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Abstract

Although social research on sexuality is growing in Latin America, studies into tolerance are scarce. The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between queer male practices and tolerance amongst a group of gay, bisexual and travesti men in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. To explore this issue 83 men were interviewed and ethnographic research was carried out with the gay rights organisation Arco-Íris and AIDS organisation ABIA. Whilst current literature generally positions the queer community as requiring tolerance from an intolerant society, this study suggests that intolerance of certain gendered and sexualised behaviours is produced within the queer community and affects queer male behaviours. It is suggested that factors such as race, class, religious belief and notions of beauty, style and respect influence the construction and experience of various sites across the city, such as the home, the workplace, the gay scene and the street as tolerant and intolerant. Current work is expanded through exploring the relationship between gendered and sexualised behaviours and (in)tolerance in understudied spaces, such as LGBT organisations, religious spaces and online communities. It is argued that future work must consider the way in which tolerance and intolerance function within the queer community as this study has done, rather than relying on taken-for-granted assumptions that intolerance towards queers originates from those outwith the queer community.
Introduction

On October 11th 2009 the mayor of Rio de Janeiro, José Camilo Zito, cancelled the city’s second largest gay pride parade which was due to take place in the working class neighbourhood of Duque de Caixas in the Zona Norte (northern area) of the city (Terra 2009). In justifying his decision the mayor was quick to point out that whilst he had nothing against homosexuals per se, he was opposed to public ‘events that demonstrate a certain type of conduct that is against family values’, stating that the pride parade would be better suited to a club venue rather than the city’s streets (Terra 2009). An amalgamation of complaints from the previous government and signed documents condemning the parade from those within the Catholic Church were used to further demonstrate the immorality of the event and highlight the necessity for its annulment. In response, the ‘state secretary for social assistance and human rights’ and leader of Rio de Janeiro’s largest gay right’s organisation, Claudio Nascimento, confirmed that he would file an indictment against the prefeitura (council) for discrimination based on sexual orientation under law 3406.

This case not only dramatically exemplifies the polemical nature of sexuality today in Brazil, but draws attention to the complex discourses that are drawn upon to validate positions that support and oppose the expression of one’s sexuality. The family, religion and public space, as well as notions of discrimination and morality, are all forwarded as relevant in arguments related to our right to express our sexuality as and when we choose. Above all, the example stresses the importance of a set of issues related to who is permitted to express their sexuality, where and under what terms? This thesis is an attempt to illuminate the significance of, and offer answers to, these questions with respect to a group of queer-identified males living in Rio de Janeiro. The central argument of this work is that in answering these questions it is useful to identify the effect of several factors: the family, religion, class, humour, language and notions of respect, which are imperative to, and cut across the spatial negotiation of gendered and
sexualised identities in complex ways. This is not to say that all of these factors are significant to the playing out of identities for all men, but rather that through considering the connections between these factors and performances of male queer identities we can grasp new, more helpful understandings of the spatial nature of tolerance in Rio de Janeiro.

The idea of tolerance is increasingly prevalent within governmental, NGO (non-governmental organisation) and gay right’s discourses both within Brazil and elsewhere as a viable ‘solution’ to problems of difference in contemporary societies. In contrast, and as will be argued throughout this thesis, it is to the detriment of the queer community in Brazil that more critical approaches to the use of the term are relatively lacking (see Brown 2006 for a recent exception). This study can be seen as an attempt to interrogate and critique tolerance from a geographical perspective through considering how performances of gender and sexuality both create and deny tolerant spaces and how notions of tolerance are spatially negotiated by queer men in Rio de Janeiro. Within this framework, principal questions that this research seeks to answer are: which spaces can be understood as (in)tolerant for queer performances of gender and sexuality? For whom are they seen as (in)tolerant?, and, which performances of gender and sexuality are allowed or denied in such spaces?

Related concepts which overlap with discussions of tolerance are those of inclusion and exclusion. Indeed, as part of a central concern with increasing understanding on (in)tolerance and (in)tolerant spaces, this research seeks to draw out some of the connections between tolerance and in/exclusion through focusing on the day-to-day playing out of queer lives in Rio de Janeiro. More specifically, three key aims of this thesis are: to illustrate the extent to which ‘tolerant’ spaces can be understood as inclusive, to determine the similarities and differences in the performances of gender and sexuality that are included/excluded from certain spaces, and to consider how the process of in/exclusion works spatially across Rio de Janeiro. An
additional concern throughout is to consider how queer performances both reinforce and disrupt norms which privilege certain expressions of gender and sexuality and lead to in/ex-clusion across the urban fabric of the city.

While the over-arching objective of this research is to consider the relationship between the spatial nature of tolerance and the playing out of identities, this is approached from the highly specific way that queer identities are negotiated within Brazil, and more narrowly, within the urban context of Rio de Janeiro. In doing so, this research can be understood as part of an increasing body of work taking a critical approach to heterogeneous, but overlapping, ‘northern’ theories of gender and sexuality through remaining sensitive to the cultural specificities and nuances of being a queer man in a particular non-Western setting (see for example Parker 1991, Parker 1999, Gutmann 2004, Oswin 2008). An important goal of this research is to add to the relative lack of theorisation on queer lives in Latin America (Quinlan 2002) and to demonstrate, both the usefulness, and dangers of applying ‘western models’ of thinking to non-western cultural contexts. Through reference to data collected as part of eleven months of fieldwork, consisting of participant observation at a gay rights and AIDS organisation and semi-structured interviews, specific attention is paid to the local meanings of homosexualities and masculinities and their influence on the articulation of gendered and sexualised identities.

At its core this thesis is about power relations implicit in tolerance and intolerance and their relationship to a group of queer men living in Rio de Janeiro at the start of the twenty-first century. Thread throughout the pages of this thesis is the endeavour to better understand the power relations that are linked to tolerance and intolerance and affect the playing out of queer male identities. Related to this is the central argument that class, religion, humour, language and notions of respect be understood as vehicles that both reinforce, and are used to negotiate and resist, dominant power relations related to gender and sexuality. Each chapter demonstrates from a
different perspective how there is an identifiable spatiality to the way in which queer men attempt to negotiate the gendered and sexualised power relations which they find themselves embedded in.

In this vein, this study seeks to further understanding related to the linkages between ‘the closet’, power relations, tolerance and the expression of gendered and sexualised identities. This will be achieved through focusing on the spatiality of the closet, building on work by geographers such as Michael Brown (2000, p 3) who remind us that the closet ‘has an important geography since it is always situated somewhere’. Thus, a primary concern of the thesis is to demonstrate how performances of gender and sexuality (dis)locate the closet across various sites of a specific Latin American urban context. Key questions focus on where the closet is situated and how queer men reproduce and contest these positionings. In doing so, the multifaceted ways in which the closet is spatially ‘done’ in Rio de Janeiro are illustrated and connections are made with readings of urban spaces as (in)tolerant.

In-keeping with post-modernist perspectives, this thesis must be understood as an attempt to draw attention to the performed, fluid and blurry nature of various urban spaces such as the home, the church, the school or the gay club. It will be demonstrated that queer male identity performances are not neatly contained within separate sites of Rio de Janeiro, but spill out, merging seemingly discrete spaces into one another (see Gorman-Murray 2008a for blurring of ‘the home’). For example, It will be argued, that religious performances are prevalent in ‘non-religious spaces’ such as the city’s gay bars and clubs, that ‘camp’ performances are not restricted to sites understood as gay and that homophobic performances are prevalent in the city’s LGBT organisations. More than this, however, my thesis seeks to push current thinking further by asking how, where and which performances of gender and sexuality can blur spaces into one another? Through considering the way in which performances of gender and sexuality smear spaces into
each other I argue that we can, and must rethink current notions of tolerance and understandings of how space becomes marked as (in)tolerant.

Although this research is focused on the experiences of queer men living in Rio de Janeiro, it does not remain insensitive to other aspects of identity. On the contrary, this study demonstrates the importance of recognising the intersectional nature of our identities and explores linkages between factors such as race, religion, socioeconomic status and the spatial nature of gendered and sexualised performances. Indeed, an argument that weaves throughout this thesis is that it is only possible to understand the practices of queer men in Rio de Janeiro through an awareness of interconnections with other aspects of their identities. None of us are only ‘gay’ or ‘straight’, ‘male’ or ‘female’, ‘Catholic’ or ‘atheist’ etc, but rather a complex combination of some, all or none of these and the men represented in this thesis are no exception. Consequently, a preliminary assumption of this study is that the meaning of being a queer man, and behaviours understood as queer, can only be made sense of through an appreciation of the interconnections between various aspects of identity.

Thus far I have outlined some of the key aims of this project and highlighted some of the theoretical arguments that will be expanded upon in the first two chapters. However, something that weighs even heavier on my consciousness than any academic reason for writing this thesis is my commitment to those that started off as ‘research participants’ but became acquaintances, colleagues and good friends over a year in which I became enmeshed in their lives and them in mine. This thesis is my attempt to represent some of their worries and concerns, their lutias (struggles) with their identities, their stories, which were sometimes upsetting, but often empowering, and to offer an interpretation of these experiences within the context of the gendered and sexualised power relations in which their lives are inextricably connected. Ultimately, it is their assessment of whether this thesis has successfully conveyed what it means to be a queer man in Rio de
Janeiro at the start of the twenty-first century which I am apprehensive for and will find most meaningful on a personal level.

**Thesis Outline**

Chapter one provides an outline of some of the current literature on tolerance, sexuality and masculinity in the social sciences. The chapter aims to chart some of the key developments in work on sexuality space and tolerance, paying particular attention to American, British, Australian and Latin American work. Common links between sexuality work in Latin American and Anglo-Saxon studies will be identified, where appropriate, whilst remaining attentive to region specific differences and concerns. The chapter begins with a consideration of theoretical approaches to work on tolerance and sexuality, beginning with work that positions tolerance of LGBT communities as unquestionably beneficial and necessary. Next more critical theorisations of tolerance are emphasised which show that tolerance of LGBT individuals can be positive and negative, constructive and destructive (França 2005, Brown 2006, Grabbham 2009). It is argued that, despite their differences, approaches that are critical towards tolerance and those that are not actually share a commonality in the way they position the LGBT community as recipients of tolerance from a largely homophobic, intolerant society. As part of work post-modern project of deconstructing notions of identities as fixed, the chapter moves on to highlight a growing influence in work which has problematised homogeneity in the experience of tolerance in the queer community.

Next, the chapter illustrates how spatial theorists have become increasingly involved in debates regarding the application of tolerance and intolerance to the ideas of space and place. It is argued that geographical work has integrated post-modern approaches to aspects of our identity, such as gender and sexuality, to challenge notions of urban space as easily delineated, fixed and easily falling into binary categories such as tolerant or intolerant. The chapter moves on to mark out some of the similarities and
differences in approaches and findings of spatial research into sexuality, masculinity and tolerance. The framework for the second half of the chapter is provided by reference to studies showing a growing influence of queer theory and related concepts such as Butler’s (1990, 2002 & 2004) idea of performativity in spatial work on (in)tolerance. Attention is paid to work in various locations including the home, the workplace and the gay scene. Finally, work focusing on the spatiality of the closet is also considered. It is argued that, like much of the literature taking a performative approach, work focused on the closet emphasises the difficulty of neatly separating tolerant from intolerant spaces. The chapter closes by outlining how this study takes a novel approach to work on sexuality and tolerance which increases our understanding of how tolerance functions in Latin American urban space. This is achieved through a consideration of the spatiality of tolerance in spaces that might be conceived of as ‘everyday’ such as the home, the workplace and the school, which remain understudied in work on sexuality and space in Latin America, through considering identity components such as religious belief and age, and through focusing on the use and meaning of Brazilian specific terminology related to gender and sexuality.

Chapter two justifies the methodological approach that was taken for this research project. The first section concentrates on how research was conducted, contextualising my decision to use a mixture of photo-elicitation interviews and participant observation within current gender and sexuality research. It is argued that in order to capture the identity citations that make up the sexual performances of queer men an ethnographic qualitative approach involving semi-structured interviews was most appropriate. The second section is concerned with reflexive questions, focusing on issues such as my ascribed and self-identified gendered, sexualised and racialised identity and the effect that this had on the research process. It is argued that there were significant advantages and disadvantages of being ‘out’ in the field and in being what Kulick (1998) describes as a ‘blond bauble in a non-
Native setting. Finally, through reference to existing literature on researching sexuality, poignant ethical issues regarding the research are highlighted.

Chapters three to six illustrate linkages between tolerance and gendered and sexualised performances with reference to the findings of my research. Chapter three considers the relationship between race, class and the expression of queer identities. It is argued that despite assumptions to the contrary, the Zona Sul (south zone) of Rio de Janeiro represents both an intolerant and tolerant area for queer men. It is suggested that as a result of the privileged status of certain class and racial norms, black, working class men, in particular, often experience the region as an intolerant area of the city. This chapter extends recent work by Rink (2005) Taylor (2007), Caluya (2009), which focuses on the importance of race and class norms on the gay scene, in two ways: by considering spaces important for the LGBT community outwith the gay scene, such as the Zona Sul's streets and squares, and through considering specifically Brazilian terms and concepts that remain unexplored in English literature on sexuality but were meaningful for men in the region.

It is argued that the devaluation of behaviours associated with the bicha pintosa and the privileging of behaviours associated with the barbie, and experiences of homophobia in relation to the white, middle class pitbulls, associated with the region, represent attempts to regulate racial and class boundaries in the gays bars and clubs and streets of the Zona Sul. This is seen in the marking of behaviours associated with non-white, poor queer men as undesirable, which it is suggested, occurs through humour, name-calling and discrimination towards certain language uses within and outwith the queer community. Throughout the chapter attention is paid to participants' experiences which suggest apprehensions directed at poorer, non-white queers who are positioned as disrupting a carefully manicured image of the Zona Sul carioca1 gay. I contend that as a result of concern and

---

1 The term 'carioca' refers to an individual or object from the city of Rio de Janeiro.
anxiety felt amongst many middle and upper-class queer men, many non-white, poor queer experience the Zona Sul as an intolerant and restrictive space. However, participants’ experiences presented in the chapter also emphasise that, at times, queer men resist racial and class norms associated with the Zona Sul, which challenge notions of the area as the domain of white, middle-class queer men.

Respectful performances provide the focus of the fourth chapter. It is argued that certain gendered and sexualised performances are interpreted as more respectful than others, and that it is possible to identify a spatiality of respect in Rio de Janeiro which has consequences on the experience of spaces as tolerant and intolerant. I argue that the family home and the workplace are two sites in which ‘disrespectful’ performances of gender and sexuality are strictly policed by queer men, contrasting with other sites of the city where there is less obligation to ‘behave respectfully’. Furthermore, this chapter identifies children, the elderly and parents as three specific groups that are understood as requiring more respectful performances of gender and sexuality than others. Two key conclusions are drawn in the chapter. Firstly, that age, professionalism and ownership cut across and influence spatial notions of respectful behaviours and, secondly, that, queer men self-regulate their own behaviours to ensure they are being respectful as a result of their internalised notions of what constitutes being respectful. Parallels are drawn between respect and Foucault’s (1990) notion of the panopticon and it is argued that respect amongst queer cariocas appears to a largely internal process, rather than a social process as current Latin American research suggests (Archetti 1996, Prieur 1996, Fuller 2004). Finally, it is argued that the idea of respectful spaces and respected people offers a useful lens through which to understand the spatial self-regulation of gendered and sexualised performances in Rio de Janeiro and, related to this, respect allows us to understand how tolerance functions by illustrating how behaviours are organised into those that are tolerated and those that are not amongst queer cariocas.
Chapter five is focused on the relationship between tolerance and queer male performances in LGBT spaces. It is argued that despite the positioning of Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT spaces as tolerant and accepting counterpublics (Fraser 1992, Warner 2002) for queer men, participants’ behaviours suggest they are experienced as ambivalent spaces which are both tolerant and intolerant. Current work on the nature of tolerance in LGBT spaces is expanded through a focus on non-scene spaces, such as LGBT organisations, gay beaches and internet sites, in addition to more commonly studied spaces such as gay bars, clubs and pride parades. It is argued that through these spaces there are differences in the specific behaviours that are tolerated. Whilst discrimination of stereotypically effeminate behaviour is ubiquitous through LGBT spaces, prejudice of other behaviours such as sexual passivity and travesti characteristics vary. However, the chapter also draws attention to the difficulty in identifying fixed gendered and sexualised behaviours that are tolerated within specific LGBT spaces, and emphasises counter examples where, in certain circumstances, generally devalued behaviours can be interpreted favourably.

The chapter contends that notions of LGBT spaces as universally tolerant and accepting for queer identity performances need to be problematised. Tangible experiences of discrimination, which manifests itself in joking, humiliation and embarrassment, result in ambivalent LGBT spaces that are both tolerant and intolerant. I argue that Lynda Johnston’s (2007) concept of abjection can usefully be applied to ‘non-spectacle spaces’ and used to incorporate the, often unwitting, role that queer men play in the reproduction of exclusionary norms related to the devaluation of, and shameful response elicited by, certain performances of gender and sexuality. In addition, it is argued that there is a link between the nature tolerance and whether LGBT spaces are public or private meaning that in public spaces high levels of intolerance are directed at effeminacy and travesti behaviours, whilst in private spaces tolerance is related to sexual role. The chapter contends that
the understanding of LGBT spaces as unquestionably tolerant is not only flawed, but leads to the exclusion of groups of queer men that are often most reliant on the social network of support that they purport to offer. It is argued that Warner’s (2006) notion of counterpublics is an inadequate and overly-optimistic reflection of queer male experiences through LGBT spaces and that a more plausible and fruitful approach would be to recognise the contradictions, tensions and paradoxes that result in their ambivalent nature.

Chapter six considers the relationship between religious and queer male identity performances. It is argued that queer performances of gender and sexuality and religion are not mutually exclusive, as the rhetoric of many Brazilian LGBT and religious organisations suggests. In the first section, the chapter illustrates how queer behaviours are commonplace in religious spaces such as the church and the terreiro. I argue that religious sites are important spaces through which carioca men establish social networks and materialise queer identities, including spaces often assumed to be intolerant for queer men, such as the Evangelical or Catholic church. It is also argued that seemingly tolerant religious spaces, such as the Candomblé terreiro, can represent intolerant spaces for certain gendered and sexualised behaviours. In the second section, it is suggested that religion plays a key role in gendered and sexualised performances in seemingly profane spaces such as the family home, the workplace and in LGBT spaces. It is argued that religion plays an important, and often ignored, role in the ‘coming out’ process and influences the decision of when, how and to whom queer men choose to disclose their sexuality in such spaces. Throughout this chapter links between religious and queer performances are demonstrated and the interrelated nature of ‘religious’ and ‘profane’ spaces in Rio de Janeiro is highlighted. The chapter extends current work on religion and sexuality, which is focused on the terreiro (Fry 1986, Cornwall & Lindisfarne 1994), through considering less-studied spaces, such as LGBT clubs, the home (Olavarría 2004) and the workplace (Burke 2001). Throughout the chapter it is argued that current research must move beyond a focus on the dichotomy
between tolerant and intolerant religious spaces and challenge assumptions that assume that religion has little impact on performances of gender and sexuality outside religious spaces.

