and mind/body binaries. Tourists are no longer safe behind the road barriers from queer bodies. Tourists become part of the spectacle when they are drawn into part of the performance with the HERO Marching Boys. Furthermore, their tactile connection upsets the reliance on, and dominance of, the visual at the parades. The actions of the HERO Marching Boys, for a queer sexed space moment, unhinge heterosexism.

On the one hand, therefore, parades serve to reinforce western dichotomies such as mind/body, heterosexual/homosexual, and
public/private. Gay pride parades can work to Other bodies through cultural imperialism by the dominant group (Young 1990). Dominant discourses of the HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades work to construct heterosexuality and homosexuality as radically different. On the other hand, there are moments of resistance to the heterosexual/masculinist tourist gaze.

Resistance to dominant discourses can also be found by examining the historical construction of heterosexuality. Rather than conceptualise homosexuality and heterosexuality as distinct and separate, another approach is to position homosexuality and heterosexuality as thoroughly entwined (Foucault 1981). This approach insists that heterosexuality depends on homosexuality. Historically, heterosexuality is understood as being derived from homosexuality. According to Foucault (1981), it was not until 1870 that homosexuality was specified as a particular identity category and the concept of heterosexuality could consequently emerge. Heterosexuality, therefore, requires a material conception of homosexuality and the active Othering of homosexuality in order to define itself as a distinct social form (Butler 1990). The gazing heterosexual tourists at the side of the streets are reconstituted through/by their Other, the homosexual bodies in the parades.

Given the structures and complexities of the power of tourists’ gazes, it is difficult, and not necessarily useful, to attach a single meaning to the marching boys’ bodies. It is possible to ‘read’ the marching boys’ bodies in two (or more) ways. I am aware of the complexity and difficulty in theorising gay male bodies, that is as double subjects: masculine and gay. The first of these discourses that I discuss is that at gay pride parades western hierarchical binaries such as masculine/feminine, mind/body, and nature/culture are inscribed onto the bodies of the marching boys.
HYPER-MASCU LINE 'MARCHO' MEN

Becoming a Locker Room Boy involves engaging in specific exercises, usually carried out at a gymnasium, in order to become muscular. Having a muscular body - in western traditions - has tended to be a masculine pursuit. Body building for men can be seen as the fulfilment of a hegemonic notion of masculinity and/or virility. Male body building can be read as an attempt to render the whole body into the phallus, “creating the male body as hard, impenetrable, pure muscle” (Grosz 1994, 224). This narcissistic attention, development, and display of muscular male bodies as the indicator of a dominant form of masculinity, has largely been restricted to “Post-Renaissance western society, its earlier manifestation in the ancient classical world having given way for over a millennium (largely under the influence of Christianity) to alternative models” (Dutton 1995, 16). Strength, stamina, control and virility are all attributes associated with muscular male bodies and appear to be sought by the Locker Room Boys’ bodies. The connection between musculature and maleness often becomes naturalised and essentialised.

In a discussion on gay male body building, David Halperin (1997, 116) insists that “queer muscles are not the same as straight muscles.” Halperin (1997) draws upon an argument put forward by Miller (1992, 31, emphasis in original) who states:

Only those who can’t tell an elbow from an ass will confuse the different priorities of the macho straight male body and the so-called gym-body of gay male culture. The first deploys its heft as a tool (for work, for its potential and actual intimidation of other, weaker men or of women) - as both an armoured body and a body wholly given over to utility ... whereas the second displays its muscle primarily as an image openly appealing to, and deliberately courting the possibility of being shivered by, someone else’s desire.
I do not find this distinction between straight male body building as a potentially powerful ‘tool’, and gay male body building as an object or ‘image’ of beauty, particularly useful. Power and eroticism is inscribed on both straight and gay male body builders, albeit in different ways. There is (potential) violence in both straight and gay male built bodies. Within the parades, this violence is used to Other bodies, such as the drag, transgendered, or lesbian marching girls’ bodies. In this way the marching boys’ bodies can be read as reinforcing several dichotomies, for example, Self/Other, masculine/feminine, and hard/soft bodies.

**Hard bodies**

It is possible to read the bodies of the Locker Room Boys’ as hyper-masculine. It is also possible to read the bodies of the HERO Marching Boys’ as hyper-masculine. A photograph of the HERO Marching Boys appeared in the *New Zealand Herald* (1997, A20) under the caption ‘Marcho Men’ (see Figure 6.1). The caption, ‘Marcho’ is a play on both macho and marching. The emphasis on the masculine (macho) pertains to the corporeal specificity of their bodies. The photograph of the HERO Marching Boys’ depicts bodies that are hard, muscular, and masculine. The bodies are broad shouldered and small waisted. This creates a V shaped torso that is a traditional marker of masculinity. The lack of clothing (usually the HERO Marching Boys wear small tight shorts or some variation on this theme) exaggerates the crotch and accentuates stomach, thigh and buttock muscles. These bodies are produced through the “calculated tearing and rebuilding of selected muscle groups” (Grosz 1994, 143) and through a marching routine that ‘pumps’ their muscles. The pump is the result of high intensity training and muscle stimulation. Muscles become engorged with blood and short of oxygen. The skin stretches tight over the muscles. The pump normally results in muscle
growth because more blood flushes through the muscles. A pumped muscle is larger than a non-pumped muscle. There is an associated narcissistic thrill for the HERO Marching Boys in watching and feeling the pump transform the body. Pumped up bodies become hard bodies.

The hard, pumped, muscular bodies of the HERO Marching Boys attract a great deal of attention from the crowd. The boys move in unison. This gives the appearance of being one large masculine and muscular body. Attributes of strength, stamina and control become inscribed on the bodies of the HERO Marching Boys’ during the length of the parade.

Grosz (1994, 202-210) argues that women’s bodies tend to be constructed as fluid, uncontrollable and formless. Their bodies are represented as ‘leaky’ or soft. Female bodies are also represented as threatening, in that they may ooze liquid and disrupt order. Hyper-masculine bodies, however, are thought to remain firmly contained with the epidermis. They are the binary opposite of women’s bodies. This is not to imply that these male bodies are fluidless (a point I elaborate on later in this chapter). Ironically, their sweating bodies become more masculine as they ‘work’ their marching routine.

Another indicator of the HERO Marching Boys’ masculinity can be found in a report in the *Man To Man: New Zealand’s National Gay Community Newspaper* (13 April 1995, 1) entitled “Warriors court marching boys” (Bennie 1995, 1). The ‘Warriors’ - who are the Aotearoa/New Zealand national representative male rugby league team - approached the HERO Marching Boys looking for a compliment to the usual (and ‘traditional’) marching girls which perform to the audience before the rugby league game begins. The notion of complementation could be seen as an attempt to reinscribe the HERO Marching Boys in a dichotomous (male/female or
hard/soft) relationship with marching girls. The HERO Marching Boys’ spokesperson Robert Chung said “I was very flattered when the call came through” (cited in Bennie 1995, 1). Bennie reports that:

The [HERO] Marching Boys were one of the hottest acts of this year’s HERO Parade down Auckland’s Queen Street. Fans, many of them young heterosexual women, showed their appreciation with enraptured screams (Bennie 1995, 1).

