

The Centre of Periphery: the Case of Contemporary Bangkok's Gay Spaces

Sant Suwatcharapinun, PhD.

Faculty of Architecture, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand

ABSTRACT

This paper explores how the spatial metaphors of heterosexual-centre/gay-periphery are becoming blurred and flexible. It begins to question how the periphery was constructed. The Center of Periphery focuses on gay spaces in contemporary Bangkok, Thailand and the specific conditions that form the structure and construction of gay identities in these spaces. Two particular areas of Bangkok's city centre are known as gay spaces: *Surawong's* Boys' Town and *Silom*; these two areas illustrate how the dichotomy between centre and periphery gets destabilized. Although in many countries gay spaces can be characterized as hidden, closeted and marginalized; gay spaces in Bangkok can be seen differently. Not only do these gay spaces become explicitly seen and known, but they also become legitimized and tentatively acceptable. Interestingly, within the rapidly growth of gay commercial spaces, they seem to be divided along demarcation lines between old/new centre of Bangkok's gay spaces; sex-business-oriented/lifestyle-oriented bars and, more importantly, lower-class/upper-middle-class gay men.

The emergence of research related to the comprehension, explanation of the relations between gayness and space can be seen in the increased demand to insert space back into social theory. That is to say, society produces space, at the same time space is also a factor in how society is produced.¹ Gay society is not just about people who have a same-sex desire or have same-sex sexual practices, but it is more about the spaces in which they occupy. The question is whether gay people occupy these spaces by their own choice or whether the choice is already made by the others – given enclosed spaces, peripheral spaces, closet spaces, or spaces of the *Other*.² Could it be possible for those who have been assigned a space to reposition themselves and choose the space they occupy? In particular, when relations between gayness and space is produced but manifested differently through different socio-cultural and political backgrounds, should we use the same explanations, methodologies to view the spatial relations, or modes of representation to conceive space?

The aim of this paper can be divided into three parts. The first part is to explore the use of spatial metaphors. The investigation is drawn precisely on how the spatial metaphors of centre and periphery have been implemented. This section can be spelled out through the exploration of the work of bell hooks – theorising a particular spatial metaphor between centre and margin – and using it as a way of destabilising the centre from the margin, and the work of Neil Smith and Cindi Katz – criticising the way in which space is used as materials in spatial metaphors in unproblematic way and without carefully examination.³ The second part is drawn on historical the investigation of both the construction of Thai gay identities and the establishment of Bangkok gay spaces; in particular the areas called *Surawong* – a centre of gay commercial sex business and *Silom* – a centre of gay lifestyle. This section aims to examine how Western models of the centre-periphery metaphor can be used to articulate gay spaces in different socio-cultural and political arenas. The final part focuses on an alternative spatial metaphors, as I argue the

notion of the centralised periphery or the centre of the periphery is based on different materials: the construction of Thai gay identities and the spatial division of gayness in contemporary Bangkok, Thailand.

SPATIAL METAPHORS

For me this space of radical openness is a margin – a profound edge. Locating oneself there is difficult yet necessary. It is not a “safe” place. One is always at risk. One needs a community of resistance.⁴

Spatial metaphors allow us to conceive the complex structures of social, sexual, and more importantly power relations. Jane Rendell mentions that “spatial metaphors are epistemological statements which can highlight the importance of space in the construction of identity, both conceptually and materially, in the abstract and in the concrete”.⁵ Spatial metaphors explain, make the unfamiliar—familiar, help us to think of something unthinkable, and to map one-to-one correspondences between representation and represented.⁶ The particular spatial metaphor between centre and periphery has typically been used to differentiate positions between minority and majority, tainted and untainted, bad and good, and in particular, gay and straight. For those who obtain the centre it is possible to be ignorant of how power is manifested in and distributed through such a position. Yet for those who obtain the periphery, they have been positioned rather than positioning, mapped rather than mapping, and objectified rather than subjecting themselves. In short, the space of periphery can be seen as an enclosure, a site of struggle.