Through a consideration of queer male manifestations of gender and sexuality across various sites of Rio de Janeiro this thesis provides a critique of what we think we know about the relationship between tolerance and space in urban settings. Respect, religion, humour and queer vernacular are offered as fresh perspectives in work on sexuality and space in Latin America which open up new understandings of the ways in which gendered and sexualised norms are reproduced and challenged and how urban spaces are interrelated. An underlying concern of this thesis is the need to question assumed binary understandings of space as either intolerant or tolerant for queer men, and the need to recognise that even in the seemingly ‘tolerant’ sites (such as the gay bar, or in a gay NGO) certain queer male expressions of gender and sexuality are devalued and at times denied. More importantly, however, this thesis demonstrates that even in spaces understood as deeply heterosexist and homophobic, queer men are constantly performing ‘other’ devalued identities which challenge gender and sexuality norms and the marking of spaces as (in)tolerant. Principally, this thesis represents an attempt to better understand the nature of tolerance for a group of queer men in Rio de Janeiro at the start of the 21st century and, in doing so, pushes us to question taken-for-granted understandings of tolerant and intolerant spaces in Brazil and elsewhere, as will become apparent through the stories, opinions, and personal experiences presented in the following chapters.
Tolerance in Gender and Sexuality Studies

This chapter situates this study in Latin American and Anglo-Saxon research into tolerance, gender and sexuality. I begin conceptualising tolerance itself, describing how it has been theorised by social researchers. It is argued that whilst it is possible to identify two broad approaches in tolerance, gender and sexuality research (i) those that are pro-tolerance and (ii) those that are anti-tolerance – one commonality of these approaches is that they generally position the LGBT community as a relatively homogenous group that suffers intolerance from a wider homophobic society. In the next section it is suggested that studies into masculinities in Latin America, Europe and North America problematise these assumptions that the homosexual community is bound together by shared concerns related to their sexual identities and politics and is unquestionably subjected to intolerance. It is argued that factors such as race, class, sexual role and culturally specific factors such as language use cut across gender and sexuality resulting in variable levels of tolerance of the LGBT community. In the next section it is argued that space is also an important factor in thinking about tolerance in relation to gender and sexuality and that, like spatial research on race and class and LGBT identities, problematise straightforward assumptions of the LGBT community as homogenous in terms of its interests and experience of intolerance. It is suggested that spatial research on gender and sexuality has raised important questions for, and brought about new approaches to, theorising tolerance. Finally, it is emphasised that scholars have combined spatial analysis with considerations of performativity through focusing on the closet and it is argued that this is an important starting point for understanding the construction of spaces as (in)tolerant within and outwith the gay scene. Overall the chapter outlines trends in thinking about space, sexuality, gender and tolerance and emphasises the usefulness of work taking a spatial approach in order to understand the functioning of tolerance in relation to gender and sexuality.
Theorising Tolerance

‘The case for greater tolerance of homosexuals is simple’ stated the anonymous author of a TIME cover story article from 1969 (TIME 2010). The article positioned tolerance as a solution to homophobia in American society. A more tolerant society could be created and discrimination reduced through removing laws prohibiting same-sex relations and by preventing police harassment of homosexuals, argued the author. Both in the US and elsewhere tolerance has long been seen as a remedy for the problems faced by the queer community, and this aim is still apparent in the goals of many queer organisations today. In the UK for example, the role of lesbian and gay organisations at the Brighton pride parade is described as ‘spreading the message of tolerance and acceptance’ (Pride in Brighton & Hove 2010), and recent school visits by British actor Sir Ian Mckellen were described as ‘hoping to encourage tolerance’ of the queer community and reduce homophobia (Telegraph 2008). In Brazil, the picture is similar with queer initiatives and organisations aiming to increase tolerance towards lesbians, gays and travestis'. Co-ordinators of programmes such as the Promação da Cidanania Homossexual (Promotion of the Homosexual Citizen) are primarily concerned with promoting tolerance, which is described as ‘one of the necessary means to guarantee common good and social peace’ (Rossi 2008). Likewise, the Brasil sem Homofobia (Brazil without Homophobia) campaign is centred on ‘the issue of tolerance in the face of diversity’ (Rossi 2008). In discourses related to the queer community, tolerance is everywhere. But what is tolerance and how has it been theorised in social research?

The Oxford English Dictionary (2010) defines tolerance as the ‘freedom from bigotry or undue severity in judging the conduct of others’. It would seem logical, then, that gay organisations and governments around the world should strive to achieve more tolerant societies. Tolerance is seen as

2 Travesti is used to refer to individuals that are biologically male but wear female clothes and jewellery, and use feminine names. In contrast to the English term, transsexual, travestis generally have no desire to have gender reassignment surgery in order to ‘become female’ (Cornwall 1994, Kulick 1998).
something necessary and beneficial for our towns and cities, whereas a lack of tolerance is seen as problematic and leading to social division and bigotry. Tolerance has been imagined as a solution to the problems of discrimination that confront the queer community. This is mirrored in social research on gender and sexuality that suggests that physical and verbal homophobia occur due to a lack of tolerance (Namaste 1996, Kirby & Hay 1996, Grube 1997, Hubbard 2000). As a consequence of fears of homophobic abuse and intolerance, Hubbard (2000 p 192) states that ‘homosexuals are often forced to deny or distinguish their sexual orientation except in specific spaces’.

Grube (1997) praises Toronto’s gay scene for its tolerant nature compared with the homophobic gay ghetto of the 1970s. In each case they state that discrimination directed at stereotypically effeminate males is evident in derogatory terms such as faggot and dyke that are seen as indicators of the limits of tolerance. Thus, within and outwith academia, tolerance of the discriminated queer community by a seemingly intolerant society is often seen as necessary and desirable in urban space.

However, straightforward assumptions of tolerance as unquestionably beneficial have been challenged by a growing body of anti-tolerance research that takes a more critical approach suggesting that tolerance can be unhelpful and destructive for the queer community. For example, Moore and Petrow (2007) argue that tolerance can be negative or positive. Negative tolerance, they argue, represents accepting what we do not like, whereas positive tolerance protects our freedom to be different. They argue that tolerance towards the gay community is generally negative since it requires society to endure behaviour that is positioned as abnormal (as argued by Warner 2002). Thus, homosexuality is positioned in opposition to right, proper and healthy heterosexuality in wider society. Consequently queers who behave in a stereotypically heterosexual manner are more likely to find their behaviour tolerated. This mirrors arguments proposed by Rich (1980, p 46) who comments that the ‘lesbian experience has been more recognised and tolerated where it has resembled a “deviant” version of heterosexuality’.
Rich (1980, see also Warner 2002 and Moore & Petrow 2007) suggests that tolerance can be damaging to the queer community since only those ‘behaving as heterosexuals’ are tolerated. The assertion that tolerance is restrictive and capable of reinforcing heterosexual norms is also evident in França’s (2005, p 189) description of Soares’ (2003) scathing study into the gay version of the popular dating programme Fica comigo (Get with me) on MTV Brazil; ‘They created a homosexual in line with norms, tolerance that denied other forms of homosexual living [emphasis added], strengthening the heterosexual point of view as a regulatory model’.

Wendy Brown (2006) is similarly critical of current notions of tolerance, stating that despite its guise of positive acceptance and approval, tolerance is actually about permitting the undesirable. It is concerned with dislike, disapproval and regulation of a group from whom we must be separated and dispersed (2006, p 89). Tolerance is not about showing support for non-normative behaviours, but to conditionally allow what is unwanted or deviant. ‘Liberals who philosophise about tolerance almost always write about coping with what they cannot imagine themselves to be: they identify with the aristocrat holding his nose in the agora, not with the stench’ (Brown 2006, p 178). Groups such as queers thus become marked as abnormal, while behaviours such as homosexual sex and gay marriage are similarly identified as wrong and deviant. Brown challenges assumptions that tolerance is unrestricted and through her critique she reaches the conclusion that tolerance must be thought of as ‘a conditional, circumspect and careful hospitality’ (Borradori 2003, cited in Gregg 2007, p 324).

Less optimistic, restrictive notions of tolerance are, perhaps, most clearly seen in studies exploring religion and homosexuality. Powell and Clarke (2010, p 4) concur with Brown (2006), stating ‘we do not use the terms “toleration” and “tolerance” to describe cases where inaction is the result of indifference or approval’, rather, they continue, ‘An attitude of tolerance is only possible when some action or practice is objectionable to us…’. In
contrast to other studies on tolerance (see Powell and Clarke 2010 and Brown 2006) Burack (2003) is more critical of contemporary approaches to tolerance. He differentiates between ‘new’ and ‘traditional’ tolerance. The former, he argues, is apparent in the self-proclaimed tolerant discourse used by the US Christian right to describe their attitudes towards queer men and women. Burack describes it as a ‘divinely mandated intolerance’ that ‘tries to obliterate the value distinctions between alternative beliefs, practices, and social arrangements’ (2003, p 336). New tolerance is understood as dangerous since it is in opposition to, inter alia, gay rights. This contrasts with traditional tolerance where, despite the underlying conviction that some beliefs or practices are wrong or sinful, there exists ‘respect for others’.

In contrast to pro-tolerance approaches in social research and LGBT organisations, which position tolerance as an unquestionably positive force crucial in reducing homophobia and discrimination, tolerance thus also becomes understood as restrictive to aims of more unconditional acceptance. It is positioned as something ‘bland, apparently meaningless and dangerous’ (Grabham 2009, p 101/2). Consequently, França (2003), Borradori (2003) and Brown (2006) have suggested that we should not settle for mere tolerance consistent with existing norms, but actually challenge the norms upon which tolerance is based.

Despite the strong arguments from both directions, these two approaches – positioning tolerance as beneficial and necessary, or problematising it as potentially regressive and damaging– represent a false dichotomy. One commonality of both approaches is that they rely on the assumption that the queer community is being tolerated by the wider intolerant heterosexual community. This relies on homogenous understandings of an LGBT community suffering discrimination at the hands of an intolerant society. It is assumed that the homosexual community is bound together by shared concerns, sexual identities and politics which mean that their broadly common behaviours are not tolerated. Research on masculinities suggests
that such assumptions are problematic and fail to recognise the diverse experiences and practices of those that make up the queer community. Through critiquing approaches that rely on homogenous notions of the queer community, work on masculinities has furthered understandings of the way in which tolerance functions in relation to gender and sexuality.

In contrast to work taking a pro- or anti-tolerance stance, social research on masculinities indicates more complicated linkages between masculinity, sexuality and tolerance in which the behaviours tolerated vary dependent on race, class, sexual role, as well as gender and sexuality. Connell (1995) differentiates between hegemonic masculinities that are highly valued, and subordinate masculinities that are viewed as undesirable. Hegemonic masculinities are rewarded and interpreted as the most honoured way of being a man, whilst those expressing alternative masculinities are subject to feelings of shame, guilt or inadequacy (Connell 1995, Goodey 1997, Johnston 1998, Longhurst 2000, Longhurst & Berg 2003, Connell & Meerschmidt 2005, Stoudt 2006, Luzia, 2008, Anderson 2008). Since Connell (1995) views hegemonic masculinities as the most socially endorsed and accepted way of being a man, and composed of behaviours that reduce the risk of homophobia, they can also be understood as the most widely tolerated male practices. Privileged masculinities include qualities such as being in control, being emotionally detached and athletic, whilst subordinate masculinities include emotional involvement, sensitivity and physical weakness (Cohen 1991, Connell 1995, 2005). This hierarchical understanding of masculinities is inextricably tied up with sexuality, with heterosexuality being one element of privileged, hegemonic masculinity and homosexuality associated with subordinate masculinities.

Various social researchers have argued that tolerance of certain forms of masculinity is dependent upon the relationship that men have with their ‘other. In the case of Latin America this is naturalised as women, which places women and gay men in an undesirable position in conventional
understandings of sexualities. This is evident in studies into machismo. Although machismo is a contested term, and varies widely across South American Latino cultural groups, Stobbe (2005, p 105) argues that it 'should be defined as a set of hegemonic masculinities'. Stevens3 (1973, p 90) describes machismo as the ‘cult of virility’ demonstrated by male displays of arrogance and sexual aggression in interpersonal relationships. Similarly, Willis (2005, p 97) and Ford et al (2003) use the term macho to refer to men who behave in an exaggerated masculine way, based on aggressions, violence and womanising. Researchers have argued that privileged masculinities are in a dialectical (in opposition to, but reliant on) relationship with women and homosexuals who thus comprise subordinate groups (Stevens 1973, Lancaster 1995 & 1997, Carallo 2003, Manzelli 2003, Melo & Vaz 2006). For example, Stevens (1973) argues that machismo and its female counterpart marinismo are interdependent. Marinismo is used to refer to the way in which ‘real women’ are understood as not-macho through being passive, religious, and compliant to the demands of their husbands, brothers and sons (Stevens 1973). Lancaster (1995 & 1997) argues that the cochón or maricón (faggot) is defined in opposition to the macho and that male behaviour is influenced by this dialectic. All men are affected by this opposition since the honour related to being a macho is dependent on the shame related to being a cochón. All men are thus at risk of being labelled cochón and nobody wants to be left holding this stigma. In contrast to Stevens (1973) and Lancaster (1995), Carallo (2004), Manzelli (2004) and Melo & Vaz (2006) argue that the macho is simultaneously dependent on both the maricón and the ‘real woman’. In social interaction, men must demonstrate that they do not belong to either of these two groups in order for their behaviours to be tolerated and for them to be understood as real men.

The argument that tolerance of male behaviours must be understood in relation to women and homosexuals is also highlighted in work on
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3 See Stevens (1973) for her problematic argument that the ‘fully developed syndrome’ of machismo only occurs in Latin America and was brought from Iberia through soldiers and adventurers who ‘discovered’ the continent.
homophobia in Europe and North America. Men giving subordinate masculine performances, particularly effeminate men, have been identified as at the highest risk of homophobia as their behaviours are more likely to be perceived as gay than their stereotypically masculine counterparts (Epstein 1996, Namaste 1996, Kirby & Hay 1997, Stanko & Curry 1997, Tomsen & Mason, 2001). Harassment of gay men and lesbians (or those that are perceived as gay/lesbian) can be seen as attempts to reinforce ‘compulsory heterosexuality’ by punishing those that are not sufficiently like ‘real men’ or ‘women’ (Rich 1980, Epstein 1996). Epstein (1986) refers to compulsory heterosexuality as the social, institutional and legal rewarding of heterosexuality and the linking of male heterosexuality with masculinity. Stanko & Curry (1997) state that this functions to the detriment of men performing subordinate masculinities who are seen as behaving irresponsibly and more likely to suffer homophobia. This is reiterated by Namaste’s (1996 p 2221) study on transgenders, or what she terms ‘gender outlaws’. She argues that transgenders must engage in the spatial process of ‘passing’ (see Sycamore 2006), where their gender presentation must be carefully self-regulated to avoid homophobic attack or, ‘genderbashing’. Mott (2003a) makes a similar conclusion, arguing that travestis face more intolerance because of their perceived gender crossing, arguing that they too frequently become victims of crimes such as physical attacks and muggings. Whilst studies into homophobia challenge pro- and anti-tolerance work that understands the queer community as a discriminated, homogenous group, they still assume that gendered and sexualised behaviours that are/are not tolerated can be easily defined.

Although many Latin American and Anglo-Saxon studies on gender and sexuality treat hegemonic masculinities as easily identifiable and separate from less tolerated masculinities, the specific behaviours that are seen as hegemonic in each cultural context are often different (For a non-Anglo-Saxon/Latin American example example see Oswin 2010). Indeed, one of the critiques of Connell’s (1995) model of hegemonic masculinities is its
inability to incorporate such cultural nuances (Demetriou 2001). The inadequacy of a fit-all model of hegemonic masculinities is highlighted in studies on active and passive male sexual roles. Despite being recognised as a component of hegemonic masculinities by Connell, it is rarely identified as an important factor in determining male behaviours that are/are not tolerated in Euro-American work (see Devries & Free 2010 and Logan 2010 for recent exceptions). In contrast, many studies focused on Brazil (Fry 1986, Parker 1998, Leal & Boff 1998, Green 1999, Nesvig 2001 and Vigoya 2004) have argued that male dominance and sexual activity are privileged practices and positioned as normal male behaviour, whilst male acquiescence and passivity are seen as undesirable and unmanly. Green (1986) and Nesvig (2001) take a historical perspective, situating the privileged status of male activity and dominance in the legal framework and societal attitudes of (post-) colonial Brazil. Most recent studies have demonstrated that the active/passive binary is inextricably tied up with notions of honour and shame, and conceptions of machismo (Lancaster 1997, Parker 1999). They contend that being in control, dominating and active represents the most tolerated, honoured and privileged way for men to perform their masculinity.

Social researchers (e.g. Fry 1986, Parker 1991, Lancaster 1995 & 1997, Prieur & Stølen 1996 & Rebhun 2001) have demonstrated how the stigmatised position of being sexually passive and biologically male is mirrored in the Portuguese and Spanish lexicon. For example, Leal & Boff (1996) and Parker (1991 & 1999) state that intolerance of male sexual passivity is evident in the depreciating terms bicha, viado and maricon (faggot), and by ‘acting active’ (Lancaster 1995) men can avoid homophobic discrimination and pass as straight homens/hombres (men) or machos, (very masculine men). In addition, Parker (1991) comments that the term comer (to eat, or in this context, to penetrate) is linked to being male and dar (to give, or in this context, to be penetrated) is linked to femininity and is frequently
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4 Despite helping to contextualise notions of activity and passivity, their studies are problematic since they fail to recognise that this is a modern and western dualism that carries different assumptions today, than in colonial Brazil.
used as an emasculating insult in the phrase *da cu* (to give your arse or be penetrated). Derogatory terms related to male passivity are pervasive in phrases, jokes and insults in Portuguese and Spanish (Almeida 1996, Leal & Boff 1996 & Cecchetto 2004) Through joking about the passivity of others, men can strengthen their own masculinity and avoid the humiliation of being labelled a bicha, viado or maricón.

Two general conclusions might thus be drawn from the active/passive binary attached to masculinity and sexuality in Latin America. Firstly, the sexual role of a person is an important component of hegemonic masculinities in the region, and while male activity is generally tolerated, male passivity is not. Passivity is viewed as undesirable and risks threatening one’s honour and, in some cases, is a more important factor than whether one is attracted to men or women. Secondly, understanding Latin American sexuality as a ‘tropical’ version of what happens in Europe and North America is overly simplistic and ‘northern’ models of hegemonic masculinities and tolerance cannot be simply and blindly applied to other cultural contexts. For example, words used to oppress and stigmatise as part of a wider machismo discourse, such as viado/bicha, fail convey shame related to sexual passivity and loss of honour when their English equivalents faggot/queer are used. The studies above imply that practices of masculinity that are tolerated vary across different social and cultural contexts, such that masculinities generally privileged in Brazil are not identical to those generally privileged in Euro-American cultures (Parker 1991, 1999, Cechetto 2004 and Fonesca 2004). Despite their differences, the research presented up to this point worked with the assumption that it is possible to identify specific hegemonic masculinities that are tolerated within specific cultural contexts.