It seems as though the HERO Marching Boys were approached with an offer to perform because ‘young heterosexual women’ find their performance enrapturing. This is another example of the way the marching boys’ bodies can be read as hyper-masculine or ‘all-man’. The HERO Marching Boys, however, turned the offer down. Chung stated: “On reflection we felt that the [HERO] Marching Boys worked well in the friendly context of the HERO Parade, but we were unsure how we would be received by a rugby league crowd ... some of the boys felt it just wasn’t the right place” (cited in Bennie 1995, 1). New Zealand rugby league fans at the Auckland stadium, therefore, were not provided with pre-match entertainment put on by the Marching Boys at the rugby league stadium.

Professional male rugby league players and the Marching Boys have several corporeal similarities. Rugby league players are usually very muscular and have little body fat. Their muscles are visible. Their uniforms are tight and reveal flesh. The HERO Marching Boys’ bodies, as I have been arguing, are also muscular and they work their bodies to make their muscles ‘stand out’. Both body ‘types’ could be regarded as hyper-masculine, or ‘all-man’, as they are hard - not leaky or soft - bodies. The rugby league players and the Marching Boys are both popular ‘body’ spectacles, and hence both are inscribed by the heterosexual gaze.
Dominant bodies

Dwayne, one of the HERO Marching Boys with whom I talked, said that he was attracted by the ‘international’ status and prestige associated with being one of the HERO Marching Boys. Dwayne explained his involvement in the HERO Parade:

Dwayne: Ah, I think a) they look excellent, um when they do their little\textsuperscript{36} routine thing. And um, b) it seems like, for example in Sydney, it’s such a, a honour, you know (//)

Lynda: (//) A privilege really?

Dwayne: Yeah.

Lynda: It seems to be a very high profile kind of um, thing to be in the parade?

Dwayne: It is. Yeah it is, I agree.

Lynda: Yeah, did that attract you to the job?

Dwayne: It certainly did, all the glamour (individual interview, 13 February 1996).

Prestige, privilege and honour suggests that the HERO Marching Boys hold a dominant and powerful position within the parades. A position that could also be read as hyper-masculine. Dwayne reiterates this position.

Lynda: Now why, why did you want to do it? What got you motivated to be a Marching Boy?

Dwayne: Um, because I’m sick of being a spectator (oh, right), and it looked like fun ... So um and I’ve seen a few of the parades and I go to Mardi Gras and it’s, it’s just fun.

Lynda: Yeah. High energy?

Dwayne: Yeah. No political statements (individual/group interview, 13 February 1996).

\textsuperscript{36} This is a point of contradiction. A male league player would not necessarily refer to his game as a ‘little’ routine.
Dwayne just wants to have fun. He suggests that gender/sex roles are a thing of the past:

Lynda: But it [marching] is something that usually a bunch of girls do in dresses?

Dwayne: No I've never really thought that. Because gone are the - what girls do, and what boys do - days.

My reflection on this comment is also telling:

Dwayne doesn't think there are girl-things or boy-things! Only a guy could say that so arrogantly as he entwined his pom pom! (participant observation notes, 13 February 1996).

Grosz (1994, 191) argues that:

The proclamation of a position outside, beyond, sexual difference is a luxury that only male arrogance allows. It is only men who can afford the belief that their perspective is an outside, disinterested, or objective position.

Dwayne insists that gender/sex roles no longer exist. Is it possible for the marching boys to occupy ‘neutral’, non-gendered bodies? Or, could Dwayne be speaking from the position of ‘master subject’, whereby from his position of power he perceives people only in relation to himself? Do marching boys embody a new type of hegemonic masculinity which takes itself as the unquestioned norm and hence has no idea about the violence that his representational positioning does to Others? In response to these questions, I think that marching boys’ may be embodied as hyper-masculine, and may not recognise themselves as ‘different’. Instead, they become master subjects within the parades, a position that is contingent on the tourist site/sight of gay pride parades.

The tourists reinforce the dominant position of marching boys in the parades therefore helping helps to normalise and valorise them. This, in
turn, helps to (re)position the marching boys as hyper-masculine. National television coverage of the 1997 HERO Parade reflects the reaction of spectators towards the HERO Marching Boys:

Anita McNaught: They are a firm favourite with the crowds on the HERO Parade. They were here last year, they were here the year before that. They are now 50 strong and that's a record (TV 3 Network Services Limited 1997).

Furthermore, the HERO Marching Boys are the only team to officially represent Aotearoa/New Zealand in the Sydney Mardi Gras (see *express*, 21 February, 1998). This is another indication of the dominance and prestige that the marching boys embody.

When I asked Malcolm and Brad why the HERO Marching Boys are so popular, they responded that:

Malcolm: Cos they're all spunks.

Brad: Cos they're all like sex symbols. They're half naked and most of them are pretty good looking.

Lynda: Yeah. Good bodies?

Brad: Yeah and pretty skimpy shorts (individual/group interview, 13 February 1996).

Despite their attempts at displaying hyper-masculine, or ‘all-man’ bodies, and maintaining a position of dominance within the parade, the Marching Boys can also be conceived of as feminine,

**FEMININE MARCHING BOYS**

Marching boys devote substantial amount of time and energy to making their bodies ‘right’ for gay pride parades. This attention to the appearance and performance of their bodies could be understood as a feminising process.
The HERO Marching Boys' routine could be interpreted as hybrid activity, part cheerleading and part 'real' marching girl style. Their display can be read as hyper-masculine, or being 'all-man', but it can also be read as 'feminine'.

Prepping up

In the *Sydney Morning Herald*’s (3 March 1998) feature article on the Sydney Mardi Gras several body tips were disclosed for getting ready for Mardi Gras. Under the heading ‘Prepping Up’ was the following advice to recognise the importance of the event:

> Somewhere between obsession and slovenliness lies a healthy desire to look one’s best for an important occasion. And for gay men and lesbians in this town, occasions don’t come any more important than Mardi Gras night.

Working out at the fitness centre, swimming, running and attention to diet were all recommended to create a body to be proud of. Procedures for tanning, waxing, tattooing and piercing were also covered in the article. Shopping for the parade outfit to complement the worked body was also listed as a high priority in the article.