However, for bell hooks, as quoted above, it is precisely this given enclosure that provides her with a point of departure, and in turn, to construct the space of radical openness. She has lived and experienced small-town Southern black life; she speaks for the oppressed, exploited, colonized people who have thickly accented black Southern speech. After moving to the openness of universities, regarded as a space of privileged cultural, hooks is caught within the enclosure of “being poor and com[ing] from underclass communities”. As she mentions, “Everywhere we go there is pressure to silence our voices, to co-opt and undermine them”.⁷ For her, the condition of spatial metaphors is rather different. Because the space of periphery is made, pre-given, and constructed, it can be re-made, rejected, and re-constructed. Space of radical openness seeks to unfold itself from the folded structure of an enclosure.

To challenge such enclosure, for hooks, what is needed is not to speak of the margin, or to conform ourselves to being marginalised, but rather to speak through it – not to the space of struggle, but the site of resistance.⁸ Resistance is not simply moving away from the assigned enclosure or from the embedded negative meaning. In this space of radical openness, hooks rather chooses to live *at* the margin, chooses to be *in* the margin by destabilising the negative enclosure and obtaining positive meaning from within, as hooks remarks, “making ‘Other’ there in that space with them”.⁹ Through spatial metaphors, hooks profoundly illustrates not only a spatial division between a given enclosure and a radical openness. Radical openness is a site of deprivation, struggle and negativity, while also being a place of resistance, liberation, positiveness.

While hooks argues for reconstituting the meaning and definition of the periphery, Neil Smith and Cindi Katz argue for reconsidering ways of using space as material in spatial metaphors. Because, as Smith and Katz argue, through spatial metaphors space is described through language; in other words, language enables us to conceive space and our spatial experience, such as exploring, travelling, or colonizing. Think of the discursive practices of those post-structuralists, we now realise that language can be a means of maintaining the dominant power. That is to say the way in which the meaning of *centre* and *periphery* signifies. Thus, once we use spatial metaphors we should not take the relations between space and language for granted, because through language space is always problematic and political.

For Smith and Katz, perhaps for hooks as well, it is important to examine space, used in spatial metaphors of centre/periphery, because it might be misarticulated through a sense of space regarded as empty or “*absolute*”.¹⁰ Once we try to differentiate social subjects by the place they stand, we put them in an empty space and map them across an imaginary spatial field. This is precisely the point Smith and Katz tries to argue. Space is not and cannot be empty, but it has rather been constructed. They argue “the emergence of capitalist social relations in Europe brought a very specific set of social and political shifts that established *absolute* space as the premise of hegemonic social practices”.¹¹ It is important to emphasize that the concept of space regarded as emptiness has been persistently misunderstood but remains in use in social practices, such as the concept of private property; juridical assumption of the individual body as the basic social unit; conquest and colonisation of new territories; and more importantly, the division of global space into mutually exclusive nation-states on the basis of some presumed internal homogeneity of culture, i.e., patriarchal-heterosexual normality as the centre of this spatial division.¹²

The way in which Smith and Katz criticise the use of spatial metaphors, to be more precise, the use of space as material in spatial metaphors, leads me to reconsider whether it is possible to take the centre/periphery model to explain, map, and represent gay spaces of Bangkok. Should we use this rhetorical metaphor as a way to explore, travel, or perhaps colonize the gay spaces of Bangkok? If we do so, we already agree on both the way Bangkok gay spaces should be prescribed through this particular model, and that they should be homogenised based on a particular conceptual model of space regardless of different social, cultural, political and economical backgrounds. Can gay spaces be homogenous? Hook’s theory deconstructs and reconstructs the negative meaning of the periphery; however, it is important to ask why we need to arrive at or live in the periphery while the centre is different. Thai gay identities and gay spaces of Bangkok have been constructed; but, should we not start searching for alternative models of spatial metaphors, unfolding perhaps the way in which the different concepts of space are used?