Given that existing theories are likely to be inadequate for analysis of the Latin American context, critiques of hegemonic masculinities might provide
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5 Whilst I recognise that hegemonic masculinities have been used to refer to a wide variety of practices in northern literature, similarities exist across such studies, such as the general lack of focus on sexual role.
some insights into alternative approaches for studying the relationship between tolerance and hegemonic masculinities. One critique levelled against the hegemonic masculinities model is that it is too static and fails to take into consideration the interconnected nature of various aspects of our identities, such as race, religion, class, gender and sexuality. This is demonstrated in recent work on homophobia that seeks to highlight cross-cutting aspects of our identities and risk of discrimination (Moran et al 2001 & 2003, Mott 2003a, Kitchin & Lysaght 2003, Heasley 2005, and Myslik 2006, Fundação Perseu Abramo 2008). For example, Kitchin & Lysaght’s (2003) Belfast study demonstrates how nationalism and religion influence the imagination and experience of different spaces of the city as (in)tolerant. Moran et al (2001 & 2003) show how class is an important factor in the spatial experiences of queer men in Manchester. They suggest that those expressing non-hegemonic identities can be understood as privileged and powerful users of the gay scene and often represent the subjects of homophobia by positioning working class men as ‘dangerous others’. The recent nationwide assessment of homophobia in Brazil conducted by the Fundação Perseu Abramo (2009) also highlights that factors such as religion, race and class are important for understanding which groups tolerate the expression of subordinate masculinities. In short, tolerance of different expressions and performances of masculinity is linked to other kinds of identities in sometimes unexpected ways, and tolerance intersects with the ways that people and communities become positioned within broader social structures related to social class, race, and ethnicity.

An additional critique of Connell’s model of hegemonic masculinities is that it fails to recognise that individuals constantly shift between various notions of tolerated and not tolerated masculinities and femininities. Heasley (2005) argues that men move in and out and between various hegemonic and subordinate masculinities over time and space between overlapping categories such as ‘straight sissy boys’, ‘elective straight queers’. Research on travestis in Brazil has reiterated the need to rethink assumptions that
individually can be placed on one side of the hegemonic/subordinate boundary (Cornwall 1994, Lancaster 1997, Kulick 1998, Prieur 1998, Van de Port 2005). Travesti performances have been described as highlighting how gender and sexuality are ‘in play’ (Lancaster 1997), through movement between hegemonic and subordinate gendered and sexualised categories such as active/passive, man/woman, heterosexual/gay. Cornwall (1994), Kulick (1998) and Prieur (1998) illustrate how Brazilian travestis and Mexican *jotas/vestidas*⁶ construct their identities by strategically moving between masculine and feminine performances. These individuals may conform to ideas of hegemonic manliness though their possession of a penis, behaviours such as fighting, violence, drinking and through taking a sexually active role, but may also be understood as feminine through their physical appearance, their female gestures or sometimes taking a sexually passive role. Consequently, Kulick (1998, p 193) refers to travestis as ‘constructive essentialists’ – essentialist because, by their own admission, they are unable to undo their birth gender, but also constructivist through the clothes, make-up and other aspects of appearance that they use to create their feminine identities. Not only do travesti identity performances highlight the false fixity in Connell’s model, but they also challenge assumptions of the privileged nature of hegemonic masculinities. The performance of subordinate masculinities by travestis may be tolerated or even desired, and is beneficial in attracting clients, conducting sexual relations, and avoiding danger (by passing as female) in certain contexts and spaces (Lancaster 1997, Kulick 1998).

By recognising the variable nature of tolerated masculinities across various contexts Kulick (1998) and Lancaster (1997) draw attention to the importance of space and place in theorising tolerance. This has been reiterated by studies considering male behaviours in a variety of sites from the workplace (McDowell & Court 1994, Stout 2006) to the soap opera (Carallo 2004) and fighting ring (Melo & Vaz 2006). Melo & Vaz (2006) and Carallo (2004) have

⁶ Used to refer to men who have a feminine appearance and are assumed to take a passive sexual role.
demonstrated how film and television are important media through which the macho image as the most privileged and tolerated male in fighting spaces is reproduced in Latin America. For example, the lack of homosexuals or women in fighting scenes and a strong preference for aggressive, active, dominating male characters means they represent the macho domain par excellence. The intolerance of non-macho behaviours in fighting scenes, Melo & Vez (2006) argue, is evident in language choices that emphasise the phallus, virility and control evident in common phrases such as *botar o pau na mesa* (to be ready to fight, literally, to put your dick on the table). Other studies have also argued that the workplace is a space where hegemonic masculinities are reinforced and effeminate male behaviours are devalued. (McDowell & Court 1996, McDowell 2000 & 2002 and Stout 2006). Joking, name-calling and ironic comments are identified as behaviours used to define the limits of tolerated masculinity. For example, McDowell & Court (1994) show how in the setting of the merchant bank those who behaved in a stereotypically masculine manner and ‘had the balls’ were honoured and dubbed ‘big swinging dicks’ whilst those who expressed subordinate masculinities were discriminated against.

The construction of space and place therefore plays an important role in the ways that tolerance becomes reconstituted, and also in the assertion of hegemonic and alternative masculinities. The assumption that hegemonic masculinities are privileged and more likely to be tolerated has been criticised for failing to recognise the temporally and spatially contingent nature of our identity performances (McDowell 2002, Kitchin & Lysaght 2003, and Hopkins 2006). Such understandings take a ‘fit-all’ model of masculinity by assuming that hegemonic, normative forms of gender and sexuality are static and privileged across all times and spaces. Even in studies that focus on specific spaces such as the terreiro (Fry 1986), the sports venue (Vitor & Melo, 2006) or the home (Nast & Mabel 1994, Madigan & Munro 1999, Heilborn 2004), the spatially variant nature of tolerance towards hegemonic masculinities is a secondary concern. Several studies have emphasised the
way in which tolerance changes over urban spaces. In urban contexts, for example Namaste (1996, p 222) comments that in ‘certain social, cultural and historical contexts, a separation of gender and sexuality seems impossible’, whilst in other locations they appear to be “markedly distinct” which results in uneven levels of violence against transgender individuals across different urban spaces’. Myslik (2006) recognises that spatial factors related to feelings of social control and empowerment result in variable tolerance of performances of masculinity and sexuality across Dupont, Washington D.C., Mott (2003) demonstrates that specific spaces, namely the streets and squares of Brazilian towns and cities are foci for attacks against queer men giving non-normative, subordinate gendered and sexualised performances.

Geographical debates of tolerance in relation to aspects of identity other than gender and sexuality, such as race, class and religion, have also emphasised the spatial nature of tolerance as well as furthering understandings of the functioning of tolerance (Bass 2001, Puwar 2004, O’Neil et al 2008, Olund 2010, Olund & Oswin 2010, Oswin 2010, Raimondo 2010, Leitner 2011). Such work has demonstrated how tolerance can be understood as white class power and privilege across urban spaces and has shown how tolerance is extended and denied based on spatial sorting, segregating and judging of bodies along the lines of race, class and religion. Puar (2004) argues that in elite public spaces such as Westminster, Whitehall and in academic institutions non-white, non-middle class, female bodies are ‘named, denied and often denigrated’. These behaviours are used to deny tolerance and mark these bodies as trespassers, intruders or, what she terms, ‘space invaders’. They are unwelcome because they disrupt the white, middle-class, masculine nature of such spaces. Focusing on non-elite, everyday spaces of the residential neighbourhood Leitner (2011) also highlights the ways in which tolerance is denied based on race, class and religion. He argues that tolerance towards migrants is conditional on their conforming to white American values and show how those unwilling to accept
such values experience prejudice and intolerance. In a different vein, Bass (2001) shows how zero tolerance policing approaches have been used as a tool to discriminate along the lines of race and class in certain spaces of the city. Fear of the non-white, non-middle-class ‘other’ prompts surveillance and regulation of those deemed a threat to white, middle-class spaces. O’Neil et al (2008), Olund (2010) and Olund and Oswin (2010) show how this racialised regulation is actualised in the treatment of street sex workers who are construed as non-white and non-heteronormative and threatening to the white, middle-class, heteronormative liberal subject. Race and class represent aspects of our identity that allow ordering in terms of tolerated/not tolerated and, in certain spaces, result in non-white, non-middle class subjects becoming objects of regulation. Despite their differences, geographical studies on race, class and tolerance show that taking a spatial perspective is vital in order to illuminate the processes through which tolerance functions and the ways in which it includes certain bodies while excluding others.

This section has argued that whilst work on tolerance can be separated into two broad approaches, pro and anti tolerance, this represents a false dichotomy since both imagine the LGBT community as homogenous in that it is positioned as experiencing discrimination and requiring greater acceptance. Critical research on hegemonic masculinities has pointed towards more complicated linkages between masculinity, sexuality and tolerance arguing that a variety of factors such as race, class, sexual role and cultural understandings result in varied experiences of tolerance within the LGBT community. This has problematised work taking a pro or anti tolerance approaches which assumes homogeneity of experiences of tolerance in the queer community. One of the critiques of Connell’s understanding of hegemonic masculinities has identified the importance of space and place in theorising linkages between tolerance, masculinity and sexuality. These factors have not been fully theorised in studies on tolerance and masculinity in Latin America. Thus, it is argued that a useful way for
developing a theoretical approach into the relationship between urban sexualities and tolerance in Latin America would be to incorporate work on space and place.

**Tolerance, Gender and Sexuality in the Gay Scene**

**Mapping Homogenous Tolerant Oases**

In the 1980s Bob McNee criticised geographers for being ‘squeamish’ about sexuality and space due to the fact that, at the time, such studies were few and far between (also see Blunt & Willis 2000). Since then there has been a great upsurge in work on sexuality, space and tolerance and today studies cover a variety of areas from homophobia (Namaste 1992, Stanko & Curry 1997) to the home (Heilborn 2005, Gorman-Murray 2006 & 2007) and the gay scene (Taylor 1998, Valentine & Skelton 2003, Gontijo 2009, Vasconcelos 2010). Many of the early studies into sexuality and space were focused on what Binnie & Valentine (1999) refer to as a ‘dots on a map’ approach centred around mapping and statistical analysis of emerging gay neighbourhoods and commercial districts in cities such as Boston (Levine 1979), San Francisco (Levine 1979, Castells & Murphy 1982, Castells 1983), New Orleans (Lauria & Knopp 1985), Paris (Winchester & White 1988) London and Amsterdam (Binnie 1995).

Although there are differences within the approaches taken by individual studies, early work generally relies on two related assumptions; firstly, that gay space is easily identifiable and can be delineated against the heterosexual space of the rest of the city, and secondly, that gay space represents a uniquely tolerant part of the city for the LGBT community. These two assumptions are evident in the pioneering work of Castells and Murphy (1982), which aimed to ‘chart as solidly as possible the precise spatial boundaries of the gay community’ (1982, p 228). They concentrated on statistical relationships between factors such as the cost of rent, voting patterns and the presence of gay males in certain areas of San Francisco that were used to map gay communities. Castells (1983) emphasised the
specifically tolerant nature of gay spaces, referring to them as ‘liberated zones’ and earmarked them as places where ‘they [gay men and women] could be safe together and develop new styles’. Similarly, Levine (1979) and Castells & Murphy (1983) saw the bars and venues of gay neighbourhoods as tolerant, ‘gay friendly’ and free from bigotry. Levine (1979, p 204) adds that the process of tolerance is integral to the creation of ‘gay ghettos’, stating ‘With a modicum of tolerance the process [of gay ghetto construction] begins. At first gay institutions and cruising places spring up in urban districts known to accept variant behaviour, resulting in a concentration of such places in a specific location of the city, as shown on the spot maps.’ The common conclusion of this research is that geographically-contingent expressions of tolerance lead to the development of gay residential neighbourhoods and services that represent gay enclaves which are discrete from the rest of the city’s heterosexual space. Castells (1983, p 139) contends that a ‘city emerges within a city’ since gay communities represent ‘spatial subsets of the urban system’.

Winchester & White’s (1988) work on lesbian neighbourhoods in Paris and Adler & Brenner’s (1992) and Forsyth’s (1997a & b) American studies were early critiques the over-representation of research on gay male neighbourhoods in the emerging sexuality and space field. Early studies on lesbian communities appeared to reinforce the conclusions that homosexual space could be easily demarcated due to its particularly tolerant nature. Like Winchester & White (1988) and Adler & Brenner (1992), Forsyth (1997a & b) theorised lesbian spaces as spatially concentrated and highly visible communities that could be easily mapped through a variety of census data and information regarding lesbian and gay businesses. She referred to Northampton, USA, as a particularly tolerant ‘gay haven’ like other seemingly especially liberal places, such as Key West and Palm Springs. Winchester & White (1988, p 49) commented that gay neighbourhoods represent spaces
for those that suffer marginalisation elsewhere, allowing ‘a group without full social respectability to maintain its existence unthreatened’.

On the one hand, studies by Lauria and Knopp (1985) and Knopp (1990) make similar assumptions about gay space as uniquely tolerant, relatively closed communities and easily defined spaces of the city’s heterosexual landscape. They describe gay space as an ‘oasis of tolerance’ for the LGBT community (Lauria & Knopp, p 185). But on the other hand, their work takes a different approach to that of Castells (1983) and Castells & Murphy (1982) by focusing on the relationship between gay men and gentrification, which they term ‘urban renaissance’. From a structural Marxist perspective, considering the Marigny neighbourhood of New Orleans, Lauria & Knopp (1985) and Knopp (1990) suggest that there is a link between the economic wealth of single gay men and the gentrification of specific urban areas. They contend that social and economic privileges result in gay men having a greater capacity than other groups to engage in the historical preservation of neighbourhoods, which eventually attracts a range of gay services, organisations and entertainment venues. In contrast to Castells (1983) and Levine (1979), who were primarily concerned with charting locations of gay neighbourhoods, Lauria & Knopp (1985) and Knopp’s (1990) studies explain the existence of gay neighbourhoods as outcomes of and accompaniments to broader social and economic inequalities.

Despite this similarity across the three articles, work by Adler & Brenner (1992) and Winchester & White (1988) states that lesbian communities are largely invisible, describing them as ‘quasi-underground’, ‘hidden neighbourhoods’ that are ‘discreet and virtually anonymous’ and ‘unknown to many of those who live and work within the areas concerned’. The reason for the hidden nature of lesbian communities is related to unequal gendered power relations and wider systems of oppression and patriarchy and the fact that lesbians, like all women, are less likely than (gay) men to have the capital to establish lesbian bars, clubs and services.
Whilst notions of the gay scene as a uniquely tolerant space are generally associated with studies from the 1970s and 80s (Levine 1978, Castells 1983, Knopp 1985, Winchester & White 1988) they are also apparent in more recent work on counterpublics (Fraser 1992, Warner 2002, Blaustein 2004). Counterpublics can be understood as public spaces where marginalised groups ‘formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests and needs’ (Warner, 2002). Although Warner states that counterpublics are not premised upon concrete space and discusses the limits of thinking about public and private spaces, he does provide material examples, such as the modern gay scene and molly clubs in early London as cases of counterpublics (Warner 2002, Blaustein 2004). They are seen as representing exceptionally tolerant spaces for groups that are ‘socially marked' (Warner 2002, p 93) by regulatory discourses. Indeed, Fraser (1992) comments that it is precisely because of societal intolerance that oppressed groups, such as lesbians and gays construct counterpublics which are seen as sites where they can escape discrimination and express alternative and transformative gendered and sexualised practices without oppression and intolerance.

In addition to positioning queer communities as uniquely tolerant spaces, a further problematic aspect of initial (and in the case of counterpublics, more recent) work on sexuality and space is that the gay scene was often cast as unquestionably gay space. Neatly gentrified neighbourhoods and beautified bars, clubs and restaurants were identified as physical markers of ‘gay’ characteristics. Indeed, through a preoccupation with drawing boundaries around gay and straight neighbourhoods in early studies, it was assumed that gay space could be easily delineated, and by association, was static and homogenous. Forsyth (1997, p 57) even raises concerns about a ‘certain arbitrariness in classifying lesbian and non-lesbian spaces’, despite, arguably, reinforcing such binary herself. One problem with the reliance on binary gay/straight understandings of the urban landscape in early work was that it denied the possibility that the sexualised nature of urban space could
change over time, thus rejecting more dynamic notions of space. Rather it was more concerned with identifying homogeneity across diverse spaces that were owned, lived in, or otherwise produced by gay people. Knopp criticises initial geographical studies on sexuality for relying too heavily on ‘naïve mappings of sexual space’ and ignoring the spatial processes through which spaces becomes gendered and sexualised (1995, p 149). For example, Lauria & Knopp’s (1985) work on Marigny, New Orleans takes a structuralist approach linking fixed structural inequalities to the marking of space as gay or straight, offering little room for other spatial codings of gender and sexuality.

However, in the 1990s, work on sexuality and space moved away from its narrow focus on mapping and visibility (in terms of gentrification and gay commerce), to a concern with the fluid nature of spaces and identities. This challenged understandings of gay communities and neighbourhoods as fixed, tolerant spaces. That said, certain early researchers chose not to follow the majority of ‘first wave’ approaches to sexuality and space. For example, Bob Mcnee’s (1984) groundbreaking and, at the time, controversial work concentrated on same-sex sexual desire and was described as particularly forward-looking (Brown and Knopp 2003, p 314) since it focused on how, why and where gendered and sexualised identities were played out by gays and lesbians, rather than simply mapping tolerant gay space. Work following early approaches to sexuality and space paid closer attention to the performative nature of spaces such as the gay scene and generated a new approach to theorising tolerance, masculinity and sexuality that can be described as falling under the general category of queer geographies.

**Intersections of performativity, tolerance, gender and sexuality**

Queer geographies can be understood as part of the ‘new cultural geography’ (Binnie 1997), which emerged through the 1980s as an alternative to the predominantly positivist approach to early gender and
sexuality work. Instead of quantifying through mapping and statistics, attention was focused on interrogating binaries such as man/woman, gay/straight, tolerant/intolerant through engaging with the way in which gendered and sexualised identities are played-out, or performed\(^8\). The formation of a broadly queer geographical approach to research into gender and sexuality was influenced in multifaceted ways by queer theory. Queer theory can be thought of as a radical, and in many ways, frustrated reaction to the efforts to forge political solidarity based on a common gay identity in early gay movements. Early activist and academic work often relied on assumptions that LGBT individuals constituted a natural community because of common sexual identities and that this could be capitalised on by political projects benefiting the homosexual community in general (Seidman 1997, Barry 2000). By the end of the 1980s, there was increasing disquiet within western LGBT communities in cities such as New York, San Francisco and London, and mounting pressure for a movement that was ‘more inclusive and more radical’ (Armstrong 2002, p 190). Queer theory represented an ‘angry offshoot’ of a predominantly western gay and lesbian movement that was being increasingly criticised, within and outwith academia, for ignoring the reality of complex, ambiguous and contested notions of sexual identities through attempts to create a unified, homogenous gay identity (Armstrong 2002).

Within this context, queer theory emerged as a novel way of understanding or theorising sexual identities by rejecting earlier identity-based movement approaches that proposed gays and lesbians ‘will share certain moral values, political beliefs and cultural tastes’ (Highleyman 2002, p 108; see also Fraiman 2003). Queer theory approaches represented a radical rethinking of sexuality and politics through emphasising the need to acknowledge difference and reject former notions of a homogenous ‘gay identity’ that essentialised differences and led to unwitting self-subordination. Thus, queer

\(^8\) Butler’s (1990, 2004) notion of performance refers to the speech and action ‘citations’ that create our unstable and unfixed gendered and sexualised identities. Performativity is considered in more detail in the methodologies chapter.
theory paid increasing attention to diversity and internal contradictions within LGBT identities. Sexual difference was no longer seen as a threat to the formation of a unified, coherent gay identity, but as something positive that should be acknowledged in an effort to create a more inclusive and tolerant LGBT community. Rather than relying on essentialist assumptions that the homosexual community was homogenous, open and tolerant for all queer LGB & T individuals, researchers sought to highlight inequalities and exclusion within the movements and spaces associated with the queer community.