Shops specialising in “skimpy shimmy shorts” did a brisk business in Sydney prior to the Mardi Gras. The bodies being prepped for the parades are reconstituted through traditional feminine practices. Several beauty companies advertised their services prior to the HERO Parade. One company, Adeva Esthetique, specifically targeted gay males in time for the HERO celebrations. Their advertisement read:

---

Get off my back this HERO! If you’ve got hair in places you could do without, why not lose it completely. We offer a safe, hygienic and private waxing/clipping service that’ll get the hair off your back and maybe someone new on your tail. Back waxing, Aromatherapy, Facials, Massage. For bookings just give Bradley a call on ...

(Express, 1 February 1996, 13).

To fulfil the requirements of becoming a member of the hard-bodied (read hyper-masculine) marching boys, they also had to become feminised through the effects of training, tanning, and waxing. The body becomes marked with the use of makeup, hair products, clothing, posture, diet, weight training, and aerobics. Several of the HERO Marching Boys were aerobic instructors.

Training the body

The HERO Marching Boys team trained for several months prior to the parade. When I observed a training session in Auckland, they had their own female choreographer who regularly trains female (‘real’) marching girls’ teams. Through habitual (feminine) patterns of movement and exercise, the marching boys sculptured their bodies for the parade. I reflected on the training session in my participant observations notes.

7.30 pm the HERO Marching Boys arrive. They are briefed first by the lead marching boy. There are lots of jokes about waxing bodies and getting hair done etc. Some laugh nervously. Competing smells of expensive aftershave fill the air! (Participant observation notes, 13 February 1996).

Their training and marching routine is designed to accentuate and build their bodies. The performance is high energy and necessarily predicated on exposed flesh. Another reading of the marching boys’ bodies is that their small waists, curvaceous pectoral muscles, hairless and oiled flesh are all corporeal indicators of femininity. Furthermore, the processes of obtaining a carefully crafted body is a feminising and disciplining activity.
As stated at the beginning of this Chapter, the Sydney Mardi Gras Locker Room Boys are willing to experience pain in order to obtain the ideal body.

The commentary for the 1997 HERO Parade was provided by the television personality Anita McNaught, and the lesbian performance duo, Lynda and Jools Topp in their masculine personae of ‘Ken’ (Lynda Topp) and ‘Ken’ (Jools Topp). “The Kens co-commentated, heavily working the irony of having a couple of lesbians playing the sort of guys who, in real life, would consider a suitable finale to the HERO Parade to be a well-aimed lightning bolt from God” (Wichtel 1997, 64).

Ken (Jools Topp): Well, it looks like they’ve got a great routine worked out Anita. Do they spend a lot of time on it?

Anita McNaught: Apparently so - they rehearse to within an inch of their lives, those boys.

Ken (Jools Topp): Oh - it’s great to see that, isn’t it Ken?

Ken (Lynda Topp): Oh it is Ken. And good to see, ah, blokes out there actually cheer leading for a change Ken and, ah, by God they do it well don’t they?

Anita McNaught: They put in about 25 hours practising their routines over the last, over the last month or so.

The results of this disciplining are displayed through their bodies:

Ken (Lynda Topp): It looks like there’s been a bit of working out ... Look at the muscles on some of those Anita.

Anita McNaught: There are some fine, fine looking men there.

Ken (Lynda Topp): Yeah, very athletic (TV 3 Network Services Limited 1997).

The training of the HERO Marching Boys creates bodies which can be read as both feminine and masculine. The evocation of femininity (through training, routines, prepping and so on) enables the bodies to be built to a ‘parading’ state of hyper-masculinity. As a result, these marching boys’
bodies also confuse traditional, or ‘natural’ corporeal indicators of masculinity. There is more at stake here. Through an investigation into the workings of corporeal politics I argue that the marching boys’ bodies demand a reconceptualisation of sexual difference based on the ability to give and receive body fluids. This notion of male bodies as ‘fluid’ also operates as a metaphor for shifting and changing subject positions.

FLUID BODIES AND BODY FLUIDS

All queer bodies on parade are paradigmatically situated. By this I mean that each subject position is contingent on, and constituted through, other subject positions. In western hierarchical binary terms, this positioning of straight/gay, masculine/feminine, and mind/body may shift and change depending upon the particular context, time, and place.

Different types of gendered/sexed bodies are produced at gay pride parades that have potential to prompt a rethinking of western hierarchical binaries. Earlier in this Chapter I referred to Grosz’s (1994) notion of the construction of women as fluid, leaky and formless. This section expands on this notion. I argue that the bodies of marching boys are not only constructed as hard, but also as bodies with the potential for fluidity.

Drawing on Kristeva’s (1982) notion of the abject, and Mary Douglas’ (1980) notion of Purity and Danger, Grosz (1994) focuses on the elision of fluids in the male body and the derogation of the female body in terms of various forms of uncontrollable flow. Grosz (1994, 203) asks the question:

Can it be that in the West, in our time, the female body has been constructed not only as a lack or absence but with more complexity, as a leaking, uncontrollable, seeping liquid; as a formless flow; as viscosity, entrapping, secreting; as lacking not so much or simply the phallus but self-containment - not a cracked or porous vessel, like a leaking ship, but a formlessness that engulfs all form, a disorder that threatens all order?
Western tradition has inscribed women's corporeality as a 'mode of seepage', as lived liquidity (Grosz 1994). In order to establish the solid male body, there must be a contrast with the non-solid or liquid female body. The dualistic organising mechanisms of western thought are implicit in this categorisation of bodies. The Same or Self requires an Other against which to identify itself.

Grosz (1994, 210) suggests that the process of phallicising the male body, through "sexual penetration and male orgasm, involves the constitution of the sealed-up, impermeable body." She adds that: "perhaps it is not the flow [seminal fluids] in itself that a certain phallicised masculinity abhors but the idea that flow moves, or can move, in a two-way or indeterminable direction that elicits horror" (Grosz 1994, 201).

I am struck by the very different attitudes and relations at least some gay men take to their own bodies, body parts, and body fluids compared with heterosexuals ... I am suggesting that a different type of body is produced in and through different sexual and cultural practices that men undertake (Grosz 1994, 200).

Male bodies that give and receive seminal fluids may be a defining feature of the distinction between heterosexual, male, tourist bodies and gay, male bodies on parade.

A body that is permeable, that transmits in a circuit, that opens itself up rather than seals itself off, that is prepared to respond as well as to initiate, that does not revile its masculinity (as the transsexual commonly does) or valorize it (as a number of gay men, as well as heterosexuals, tend to do) would involved quite a radical rethink of male sexual morphology (Grosz 1994, 201).

If marching boys' bodies are potential receivers of fluid then they may become constructed as abject by some people, such as, city councillors and Christians, who are opposed to the parades. Straight male tourists may also perceive the marching boys' bodies as a threat to their corporeal and
conceptual boundaries of outside/inside, solid/fluid, hard/soft and masculine/feminine.