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THAI GAY IDENTITIES

Before exploring gay spaces of Bangkok, it is important to know how Thai gay people identify themselves and how they

use spaces. For the construction of Thai gay identities, it is believed that they have been constructed in opposition to the ones of the *kathoeys*, not to heterosexual identities as in the West.



Source: (Thai film, Phae Sud Thairi ('The Last Song'), 1985)

Figure 1. Images of *kathoeys*, performed by Thai movie stars Somying Daorai and Chalit Fiuangarom.

In a traditional sense, the *kathoeys* was understood as the “third” gender, which could be distinguished from the male sex and female gender. The *kathoeys* was considered both “not-male” because of his/her female appearance and “not-female” because of his/her male body, they were quite often considered “asexual”.¹³ Based on historical interpretation, Terdsak Romjumba suggests that there are two types of traditional *kathoeys*, one of which can be regarded as “physically disordered” – hermaphrodite and the other as “socially disordered” – cross-gendered behaviour and/or same-sex sexual behaviour.¹⁴ During 1851-1932, the period of the absolute monarchy of Siam, the notion of the *kathoeys* was gradually transformed from someone marked by a sexed body (male/female) to someone marked by a sex-gender appearance (male-masculine/female-feminine).¹⁵ This could be understood as a result of how Siam leaders attempted to systematise Siamese sex-gender, known as the *phet*, in response to the expansion of Western authority over Siam.¹⁶ The *phet* was used as a political tactic to construct positive counter-images of Siamese “civilisation”; and yet it overtly adopted those of Western civilisation, in particular the norms of the sex-gender system, to “civilize” Siamese sex-gender. It is important to emphasize that the *kathoeys* has become a form of social misbehavior (see Figure 1). It has gradually been marginalized. Alternative sexual practices still remained invisible and unknown in Siam society.

After the overthrow of the absolute monarchy in 1932, the name of the country was changed from Siam to Thailand, during the reign of Field Marshal P. Phibun, 1938–1941 and 1948–1957. The aim of Phibun’s nationalist policy was to build Thailand through the model of nation-state. Through the various social practices he introduced his policy which emphasized behaving in a manner appropriate to one’s sexed body, the role of a proper Thai citizen, and unequivocally how to be a good woman. Within the limited availability of sex-gender appearance and role, Thai men might see the *kathoeys* in relation to a woman. Because the similarity of their feminine-therefore-passive identity, people might perceive the *kathoeys* as “a pragmatic means of sexual release in certain situations”, to some

extent, it can be identified with prostitution.¹⁷ In short, through the implementation of Phibun’s heterosexual-patriarchal nationalist policy, various sexual practices including male-masculine-identified homosexuals became invisible and unknown, that is because the power was exercised through sex-gender discourse, not sexuality discourse. As Romjumba and Thitikorn Trayaporn suggest, male-masculine-identified homosexuals or “gays” did not appear in Thai public society until 1965.¹⁸

The *phet* has been transformed once again through the discourse of class hierarchy, in particular through the appearance of the *farangs*, in particular American servicemen who were stationed and lived in Bangkok during and after the Vietnam War.¹⁹ The influx of foreigners at this time was important both as a significant factor in the increase in sex industry venues for heterosexual men in Thailand, and a major influence in establishing gay commercial venues in Bangkok, in particular the area called Surawong’s Boys’ Town during the late 1970s.