Queer theorists have drawn heavily on French poststructural theory and the method of deconstruction that aims to ‘disturb or displace the power of hierarchies showing their arbitrary, social and political character’ (Seidman, 1997, p 146; Barry, 2000). In doing so, a key concern of queer theorists has been to critique binary modes of thinking, pervasive in Western societies. Bourdieu (2001), whose arguments have been employed by queer theorists (see Rooke 2007), argues that such binaries simultaneously create and naturalise differences by locating them in distinctions such as man vs. woman, gay vs. heterosexual, masculine vs. feminine, tolerant vs. intolerant. A principal concern of those engaged with queer theory is to better understand the construction of these dualities, and the consequences they have on individual identities and society. Bourdieu (2001, p 11) argues that we must understand the heterosexual-homosexual and man-woman boundaries as socially constructed differences that are also the bases through which the binary is naturalised and heterosexuality is privileged. Heteronormativity, in which non-heterosexual performances of identity are excluded and marginalised (Brickell 2000), is the outcome of the naturalisation of these binaries and has consequences on ‘our way of defining and organising selves, desires and behaviours’ (Seidman 1997, p 150). Thus, through their interrogation of binary understandings of identities, queer theorists aim to valorise individuality and difference and challenge norms related to gender and sexuality (Armstrong 2002, Fraiman 2003).
The shift from geographies of sexuality to queer geographies can be understood as part of a broader attempt by geographers to critically incorporate this deconstructionalist approach into work on gender, sexuality and space. In doing so, they have challenged notions of unified subjects and spaces. The result is a queer geographical approach that, whilst related to, is ultimately different from geographies of sexuality work (Browne 2006). As part of this endeavour, geographers have argued that conceiving of identities and spaces as performed provides a useful framework through which to rethink the relationship between sexuality and space (Rose 1999, Gregson & Rose 2000, Lim 2004). Geographers have extended Judith Butler’s (1990) notion of performativity by arguing that, like our gendered and sexualised identities, spaces are created through our actions. Rose (1999, p 248) argues that space can be better understood as a ‘practised matrix of play’, which is ‘dynamic and iterative [since] its forms and shapes are produced through the citational self-other relations’. Thus, Geographers have used a performative lens to critique earlier work that assumes that the gendered and sexualised nature of urban space was pre-determined and fixed along the gay/straight binary (see Levine 1979, Castells & Murphy 1983). Queer geographical work has demonstrated how spatial codings of space as ‘gay’ or ‘straight’ are actually the effect of identity performances and heterosexist forms of space tend to occur through repetitive, normative performances of gender and sexuality (Lim 2004, Kitchin & Lysaght 2004).

Early geographical attempts to engage with performative theory in the sexuality and space field are evident in work by Valentine (1996) and Binnie (1997) which argue that the heterosexual nature of urban spaces, such as the street, are naturalised through the constant repetition and regulation of identity performances. Valentine (1996) contends that homophobia must be understood as an attempt to regulate non-straight expressions of identity through fixing and stabilising space as heterosexual. Valentine (1996) maintains that the sexualised nature of the street is multiple, shifting and
provisional and its ‘straightness’ is actually always under threat from dissident performances of identity. In their much critiqued paper, Bell et al (1994) focus on the construction of lipstick lesbian and gay skinhead identities and their ability to unsettle the heterosexual nature of the street and reshape dominant gender and sexuality narratives. Thus, while the work of Vaentine (1996) and Binnie (1997) stresses the ongoing and constantly contested nature of heterosexual space, Bell et al’s (1994) has been criticised for implying that the (hetero)sexual nature of space is innate and pre-existing (Gregson & Rose, 2000). Despite multifaceted approaches, recent geographical work on the gay scene also employs a performative approach, focusing on the specific practices that bring the space into being. Within this wider field of research, tolerance is either understood as being an innate quality of the gay scene (as Levine 1979, Castells & Murphy 1982, Grube 1997, Wolfe 1997, Nash 2005), or as it is understood as a contested characteristic of gay spaces (Skeggs 1999, Holt & Griffin 2003, Valentine & Skelton 2003). As I explain below, understanding tolerance as performed rather than innate provides a compelling starting-point for understanding the heterogeneity of queer experiences within ‘gay’ spaces.

**Performativity and the functioning of tolerance in the gay scene**

Through focusing on gendered and sexualised performances recent studies have begun to challenge the idea of the gay scene as an innately tolerant space. In doing so they have raised important questions for the functioning of tolerance in the gay scene and have argued that gendered and sexualised behaviours construct such spaces as welcoming and unwelcoming, inclusionary and exclusionary (Skeggs 1999, Moran et al 2001, Valentine & Skelton 2003, Holt & Griffin 2003, McLean 2008). Valentine and Skelton (2003, p 863) contend that the gay scene must be conceptualised as
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An additional critique levied by Nelson (1999) and Gregson & Rose (2000) is that Bell et al (1994) mistakenly insert intention into Butler’s understanding of performativity, implying that performers have total agency in selecting the performances that they give. This contradicts Butler’s antifoundationalist understanding of identities and insistence that gendered and sexualised norms are not ‘ours’, but actually originate in the heterosexual matrix (Butler 2001 - see Methodologies section for description of the heterosexual matrix).
‘paradoxical space’, providing an accepting and supportive environment, especially whilst ‘coming out’, whilst concurrently being alienating, isolating and unwelcome. Drawing upon Gillian Rose’s (1993, p 159) concept of ‘paradoxical space’, Valentine and Skelton (2003) refer to the varied, and even contradictory, way that queer men and women experience the gay scene, resisting dichotomous understandings of the space as a site of inclusion or exclusion, oppression or resistance, sameness or difference. The gay scene thus becomes a space where queers can ‘be themselves’ while having to follow strict rules related to appearance, behaviour, race and class that stipulate specific identity performances used to determine the authenticity of one’s (homo)sexuality (Skeggs 1999, Holt & Griffin 2003, McLean 2008). When experiences, desires and practices fail to match authentic notions of what it means to be lesbian, gay, bisexual or trans the gay scene may also become an unwelcoming space as highlighted in McLean’s (2008) study into womens’ experiences of relinquishing non-heterosexual identities. The paradoxical – tolerant and intolerant – nature of the gay scene is captured in Rooke’s (2007 p 248) description of the experience of indifference for queers in Kempton, Brighton:

‘The promise from the outside is that of a space that is welcoming to those who feel different on the basis of their sexuality and gender appearance. The disappointment when positioned on the inside is that of questions of difference continue to play themselves out on the basis of age, ethnicity, body size, gender and sexuality’.

Through focusing on performances in the gay scene Taylor (1997), Moran et al (2001), Valverde & Criak (2003), Sibalis (2004), Waitt & Gorman-Murray (2007) and Matejskova (2007) have demonstrated how behaviours that are/are not tolerated are related to class. They show that notions of the gay scene as universally accepting and tolerant must be challenged since class performances are used to determine whether one is to be tolerated or not, whether one is marked as a worthy user or an ‘undesirable other’ and excluded. Rules regarding behaviour and appearance therefore regulate and
restrict working class access to gay bars and clubs and often only allow wealthier queers to make spatialised claims for recognition on the scene whilst poorer queers are seen as threatening on otherwise well-ordered gay space (Taylor 1997; Valverde and Criak 2003). Matejskova’s (2007) study on Bratislava’s gay scene and Moran et al’s (2001) Manchester study demonstrate how social class, sexualised performances and the time of week interact to produce varying and contested levels of tolerance for certain queer men. Their work suggests that tolerance is a class process and leads to a gay scene that is both intolerant and tolerant simultaneously.

Studies focusing on gendered and sexualised performances on the gay scene challenge notions that it represents a unified, tolerant, gay space. They have suggested more heterogeneous understandings through drawing attention to the diverse practices and complicated identity politics that take place across the gay scene, acknowledging the overlapping and contesting nature of ideological queer movement stances and disjointed queer identities played out through the space (Sibalis 2004, Miller 2005, Nash 2005 & 2006, Podmore 2006). As a result tolerance is uneven and contested across the gay scene\(^\text{10}\).

Physical appearance has also been related to the construction of tolerance and intolerance in the gay scene (Butler 1999, Casey 2007, Waitt & Gorman-Murray 2007, Gontijo 2009). The growing commercialisation of the gay scene and desire for ‘pink pounds’ has resulted in an increasing focus on young, muscular, able-bodied men (Hancock 2009, Slevin & Klinneman 2010). Waitt & Gorman Murray (2007) argue that despite representing meaningful spaces

\(^{10}\) Not all recent studies considering performances in the gay scene challenge notions that it represents tolerant space. Despite drawing attention to the multi-faceted nature of queer identity performances in the gay scene work by Cavalho (2007) and Vasconcelos (2010) in Rio de Janeiro and studies by Grube (1997), Kirby & Hay (1997) and Nash (2006) in Canada and Australia they still rely on simplistic notions of the gay scene as uniquely tolerant and separate from the aggressively heterosexist nature of the rest of the city’s urban fabric. Grube (1997) draws links between the practices such as a reduction in police violence, closing of homophobic bars and clubs and visible same-sex intimacy as resulting in Toronto’s contemporary democratic gay scene. Kirby and Hay (1997) state that due to the tolerant nature of the gay scene gays and lesbians are able to meet ‘like minded people’ and ‘for a sizable number [to] live their lives largely outside straight society’.
free from homophobia, tightly prescribed homonormative norms exist in gay bars and clubs, privileging certain aspects of appearance, such as youth and body form and performances that allow one to pass as young and ‘sexy’, as part of a tightly prescribed version of homosexuality and position certain groups as ‘unwanted’. They quote one interviewee who worries that he is ‘too fat, old and sexually undesirable’ for the gay scene (see also Slevin & Klinneman 2010). Similarly, Gontijo (2009) states that since the 1990s the muscular, hypermasculine body form associated with the middle class barbie has been privileged on the increasingly commercialised Rio de Janeiro gay scene. Butler (1999) states that the Newcastle gay scene is focused on dancing, drugs and the ‘body beautiful’, centred on notions of able bodies as attractive. Consequently, whilst the gay scene represents an important and permissive site for the disabled queer community, providing a space of social interaction, it is also a site of intolerance and exclusion. Work by Levine and Kimmel (1998) suggests that the privileged nature of the butch, muscular and rough homosexual men within the gay community, which they term the ‘gay clone’, has been present in bars, clubs and cruising grounds from at least the 1970s in New York. In spite of differences in the timings of the privileging of the gay clone work highlights that hypermasculine, able-bodied performances have become more tolerated than others on the gay scene.

Of course, performance is never limited to the expression of a single identity, and (in)tolerance in the gay scene can also reveal broader intersections between identities, such as social class and race (Parker 1999, Visser 2003, Rink 2007, Gontijo 2009). Visser (2003, p 136) states that ‘Beneath the image of the gay village as a liberal space, lies a far more complex and “un-liberated” race-class-gender matrix which serves to exclude certain non-white, poor queers’. Rink (2007) illustrates that in the case of Cape Town’s Waterkant advertising, tours and consumption practices reinforce the idea that the neighbourhood represents a homomasculine territory for the white, toned, twenty-something playboy guy. This mirrors Parker (1999) and

11 See chapter three for discussion of the barbie.
Gontijo’s (2009) argument that the ‘Euro-American’ body form associated with rich, white, middle class men is privileged on the Brazilian gay scene. Through his work in Capte Town Rink (2007) argues that since gay scenes can be understood as both inclusive space and exclusive sites, they simultaneously represent utopian tolerant spaces and dystopian spaces that marginalise certain queer men and women. In contrast to much of the work on gay enclaves (Skeggs 1999, Butler 1999, Holt & Griffin 2003, Wait & Gorman-Murray 2007), which argues that certain groups are excluded due to seemingly fixed, racial, class or appearance norms, Rink (2007) and Miller (2005) argue that we must also consider how these norms are constantly contested. As a result, they contend that the (in)tolerant nature of the gay scene must be conceived of as ‘unfinished’. It includes and excludes and is tolerant and intolerant simultaneously. Various groups are concurrently attempting to ‘carve out their own space of meaning’ (Miller 2005, p 75) and territorialise the space for their own agendas. This is demonstrated in Tucker’s (2009) work on Cape Town’s gay scene, which demonstrates how queer visibilities and participation in the gay scene are always a question of interactions of race, class and sexuality. According to Tucker (2009) apartheid racial classifications cut across sexuality and class to dictate options for different sectors of South Africa’s queer community have to become visible. This results in varying levels of participation and inclusion in the gay scene. Due to the constant (re)construction of race and class norms demonstrated by Miller (2005) and Tucker (2009) the tolerant nature of the gay village can be understood in a constant state of tension.

In contrast to work on gay spaces, which has emphasised the importance of racial and class performances in understanding the nature of tolerance, work on pride parades has underlined the need to focus on gendered and sexualised behaviours in order to better understand how tolerance functions. In considering specific gendered and sexualised behaviours work on pride parades in Sydney (Markwell 2002), New York (Gotham 2005, Mulligan 2008), Edinburgh and New Zealand (Brickell 2000, Johnston 2006 & 2007)
has demonstrated how tolerance is as much about drawing limits around acceptable performances of gender and sexuality as it is about allowing certain raced and classed behaviours. For example, Brickell (2000) indicates how same-sex affection and effeminacy are both welcomed and discouraged by those present. Thus, notions of gay space as simultaneously tolerant and intolerant, permissive and restrictive, inclusionary and exclusionary are commonplace in literature on pride parades. Brickell (2000) and Markwell (2002) state that pride parades can be seen as tolerant since they resist heteronormativity, but are also intolerant because they are simultaneously sites of oppression, homophobia and discrimination. Gotham (2005) states that despite their official rhetoric of tolerance, pride parades must be seen as Janus-faced since they are based on the ideas of including certain groups whilst excluding others based on their gendered and sexualised behaviours. Through focusing on gendered, sexualised, class and race performances geographical research has given us a better understanding of how tolerance functions in gay spaces.

Taking a different tact, Johnston (2006 & 2007) has shown how observing tourist reactions to gendered and sexualised performances can allow us to understand how tolerance functions throughout gay space. She focuses on simultaneous feelings of disgust, intrigue and amazement of queer behaviours such as same-sex intimacy, S & M and cross-dressing at pride parades, a process she identifies as abjection (Johnston 2005, 2006 & 2007). Analysing such reactions to these performances shows that whilst pride events can be understood as moments of celebration and tolerance that allow non-normative gendered and sexualised behaviours they also ‘construct normalcy’ by marking such behaviours as odd, bizarre and different). In this respect Johnston terms pride events as paradoxical events. Considering abject reactions at such events is useful in understanding how tolerance combines ‘fascination in, with revulsion against, queer bodies’. Like Kristeva (1982), Johnston argues that abjection is seen as provoking fear

---

12 See Hubbard 2000 for desire, disgust and space arguments.
because it ‘exposes the border between the self and the other (between the homosexual and the heterosexual) as fragile’. Although Johnston’s use of the term abjection is essentially Kristevian (1982), it is perhaps more closely related to Probyn’s (2000 & 2004) notion of shame since Johnston maintains that although abjection can be constraining, it is also productive and opens up opportunities for the playing out of identities and allows queer subjects to become intelligible. In short, not only are pride parades tolerant and intolerant spaces, but tolerance and intolerance are manifested in feelings of shame and pride that are brought about through explicit performances which clarify what is acceptable behaviour and what is not.

Focusing on performance allows us to begin understanding how tolerance becomes constructed and contested by exposing how diverse identities and social positions become manifest in gay spaces. Taking a performative approach is useful as it illuminates the competing class, gender, sexuality, disability and racial discourses that construct gay spaces as sites of tension, or as Gotham (2005) states ‘battlefields of contention’. In contrast with early studies (Levine 1979, Castells & Murphy 1982, Castells 1983), research on performativity in the gay scene and pride parade has suggested that such spaces are not unquestionably tolerant and inclusive spaces; they are simultaneously, intolerant as a result of the multifaceted class, race, gendered, sexualised behaviours that occur through them. As I argue through the remainder of this chapter, attentiveness to the spatiality of queer performances provides an important starting point for analysing the construction and maintenance of tolerance and intolerance within spaces that are claimed as gay, while simultaneously raising important questions about ways that lived sexualities conform to these very stringent conceptualisations of queer space.

**Homonormativity and tolerance within and outwith the gay scene**

For the last decade, there has been a considerable debate in interdisciplinary queer/sexuality studies, including within geography, about ‘homonormativity’
– the racialised, classed and gendered norms reproduced within gay spaces and communities. Lisa Duggan coined the term ‘homonormativity’ (2004, p 50), describing it as ‘a politics that does not contest the dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions, but upholds and sustains them, while promising the possibility of a demobilized gay constituency and a privatized, depolitized gay culture anchored in domesticity and consumption’. In this way homonormativity is positioned as a politics that supports heternormativity, which is described by Warner (2002) as the institutions, structures and practices that make heterosexuality seem coherent and privileged. Both heternormativity and homonormativity endorse marriage (gay or straight), adoption and gender normative roles and marginalise individuals that challenge these. In addition social researchers (see Duggan 2004, Puar 2006) have argued that neoliberal practices of consumption represent the economic base of homonormativity, which contrast the modern gay movement focused on consuming with that of the 1970s and 1980s, which was focused around citizen rights. Sears (2005) goes as far to argue that, today, being an ‘out’ gay manifests itself in predominantly commodified practices through consumption of food, drink and fashion in gay bars, bathhouses and clubs. Though consuming gays can ostensibly express their sexuality and participate in social involvement devoid of exclusion and discrimination. Nast (2002) argues that, consequently, some white, middle class gays have enjoyed unprecedented liberation and visibility as a result of their participation in capitalist social relations through sites associated with the gay scene.

A growing body of literature has begun to critique homonormativity and practices associated with it as exclusionary and damaging to the notion of an open and accepting gay community (see Peñaloza 1996, Valocchi 1999, Nast 2002, Bell & Binnie 2004, Ferguson 2009). Peñaloza (1996 p 34) argues that ‘aspects of gay/lesbian culture are forwarded at the expense of others in advertising and marketing appeals. Particularly noteworthy are the pervasive images of white, upper-middle class, “straight looking” [men] at the
expense of those more distanced from and threatening to the mainstream, such as the poor, ethnic/racial/sexual minorities, drag queens, and butch lesbians’. Consequently, such studies argue that the notion that the market and media offer queers social citizenship, and therefore a political voice, tend to be exaggerated by failing to account for those who remain invisible due to their inability to enter the ‘commodified realm of gay visibility’ (Sears 2005, p 104). Steven Epstein (1987) was one of the first social theorists to recognise the exclusionary nature of norms within the gay community for those from racial minorities and the working class. Although he didn’t use the term homonormativity specifically, he argued that the lives of homosexuals and heterosexuals were becoming more similar in the 1980s and that this was the case primarily amongst the white, middle-classes who were able to consume. Overall studies considering the privileged nature of middle class practices in the gay scene have emphasised that those who are not wealthy and white and who cannot buy into the consumption practices necessary for participation in the gay scene are often left excluded or on the margins of gay, homonormative, culture (Epstein 1987, Nast 2002, Ferguson 2009, Sears 2005). Brown (2009) and Haritaworn (2009) argue that rather than simply drawing attention to the privileged nature of practices associated with white, middle-class gays, much of the literature on homonormativity actually recentres and normalises such practices (such as Sears 2005 and Puar 2006).