The organisers of the HERO Parade stipulate that simulated sex is not allowed on floats. This has been a contentious issue since the first HERO Parade in 1994 and one of the reasons why the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Auckland stand opposed to the parade. Simulated sex between gay males, it seems, may come too close to representing a male sexual morphology that is permeable, fluid, both masculine and feminine, and abject.

The impact of HIV/AIDS, furthermore, may mean that marching boys' bodies are “reinvested with notions of contagion and death, danger and purity” (Grosz 1994, 193). Douglas (1980, 3) argues that: “some pollutants are used as analogies for expressing a general view of the social order. For example, there are beliefs that each sex is a danger to the other through contact with sexual fluids.” Straight males at gay pride parades may feel horror and fascination at the very thought of marching boys bodies receiving fluids. In western hierarchical terms, straight males are solid, and marching boys are fluid. The subject position of the marching boys shifts yet again, however, when they discuss other participants in the parader, such as drag queens and lesbian marching girl teams.

The marching boys' Other

Marching boys Brad and Malcolm discuss some of the difference between the HERO Marching Boys and drag queens. Malcolm begins:

Malcolm: I think it's a shame, though, that the only thing that the heterosexual community sees in the homosexual community is when they're all dressed up in drag and they're all sparkly and wearing sequins ... But (.) like the [HERO]Marching Boys.
Brad: That's the only thing that they see.

Malcolm: So it's good, yeah, cos a lot of the society will see the [HERO] Marching Boys; they're not drag queens. [The HERO Marching Boys] are people having a good time, they're spunks as well (individual/group interview, 13 February 1996, emphasis in original).

The HERO Marching Boys tend to disassociate themselves from the drag queens. This reinforces a separation between masculinity and femininity. This separation, however, appears to need constant reinforcing because the bodies of the marching boys are, in this instance, able to be defined as masculine through their Other, the feminised drag queens. In binary terms, drag queens become the (passive and feminised) abject, or receiver of fluids. The HERO Marching Boys become the (active and masculinised) giver of fluids.

Why is it necessary for the feminine to be expelled from the masculine? What is at risk when the marching boys inhabit a feminine body? Perhaps the marching boys' 'built' bodies are (already) at risk of becoming feminised and Othered. They can be read as hyper-masculine but also as feminine. Moreover, these built bodies aspire "to a hyper-masculinity that fails, insofar as it exceeds, to guarantee the gender category it means to secure" (Goldberg 1992, 176).

Drag queens also perform marching routines in HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades. These hyper-feminised bodies, although they tend to be Othered by the male marching groups, also engage in contestatory politics. The status and seriousness of the official marching boys has invoked some reactions. One such reaction was a parade entry called the Express Check-Out Girls. Robert, a member of the Express Check-Out Girls, described their intentions:

We are twelve drag queens or so, and it's almost a parody on the [HERO] Marching Boys and it's a full parody of
The stylised routine of the HERO Marching Boys was parodied. Like the HERO Marching Boys, the Check-Out Girls use whistles in their routine. Rather than 'strip down', like the HERO Marching Boys, the Express Check-Out Girls 'dress up' in full drag (see Figure 6.2). They explicitly hyper-feminised themselves in an attempt to send up the hyper-masculinism of the HERO Marching Boys. The supermarket trolleys also feminised their performance and enhanced the parody. The name 'Express' was a play on their sponsor, a newspaper called *express: new zealands newspaper of gay expression*. 'Express' is also a reference to the express, or fast-track check-out lanes at the Foodtown supermarkets. Shopping at supermarkets can also be understood as a feminised activity, or what Robert called 'normal' activity. This is a parody because tourists are not expecting to see 'normal' or 'everyday' activities such as shopping in a gay pride parade.

The HERO Marching Boys also maintain a hyper-masculine position in relation to the lesbian marching girls team. The HERO Marching Girls are relatively new to the HERO Parade. A group was formed for the 1997 parade. An advertisement was placed in express (5 December 1996, 3).

I want to draw attention to the assertion that the Marching Girls are advertised as 'HERO's OTHER Official Marching Troupe'. This advertisement could be read as partial play on the dominant discourses that attempt to position the Marching Girls as the Marching Boys' feminised Other.
Figure 6.2 Express Check-Out Chick

HERO Parade 1997 Marching Girlz!!

- Desired 25 women -
we’ll give you the venue, the audience, the lights, the cameras and the costume

ALL THE MARCHING IS YOURS!!

Commitment to performing is needed (gym bunnies, dancers, footballers, those with stamina and rhythm).

BODY SIZE NOT IMPORTANT

Be part of the HERO’s Other Official Marching Team

The advertisement also claims that ‘body size is not important’. To the marching boys ‘ideal’ body sizes and shapes appeared to be very important. It would seem that a marching girl could be any size or shape but it is highly unlikely that a marching boy would be anything but hard, muscular, low in body fat, broad in shoulders and small in the waist. There is strong competition to become a member of a male marching team. To become a member of the team, one must conform to the dominant notion of what marching boys’ bodies are: hard, muscular and ‘well groomed’.

The HERO Marching Girls, however, attempt to undo the regulations of conventional and traditional (heterosexual, patriarchal) femininity. Activities such as dieting, hair removal, dressing-up, make-up, and so forth, are not prerequisites for becoming a member of the HERO Marching Girls. The Marching Girls could be understood as lesbian feminists who reject patriarchal notions of femininity because it is seen as a symbol of women’s oppression.

Femininity and its trappings thus came to represent to some feminists women’s oppression. Feminism sought to separate femininity from the woman or gender
identity from the sexed body and return it to the 'original, natural' woman underneath all that make-up (Bell, Binnie, Cream, and Valentine 1995, 41-42).

With this stance there is an implicit rejection of those lesbians who might think body size is important, and who might engage in dieting, hair removal, make-up, maintaining low body fat, the body aesthetics of gym training and so on.

The success of dress as a transgression of heterosexuality/patriarchy and heteropatriarchal space is reflected in the fact that dungerees (overalls) and Doc Marten boots became for the popular press synonymous with feminism, feminism with lesbianism - a success which could be measured in the popular press backlash against these forms of dress (Wilson 1988; A. Young 1990) and the abusive and hostile reactions of men in public space to women dressing in this way (Bell, Binnie, Cream, and Valentine 1995, 41).

The HERO Marching Girls gained sponsorship from 'Doctor Martens' and subsequently wore Doc Marten boots in their marching routine at the HERO Parade. They wore full bodied skin coloured leotards and tights with skirts, and did not 'show' any flesh apart from bare arms.

In terms of 'popularity', the HERO Marching Girls did not excite, or turn-up the heterosexual tourists. Their performance was not explicitly sexualised, nor did they play with the crowd in the way that the HERO Marching Boys did. They became a subordinate parade entry to the dominant HERO Marching Boys.