The significance of the servicemen should not be regarded as the only the point from which Bangkok, or to be more precise the Patpong area, has become a paradise for the sex industry. Instead there are three main points that arise from the increased number of foreigners living in Bangkok that need to be elaborated on. Firstly, how Thai laws have been influenced by many foreign military officers – the forceful change of the Prostitution Prohibition Act of 1960 to the Entertainment Places Act of 1966. This change blurred the distinction between illegal sexual performers and legal entertainers. The law changed because foreign military officers considered prostitution to be a necessary sexual outlet.²⁰ Secondly, this period should be recognized as the first time Thai gay commercial sex business came into public view – allowing massage parlours, nightclubs, bars, coffee shops to be seen as legal entertainment places, not male prostitutes’ parlours.²¹ Lastly, class hierarchy become more explicit in this period, in particular when it was integrated into the *phet*. Due to the large number of foreigners, the position of male-masculine superiority in Thai heterosexual-patriarchy has been challenged and replaced by the upper class male *farang*.²²

Although the influx of foreigners in Bangkok can be seen as an important factor in making Thai gay men visible and known, the social conditions of local agency must be taken into account. It can be spelled out through three main points. Firstly, Thai gay identities have been produced (*gay king* and *gay queen*) through the *phet* based on the binary opposition between male/female and masculinity/femininity – because it is the only system of self-identification and self-presentation available for Thai people.²³ Secondly, Thai gay identities can be understood as a negation of the feminine *kathoeys*, or to be more precise, they want to present a male-masculine (or male-feminine in the case of *gay queen*) self-presentation in order to be recognized in a better social status and class than the *kathoeys*.

Lastly and most importantly, Thai gay identities have been re-defined and polished through the establishment of gay commercial sex businesses in Bangkok, Surawong’s Boys’ Town. As I have argued in previous works, the way in which Thai gay identities have been produced through sex-gender discourse becomes reinforced self-categorisation because it takes the presumption of sex-gender norms. Thus, gay identities can be seen as another label of performing gender, or known as gendered sexual identities. Such label becomes confining rather than useful for gay people to appreciate and liberate their sexual identities.

ties.²⁴ Due to the increased number of gay commercial sex businesses in which male prostitutes elaborate their sex acts, sex roles and sexual behaviour is becoming regarded as performative act – to be passive or active has nothing to do with their self-identities, the construction of gendered sexual identities has been challenged.²⁵ Gay identities no longer rely on the relations between sex acts and gender roles. *Gay king* and *gay queen* become rather forms of self-presentation and it has nothing to do with sexual preferences. The following section explores the relations between the new gay identities and the spaces within commercial sex venues, in particular in relation to the class different of the male *farangs*.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GAY SPACES OF BANGKOK

To state that *Surawong* was the first established gay space in Bangkok might not be fully accurate. In fact, there were several meeting places for gay people located around Bangkok, but they could not be named as gay because the terms gay remained unknown in the public discourse until the early 1970s.²⁶



Source: (Author's archive, 2002)

Figure 2. Photographs showing the difference between day and night on the street in *soi Phatuchai*, known as *Surawong's Boys' Town*.

After the 1970s, according to Jackson, the gay commercial sex business was established in the entertainment district of Patpong, but in a relatively fixed number.²⁷ It is important to note that Patpong is one of the most significant streets in the central business district in Bangkok. But for many, it is also well known as “the central area of sex tourism in Bangkok”.²⁸ The endorsement of the Entertainment Places Act of 1966, as mentioned above, provided the possibility for an alternative sex industry to house itself in or around the already well-established sex industry in Patpong. From my interpretation, the establishment of gay commercial sex business can be regarded as being

derived from the transgressive image produced by the establishment of heterosexual go-go bars in Patpong. There was an opportunity for gay go-go bars to disguise themselves as entertainment places in this area. Since the 1980s, gay commercial sex business has begun to appear gradually in Patpong area, in particular *Thanon Surawong*, today known as *Surawong's Boys' Town* (see Figure 2). I suggest that the gay commercial sex business in *Surawong's Boys' Town* shares a mutual interest with the heterosexual sex business in Patpong – suggesting that not only do they share business strategies in order to maximize their profit by reinforcing the cultural relation of client/work as higher/lower, but also a certain knowledge of how to deal with the local authorities, law and regulations.