Geographers and others have emphasised that homonormativity, and the inclusion/exclusion associated with it, is played out in specific spaces and contexts both at the level of the city and at the global scale (Bell & Binnie 2004, Oswin 2004, Brown 2009, Haritaworn 2009, Bell 2010). In a recent interview (Silva and Veira 2010, p 328), David Bell comments that homonormativity is based on notions of the “globalised, western model of the ‘good gay citizen’”. Like many geographers homonormativity is understood as a modern gay politics situated in the gay business districts of western cities of the global north (Nast 2002, Bell and Binnie 2004, Richardson 2005,
Holmes 2009). It is precisely in these spaces of our towns and cities where gay and bisexual men have been targeted by companies selling services and products in search of pink pounds, dollars and euros (Nast 2002) and where consumption is seen as being part of a larger, global gay community (Ruting 2008). Bell and Binnie (2004 p 1807) argue that homonormativity ‘produces particular kinds of spaces, at the exclusion of other kinds’, adding that gay city spaces are ‘caught between imperatives of commodification and ideas of authenticity’. To be a ‘proper gay’ we need to buy the correct gay products in gay districts such as Soho, Greenwich and Waterkant. Homonormativity is understood as producing gay spaces focused on neoliberal consumption practices such as gay cafés, bars, stores and bathhouses that constitute modern gay neighbourhoods in the global north. Despite differences in the focus of work on homonormativity most literature comes from the western context and has argued that homonormativity is produced around a gay subject framed by neoliberal relations. Gay life and spaces associated with the LGBT community are thus theorised as saturated with practices of homonormativity.

However, some geographers have questioned binary assumptions of homonormative spaces associated with white, middle class gays and those that are non-homonormative and not associated with these groups (Oswin 2004, Brown 2009, Holmes 2009). They argue that work that has reiterated these assumptions has resulted in the exclusion of certain bodies in Geographical research on homonormativity, namely queers of colour, the poor and those with disabilities. Oswin (2004) and Haritaworn (2009) have criticised reductionist notions of white, middle class behaviours as privileged by emphasising the multiple discourses of race, class, gender and sexuality that are cut across with space resulting in a more fluid notion of privileged gay behaviours than often forwarded in literature on homonormativity (Suggan 2004, Puar 2006). Oswin (2004) rejects the stereotype of white, gay, affluent males as complicit in reproducing the gay scene as a neo-liberal space of consumption. She argues that spaces of the gay scene must also
be seen as porous, open to resistance and capitulation (Oswin 2004, p 84) and stresses that we must also pay attention to other practices that might resist the homonormativity of ostensibly gay spaces.

In a similar vein, Brown (2009) stresses that homonormativity is ‘not all-encompassing, impassable as literature implies’ since there are many aspects of gay life that offer alternatives to homonormative practices of neoliberalism, such as faith based, third sector and sport spaces that remain understudied in LGBT literature. Brown’s critique of homonormativity as pervasive and all-encompassing in gay and lesbian lives is framed by Gibson-Graham’s work on the nature of the economy. Gibson-Graham argue that capitalist relations, which are perceived as the mainstream economy, should be seen as one amongst many economic relations ‘in a vast sea of economic activity (2006, p 70) which constitute what they term the ‘diverse economy’ (Gibson-Graham 2002, 2006). They argue that economic relations such as volunteering, un-paid labour, fair-trade and non-for-profit groups exist alongside capitalist practices which are generally understood as dominant and pervasive. Brown draws on Gibson-Graham’s work (1996, 2006) to suggest that homonomormativity could be looked at in a similar way arguing that homonormativity is not as an all-encompassing monolith, but as practices that make up the diverse economies of gay and lesbian life. Consequently, Brown (2006) stresses the importance of making non-capitalist practices more visible and emphasises the need to recognise the ‘incomplete diffusion of neoliberal homonormativity’ in queer lives and, related to this, the ‘contradictory and independent nature of the spaces gay men and women use on a daily basis’ (Brown 2009, p 1503). In doing so, Brown (2009) considers the importance of non-neoliberal practices and non-paying, non-commercial spaces, such as institutions of the local-level LGBT community which play an important role in constituting gay lives in complimentary and contradictory ways homonormative practices. Tacking a different tack, Visser’s (2008) South African based study also argues that geographers seeking to understand homonormativity must look outside the
bars, clubs and saunas of the gay scene. Visser (2008) contends that, in Cape Town at least, homonormative spaces are far more than heteronormativity infiltrating gay leisure spaces since seemingly white, heterosexual leisure spaces are also becoming homonormalised. Thus, he suggests that homonormative practices constitute ostensibly heterosexual spaces, such as bars, clubs and cafes outside the visible gay scene.

Whilst this research recognises the real danger of ignoring scene spaces and the neoliberal practices that (often) take place through them, which are often meaningful for the LGBT community, it is also attentive to critiques of current research into LGBT communities (Oswin 2004, Visser 2008, Brown 2009, for example) which question notions of homonormativity, as reproduced in neoliberal gay scene spaces of the global north, and of homonormative practices as meaningful for gay men and women. This study is based on the assumption that other spaces, outside the consumption oriented gay scene, and non-neoliberal practices are also important for constructing queer identities. This research considers the extent to which homonormativity applies to the lives of Brazilian queer men across commercial spaces of the gay scene and in non-commercial spaces such as the church, the home and the LGBT organisation. In addition, this research aims to emphasise how queers move between various spaces of the city, constructing their identities as they move between commercial and non-commercial spaces in ways that reinforce and resist homonormative practices and to explore what this means for the construction of queer identities. Through focusing on the nature of homonormativity in a non-western context and in spaces outside the neo-liberal sites of the gay scene this research takes an original perspective which furthers our understanding of the way in which the concept travels and is constructed, appropriated, contested and re-worked spatially by queer men outside the global north.

In addition to extending our understanding of homonormativity by focusing on a non-western context and on everyday non-commercial LGBT spaces, the
concept of homonormativity is particularly relevant to research focused on understanding (in)tolerance and exclusion within LGBT and non LGBT spaces. Through being attentive to the way in which homonormativity travels and is reinforced and contested in the gendered and sexualised performances of queer Brazilians we can gain a better understanding of the relationship between tolerance and homonormativity which can help illuminate the way in which tolerance functions across the city. This research seeks to question some of the linkages between tolerance and homonormativity in spaces outwith the gay scene, expanding on work which focuses on the way in which homonormative practices include and exclude in gay bars, clubs and saunas (Nast 2002, Richardson 2005, Sears 2005 and Nash & Bain 2007). Building on such research this study is interested not only in the way in which homonromativity is constructed and contested in the lives of a group of Brazilian queer men but, more specifically, in the way in which homonormativity allows and denies, permits and negates certain gendered and sexualised performances across various urban spaces such as the church, the home, the workplace, and the LGBT organisation, in addition to more studied spaces such as the gay scene. Focusing on understudied spaces away from the commercial gay scene and concentrating on a city outside the global north (see Collins 2009 for a recent exception) will allow for a better understanding of the way in which homonormativity is constructed by Brazilian queer men and what this means for the specific gendered and sexualised practices that are tolerated across the space of Rio de Janeiro, thus giving a better understanding of the relationship between tolerance and homonormativity.

**In and Out Performances: Marking Spaces as (In)tolerant**

The last section emphasised the importance of thinking about homononrmativity and performances of queer identities in and out of the gay scene to understand the functioning of tolerance. In this section, this argument is extended through a consideration of how scholars have combined spatial analysis with considerations of peformativity through a focus on ‘the closet’.
This chapter argues that acknowledging how queer men constantly move ‘in’ and ‘out’ of the closet through non-LGBT spaces is useful since it exposes the ways that queer male performances construct and challenge spaces as tolerant and intolerant. Trends in reproducing the gay scene as representing archetypically gay space, seemingly separate from the heterosexual nature of the rest of the city, have been interrupted by new interrogations of these taken-for-granted spaces. Through focusing on performances of the closet, geographers and other social researchers such as Gorman-Murray (2008b), Brickell (2007), Browne (2005), Kitchin & Lysaght (2004), Lim (2004) and Waitt (2003) have challenged the assumption that the gay scene is the only space where queer ‘out’ performances are tolerated and that gay space stands in opposition to other, restrictive closet spaces by considering how spaces outwith the gay scene become constantly (re)constructed as tolerant and intolerant, ‘in’ and ‘out’. Understanding the performative nature of the closet pushes us to consider more unstable understandings of urban spaces, such as the home, workplace, street, park and religious spaces as unfixed and moving between restrictive, intolerant closet spaces and generative, permissive ‘out’ spaces by recognising that ‘in’ and ‘out’ performances are occurring are simultaneously prevalent across these spaces. One such location is the queer support space of the geography club, in the novel of the same name, which Michael Brown (2006, p 332) describes as going ‘from being a closeted haven for outcasts to a hostile forum for debate over the relations between universal tolerance and the limits of identitarian politics, and then back to a utopian space’ (Brown 2000, p 27). Consequently, assumptions that queers lead ‘double-lives’ as either ‘in’ and ‘out’ in different spaces are challenged by recognising the contradictions and complexities in identity performances. Valentine (1993) argues that it is fruitful to recognise
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13 In and out are written as ‘in’ and ‘out’ when referring to the closet to avoid confusion with the use of the prepositions.

14 Brown (2000 & 2006) argues that we must build on previous work by Sedgwick (1990) and Chauncey (1993) which have ‘meticulously broken down the closet’ and criticise previous sexuality and space work that relies too heavily on an overly-simplistic closet-gay ghetto dualism.
gays and lesbians as constantly negotiating the closet as they manage multiple identities in different spaces and in one space at different times.

Geographers have played an important role in reconceptualising gay spaces by clarifying that the closet is not located in hidden, secret spaces, but as ubiquitous across urban space and constructed on a variety of interlinked scales through gendered and sexualised performances (see Butler on performativity 1990, 2001, and 2004). Indeed, despite working with Butler’s notion of performativity, Brown (2000) critiques her ‘elsewhereness’, stating that she fails to recognise that the closet is always located somewhere. Brown (2000) argues that closets are not ‘dead spaces’, but are constantly done through the spatial playing out of our gendered and sexualised identities. As a result urban spaces are not fixed as ‘in’ or ‘out’, but are always in a state of becoming. In particular, he refers to ‘performative speech acts’ such as speaking, lying, remaining silent and using secret language that allow queer men to move ‘in’ and ‘out’, a process that entails a complex spatiality (Brown 2000, p 37). In this vein he takes a spatial approach to arguments raised by linguistic theorists such as Kulick and Cameron (2003), who point to the creative use of language through hyper-correct pronunciation, slang and changing of registers as an important, and often ignored, part of performing queer identities. Through his performative approach, Brown (2000) pushes geographers to re-think the closet, moving from a notion of an either/or to a both/and understanding of space that allows for spaces to be ‘in’ and ‘out’ of the closet concurrently, recognising that ‘people can be ‘in’ and ‘out’ of the closet simultaneously’ and ‘space can reveal and conceal at the same time’ (Brown 2000, p 147). Consequently, space is neither fixed as tolerant or intolerant and being ‘out’ is not something that is solely done in gay-tolerant sites of the gay scene, but is also achieved as a result of performances across and between a wide variety of seemingly intolerant spaces too.
Drawing upon this more critical approach to gay spaces, the closet has now been recognised to exist in a variety of locations, such as the home (Gorman-Murray 2005, 2007 & 2008b), the workplace (Rumens 2008) the street and the park (Kitchin & Lysaght 2002, Lim 2004). For example, studies have questioned the assumption that the family home represents an unquestionably intolerant space where lesbians and gays must remain closeted due to stigmatisation (see Newman & Muzzonigro 1993, Kirby & Hay 1997, Prieur 1998 p 123, Robinson et al 2004, Poachy & Narid 2007).

Rather, the home is constantly ‘queered’ by non-normative gendered and sexualised performances (Kentlyn 2008). Gorman-Murray (2008b) and Kentlyn (2008) claim that practices such as doing housework, watching television, looking at photos, or taking part in family discussions, often resist normative constructions of the home as restrictive ‘closet’ space and demonstrate continuous movement between being ‘in’ and ‘out’. Similarly, Valentine & Skelton (2005) demonstrate that ‘coming out’ is a continuous process negotiated within the space of the home between gay sons and their heterosexual fathers. Studies by Gorman-Murray (2008b) and Valentine (2005) demonstrate how the home can be (re)created as an accepting space, open for the negotiation of ‘alternative’ gendered and sexualised identities, challenging notions which conceive of it as fixed, pre-determined intolerant ‘closet’ space. Since the home has been repositioned as ‘in’ and ‘out’ space, Gorman-Murray (2006, 2007 & 2008b) and Wait & Gorman-Murray (2006) demonstrate how spaces such as the home must be thought of as connected and relational to other spaces such as the gay scene. ‘Out’ performances are evident in social interaction, house parties and the provision of emotional support stretch and blur the spaces into one another, meaning that the home becomes ‘queered’ and the gay scene domesticated, and the spaces are not easily distinguishable as tolerant and intolerant (also see Reed 2003).

From the standpoint of performativity, then, how the closet transforms and is transformed across public spaces requires close analysis of queer men and
women moving between ‘in’ and ‘out’. This approach provides insight into the ways that diverse locations become constructed as simultaneously tolerant and intolerant, permissive and restrictive (Fry 1986, Leap 1999, Barriga 2000, Kitchin and Lysaght 2002, Lim 2004 and Natividade 2007). Lim (2004) shows that queers in Singapore are not simply passive victims of restrictive panoptic surveillance of the gendered and sexualised norms of others, but actually destabilise the city’s heteronormativity, temporarily coding public space in other, ‘queer’ ways, such as through consumption practices and holding coming out parties. In this vein, Young (2000, cited in Iveson 2003) suggests that urban spaces are better thought of as ‘hybrid spaces’ and ‘spatial shadings’ in order to resist dichotomous understandings that separate intolerant from tolerant spaces. Out performances are present in seemingly intolerant, closet spaces, such as the public toilet (Humphrey 1975, Higgins 1999), the public park (Bergman 1999, Brown 2000, Natividade 2007), the backroom of an adult bookstore and the gym-locker-room (Leap 1999). Leap (1999), Bergman (1999) and Kitchin & Lysaght (2002) flag practices such as using gay grammar, discourse and topics, cruising, cottaging and the ‘knowing gaze’ of an other’s queerness as behaviours that unsettle heteronormative codings across such spaces. Leap (1999) states that as a result of such behaviours spaces such as the gym or the toilet are neither ‘in’, nor ‘out’, tolerant nor intolerant, public nor private, but are constantly and simultaneously reconstructed as all of these.

Studies by McLelland (2005), Hopkins (2006) and Rumens (2008) also challenge the assumption that the workplace is intolerant, intensely homophobic and restrictive space where queer men have to remain closeted (see also McDowell 1995, 2000 & 2002, Mott 2003, Stouds 2006, de Almeida 2006, Embrick et al 2007). How queer men and women move ‘in’ and ‘out’ of the closet across the workplace both reinforces and challenges norms that privilege masculine and heterosexual gendered performances and construct the space as tolerant and intolerant for queer men. McLelland (2005), for

15 Cottaging refers to the practice of sex in public toilets or ‘cottages’.
example, argues that the performance of non-hegemonic sex and gender roles and disclosure of homosexuality amongst Japanese business men are played out alongside more accepted heteronormative practices in ways that challenge and reiterate the workplace as a space that is intolerant for queer men. Similarly, Rumens (2008) demonstrates how queer men working for the UK National Health Service encounter some advantages to being open about their sexuality in friendships with straight men, and that they were provided emotional support and same-sex physical affection by gay and straight male colleagues alike. Although work by Rumens’ (2008) is not explicitly spatial it does argue that further research into the spatial factors that influence queer male comportment in the workplace is needed. Through considering the nature of the closet in spaces such as the home, workplace and gay scene have increased our understanding of spatial similarities and differences in the functioning of tolerance.

Brazilian studies into performance of gender and sexuality and the closet in religious sites are particularly progressive in their critique of assumptions that they represent intolerant sites and their focus on the possibilities of being open about one’s sexuality through such spaces (Fry 1986, Skar 1994, Paris & Anderson 2001, Gomes 2004, Gomes & Natividade 2005, Natividade 2007, Santos & Curto 2008, Tavares & Perez 2008). Early groundbreaking work by Peter Fry (1986) on the Afro-Brazilian religion of Candomblé positions the temple, or terreiro, as a tolerant refuge for marginal people in Brazilian society, and in particular the bichas (effeminate gay men), travestis and mulheres de programa/putas (prostitutes). Queer men can give seemingly out performances in social interaction with others in the terreiro, such as through discussing their sexuality and behaving effeminately (Fry 1986, Moutinho 2005). Similarly, gay friendly churches have also been positioned as tolerant sites through which queer men can, unquestionably, be out of the closet (Paris & Anderson, 2001 Santos & Curto 2008). Other studies have problematised assumptions in Brazilian work that it is only LBGT churches and the terreiro where queer men can openly be out of the
closet. For example, work by Gomes (2004) and Natividade (Natividade 2005, Natividade & Gomes 2005, Natividade 2007) has suggested that the Evangelical church be understood as a paradoxical space where out performances are strongly disapproved and restricted, but are also commonplace and, in some circumstances at least, tolerated. They are sites of rejection and exclusion, but also important spaces for social opportunities, acceptance and the prospect of a ‘new life’. Consequently, they suggest that the Evangelist church represents both in and out, tolerant and intolerant space. In general, studies considering ‘in’ and ‘out’ performances across various spaces, such as the home, workplace and religious space, illustrates the limits of conceptualisations of LGBT spaces as the only tolerant sites for the queer community.

Various geographers have suggested that the interrelational nature of urban spaces might offer an explanation for the inconsistency and fluidity of tolerance across various sites as highlighted in work focused on the closet. Interrelationanality is taken to mean the way in which spaces are related to one another through the behaviours that constitute them. Netto (2008) argues that spaces and practices can only be made sense of in relation to other things, contexts and acts as they are communicative. He contends that ‘space cannot be experienced independently, neither can it exist on its own, nor can it have effects [only on] itself. Space is already embedded in referentiality’ (2008, p 374). Put differently, spaces are always formed in relation to and influenced by what is happening elsewhere. Such an understanding resonates with Massey’s (2005, p 10) call for us to understand space as a ‘product of interrelations’. Like Netto (2008), she argues that space is created by and is part of the relationship between identities and entities and cannot be conceived of as separate from other things or places. Gregson and Rose (2000) also recognise the importance of seeing spaces as relational. They argue that performed spaces are not ‘discreet bounded stages, but threatened, contaminated, stained and enriched by other spaces’ (Gregson and Rose 2000, p 441). Gorman-Murray (2006, 2007) shows that
focusing on ‘in’ and ‘out’ performances across the home and the gay scene illustrates that such spaces are not easily distinguishable in terms of their (in)tolerant nature. Other work on the interrelationality of in/out performances and the meaning for tolerance is lacking.