The fluidity of marching boys' subject positions, and the construction of their bodies as givers and/or receivers of fluids, is specific to their relationships to other bodies. Marching boys may invoke horror from straight male tourists and city councillors because they are constructed as potential receivers of fluid. For straight male tourists, city councillors, and Christians, the marching boys become the abject. This subject position
shifts for the marching boys, however, when they construct drag queens and lesbian marching girls as feminised, Other, and the abject. In this way the marching boys' bodies can be read as reinforcing and disrupting several dichotomies, for example, Self/Other, masculine/feminine, and hard/soft bodies.

CONCLUSION

I have teased out some of the ways in which the bodies of marching boys are gendered/sexed at HERO and at the Sydney Mardi Gras parades. Social meanings produced in these parades - in which the paraders, who are both shaped by these institutions and are agents of change - produce changes which may both serve hegemonic interests and challenge existing power relations.

These parading bodies are always sites of contradiction and are constantly reconstituted in dominant, subversive and competing discourses. My project here has been to decentre the subjects of the parade by abandoning the belief in an essential subjectivity. Rather I establish a changing and shifting subjectivity. These conflicting meanings become written on bodies.

HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades, however, can be thought of as heterosexual tourist sites/sights that are immensely popular. Their popularity hinges on the notion of the abject - their bodies are both dread(ful) and desire(able).

Bodies on parade, such as the HERO Marching Boys and the Locker Room Boys of the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade, demand to be rethought in terms of sexual differences and sexual practices. Reading the marching boys' bodies as masculine, feminine, and as both masculine and feminine (hard
and fluid, permeable and closed) opens up powerful possibilities for shifting subject positions and upsetting western hierarchical dualistic constructions of bodies.

The constitutive relationship between the marching boys and the tourist sites/sights of gay pride parades allows for a re-examination of gendered/sexed bodies. These bodies are gendered/sexed and organised in ways that both confirm and upset binary discourses of heterosexual/homosexual, masculine/feminine, and Self/Other.

Portraying femininity and masculinity as radically disconnected is the basis for promoting one sexed body over the other. In an alternative approach, homosexuality and heterosexuality, femininity and masculinity can be positioned as thoroughly entwined, the borders are indeterminable. Other binaries are also called into question. These bodies defy normative assumptions about gendered/sexed bodies and the categories that limit and define them: male versus female, culture versus nature.

Political change involves a struggle over meaning, therefore, it is not possible to dismiss gay pride parades as merely servicing or opposing the dominant and oppressive (dualistic) systems of western thought. Consequently, these gendered/sexed bodies are always open to challenge and redefinition with shifts in their discursive contexts. Therefore, at any given moment, bodies are open to constant rereading and reinterpretation.

Cream (1992, 4) asks: "If the sexed body is no longer stable and fixed, no longer that biological bedrock of truth upon which we can build our theories, then what is left?" I suggest what is left are spaces of resistance to the masculinist studies of tourism. These spaces allow for contradictory
readings of pliable bodies whose gendered/sexed form is geographically, historically, politically and culturally specific.
Disciplinary knowledges in the social sciences, including the field of tourism studies, are steeped in western hierarchical dualisms. This research relates to the questioning and destabilisation of these epistemological dichotomies. My first aim was to illustrate that the mind/body dualism underpins, and is vital to the production of, knowledge in studies of tourism. The mind/body dualism has significant epistemological implications and I have identified and worked with a number of these. The mind and its associated attributes of reason, masculinity and heterosexuality, have been privileged in tourism studies. The body, and its associated attributes of emotion, femininity, and homosexuality have simultaneously and inevitably been devalued and Othered in tourism studies. Awareness of this binary provided a platform for my second objective. I aimed to create a sexually embodied study of tourism. Recognition of gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies and tourist sites is one way to articulate resistance to hegemonic, masculinist, heterosexist and disembodied studies of tourism.

I have drawn on the academic work of feminists such as Gatens (1988, 1992, 1996), Grosz (1988, 1993, 1994), and Lloyd (1993), to argue that the mind/body dualism is also gendered/sexed and sexualised. This dualism
has been hierarchically maintained, with the mind being the privileged over the body. While many geographers are now engaging with and critiquing the mind/body dualism, this has not been the case in tourism studies. Given that discourses of tourism studies are often, consciously and unconsciously, constructed around dichotomies such as tourist/host and ordinary/extraordinary, it has been surprising that the mind/body dualism has remained implicit.

THE MIND/BODY DUALISM IN TOURISM STUDIES

I have found that in many of the tourism studies' literatures the mind has been privileged while the body has been devalued and Othered. I have turned my attention to particular studies of tourism in order to understand how the mind/body dualism operates to Other the body. In sub-areas of tourism studies - such as hallmark tourism, postmodern tourism, ethnic tourism, sex tourism and gender and tourism - the body has been disassociated from the mind.

In hallmark tourism, economic impacts of tourism are the focus of most studies and the tourists have been relegated as economic indicators. A level of abstraction, quantification and objectification remains in the studies of hallmark events to the extent that the body found in hallmark event studies is only a host's body and seen to be either deviant or criminal.

In those studies which can be categorised as postmodern tourism, the materiality of the body tends to be ignored in favour of tourism and travelling metaphors. The metaphorical tourists - such as flânuers and nomads - take 'mind' journeys without being located in any particular place or attached to a particular body. The gazing tourist in postmodern tourism is constructed as masculine and disembodied.
Ethnic tourism studies has tended to Other the body by insisting that ethnic tourism should be sustainable. In other words, ‘ethnic’ hosts and ethnic places are expected to remain ‘untouched’ and static to provide the tourist with an ‘authentic’ product. Tourism studies’ academics construct the tourist as masculine and of the mind, while aligning the hosts and the host countries with the body.

Studies of sex tourism tend to Other the body by constructing the sex worker as imprisoned in her body. She is discussed as deviant and criminal and/or a victim of white male tourists. The male tourists are constructed as actors and of the mind, while the sex worker is constructed as passive and of the body.

Many studies on sex tourism could also be classified as studies of gender and tourism. Feminists and tourism studies’ academics working ‘on gender’ have valued and privileged gender as a social construction (mind) over sex as a biological given (body). Such a distinction removes the gendered/sexed and sexualised body from gender and tourism studies. Some tourism studies’ academics are beginning to research into areas identified as gay tourism. Gay bodies in tourism, however, are kept at a distance from tourism studies’ academics through a focus on the economic possibilities of capturing the ‘gay consumer’.

I have offered just a sliver of the many and diverse studies of tourism. My aim was not to be exhaustive, but to offer examples of literature from tourism studies that provided insights into the ways the mind/body dualism operates. An examination of the mind/body dualism could be undertaken in any sub-area of tourism studies.