Source: (Author's archive, 2002)

Figure 3. Photographs showing the street scenes in *Silom soi 2* and *4* where major gay lifestyle-oriented businesses, such as gay-friendly pubs, bars, clubs, restaurants, cafés and clothing shops are situated.

In 1972, the territory of gay spaces was expanded from *Thanon Surawong* to *Thanon Silom* (see Figure 3). This time the expansion did not revolve around gay sex-oriented business, but a successful gay lifestyle-oriented business, called the Rome Club in *Silom soi 4*.²⁹ Although many new gay lifestyle-oriented bars in *Silom* did not provide sex services, I argue that it does not mean that these bars had no freelance young men working on their premises. According to Jackson, 1983 was a period of “rapid expansion of commercial homosexual facilities”.³⁰ The territory of gay spaces expanded into “the suburb of Bangkok called *Saphaan Khwaay* in the north and further along *Sukhumvit Road* in the east”.³¹ Since the 1980s demarcations within gay urban culture have existed between so-called higher-, middle- and lower-class gay men whose class differences are marked by lifestyle, wage, a Western-influenced image and, most importantly, their meeting places. It is important to explore how such division takes place between *Surawong* and *Silom*, between the old centre based on sex-business-oriented bars in *Surawong's Boys' Town* and the new centre based on lifestyle-oriented bars in *Silom*; particularly, between lower and upper-class Thai gay men.

The construction of *Surawong's Boys' Town* has been produced through two main factors. Firstly, by the binary oppositions: client/worker as higher/lower, which already exists in the social hierarchies and class structures; and gay Western customers/gay Thai customers as higher/lower, which is a new social hierarchy and class structure rapidly imposed by the increasing number of gay *farangs* in Bangkok. Like Jackson, I argue that the reason Thailand has been perceived as a gay paradise is because Thai gay venues are viewed and presented from a Western-oriented

perspective. Such an image was (and still is) found to be accurate to some point, in particular in the services of many go-go bars in *Surawong's Boys' Town*. These bars chose to privilege Western gay customers, known as gay *farang* customers, over Thai gay customers. I suggest that this cultural aspect can be understood in terms of the binary oppositions of *farang* customers/Thai customers as higher/lower position.

Secondly, *Surawong's Boys' Town* has also been produced through the means of exclusion and marginalization of local gay men – a negation of local gay customers to conform themselves to be lower positioned in the binary opposition *farang*/Thai customers as higher/lower. The increasing number of gay lifestyle-oriented business outside *Surawong* can be explained by the new identity of local gay men, who differentiated themselves not only from the feminine *kathoe*, as already discussed above, but also from a cultural aspect based on the existing social hierarchy in terms of Western-customers-higher/local-customers-lower. Local gay customers have actively displaced themselves from a lower position, re-evaluated themselves in a new class, and re-located themselves in the new centre of Thai gay business in *Silom*.³²

Surawong and *Silom* each provide different niche markets – sex-oriented and lifestyle-oriented businesses. In particular, the two areas increasingly produced different images of social status not only among local gay men but also between gay *farangs* customers and local gay customers. Many gay businesses in *Surawong* attempted to preserve the predominant image of a gay paradise; they tended to reinforce the privileging position of gay *farang* customers, while regarding local gay customers as lower. I suggest that the way in which many gay businesses in *Surawong* privileged gay *farang* customers over local gay customers created a conflict between the bars and these local customers, which led them to abandon *Surawong*.

THE CENTRE OF THE PERIPHERY

In this paper, I have argued that Thai gay identities have never been marginalised through heterosexual normality per se, but through specific local conditions of heterosexual-patriarchy where the construction of the *kathoe* has paradoxically become centralised for Thai gay people. The *kathoe* became the stereotype for identifying homosexuality in Thailand until the 1970s. If the *kathoe* has been marginalised through the norms of heterosexual-patriarchy, it is not the reason that Thai gay people conform themselves to such political struggle over their sexualities.