In conclusion, notions that tolerant and intolerant sites are easily delineable and separate have been challenged in a variety of spatial locations, including the home, the workplace, and even religious communities. With a focus on the spatiality of ‘in’ and ‘out’ performances and the relational nature of spaces, research on the closet raises questions related to the assumed neat separation between the tolerant gay scene (Levine 1979, Castells 1983) and intolerant, closeted, domestic space (Newman and Muzzonigro 1993) and suggest that tolerance/intolerance cannot easily be tied to specific places. It also suggests that tolerance and intolerance have often unanticipated spatial configurations, and as such, provides a compelling theoretical framework for understanding the construction of tolerance and intolerance in the embodied performances of gay men.

A Novel Approach to Tolerance, Gender and Sexuality
This chapter has examined the ways that tolerance has been theorised in relation to gender and sexuality by social theorists. Geographical work which emphasises the spatial nature of tolerance has been highlighted and it has been argued that queer geographical approaches have brought about new ways of theorising links between space, tolerance, gender and sexuality. From the conclusions of this work it is possible to identify three critical components that are useful for exploring the nature of tolerance that inform this study: (i) that identifying the links between tolerance and space is vital to understand the functioning of tolerance, (ii) that tolerance is a classed, raced and religious process, and (iii) that considering ‘in’/’out’ performances is vital to understand the tolerance process. But, what does this mean for research into the lives of queer men living in Rio de Janeiro? This is now explored with reference to each of these three components.
Identifying links between tolerance and space is vital to understanding how tolerance operates.

Accompanying changes in the way in which gay spaces are understood, from early dots on the map approaches to more fluid understandings in which their gendered and sexualised nature is understood as performed, geographic work has shown that all space can be thought of in terms of tolerance and intolerance is a process that varies spatially. In an effort to destabilise essentialist notions of tolerated vs. not tolerated masculinities and tolerant vs. intolerant spaces, geographers have shown that tolerance and intolerance are not consistent across urban spaces and even in spaces considered to be tolerant, such as the gay scene, tolerance of gendered and sexualised behaviours varies (Valentine & Skelton 2003, Stout 2006). Geographical research taking a performative approach to gender and sexuality has focused on how spaces are constructed as tolerant or intolerant in ways that allow us to see how tolerance functions. Thus, paying attention to the spatiality of queer performances is an important starting point for analysing the construction and maintenance of spaces as tolerant and intolerant. For example geographic work on performances in gay spaces have drawn attention to the specific behaviours that mark spaces as tolerant and intolerant such as fighting, verbal and physical homophobia, joking, language use, looks and stares (Cornwall 1994, Kulick 1998, Myslik 2006). This research represents an attempt to extend such work through looking at the (dis)connections between tolerance and performances of masculinity and sexuality across various spaces of Rio de Janeiro.

This study is interested in the behaviours that make up our identity performances and which geographers have recognised as creating and challenging tolerant spaces, such as wearing certain clothes, speaking a certain way and consuming certain products. Considering the linkages
between such behaviours and the specific spaces of Rio de Janeiro that are marked as tolerant and intolerant will allow for a better understanding of the linkages between gendered and sexualised performances and the spatial nature of tolerance across the city. However, rather than considering urban space more generally, there is a renewed challenge for specific types of spatial work linking conceptions of gender and sexuality in Latin America. Current studies focus almost exclusively on the gay scene (Cavalho 2007 & Vasconcelos 2010), pride parade or religious spaces (Moutinho 2005, Paris & Anderson 2009) leaving the nature of tolerance in everyday spaces such as the home, the workplace and the street (exceptions on travesti prostitution include Cornwall 1994 & Kulick 1998) largely untheorised. The need for studies into tolerance in everyday spaces appears particularly pressing given recent news reports (Terra 2009b) and films (de Almeida 2006) that indicate extreme levels of intolerance towards homosexuals in spaces such as the workplace. In an aim to address this issue this study focuses on the nature of tolerance of queer male gendered and sexualised performances across the spaces of the home, the workplace and the religious space and the street, as well as more studied spaces such as the gay scene and the pride parade.

Even within studies into performance and tolerance in gay spaces certain sites have received little attention, such as gay organisations and gay beaches (see Poach & Nardi 2007 for a rare exception of work considering LGBT organisations). This is problematic as it leaves the nature of tolerance poorly understood in such spaces and seems to rely on the assumption that LGBT organisations and gay-friendly beaches represent unquestionable tolerant spaces for queer men. Through focusing on these spaces, the aim of this study is to better understand is the ways in which tolerance both permits and restricts specific gendered and sexualised practices within the queer community. Overall this research is concerned with the specific behaviours that construct and deconstruct specific sites of the home, workplace, religious space and street in Rio de Janeiro as tolerant and intolerant to give us a better understanding of how tolerance functions. Specific attention is
paid to spaces outside of gay bars, pride parades, clubs and the terreiro, which are prominent in current Latin American work. This will allow for a better understanding of the nature of tolerance in less-studied spaces to be grasped.

(ii) Tolerance is a classed, raced and religious process

Through criticising work that takes a homogenous understanding of gay spaces as tolerant geographers have emphasised the influence of class and racial discourses in the tolerant nature of spaces and, related to this, the role they play in permitting certain gendered and sexualised behaviours whilst denying others. Whilst early work understands tolerance of male performances as based on the relationship with the homosexual and/or women (Stevens 1973, Lancaster 1995) geographic work taking a performative approach has demonstrated how tolerance of gendered and sexualised behaviours is linked to the way we are positioned in terms of a wider array of factors including race, class, disability and sexual role (Green 1999, Brickell 2000, Nesvig 2001, Rink 2007). Tolerance is understood as drawing limits around acceptable performances based on various identity components in an effort to include and exclude certain queer men. By recognising the specific behaviours that are permitted and those that are not, such as fashion style, body form and language choice, geographers have demonstrated how discourses of race and class (in particular) are influential in constructing spaces as tolerant and intolerant for queer men and cut across discourses of gender and sexuality. In this respect geographical research has shown that taking a performative approach is useful as it illuminates the competing class, gender, sexuality, and racial discourses that construct gay spaces, inter alia, as sites of varying tolerance.

This study seeks to build on this approach by exploring the ways in which gendered and sexualised performances of queer men draw on ideas of class,
race and sexual role and how this relates to attempts to include and exclude certain behaviours. In this respect this study is concerned with the specific gendered, sexed, raced, class behaviours that are not tolerated, how this is manifested and what this can tell us about norms of race, class, gender and sexuality across specific spaces of Rio de Janeiro. In addition to race and class, which are the most commonly studied components of identity in research on tolerance, this study also explores the relationship between religious belief, age and tolerance within the queer community. Through addressing this lacuna this study takes a novel approach to current work that seeks to challenge dualistic notions of tolerated privileged masculinities and subordinate, not tolerated masculinities. In doing so this research builds on current understandings by exploring the relationship between multifaceted aspects of our identities and tolerance in urban space in Brazil.

Whilst focusing on certain specific components of our identities such as race, age or religion might seem contrary to the aims of queer theory, which aims to broadly move away from thinking in terms of identity categories by illustrating the fluidity of our identities, Seidman (1995) and Barry (2000) have suggested that queer theory approaches cannot disavow the very subjects that are the ‘agents of change’, and many of whom might find such categories meaningful and useful. Furthermore, Seidman (1995) argues that through concentrating on the individual playing out of identities, queer theorists have largely ignored institutional analysis and the importance of social structural arrangements. This is emphasised by a disregard for the relationship between micro factors, such as social relations between individuals, and macro factors, such as religion, language and jurisdiction in much queer theory work. Through exploring the linkages between individual practices that make up our performances, larger social-structural arrangements of ethnicity, religion and language this study furthers work on tolerance, gender and sexuality by exploring how the functioning of tolerance changes across urban spaces in relation to micro and macro factors.
Considering 'in' and 'out' performances illustrates the functioning of tolerance

Geographic research focusing on gendered and sexualised behaviours has furthered understandings of the specific practices that queers use to move in and out of the closet across urban space, such as using certain vocabulary, behaving in a stereotypically effeminate manner or remaining silent (Brown 2000). In doing this, geographical research has given us a better understanding of where queers are/are not permitted to express their sexuality openly and how such performances position and contest spaces as tolerant and intolerant. Current work considering the closet has emphasised the need to focus on the relationship between gendered and sexualised behaviours and tolerance outside the gay scene, such as in the home and the workplace. Such work is, however, much more pervasive in Anglo-Saxon than Latin American societies (recent exceptions include Fenster 2005, Manzelli 2006 & Cavalho 2007). This study takes a nuanced approach and addresses this omission by considering gendered and sexualised behaviours that enable queer men to move in and out of the closet across the home, the workplace and religious spaces in Rio de Janeiro. Through focusing on these everyday spaces this study is also sympathetic to calls from within Brazilian literature that those studying gender and sexuality must move their focus away from carnival spaces (Da Matta 1991& 2005, Lancaster 1997, Cavalcanti 1999, Lowell 1999, Lewiss 1999, Sheriff 1999, Barriga 2000, Fenster 2005, Green 2007, Cavalho 2007, Pravaz 2008) and consider more mundane spaces such as the street or the home and the ondas (waves) of expressions, lifestyles and happening’ (Barriga 2000) that occur through them. In particular, this study will explore whether these spaces are experienced as intolerant, closet spaces as early work implies, or as a more ambiguous sites as argued by Valentine & Skelton (2005) and Gorman-Murray (2008b). By considering how queer men move in and out of the closet in and between non-entertainment spaces, and non-religious spaces this
research this research will illuminate how tolerance functions in a wider range of spaces than current Latin American research and increase knowledge on the spatiality of tolerance.

In an attempt to extend current theorisations of tolerance, the key objective of this thesis is to consider the relationship between space, tolerance and queer male behaviours across Rio de Janeiro. By taking a critical approach to tolerance (following work by Hubbard 2000, Burack 2003, Brown 2006 and Powell & Clarke 2010) and exploring some of the problems with current understandings, this study also seeks to outline more useful approaches to thinking about tolerance. In contrast to work by Brown (2006), which, despite providing a compelling critique of tolerance, fails to suggest any positive alternatives to current conceptualisations of tolerance this study is concerned with how we can fruitfully rethink current manifestations of tolerance in ways that are beneficial to the queer community. In order to explore the relationship of tolerance, gender and sexuality this chapter has forwarded three interrelated approaches to do this through focusing on the (i) the spatiality of tolerance, (ii) intersections of gender, sexuality, race, religion and tolerance and (iii) linkages between being in and out of the closet and tolerance. It is argued that this approach is useful in furthering understandings of the relationship between gender, sexuality and tolerance in Latin America. In focusing on these three aspects this research considers the relationship between tolerance and gendered and sexualised performances across the spaces of the home, the workplace, the street, religious spaces and gay spaces (including the gay scene and LGBT organisations). Consequently, the methodological approach of this study is primarily concerned with highlighting the specific gendered and sexualised practices that constitute our identity performances across these sites. A mixed ethnographic and semi-structured interview approach was the best way to focus on the spatial behaviours of queer men in Rio de Janeiro as will now be highlighted.
Chapter 2

Methodologies

This research is primarily concerned with the spatial practices through which gendered and sexualised identities are brought into being, and their relationship to the processes of tolerance and intolerance. In this section I explain how this aim is related to the methodological approach used in this project. This research entails a multi-layered qualitative methodology, drawing upon ethnography, participant observation and photo elicitation interviews. This combined approach to data\textsuperscript{16} collection helped to clarify the specific queer male spatial tactics that bring gendered and sexualised spaces into being and for understanding the connection between identity practices and tolerance. An ethnographic approach allowed me to participate in the lives of a group of queer men\textsuperscript{17} in Rio de Janeiro and enabled first hand observation of queer male gendered and sexualised behaviours, and an insight into how a group of queer men negotiate the tolerance process. In-depth interviews complimented the ethnography by generating data on specific topics related to the tolerance of gendered and sexualised practices to be explored in detail and highlighted participants' personal experiences and understandings of gendered and sexualised behaviours across the urban fabric of Rio de Janeiro. I begin by grounding the methodologies employed in this project within Butler’s notion of performativity, before focusing more specifically on how the data was collected and analysed and, finally, considering ethical and reflexive issues related to this project.

\textsuperscript{16} Data is used as a singular word throughout. Whilst I am aware of arguments that the word should be used in the original, plural form, I take the Guardian’s (2010) editorial stance that using the word in the plural today appears ‘hyper-correct, old-fashioned and, in many ways, pompous’. See http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2010/jul/16/data-plural-singular.

\textsuperscript{17} Queer men is used throughout the thesis as a shortened reference for the research participants. However, the use of the term men is problematic, particularly for two participants who referred to themselves as being neither men nor women but as being born a man (‘nasci homen’). The use of the term queer is used with the term man/men to emphasise the fluidity of their masculinity and maleness (and, more widely gendered and sexualised identities), in keeping with the use of the term for participants generally. Thus, the use of the term queer male does not imply that participants identify as such, but stresses the performed and unstable nature of their masculinity and sexuality.
**Performativity as a Methodological Framework**

The aim of this research is to better understand gendered and sexualised performances of a group of queer men across various sites of Rio de Janeiro. More specifically, my research explores the significance of performing gender and sexuality in certain ways across specific sites of the city and the relationship that identity performances have with the tolerance process. The empirical approach of this study focused on analysing which performances of gender and sexuality were read as normal and natural, and which were positioned as non-normative performance slippages, and by whom such performances were performed and where they were and were not tolerated across Rio de Janeiro. An important factor when deciding upon the methodological approach taken was to ensure that it would allow me to capture practices of gender and sexuality by acquiring insight into, and comprehension of, performances of gender and sexuality for a specific group of queer men while being attentive to my own perspective and positioning. I thus selected qualitative methodology focused on ethnographic research and interviews in order to allow feelings, emotions and experiences, related to the (in)tolerance of specific gendered and sexualised performances to be captured (Dwyer & Limb 2001). I was further interested in the spatiality of feelings related to intolerance and tolerance, such as stigmatisations, discomfort, rejection, acceptance and comfort, in order to reveal the effects of power relations tied up with tolerance and how such power relations function in relation to gendered and sexualised behaviours.

**Capturing Identity Citations**

Judith Butler’s theory of performativity and, more specifically, her notion of identity citations provided a useful methodological framework for approaching a study into tolerance and our gendered and sexualised identities. According to Butler (1990, 1993, 2001, 2004) our gendered and sexualised identities are not fixed, but are continuously reproduced, thus we are always ‘becoming’, rather than statically occupying categories such as woman, man,
gay, bisexual and so forth. Our gendered and sexualised identities are brought into being through ‘citations’, a term which Butler uses to describe the acts, words, gestures and desires which ‘do’ gender (1990, p 185). Our behaviours such as the clothes we wear, the way we walk and talk can be understood as citations, which together, constitute our performances of gender and sexuality. Thus, the empirical approach taken in this study is informed by the assumption that our gendered and sexualised identities are performed through citations (see previous chapter) and the aim of the methodology was to capture the citations that constitute queer male subjectivities in Rio de Janeiro, thus highlighting how a group of carioca men (men from Rio de Janeiro) ‘do’ their gendered and sexualised identities.

Brown (2000, p 17) critiques recent social research for showing ‘considerable difficulty in using performativity in any sort of empirical way beyond the confines of a literary text or a ‘real world’ anecdote’. In keeping with Brown (2000), this study accepts that performativity and citationality can usefully inform empirical research into our gendered and sexualised identities. Brown identifies a lacuna of social research that applies Butler’s theory of performativity and citationality. Performative work in the area shares three main methodological characteristics. Firstly, ethnographic approaches, such as Kulick’s (1998) study on Brazilian travestis and Busby’s (2000) on gender in an Indian fishing community, have emphasised the importance of being present and actively involved in the lives of research participants in order to capture gendered and sexualised citations. They stress the need to be actively involved in social interaction between research participants if gendered and sexualised citations are to be captured and understood. Ethnographic studies emphasise the need to consider social and physical contexts in which gendered and sexualised citations take place, focusing on what was happening, who was present and where, if the gendered and sexualised realities of research participants are to be understood.
An ethnographic approach is also advocated by Latin Americanists researching gender and sexuality, such as Parker (1999) and Lowell who argue that whilst abstract theorising, such as engaging in queer theory debates, has extended our understandings of sexualities in the region, it is important that we remain focused on real everyday behaviours and empirical approaches that consider how lives are actually lived. Parker (1999, p 11) argues that methodological approaches must focus on the ‘empirical detail of homosexual lives as they are lived in specific settings’ and avoid losing focus on ‘what’s going on in real people’s lives’. Gutmann (2004, p 2) concords, arguing that ‘all the finest studies on men and masculinities in Latin America stick closely to observed events, emotions and practices’. Indeed, most of the studies, which aim to better understand our gendered and sexualised citations in Latin America, employ a broadly ethnographic approach and emphasise the importance of being actively involved in the lives of our research participants (see, Hersker & Leap 1996, Parker 1999, Parr 1998, Lowell 1999 and Scherper-Hughes 1992). For example, Prieur’s (1998) Mexican study on the gay gathering place ‘Mema’s house’ applies an ethnographic approach based on active involvement in social interaction of research participants to better understand the relationship between gender and sexuality, and bodily citations such as using certain clothes, wearing make-up and sexual behaviours.

In this vein, Schepen-Hughes (1992, p 1992) advocates a pé-no-chão (literally, foot on the ground) approach, where researchers are involved in, and part of, cultural activities. She argues that such an approach provides the opportunity for participants’ stories and experiences to be illustrated. The participant observation approach taken in this study can be seen as reflecting my desire to avoid what Schepen-Hughes (1995) calls the ‘hostile gaze’ approach to ethnographic research, where the ethnographer is separated from the community (s)he is studying. In this respect, this study is sympathetic to Melhuus and Stølen’s (1996, p 3) argument that methodology must acknowledge that the force of gendered and sexualised discourses lies
in the way they are produced and reproduced through daily activities of men and women, and meanings implied in their reproduction (see aldo Wilkinson 1999).

Secondly, researchers have employed empirical approaches that are aimed at capturing citations more narrowly related to homophobia and discrimination, with a selective focus on particular times or places when specific gendered and sexualised behaviours are marked as (ab)normal and (un)natural, and where participants are at risk from discrimination (Stanko & Curry 1997, Manzelli 2006). Such research approaches aim to capture moments of inclusion and exclusion for specific gendered and sexualised groups and consider which identity citations are marked as normative and deviant (Lim 2004, Matejskova 2007). In order to better understand the process of tolerance and intolerance of queer male performances, and further understanding into the power relations implicit in dominant gendered and sexualised discourses and their effect on gendered and sexualised citations, it was important that the methodology chosen was attentive to the specific behaviours that were marked as normal, and natural and which were seen as dissident and abnormal and where this occurred.

Thirdly, whilst various studies focus solely on physical behaviours, (see Bell et al 1994, Valentine 1996, Lancaster 1997, Busby 2000) others argue that empirical approaches, aimed at capturing out gendered and sexualised identities, must also consider verbal interaction since it is our physical and spoken citations together that make up our identity performances. (Kulick 1998, Brown 2000, Goldstein 2003). Kulick (1998, p 17) criticises methodological approaches that are restricted to ‘bodily and social practices’, arguing that we must also consider ‘the words they [participants] use to talk about their lives’. Such studies highlight speech as an important, and often ignored, way in which we perform our gendered and sexualised identities and employ methodological approaches that seek to identify and record such ‘speech acts’ (Brown 2000, p 37). A concern of such research is what speech
does and how this varies across different social and spatial contexts (Brown, 2000). Goldstein (2003) takes a narrower focus, considering humour in conversation and speech. For Goldstein (2003, p 3), capturing citations of laughter and humour helped unravel the ways that those living in one of Rio de Janeiro’s favelas ‘comprehend their own lives and circumstances’ and helped to understand the power relations implicit in identity performances through opening up a ‘consciousness of how lives there were burdened by their place within their racial, class, gender and sexual hierarchies that inform their social world’ (Goldstein 2003, p 4).