Studies of tourism cut across many academic disciplines. This has particular implications for the construction of tourism studies’ discourses
in the academy. On the one hand, there seems to be a tight ‘policing’ of knowledge so that gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies do not mess up, dirty and contaminate the dominant discourses of tourism studies, which are based on economic and positivist frameworks. Tourism studies, furthermore, does not rest on any core historic (and therefore prestigious) academic tradition, but must establish its reputation on the basis of existing disciplines. The intellectual models for tourism studies that confer status include economics, management studies, and ‘hard’ empirical science.

On the other hand, the academic diversity of tourism studies can provide gaps and spaces where discourses of resistance can find some academic place. Queer bodies can seep into and permeate the very self-perception of what it is to be heterosexual and what it is to be ‘of the mind’. “The rigid alignments of sexual stimuli and responses, the apparent natural coupling of male and female lovers, are unstuck by the existence of lesbians and gays” (Grosz 1995, 227). The inclusion of gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies, both empirically and theoretically, begins to challenge the hegemony and masculinism of tourism studies.

My analysis of the mind and the body in tourism studies’ literatures has been aided by an engagement with studies in feminism, poststructuralism, psychoanalysis and philosophy. In some respects I have continued the tourism studies’ trend of working from many disciplines. My areas of study, however, are not widely represented in current studies of tourism. I have provided new discourses and made explicit the power relations produced through acts of tourism.
The Body in Tourism


Veijola and Jokinens' work challenges the mind/body dualism which underlies studies of tourism. Including the gendered/sexed and sexualised body in tourism studies upsets the distinction held between the mind and the body. Undoubtedly there is enormous scope for more embodied research in studies of tourism. I have found the notion that place and people are mutually constituted (Grosz 1992) to provide a useful entry into sexually embodying tourism studies. A study that focuses on the mutually constitutive relationships between places of tourism, or tourist sites, and people of tourism (tourists and hosts), may give rise to some of the ways bodies are:

psychically, socially, sexually and discursively or representationally produced, and the ways, in turn, that bodies reinscribe and project themselves onto their sociocultural environment so that this environment both produces and reflects the form and interests of the body (Grosz 1992, 242).

My intervention into the discourses of tourism studies has provided a space in which to apply feminists' critiques of disembodied and masculinist knowledge. I have built my case around, for the most part, feminist geographers who have undertaken a retheorising of the

---

discipline of geography. Rose (1993) argued that it is the very claim to knowing in geography, which excludes women as producers of knowledge. Longhurst (1997) argued that knowledge becomes disembodied and hence marginalises women. I have extended these arguments to argue that tourism studies is disembodied and excludes all those who are associated with, or tied to, their bodies, such as homosexuals.

Through my investigations into the workings of the mind/body dualism I have made the masculinism of studies of tourism explicit. All those associated with the feminine, and considered to be homosexual, ugly, dirty, weak, diseased, criminal, elderly, non-white, poor, disabled, and so forth, have been Othered in tourism studies. All these Others are considered to be emotional, irrational, and tied to their bodies, to be unable to reason, or to be rational, and hence are inappropriate for tourism studies.

I have insisted that bodies have minds and minds have bodies. I argue that reason, rationality, masculinity and heterosexuality are partial and situated discourses which are inseparable from emotion, irrationality, femininity and homosexuality. My project has been to highlight the costs of these discourses when they are hierarchically separated. I have shown, that the mind/body dualism underlies and is pervasive in studies of tourism and produces disembodied and masculinist knowledge. This has been my first aim for my thesis.

**SEXUALISING TOURISM STUDIES**

The second aim of my thesis was to create a study of tourism which was based on gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies. The two gay pride parades, the HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades, provided an
exemplar for a tourism study which is sexually embodied. My main focus has been on the HERO Parade in Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand. The 1996 HERO Parade provided the bulk of my data, however, previous parades (1994 and 1995) added historical, political and spatial specificity to the 1996 HERO Parade. The 1997 and 1998 HERO parades have also been discussed in a way that charts on-going discourses over the tourist popularity of the event. The 1996 Sydney Mardi Gras has also been an important element to my research. In many ways the HERO Parade is linked to the culture, politics, performance, and dominant form of the Sydney Mardi Gras.

HERO, and the Sydney Mardi Gras, are tourist events that attract large numbers of tourists. The majority of tourists are heterosexual. The relationship between heterosexual tourists and paraders can be understood through an examination of western hierarchical dualisms, such as tourist.getHosts, straight/gay, Self/Other and mind/body. Heterosexual tourists become gendered/sexed and sexualised at HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades, despite their unarticulated desire to remain the dominant, unmarked, and disembodied norm. One way to contest binary notions of bodies and tourist events is to examine the relationship between gay tourists and paraders. Gay tourists can be conceived of as both Self and Other, mind and body, tourist and host. Gay and heterosexual tourists’ subject positions are open to change and reformation at HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras. Such changes work to refigure traditional and fixed ‘natural’ notions of gendered/sexed and sexualised embodiment. I have also not given up on the ‘real’ fleshy body but have insisted on keeping in tension both social constructions or representations of bodies and the weighty material ‘realness’ of bodies.
As I have already noted, gay pride parades could be studied under any of the existing sub-areas of tourism studies' literature which I examined. As hallmark events, gay pride parades annually draw many people into specific areas. Gay pride parades could be studied as part of postmodern tourism. Identities of bodies and tourist sites constantly shift and change. HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras are tourist events which are built around the concept of the Other, as is ethnic tourism. Gay pride parades could also be understood as sites for sex tourism. Similarly, HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras could be studied within the area of gender and tourism. Inclusion of gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies at gay pride parades would bring the mind/body dualism into question in each of these tourism studies' sub-areas.

I have demonstrated that gay pride parades are complex tourist events in a number of ways. As specific annual events that parade for just a few hours, they are difficult to research. As such, I relied on several methods of qualitative data gathering. These were: participant observations, in-depth interviews, individual semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews, questionnaires and text sources, such as newspapers, photographs, video recordings, television and radio. The politics of my research methods intersected with poststructuralist and feminist debates. Accountability and recognition of the relations between myself and the participants guided my reflections on what I was 'really' doing out in the field. I worked to make the issues of gazing at bodies explicit and suggest most social scientists do gaze, but do not problematise their viewing. I have, therefore, placed myself in this thesis and at times have written my experiences into the research.

HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras parades were unpredictable tourist events. Dualisms, such as heterosexual/homosexual, tourist/host, and
mind/body, were mobile and changeable. Bodies and places became gendered/sexed and sexualised at HERO and the Sydney Mardi Gras. The unpredictability and spatial specificity of the events and the bodies created much potential for an examination of the sexual politics of bodies and places.

A range of postpositivist, or postrationalist, assumptions about bodies and tourism can be examined through this study. I found that HERO bodies on parade have the ability to upset and 'queer' straight streets. The popularity of this event for tourists, however, was not enough to challenge the notion that queer bodies were perceived as inappropriate bodies to inhabit the central business district of Auckland. Bodies that were 'allowed' to be celebrated in the central district business of Auckland, were national sporting, usually male, bodies. Such parades down Queen Street were described as 'real' parades of 'real Heroes'. The move from Queen Street to Ponsonby Road worked to further sexualise the suburb of Ponsonby as gay. The politics of the parade site can be understood as contingent on the mind/body dualism.