It is worth recalling the argument of Smith and Katz, focusing on the way in which the European notion of the *absolute* space is used in spatial metaphors. If there is such *absolute* space existing in Thai to be used as a material in spatial metaphors, it might produce the space of the *kathoe* as negative and periphery while the space of Thai gayness still remains outside such centre-periphery model. Thus, for Thai gay people, the spaces where they live and identify themselves with is not produced as a 'periphery' in the same sense of Smith and Katz's model of centre-periphery. In fact, Thai gay people seem to struggle with the sexuality discourse. I argue that because they seem to take on the Western model of gayness and try to locate themselves within Westernised gay spaces in which the gayness has already been constructed as marginalised and gay spaces have already

been located in the periphery. It is often that they believe in the struggle without considering the cause, in particular the case of Thai gay identities. Do Thai gays need to identify themselves as repressed, oppressed and positioned in the site of the *imaginary-Western periphery*, while in fact the place of the *real-Thai centre* has never been fully recognised? Where is the space of the *kathoe*? There is no centre but the 'periphery' from which Thai gay people want to depart. They have invented their own centre first through sex-oriented businesses and then through lifestyle-oriented ones. Thai gay spaces have become visible and known within the centre of the periphery.

¹ Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), p. 38 and Jane Rendell, 'Introduction: "Gender, Space"', in Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner and Iain Borden (eds), *Gender Space Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 101.

² See for example, Aaron Betsky, *Queer Space: Architecture and Same-Sex Desire* (New York: William Morrow, 1997), pp. 156–61; Joe Binnie, 'Trading Places: Consumption, Sexuality and the Production', in David Bell and Gill Valentine (eds), *Mapping desire: geographies of sexualities* (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 182–99 at p. 187; Michael P. Brown, *Closet Space: Geographies of Metaphor from the Body to the Globe* (London: Routledge, 2000); George Chauncey, 'Privacy could only be had in Public: Gay Uses of the Streets', in Joel Sanders (ed.), *Stud: Architecture of Masculinity* (New York: Princeton University Press, 1996), pp. 224–61 at p. 240; William L. Leap (ed.), *Public Sex: Gay Space* (New York: Columbia, 1999); and Mark W. Turner, *Backward Glances: Cruising the Queer Streets of New York and London* (London: Reaktion Books, 2003), p. 66.

³ Neil Smith and Cindi Katz, 'Grounding Metaphor: Towards a spatialized politics' in Michael Keith and Steve Pile (eds), *Place and the Politics of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 67–83.

⁴ bell hooks, 'Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness' in Rendell, Penner and Borden, *Gender Space Architecture*, pp. 203–9 at p. 206.

⁵ Rendell, 'Introduction: "Gender, Space"', p. 107.

⁶ Smith and Katz, 'Grounding Metaphor', p. 69.

⁷ hooks, 'Choosing the Margin', p. 206.

⁸ hooks, 'Choosing the Margin', p. 208.