This latter point represents an additional, overlapping empirical approach of work seeking to capture gendered and sexualised citations; that is, capturing ways in which our gender and sexuality are cross-cut by other aspects of identity such as age, class and race (Prieur 1998, Parker 1999, Gontijo 2009). An underlying assumption of such research is that gendered and sexualised identities are complex and multifaceted – we are not simply gay or straight, men or women, but are always shifting between many related identities. The methodology employed in this study aimed to highlight the ‘multiple realities of diverse social networks’ that make up the real and imagined worlds of research participants (Parker 1999, p 54). Using interviews and participant observations focused on rich personal experiences, stories and understandings of social interaction across various spaces I was able to chart the complex interactions of race, gender, class, age, religion and sexuality for a group of queer men from Rio de Janeiro.

**Spatialising Citations and Slippages**

Whilst methodological approaches focused on capturing identity citations influenced where the research was carried out and how it was conducted; Butler’s (1999) notion of slippages in identity approaches was a particularly important approach for shaping the analysis of data gathered on behaviours in this study. Butler (1990, p 129) uses the term slippage to refer to moments when dominant gender and sexuality norms are not reiterated in acts, words
and desires, meaning that the ‘call of the law’ is not matched by its articulation. Put differently, slippage is employed by Butler to refer to instances when non-dominant gendered and sexualised citations are performed. While certain slippages of performance are tolerated, others are denied and punished due to what Butler (1999, p 194) calls ‘heterosexual hegemony’. She defines this as the ‘grid of cultural intelligibility through which bodies, genders and desires are naturalised’, certain performances are normalised and understood as natural, self-evident and fixed, whilst others are stigmatised’ (Butler 1999, p 194). Heterosexual hegemony represents the conflation of gender and sexuality which results in the normalisation of heterosexuality and the dominance and control of lesbians, gays and bisexuals by heterosexuals and permeates all aspects of our lives and affects the way in which our gendered and sexualised identities are performed. As Butler (2001) argues, the norms by which we seek to make our gendered and sexualised selves recognisable are, therefore, not ours, but originate in the heterosexual hegemony. While we are free to perform our gendered and sexualised identities out, we are not free to play them out in any way we choose (Lancaster 1997). Heterosexual hegemony normalises specific ways of ‘doing’ gender and sexuality such that masculinity is viewed as normal and natural for biological men and effeminacy as abnormal and unnatural (Butler 1990, 1999). Slippage, then, occurs in these moments when gender and sexuality are ‘done wrong’, in ways that are marked as unnatural.

Attention was paid to the spatiality and temporality of moments of slippage when analysing data. Dominant gendered and sexualised behaviours (composed of specific acts and words) seen as normal in spaces such as the home, the street, the workplace and the gay scene were identified. Slippages in gendered and sexualised behaviours across these spaces were recognised and attention was paid the reactions to them to determine whether they were accepted or stigmatised. Attention was drawn to the similarities and differences in the slippages that were permitted and restricted
across various sites of the city. Through recognising slippages in queer male identity performances and paying attention to the extent to which slippages were permitted and restricted across studied and less frequently studied spaces (such as religious sites and LGBT organisations) of the city, the aim was to further our understanding of the spatial nature of tolerance of queer male behaviours in Rio de Janeiro.

Across the urban space of Rio de Janeiro, this research is concerned with understanding identity citations in four sites in particular: the home, the workplace, religious sites and LGBT spaces. The home and the workplace are considered in an attempt to expand current literature on sexuality in Brazil which has largely neglected such everyday spaces (see Gontijo 2009 on the carnival). The consideration of religious sites is the result of the frequency of comments emphasising the importance of religion and religion sites in respondents’ interview comments. LGBT spaces are also considered in this thesis. This includes ‘scene spaces’, such as bars and clubs that were referenced by all interviewees, and the LGBT organisations where the majority of my participant observation data was collected. Thus, this thesis is a nuanced attempt to understand the relationship between the gendered and sexualised lives of a group of queer carioca men and the tolerance process across the specific sites of the home, the workplace, religious spaces and LGBT spaces.

The methodological approach employed in this study – to capture gendered and sexualised identity citations – draws on approaches from previous studies within and outwith Latin America. Concerns of ethnographic researchers about being actively involved in participant social interaction, arguments that attention must be paid to gendered and sexualised citations and their relationship to homophobia and discrimination, and the need to consider verbal interaction, such as conversation and humour have, informed the empirical framework of this study. As have concerns of recognising the cross-cutting nature of our gendered and sexualised identities and a desire to
understand the spatiality of power relations, which permit certain citations of gender and sexuality, but deny others. These concerns have influenced the decision to use a combination of participant observation, interviews and photo elicitation in this study (see also DeWalt & DeWalt 1998). Such an approach enabled me to best capture the spatial nature of citations and slippages in performances of gender and sexuality and to better understand the power relations behind them.

**Semi-structured Interviews and Photo Elicitation**

I conducted semi-structured with 83 men in Rio de Janeiro between November 2008 and March 2010. Interviews lasted between approximately thirty minutes and two hours and discussed gendered and sexualised practices in different parts of the city. I chose semi-structured interviews because they allowed for key research topics to be identified beforehand while still giving interviewees the opportunity to introduce topics that were important to them. This reflected my aim to ensure that research participants could voice their own priorities and participate in shaping the data collected, while still focussing on the topic of the research. Interviews were conducted in Portuguese (despite the fact that a minority of participants could speak English) since a key aim of the research was to capture some of the culturally specific terms, slang and ideas related to gender and sexuality that are difficult to translate into English. Interviews were conducted face-to-face as it was felt that not being a Portuguese native speaker I would probably miss some of the intricacies of the language and visual cues would help ensure that I followed the conversation. After interviews had been transcribed (see below), they were coded according to 'latent content analysis' (Hay 2002, p 77). This involved manually searching the transcripts and coding them according to the prevalence of certain terms and topics related to performances of gender and sexuality. Coded sections were then
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18 Although I do not want to expand on the role of body language in interviews in the research process, I consider it an important factor that adds depth to 'what is being said' (Bondi 1999, Kitchin & Tate 2000, p 216). Notes were jotted down about body language after each interview and where they aid understanding will be referred to in the subsequent chapters.
extracted and amalgamated in Microsoft Excel where a database was created of a diverse range of experiences and opinions under key headings.  

Recruitment of Research Participants  
A snowball sampling technique was used in which I contacted friends in Rio de Janeiro and ‘branched’ outwards, contacting their acquaintances via e-mail and providing information on my research and offering them the opportunity to take part in interviews. Through volunteering and participant observation (see below), I also met gay, bisexual and travesti men with whom I openly discussed my research and invited to participate through e-mail contact. I chose to recruit via e-mail as it reduced the likelihood that research participants would feel obliged to take part simply because we had friends in common, or because we volunteered at the same organisation. The e-mail snowball sampling approach also helped ensure that participants were interested in the project allowing for richer feedback when it came to conducting the research, and reduced my own bias in the selection of research participants (Kitchin & Tate 2000) increasing the likelihood that participants were drawn from a variety of racial and socio-economic groups.  

I decided that I would not attempt to (and nor do I view it possible to) stipulate the sexual orientation of those involved in the research project, but I made it clear that I was seeking participants who were familiar with LGBT friendly sites such as bars, clubs and queer organisations. This pragmatic decision was a reflection of my theoretical stance (highlighted in the first chapter) that our sexualised identities are messy and shifting and do not fall into easily identifiable binary categories such as ‘gay’ or ‘straight’. The self-identification of participants often reflected unstable sexual identities, such as Vitor who identified as ‘homosexual’ but commented that his sexuality was ‘something that could change any day’. My decision not to pre-select the
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19 See appendices for an example of typical questions asked in interviews.  
20 Especially since initially most of my friends were from wealthy families living in the Zona Sul. The internet is widely used in Brazil, even amongst the lowest social classes.
identities of those involved in my research was also related to my expectation that participants would identify with a number of identity markers, some of which would be culturally specific. For example, whilst 50 of the 81 interviewees identified as gay or homosexual, others terms which were not easily translated into English were used such as travesti, trasformista (drag queen) and bicha (faggot/queer). Other interviewees did not identify with particular gendered or sexualised markers such as Bruno, 37, who stated that he is ‘a man who likes other men’ and emphasised his preference for relationships with the ‘sexo masculino’ (masculine sex).

In the interviews focused on the gendered and sexualised lives of a specific group of carioca men it is possible to identify two important characteristics of the data which are important for interpreting the results of the dissertation. Firstly, of the participants that identified as not-heterosexual, all were either ‘out’ to all (36 of 78) or some (31 of 78) family and friends21. The stories here do not shed any light on the lives of queer men who are ‘in the closet’ to relatives and acquaintances, which Luiz Mott (2003b) argues, still represents many Brazilian men. Secondly, most of my friends, their contacts, and those involved in the organisations where I worked were young. The age of research participants varied between 18 and 56, with 53 of 83 participants being between 18 and 29 years old. As a key goal of this research is to draw attention to the multifaceted nature of male experiences, this is achieved in this study by paying attention to the diverse ways in which this group of generally ‘young’ and ‘out’ men do gender and sexuality. The differences encountered amongst the participants highlight that even those falling within seemingly homogenous groups experience and understand various sites of Rio de Janeiro quite differently, a finding which guides much of my discussion in the remainder of the thesis.

Interview Location

21 The remainder is made up of 11 interviewees who did not mention whether they were ‘out’ in interviews. 5 interviewees did not define themselves as homosexual.
Throughout the research process I was attentive to the ways in which the setting influenced the course of the interview, and made sure that interviewees chose locations where they felt comfortable talking about themes related to sexuality (Elwood & Martin 2000). This was particularly important since some of the topics, particularly those related to ‘coming out’ and the family’s understanding of their sexuality, were potentially sensitive and difficult to discuss. My only stipulation was that interviewees were not conducted in places associated with teaching, such as in a tutorial or lecture room, as I felt that it reinforced the idea of the researcher as ‘expert’, potentially jeopardising the formation of a reciprocal relationship and the open sharing of ideas, thoughts and opinions. At times my decision to let interviewees choose the location of interviewee led to surprising consequences, such as one case where a participant decided that he was not comfortable talking in his local _lanchonete_ (corner café) and instead asked that the interview be conducted in a quiet park where he couldn’t be overheard and was unlikely to know anyone. As in other cases, this enabled the interviewee to feel at ease and talk comfortably and openly about his sexuality.

**Conducting the Interview**

Interviews began with general ice-breaking questions which involved asking the name, age and/or profession of participants as a way to establish rapport. Following this, participants were asked to select approximately five photos of important places in the city and the discussion was based around the images chosen. In particular participants were asked why such places were important and whether they were viewed as tolerant and safe. Next participants were asked more planned questions about spaces of the workplace, the home, the street and religious places which form the focus of this research. Questions were focused on participants’ gendered and sexualised behaviours in these spaces, experiences of coming out and experiences of homophobia. The interviews were structured around three
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22 See the appendices for an example of an interview template based on the most commonly asked interview questions.
principle types of questions. Firstly ‘experience questions’ (Patton 1987) focused on the behaviour of respondents in certain, often hypothetical, situations. This reflected the primary concern of the research: to focus on the spatial performances of queer men in Rio de Janeiro. Secondly, ‘feeling questions’ (Patton 1987) encouraged interviewees to discuss the emotional experiences of being in different parts of the city. Both ‘experience’ and ‘feeling’ questions helped me understand tolerance and feelings of pride, shame, comfort and discomfort, and experiences of homophobia. Thirdly, questions were asked concerning opinions and beliefs that interviewees had regarding specific locations within the city, allowing insight into the individual thoughts and perspectives on the relationship between gender, sexuality and space (Schendsul et al 1999).

Interviews were digitally recorded and time was given before and after the interviews for any ‘off the record’ comments that were not included in the transcripts. Whilst I am aware of reflexivity work which argues that the digital recorder can inhibit research participants by serving as a constant reminder of the formal research situation (Dubish 1996, Hay 2002), I believe that overall using a recorder was beneficial for several reasons. Firstly, scribbling notes can be extremely distracting for the interviewee and can give the impression that the interviewer is not attentive and reduce the likelihood of establishing rapport. Through digitally recording the interview I was able to focus on what was being said and respond with appropriate thoughts, opinions and questions. Secondly, recording the interviews ensured that all that was said was ‘captured’, in contrast to taking notes where only an overall outline of the interview can be gleaned (Hay 2002). Thirdly, as a non-native Portuguese speaker, digitally recording the interview allowed me to catch vocabulary and expressions that I was unfamiliar with and could later check with the interview transcribers.

**Translating Interviews**
After conducting the interviews they were transcribed verbatim in Portuguese by two native speakers, Pã and Renato. I then used their help to understand and translate various sections into English. It was important that the translations reflected, as near to possible, the socially and culturally situated meanings of the language used, to best grasp the meaning of gender and sexuality from a Brazilian context. This process had important and undeniable effects on the production of data presented in this thesis. Temple & Edwards (2002, p 3) argue that ‘language is not just a tool or technical label for conveying concepts, but carries accumulated particular social, cultural and political meanings’. Temple & Edwards (2002) and Temple & Young (2004) argue that the translator must be understood as an ‘active participant’ in the research process since they do not make ‘value free’, objective conversions from the ‘truth’ of one language into the ‘truth’ of another, rather they are culturally and socially situated in ways that influence this process in ways that are reflected in the words or expressions that were chosen. Our positioning, mine as a foreign, English speaking, white, gay, young, postgraduate student and my translator’s in terms of aspects such as race, gender and class and sexuality influenced this process. In addition, Portuguese is a language which, as Prieur (1998, p 23) recognises with Spanish, ‘permits ambiguity’ due to the frequent relaxing of grammar rules, articles and vocabulary in informal situations, one example being the –inho/inha diminutive which is extremely common in Brazil, but difficult to translate into English. Whilst attempts have been made to capture such nuances in translations used throughout this thesis, I am aware that at times this is impossible; for this reason I present quotes in English in the text and Portuguese in the appendices.

Simon Hutta (2009) argues that as researchers we have a responsibility to pay attention to the ‘excessive’ affective dynamics as well as the semiotics of what was being said when translating interviews. He explains this by arguing that we must consider the ‘affective preconditions of translation’, which he describes as the emotions and feelings related to the words and expressions
used by participants, which he argues vary depending on the different ways they are framed by participants in their speech. This ‘excess’ is thus a vital part of what was being said. Hutta (2009) uses the example of a conversation around a gay kiss which is framed through danger, homophobia, pleasure, defiance, moral concerns and emotions linked to these. In addition to showing how one word (a kiss) and the ideas related to it are difficult to translate from one language to another the example is used to show the importance of recognising the affective ‘excess’ involved in the kiss and ensuring that this is apparent in the translation of the incident. Hutta’s (2009) argument has influenced the way in which passages have been translated and the comments made in relation to translated passages in the following sections. The aim throughout has not been to simply find the correct English word that corresponds with the Portuguese, but to ensure the emotions and feelings involved in the way participants framed the word are also conveyed in the sections translated.

**Photo Elicitation**

Photographs were used whilst conducting the interviews for this study. The use of visual prompts in geographical fieldwork has a long history (Sidaway 2002), but is fairly infrequently employed in the interview process (Latham 2003). This contrasts with other areas of social research, such as anthropological studies (see Banks 2001) and work on children and young people (see Cappello 2005) which have been more attentive to the benefits of this method. Harper (2002, p 13) argues that photos are useful because they ‘mine deeper shafts into the human consciousness’ than solely verbal approaches. Photographs served to enrich and extend the oral semi-structured interview by acting as ‘triggers’ (Cappello 2005) which helped to activate memories of incidents of specific places, objects or events that would otherwise have gone unspoken. In this vein, the use of photos helped me better understand the spatial interpretations and behaviours from participants’ perspectives by providing examples of spaces that were discussed – the home, the workplace, religious spaces, bars and clubs and
LGBT spaces. This helped me to gain richer respondent feedback by facilitating their consideration of specific locations of the city. Using photographs also aided my comprehension of the verbal part of the interviews, since interviewees often referred to certain objects or occurrences that they showed. As highlighted in research with children (Sidaway 2002, Cappello 2005), using photographs also helps to put the participants at ease in the interview. This was particularly important here since having a conversation with a gringo23 and someone doing research for a university was an unfamiliar, and for some an anxious, experience. Discussing photos helped to relax interviewees and establish rapport.

In addition, photo elicitation helped to keep the data collection participant-centred. Kaplan & Howes (2004) and Banks (2001) argue that using photographs allows for greater agency in conducting research since participants look at the photographs and choose what is significant for them and what they want to discuss. This approach increased the likelihood that participants’ understandings, perceptions and experiences remained central to the research process through allowing interviewees to talk about the locations within the city that were important for the playing out of their gendered and sexualised identities. Consequently, whilst the sites of queer organisations, the home, the workplace and entertainment were pre-identified as locations to be discussed, the flexible interview method allowed for other sites to be considered when they were significant for interviewees. In this respect a key goal of my methodology was to illuminate ‘multiple geographical imaginations and perspectives’ (Brown & Knopp 2008). Using photographs was beneficial since it allowed for a more balanced and reciprocal approach than simply conducting verbal interviews.

23 Gringo is the everyday term used to describe a foreigner from North America, Europe or Australasia. It is more colloquial than the literal translation for estrangeiro (foreigner), and unlike elsewhere in South America, it can be used both as a term of endearment or as a derogatory term.
At the start of interviews I showed thirty photographs (see appendices) of different locations around Rio de Janeiro to the interviewees and asked them to choose those that were most important in terms of their gender and sexuality. The photos had been taken in advance and represented various locations such as bars, cafés, residential streets, the beach, public transportation, the pride parade, nightclubs and shopping centres, both in the wealthier Zona Sul (South Zone) and centro (city centre) districts and the poorer Zona Norte (North Zone) and Zona Oeste (West Zone) neighbourhoods of the city. Interviews were generally started with me asking why participants had chosen such photographs, and the significance they had in terms of their gender and sexuality. The images were also referred to by me or the interviewees during the course of the interview in order to help explain, illustrate, or query points made or questions asked.

**Ethnographic Research**

While the term ethnography is complex and contested, a specifically spatial definition is offered by Hubbard et al (2004, p 345) describing it as ‘a qualitative mode of research and writing that emphasises the importance of in-depth contextual and intensive study in excavating the relationships between people and place’. This understanding of ethnography involves the description of individual people and cultures through participation in the day-to-day lives and social contexts. Although interviews are an important part of social research, and we can learn a lot from talking to people, Jamieson (1999) argues that is also important to consider the ways in which we ‘do’ our identities by focusing on spatial behaviours and social interactions. On this note, Prieur (1998, p 22) contends that the information and behavioural experiences gained in interviews ‘are not facts about themselves or others, but their vision of themselves and others, or rather the vision they want to give me’. The ways in which our gendered and sexualised identities are
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24 This was evident when I conducted interviews for my MSc thesis in Scotland. In debriefing at the end of interviews, several respondents made comments suggesting that other interviewees would try to respond in a way that I thought was appropriate and that I should also observe behaviours in the sites being studied.
discussed do not necessarily reflect the way in which they are acted out. My decision to take a combined ethnographic and interview approach is, thus, a reflection of my awareness that relying on interviews alone fails to adequately capture identity practices.