The parades as tourist events are, I argued, a popular form of cultural imperialism. The concept of cultural imperialism helps give insight into the way bodies on parade and watching tourists are separated at the tourist site. Physical barriers, such as road barricades, maintained a material border between tourists' positions as gazers and parading bodies. The physical border was also maintained through discourses of safety. Heterosexual tourists reasserted this border in their desire to mark the bodies on parade as Other and to disassociate themselves from their own bodies. Heterosexual tourists believed they were tolerant, liberal and open-minded to 'allow' such events to happen. At the same time, they constructed bodies on parade as abject, 'ugly', and 'dirty'. There were also
bodies on parade that provoked desire and [mis]representated hyper-masculinity. There were yet other bodies on parade that provided the contestation of mind/body, Self/Other, and hetero/homo dualisms. Rainbow Youth, Gaily Normal and GABA were parade entries which could be understood to represent the mind, heterosexuality, and masculinism. Such representations created an upheaval of tourists' unmarked, dominant and powerful position.

Finally, I have taken a closer look at the sexual specificities of bodies on parades. I have examined the marching boys' bodies and the gaze of heterosexual tourists. Gay pride parades as tourist sites/sights provide socio-political spaces which confirm masculine and feminine stereotypes. Not only do bodies shape the tourist environment, but they are shaped by it. The marching boys' bodies becomes invested with relations of power and domination. One reading of marching boys' bodies is that they can be understood as hyper-masculine, or 'all-man'. Their dominant position in the parade was maintained by a feminised Other, such as drag queens and marching girls. The marching boys' bodies could also be read as feminine, however, through the prepping processes, routines and training to become a marching boy body. Lastly, these bodies could be read as 'fluid', as both feminine and masculine, and as bodies with the potential to both receive and give fluids. I offer these 'readings' as a way to challenge ontological and epistemological notions of western bodies and knowledges.

The arguments I have made in this thesis about conceptions of the gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies have implications for strategies of critique. This thesis is intended to encourage the examination of particular tourist environments and the bodies which are created in such environments. By focusing on the gendered/sexed and sexualised
embodied experiences of hosts and tourists at gay pride parades, I have deconstructed dominant and hegemonic notions of sexuality, sex and corporeality.

There is much potential for future research on embodiment and tourism. Critical social theorists refocus the gaze of tourism studies to look and see ‘different’ bodies and places. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, tourism studies’ academics have a preoccupation with ‘sustainable tourism’ in specific environmental contexts (see, for example, the conference proceedings of Tourism Down Under II: Towards a More Sustainable Tourism (Kearsley 1996)). Some of this research focuses on ‘wilderness tourism’ and begins with the notion that ‘the wilderness’ is natural, ‘virginal’, pristine, and should remain untouched by people. Wilderness tourism is necessarily predicated on western hierarchical dualisms such as culture/nature and masculine/feminine. By insisting, however, that ‘the natural’ is a cultural construct, the discourses of sustainability may be shifted to include research that focuses on the constitutive relationship between people and places. This would provide an opportunity to embody studies of ‘sustainable tourism’.

Cultural or ethnic tourism in Aotearoa/New Zealand could be another exciting area for future research on bodies and tourism. Māori tourism studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand tend to focus on issues of cultural, or local ‘authenticity’ versus global appropriation. These discourses of Māori tourism centre on ‘genuine’ and ‘authentic’ products for tourist consumption (see, for example, Diaz 1997a, 1997b; de Haas 1997, Butler and Hinch 1996). By understanding Māori culture as ‘authentic’, invariably expresses a modern desire to (re)turn Māori to ‘nature’, and reasserts a dichotomy between culture/nature (see Jacobs 1996 for a postcolonial discussion of tourism and Australian Aboriginals).
A way to unsettle these dichotomies may be to invoke a postcolonial notion of hybridity (see, for example, Bhabha 1994). A specific embodied study of Māori tourism might examine the recent ‘appropriation’ Māori art in European Fashion Shows and clothing designs. This type of research may provide examples of the ways in which tourists embody the Other. A more ‘mobile’ approach to identity and difference can be used productively in considering the relationships between tourism, place and bodies.

Research which concentrated on the bodies of tourists would reverse the Othering gaze of the tourist back onto the Self. A specific piece of research in this view might focus on Aotearoa/New Zealand’s recently opened National Museum, called Te Papa. The museum is a container of specific and limited representations of bodies. Questions about which bodies are included in Te Papa, and which bodies are excluded, might drive this research. Such research would provide opportunities to examine discourses of colonial and postcolonial national identity formation as well as providing a link to deconstruct the museum’s tourism discourses. There are also opportunities in this area of research to deconstruct other dichotomies such as real/representation, nature/culture, masculine/feminine and Self/Other. Te Papa has been constructed to signify Aotearoa/New Zealand’s home and as such calls into question geographical and touristic presumptions, such as, home and away, ordinary and extraordinary.

My thesis has infiltrated hegemonic academic discourses of tourism studies by engaging with the HERO Parade and the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras Parade as tourist events. These sites have provided me with the opportunity to offer new directions for studies of tourism. My focus has been on the ways gendered/sexed and sexualised bodies, in
particular homosexual bodies, are expelled from, and Othered, by the norms of heterosexuality, in the academy and in the streets.
APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY LETTER FOR PARTICIPANTS

15 January 1996

Kia Ora

I am a geography post graduate student from the University of Waikato. I am carrying out research on gay/queer pride parades for my doctorate. The reasons for my research are to examine the relationships between the participants of gay/queer parades and tourism. This letter is to inform you about the proposed research.

The research aims to explore what parade participants think and feel about the impacts of the public and tourists on the parade. I also wish to examine the reactions of the public/tourists to the pride parade. I am interested in sexual identities and how these identities are displayed for pride parades.

I am motivated by personal and political interests in sexualities and tourism in urban spaces. This research aims to fill a gap in geographical academic literature.

All participants have the right to withdraw from the research at any point without needing to state any reason for their withdrawal and/or to request the return of any information that has been given to me.

If you have any queries concerning the proposed research, please contact me:

Lynda Johnston: ph 07 856 8602 (Home)
                ph 07 856 2889 ext. 6028 (Work)
Or the Head of the Geography Department at the University of Waikato.

Thank you for your support,

LYNDA JOHNSTON.
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

CONSENT FORM

I, ............................................................................................ , consent to participate in the doctoral research project 'Body Tourism: Gay Pride Parades', to be conducted by Lynda Johnston of the Department of Geography, University of Waikato. The purpose of the project (to gain an understanding of gay pride parade participants and the impact of the parades on the city and tourism) has been explained to me.