- ⁹ hooks, 'Choosing the Margin', p. 208.
- ¹⁰ Smith and Katz, 'Grounding Metaphor', p. 75.
- ¹¹ Smith and Katz, 'Grounding Metaphor', p. 75.
- ¹² Smith and Katz, 'Grounding Metaphor', p. 75.
- ¹³ Terdsak Romjumpa, 'Discourses on "Gays" in Thai Society, 1965-1999', MA Thesis (Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University, 2002), p. 11.
- ¹⁴ Romjumpa, 'Discourses on "Gays" in Thai Society, 1965-1999', p. 13.
- ¹⁵ The second stage is marked by the power exercised by the Kings of Siam in the system of an absolute monarchy, that is the reigns of King Rama IV, Mongkut (1851-1868), Rama V, Chulalongkorn (1868-1910), Rama VI, Vajiravudh (1910-1925) and a part of the reign of King Rama VII, Pokklao (1925-1935). Pokklao was also the first King of Thailand in the system of a constitutional monarchy, published online <<http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Chakri%20Dynasty>>, accessed 6th July 2005.
- ¹⁶ According to Peter Jackson, from Western visitors' perspective, there were three critiques: first, the 'nakedness' of the Siamese body; second, the sexual 'excesses' of polygamy; and, third, the 'similarity of appearance' of Siamese men and women – suggesting a lack of differentiation between male and female fashions and hair styles. [Peter A. Jackson, 'Performative Genders, Perverse Desires: A Bio-History of Thailand's Same-Sex and Transgender Cultures', in *Intersections: Gender, History and Culture in the Asian Context*, published online August 2003 <<http://www.sshe.murdoch.edu.au/intersections/issue9/jackson.html>>, accessed 3rd November 2003, p. 9.]
- ¹⁷ Peter A. Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand: an Interpretation of Contemporary Thai Sources* (New York: Global Academic, 1989), p. 38.
- ¹⁸ Romjumpa, 'Discourses on "Gays" in Thai Society', pp. 55-75 and Thitikorn Trayaporn, 'The Image of Male Homosexuals as Reflected in the Content of Thai Daily Newspaper During 1965-2000', MA Thesis (Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University, 2000), pp. 97 and 100.
- ¹⁹ Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand*, p. 243.
- ²⁰ According to Leslie Ann Jeffery, the Prostitution Prohibition Act was untrustworthy because it allowed bar owners both 'to hire women under the rubric of "entertainers" and to make a profit from those entertainers as long as the sexual encounter occurred off-site'. See Leslie Ann Jeffery, *Sex and Borders: Gender, National Identity and Prostitution Policy in Thailand* (Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books, 2002), p. 17.
- ²¹ According to Manderson, the Entertainment Places Act caused the 'flourishing of places alternative to old style brothels, such as massage parlours, nightclubs, bars, coffee shops, tea houses and barber shops'. See Lenore Manderson, 'Public Sex Performances in *Patpong* and Explorations of the Edges of Imagination', in *Journal of Sex Research*, v. 29, n. 4 (November 1992), p. 456.
- ²² Nerida M. Cook and Peter A. Jackson, 'Desiring Constructs', in Peter A. Jackson and Nerida M. Cook (eds), *Genders and Sexualities in Modern Thailand* (Bangkok: Silkworm Books, 1999), p. 9.
- ²³ Jan W. De Lind van Wijngaarden, 'Between Money, Morality and Masculinity: Bar-Based Male Sex Work in Chiang Mai', in Peter Jackson and Gerard Sullivan (eds), *Lady Boys, Tom Boys, Rent Boys: Male and Female Homosexualities in Contemporary Thailand* (New York: Harrington Park Press, 1999), pp. 187-211.
- ²⁴ Sant Suwatharapinun, 'Spaces of Male Prostitution: Tactics, Performativity and Gay Identities in Streets, Go-Go Bars and Magazines in Contemporary Bangkok, Thailand', Ph.D. Thesis (London: University of London, 2005), p. 145.
- ²⁵ Suwatharapinun, 'Spaces of Male Prostitution', p. 146-50.
- ²⁶ Suwatharapinun, 'Spaces of Male Prostitution', p. 245.
- ²⁷ Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand*, p. 241.
- ²⁸ Manderson, 'Public Sex Performances in *Patpong*', p. 451.
- ²⁹ Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand*, p. 241.
- ³⁰ Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand*, p. 241.
- ³¹ Most gay-related businesses in *Saphaen Khwaay* are set up as meeting places, such as karaoke bars, regardless of any explicit activities such as go-go dancing. See Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand*, p. 245.
- ³² Suwatharapinun, 'Spaces of Male Prostitution', p. 253.