I understand that my participation in the project will include the following activities and rights:

1: Lynda Johnston will discuss with me my involvement in gay pride parades. Such discussion will be recorded on paper (field notes) and/or on audio tape (recorded interview). I have the right to refuse observation or discussion, or the recording thereof, of any event or activity, and have the right to request the erasure of any record with which I am uncomfortable for any reason.

2: I understand that (please delete a or b):

(a) personal names or any other information which would serve to identify myself as an informant will not be included in this thesis.

(b) personal names or other information which would serve to identify myself as an informant can be included in this thesis.

Lynda Johnston will keep all records confidential. Field notes and audio recordings will not be destroyed upon completion of the project, but will be kept confidential and placed in a secure locked location.

3: The data collected by Lynda Johnston will be used in her doctorate degree in geography at the University of Waikato. This data may also be used in articles, book chapters and presentations. Unless specified by participants, pseudonyms will be used.

4: I may withdraw from participation in this project at any time without recrimination.

(Date) Signature of participant

(Date) Signature of researcher
## APPENDIX C: LIST OF 1996 HERO PARADE ENTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Parade Entry</th>
<th>Description of Parade Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random Trollops</td>
<td>Performance troupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official HERO float</td>
<td>Large sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Waka Ahwina Takataapui Inc.</td>
<td>Waka with Maori gay and transgenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasoo</td>
<td>Country and western, lesbian theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino/Sky Tower</td>
<td>Polystyrene Sky tower and cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransPride</td>
<td>Fairy tale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swans of Pride Centre</td>
<td>Rainbow coloured swans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>Mika performs in a queer Maori temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express TV Cadillac</td>
<td>Express TV presenters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-gay-be Puppet</td>
<td>Puppet of Mugabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mai FM van</td>
<td>Music system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERO Marching Boys</td>
<td>41 marching boys to music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bar/Adams Family</td>
<td>Dancers on float</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drag Queen and Poodles</td>
<td>6 Foot 6 drag queen and 2 men as poodles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembrance Float</td>
<td>Large flood lit lotus flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrender Dorothy</td>
<td>Large shoe, yellow brick road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Prostitutes Collective</td>
<td>Pink Valiant Charger/safe sex messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Spirits</td>
<td>Tall, lit cocoons with men inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Positive</td>
<td>Large illuminated bug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fifth Season Garden Float</td>
<td>Mary, Mary quite contrary: garden theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karacters Bar</td>
<td>Impala car and drag queens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zee Zee Magazine - Dam it Janet</td>
<td>Dental dam banner worn by 6 women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Sex/ No Ifs, No Butts</td>
<td>10 men and 2 women dancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Check Out Chicks</td>
<td>10 drag queens with supermarket trolleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Youth</td>
<td>Auckland high school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence</td>
<td>Gay men as nuns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne Bay House</td>
<td>Mad hatter tea party, positive people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Grannies</td>
<td>2 Grannies looking lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salon Kitty</td>
<td>Rubber/latex fetish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends Night club</td>
<td>Dancers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctic Mermaids</td>
<td>Car and trailer with 3 mermaids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual Float</td>
<td>Flexi-float: the best of both worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GABA Bubble</td>
<td>Office with absolutely fab 'Bubbles'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowlers/Skittles</td>
<td>Men dressed as skittles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummers/Latin American</td>
<td>Dancers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: TRANSPRIDE FOCUS GROUP

1: Can you describe the theme of your float/performance?

2: Do you have particular goals for your performance/float in the parade?

Prompt: maaori gay spirit, celebrations, safe sex promotion, to be sexy/erotic etc.

3: Can you elaborate on what Transpride means?

Prompt: transgender is natural to you? It is ambiguously male and female?

4: Is ethnicity important in your performance/float?

5: How would you describe the relationship between gay/queer sexuality and your ethnicity?

6: The parade attracts a high degree of public and media interest. What statements do you wish to make from your float/performance?

Prompt: awareness to public, chance to make a national statement.

7: What do you want the people watching to remember your float/performance by?

Prompt: by its extravagance, colourfulness, banners, individual bodies etc.?

8: What is important about the collective performance that you will do?

Prompt: shows an aspect of your community.

9: Can you describe what you will do to get ready for the parade?

Prompt: practising performances, what you will wear, make-up etc.

10: How will your identity be expressed in the parade?

Prompt: clothing, makeup, tattoos, piercing etc.

11: How do you think the crowd will affect your float/performance?

Prompt: the noise, the looks, the smells etc.

12: Does your float/performance actively seek out people watching from the streets?

Prompt: by looking directly at the crowd, by going up to people etc.

13: Will you encourage the people watching to participate in the parade?
Prompt: walk with you, sing etc.

14: Do you feel like you are on display for tourists?

15: How does it feel to know that most of the crowd will be straight?
Questionnaire for People Attending the HERO Parade

The filling in of this questionnaire is voluntary. Any information that you give will be treated as confidential. In this questionnaire data is being collected on the Auckland HERO Parade as a tourist event.

1: Do you think this is a tourist event? Yes/No? Why? ________________________

2: What do you think the parade does for Auckland's image? ________________________

3: Why have you come to the parade tonight? ________________________

4: Age: 0-14 □ 15-25 □ 26-35 □ 36-45 □ 46-55 □

56-65 □ 66+ □

5: Sex: Female □ Male □

6: Occupation (please state): ________________________

7: Ethnicity: □ New Zealand Māori □ New Zealand European/Pākehā

□ Other European □ Pacific Islander

□ Other Ethnic Group (please state): ________________________

8: Sexuality (please state): ________________________

(For example: heterosexual, bisexual, gay male, lesbian, transgendered.)

MANY THANKS - Lynda Johnston
APPENDIX F: MARDI GRAS PARADE QUESTIONNAIRE

The University of Waikato
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato
Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand.
Fax (07) 856-2158. Telephone (07) 856-2689.

Department of Geography

Questionnaire for People Attending the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras

The filling in of this questionnaire is voluntary. Any information that you give will be treated as confidential. In this questionnaire data is being collected on the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras as a tourist event.

1: Do you think this is a tourist event? Yes/No? Why?

2: What do you think the parade does for Sydney’s image?

3: Why have you come to the parade tonight?

4: Age: 0-14 □ 15-25 □ 26-35 □ 36-45 □ 46-55 □ 56-65 □ 66+ □

5: Sex: Female □ Male □

6: Occupation (please state):

7: Ethnicity (please state):

8: Sexuality (please state): ___________________
(For example: heterosexual, bisexual, gay male, lesbian, transgendered.)

MANY THANKS - Lynda Johnston
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ADDENDUM NOTE

The following references were omitted from the References section of this thesis.