I share Schensul et al et al’s (1999, p 91) contention that ‘the researcher must be present at, involved in and recording daily routine activities of people within the field setting’. My aim was ‘deep immersion’ by being close, both physically and socially to the daily lives and activities of queer men in Rio de Janeiro (Emerson et al 1995). The majority of my ethnographic fieldnotes came from participant observation, and more particularly, what Meriam (1988) refers to as the ‘observer as participant’ role where my concern was a combination of observation and note-taking, and social interaction and participation in group activities (see also Goodall 2010). I constantly moved along the continuum identified by de Walt and de Walt (1998) between participation and non-participation, between the active and passive researcher. The ‘observer as participant’ was a useful approach as it enabled close interaction, whilst also allowing me to step-back from the field, reflect on the behaviours observed, and take fieldnotes.

More specifically, my research participant observation work was carried out with two organisations in the city: Arco-Íris (Rainbow) LGBT rights group, and the Associação Brasileira interdisciplinar de AIDS (ABIA - Brazilian Interdisciplinary AIDS association). While my ethnographic research was carried out within LGBT organisations and sites associated with them (through group visits), notes were also taken when respondents talked about other everyday sites, specifically the home, the workplace, religious space and LGBT sites. At ABIA I was involved in bi-weekly workshops for men that are HIV positive over a period of nine months. These were part of the Oficina do Corpo, Arte e Ação (Body, Art and Action Workshop) through which I participated in numerous activities from art, photography, physical exercise sessions, night outings to various pontos gays (gay points) and the
distribution of leaflets, condoms and information about the group. After all meetings there was an informal discussion session and picnic where there was the opportunity to share thoughts, ideas and anxieties about sexuality and being HIV positive, although it was often used as time to catch up with friends, to engage in informal discussion and joke with fellow group members. The workshops provided an opportunity to be actively involved in the social interactions of a group of predominantly gay males. I also participated in the activities of the Arco-Íris group through a variety of events. I was a volunteer for the group, helping to organise and execute events such as the pride-parade and the International Day Against Homophobia (IDAHO). I also participated in general meetings for bisexual, trans, travesti and gay men, which often involved discussions around gender and sexuality, and the sharing of personal experiences. In addition I took part in the Entre Garotos (Among Guys) programme aimed at ‘promoting the well-being of gay and bisexual male youths in Rio de Janeiro’ (Entre Garotos 2010). Events ranged from workshops on homophobia, discussions regarding alcohol and drugs amongst the LGBT community and off-site prevenção (safe-sex) visits to popular LGBT locations. With both organisations I actively took part in meetings and events where possible, reflecting my opinion that the goal of carrying out ethnographic research is not to be a fly on the wall, ‘neutral, detached and independent from the community being studied’, but to participate as much as possible and experience ‘what it feels like to become a member of that world’ (Emerson et al 1995). The decision to take a microethnographic (Basham 1978) approach and focus my research on two specific organisations reflects the focus of this research on better understanding the individual practices of a particular group of men and to understand how they are situated within wider

---

25 Although ABlA is not an exclusively LGBT group, all but one of the men at the meetings I attended identified as ‘gay’ or ‘homosexual’.
discourses of gender and sexuality and not with making generalisations about Brazilian men.

Throughout my ethnographic research informal interviews were conducted which were unplanned, unstructured and conversational in nature. One of the principal advantages of informal interviews was that they allowed for more flexibility, permitting topics to be explored as they as they arose ‘naturally’ in conversation (Schensul et al et al 1999). In this respect, informal interviews are flexible enough to accommodate unpredictable aspects of data collection, representing a ‘liminal time and space where the new and unexpected may occur and novel communication may be achieved’ (Kitzinger & Farquhar 1999, p 165). The responses gained in informal interviews were also more immediate and less vague than those elicited from semi-structured interviews, where events referred to often occurred weeks or months before the interview. In terms of my concerns with taking a reciprocal research approach, conversational interviews were beneficial since they allowed participants more flexibility in answering questions and control over the interview process. Finally, since these interviews were not digitally recorded and were conversational, rapport was achieved more easily than in semi-structured interviews, thus often allowing for richer, more detailed and open feedback (Limb & Dwyer 2001).

I used Emerson et al’s (1995, p 26) approach as a guide when deciding what to note down in my fieldnotes, paying attention to initial impressions (tastes, smells, colour, noises etc.), local understandings of key events, and incidents that were significant to the men in my study. I paid to the ‘what happened, to who, where, when and why’ (Schensul et al et al 1999, p 99) in the situations that I was observing and participating in. This allowed me to capture the specific practices that ‘do’ gender and sexuality across various sites of the city. Personal reflection in terms of my own feelings, emotions and understandings of key terms and events were also annotated and will be referred to where they illuminate the arguments made in the following
chapters. A ‘thick description’ approach was taken in which a dense account of incidents and behaviours was made, with specific attention to the broader social and spatial context of their occurrence (Geertz 1973, Goldstein 2003). Thus, my approach to taking fieldnotes reflects Geertz’ (1973) and Lederman’s (1990) contention that it is only through situating behavioural observations within the wider context and environment that they can be described and properly understood by others. I attempted to write fieldnotes privately at home or on the metrô (underground) when leaving meetings and events. Initially I wrote down detailed and comprehensive unedited accounts which were coded with the most important sections being entered into a fieldnote database.

**Ethical Issues**

Previous studies have shown how research into LGBT communities is potentially problematic since it can cause harm or danger to the groups being studied (Humphreys 1975, England 1994, Pastina 2006). Such work often positions LGBTs as a ‘vulnerable group’ in need of specific protective research measures related to their sexuality (Sears 1993). Whilst I disagree with a simplistic and homogenous understanding of LGBT individuals as a vulnerable group, an important concern throughout this research has been to reduce the risk of physical or psychological harm through manipulation or exploitation to myself or my research participants. I took a critical methodological approach which aimed for reciprocal research and I was attentive to Scherper-Hughes’ (1992, p 25, 1995) assertion that research is ‘something produced through human interaction and not extracted from naïve informants, unaware of hidden agendas of researchers.’ In this vein, interviews and ethnographic research was informed by social research which takes a psychotherapeutic approach, focusing on the ‘dialogical sharing of thoughts, opinions and ideas’ (Bondi et al 2002) and avoiding a one-way interrogation of the participant. Conducting interviews and ethnographic research in this way reduced this risk of misappropriation by helping ensure
that I represented the data gained as accurately and authentically as possible.

With this in mind, several methods were employed to reduce risk of manipulation or harm of research participants and to increase the likelihood that the research was conducted in a reciprocal and non-hierarchical manner. Firstly, I used the snow-ball sampling technique, which is recognised by Lee (1993, p 66) as having ‘in-built security’ features. It ensured that there were links between myself and the participants, through common acquaintances, thus building trust and reducing risk of exploitation, for example by ‘outing’ respondents who had not disclosed their sexuality. Secondly, whilst the subject matter covered in interviews was unlikely to be distressing or potentially harmful for participants, since conversation generally focusing on spatial behaviours in different parts of the city, participants were given a preamble at the start of all interviews. This informed participants of the aims of the study and stated that any comments made would be held in the strictest confidence and could be retracted at any point. Participants were also ensured that they could see the information that I held on them in any point during the research process. Thirdly, participants were told that they did not need to answer questions they felt they were too personal or sensitive. Lastly, fieldnotes, interviews notes and interview transcripts were anonymised and all participants were given pseudonyms (unless participants explicitly mentioned that they wanted their names to appear in this thesis).

The decision was made to use the real names of all queer organisations, services, bars and clubs mentioned in this study. I recognise that in certain instances this can be problematic, such as in England’s (1994) study into Toronto’s lesbian community, which was abandoned due to the worry that through identifying such sites there was a risk that participants would experience homophobic discrimination due to the ‘outing’ of otherwise clandestine establishments. However, in the case of Rio de Janeiro, gay
venues are well known, publicised in flyers, posters, local newspapers and on the radio, and are generally located in the busy centro or the Zona Sul. Even cruising areas such as the aterro do Flamengo are widely understood as such and are frequently referred to in day-to-day conversation amongst non-queer cariocas. Consequently, this thesis refers to locations that are already well known and does not leave Rio de Janeiro’s queer community at a higher risk of verbal or physical violence.

My decision not to take fieldnotes during the course of group activities was a result of my ethical concerns and apprehension that jotting down notes would have been distracting for research participants, perceived as intrusive or secretive and would risk overlooking important incidents and subtleties (Schensul et al et al 1999)\textsuperscript{26}. I am aware that this a decision which could be understood as ethically problematic (Emerson et al 1995, Goodhall 2000) and contradictory to my goal for a transparent, honest and open methodology, however, when starting new projects or working with new groups with ABIA and Arco-Íris I was always upfront about the fact that I was a researcher and that I would be taking descriptive notes about conversations, behaviours and observations. Thus, taking fieldnotes outside of ABIA and Arco-Íris sessions was deemed most appropriate.

Although it was important to guarantee that my research was carried out in a responsible manner and did not exploit participants, many of the interviewees found the process enjoyable and meaningful. Wilkson (1999) and Guimarães (2004) argue that having the opportunity to speak with someone listening can be an empowering and liberating experience. Scherper-Hughes (1992, p 29), agrees that ethnographic research can allow research participants to ‘tell part of their story’ and, citing Wolf (1980), she argues that it can be a positive experience through which the ‘ordinary lives of people often presumed to have no history’ can be illuminated’ (Wolf 1982, cited in Scherper-Hughes 1992 p 29). A particularly poignant case occurred when a close friend began

\textsuperscript{26} The principal drawback of my decision not to take fieldnotes overtly was the risk of forgetting information, although I used pauses in meetings to jot down fieldnotes in the toilet.
to cry during an interview. Initially worried, I asked him if everything was OK and he began to smile, thanking me for listening to him and saying that he was extremely grateful to be able to talk about his sexuality as he sometimes felt that he ‘couldn’t take it anymore’ and ‘was going to explode’ since he normally did not have the chance to do so. Although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to consider the importance of emotion in my research (see Laurier & Parr 2000, Bondi 2005 for expansion), this example demonstrates that participation in this project was often a significant experience providing informants the opportunity to talk-about rarely discussed topics.

**Being Reflexive: Being an Insider, Being an Outsider**

In adopting what Scherper-Hughes (1992, p 23) describes as an ‘empirical’ approach, and acknowledging my own positioning and that of my research participants, it is apparent that at times I was an ‘outsider’ and at times an ‘insider’ whilst conducting the research for this study, and that this has an impact on the data collected. By positioning, I refer to social location in terms of cross-cutting aspects of identity such as gender, class, race, age and sexuality (Hertz 1997, Rose 1997, Bondi & Mehta 1999, Bella & Mehta 1999, Mohammad 2001, Bondi 2005, La Pastina 2006, Rouhani 2006 and Datta 2008). I am attentive to reflexive studies which emphasise the need to consider the ‘self as a key research tool’ and I acknowledge that various interrelated aspects of my identity, such as being gay, ‘out’; British and a researcher, and of my research participants, meant that I was moving the positions of an insider and outsider whilst conducting interviews and participant observation.

At times aspects of my identity such as my nationality, researcher status, and physical appearance helped me gain access and establish rapport, whilst at others it served to distance me from participants and made my fieldwork more difficult. In one case, I was present in an ABIA workshop where the atmosphere became rowdy and the participants began teasing one another about factors such as their sexual role and the clothes that they wear.
Suddenly, one of the group leaders pointed at me and loudly commented ‘Stop brincando (messing about), we have an international researcher in the room!’ Immediately the men stopped joking with one another and sat down quietly to begin the session. Afterwards, the men stopped talking and joking about their sexuality and silently began their exercises. Being positioned as not Brazilian, and as a researcher, identified me as different from research participants and changed their behaviour, thus affecting the information I gathered from this session.

At other times, I was positioned in certain ways that were beneficial for my research by facilitating access to events and people that might have otherwise been difficult. Most memorably, perhaps, I was invited to a presentation to celebrate the passing of a new law against homophobic discrimination in Rio de Janeiro and arrived, unaware of the dress code for such events, wearing shorts and a shirt. When I arrived, my ‘inappropriately’ informal attire led to the security officer telling me I was unable to enter; at which point, the head of Arco-Iris shouted down to the security guard and said ‘It’s OK, he’s here from Britain doing some research, you can let him in’. If I hadn’t been positioned as British or a researcher it is likely that I would not have observed this event. In another, rather awkward case, I thanked an interviewee for his participation he commented ‘How could I say no to a beautiful Scottish guy like you with your big blue eyes?’ One of the motives for his participation in the research was seemingly my not being Brazilian and my physical appearance. Such advantages are recognised by Kulick (1998) where he refers to his ‘blond bauble’ status and ‘exotic cachet’ in researching travestis in Brazil or in Lewis and Leap’s (1998) study where they claim that being foreign allowed them fast entry into the community studied. In other instances, however, my foreignness meant that I was identified as different and made participant observation more difficult.

Whilst some researchers have chosen to remain closeted whilst conducting empirical work (see Goodman 1996, Pastina 2006), I chose to disclose my
sexuality in the field, a decision that was both beneficial and restrictive to my research. Often, this helped me develop meaningful relationships with research participants, which, in turn was beneficial for gaining insight into the lives of a group of queer carioca men. When thanking one participant for taking part in an interview he commented ‘No, it’s ok, we already have something in common. I’m gay and I know how important this study is’. Through being honest about my sexuality in conversations and discussions in the field and participants came to see me as ‘part of the group’, rather than an ‘asexual’, childlike ‘other’ as experienced by other researchers by (see Proschan 1990, cited in Lewin & Leap 1996). This facilitated my inclusion in informal conversations regarding Rio’s gay bars and clubs, gossip about boyfriends, and the latest gay fashions particularly by two close friends Judson and Pedro. In this respect I was their ‘gay project’ (and in some ways, they were mine too), a peculiar gay gringo who needed information regarding the ins and outs of Rio de Janeiro’s gay world. Our relationship was always blurred between researcher and participant and close friends in a way that has been highlighted in other reflexive work (see Burkhart 1996, Lewin & Leap 1996, Kulick 1996 & Guimarães 2004). Reinharz (1997) argues that when carrying out fieldwork, we portray many different selves which we constantly move between. This (often unintentional) movement between researcher and friend was undoubtedly facilitated by my decision to disclose my sexuality and was beneficial both on a personal and a research level. It enabled sharing of emotions, feelings and ideas which blurred the division between field and not-field, something that would most likely have been less likely had I remained closeted.

At times my sexuality was disadvantageous and served to exclude me from social interaction involved in my participant observation. One example occurred when my sexual identity was juxtaposed with another aspect of my identity – my music taste – to establish me as an outsider to the group. I was at a planning meeting for the pride parade when everybody began dancing to Madonna’s latest release. When I commented that I didn’t like the song, I
was asked whether I was gay, after saying that I was, I was greeted with shock and surprise, at which point one of the volunteers, Flávio, commented ‘Well you’re not part of this group then!’ Although the example was light-hearted and meant semi-seriously, it serves to emphasise how identifying as a gay man did not automatically enable connection to be made and rapport to be established with research participants. The example also reinforced the idea that myself and my research participants were simultaneously moving between and presenting ‘multiple selves’ in the field – at times these multiple identities positioned me as an insider, at others as an outsider during the field (Katz 1994, Dubisch 1995).

Being reflexive provides insight into how various aspects of my identity, and the identities of the project’s participants, have become inscribed in this study. My, and the research participants’, identities in terms of sexuality, nationality, (lack of) musical taste, or (non) researcher status have influenced the empirical section of this dissertation by allowing me to become an insider at certain times, whilst establishing distance between myself and research participants, positioning me as an outsider, at others. I do not advocate a transparent reflexivity which naively assumes that we can fully know the effect that our identities have on the research process (Rose 1997). Rather, less ambitiously, I would urge readers to bear in mind that the data gathered and presented in this thesis is the consequence of my positioning, and that of my research participants, as a result of various interrelated aspects of our identities. Finally, it would be impossible to focus on the infinite aspects that make up our identities and in this section I have focused on those that were explicitly mentioned by research participants and highlighted in the examples above, namely, nationality, sexuality and education. Being positioned as an insider or outsider has influenced this research in terms of who I was studying, when and where. Positionings in terms of nationality, sexuality and education also influenced my ability to gain access to group activities, make friends, and be accepted as part of the group being studied has therefore affected the data presented in this thesis.
Tolerance, Gender and Sexuality in a Southern City

Queer scholarship in general is overly focused on ‘northern’ contexts and remains the theoretical realm of Western thinkers argues Lim (in Brown et al, 2006), who advocates a movement away from minority world dominance in queer geographies. Studies outside Euro-American contexts are relatively uncommon, especially those outside of Australasia (Gorman Murray 2005 & 2007, Brickell 2007, McLean 2008, Rutling 2008, Kentlyn 2008, Caluya 2009), South Africa (Visser 2003 & 2008, Rink 2007, Tucker 2009) and eastern Asia (Lim 2004, McLelland 2005, Oswin 2010). Knopp and Brown (2003) & Oswin (2006) argue that the concentration of work on sexuality in the ‘North’ does something more than simply leaving our understandings of queer subjectivities incomplete, it potentially constitutes a form of hierarchical oppression based on the assumption that the western queer represents the global queer. Oswin (2006) ominously contends that ignoring ‘Southern’ contexts constitutes a ‘violence against queer culture around the globe’ on the part of ‘Northern’ academics (Oswin 2006, p 787). In this vein, Jackson (1991) argues that we must challenge understandings of the Western model as the model of queerness and appreciate that it is actually one amongst many models. Oswin (2006) is careful to point out that in challenging the current dominance in Anglo-Saxon, and particularly US-UK work on the topic, we must avoid binary understandings that assume homogenous and contradictory ‘Western’ and ‘Non-Western’ understandings and approaches. Rather, a global approach is more useful where we recognise the instabilities of, and connections between our gendered and sexualised identities on a number of various related scales such as the city, the nation, the ‘South’ and the globe.

Despite approaching the topic from different disciplinary backgrounds, both Boelstroff (2007) and Oswin (2006) agree that a ‘decentring’ of social science work on sexuality is needed through considering societies and cultures outside the ‘West’ and criticise studies which theorise queer culture as
spilling out of core cities such as London, Paris and New York to influence other peripheral, non-Western areas (see Castells 1983). Through exploring the specific ways that tolerance, gender and sexuality are related in the gendered and sexualised performances of queer men in a particular Latin American context this study takes a critical approach to theoretical work and models present in Northern literature. Helpful and problematic aspects of such work are identified in the light of the experiences of queer men in Rio de Janeiro.

Through its focus on Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, my work can be understood as part of decentring calls from within and outside the discipline. However, as has been demonstrated, researching masculinity and sexuality in Latin America is not an entirely new phenomenon, with groundbreaking studies such as Fry’s (1986) on sexuality in the Afro-Brazilian religion Candomblé and Perlongheur’s on male prostitution in São Paulo (1987) dating back over two decades. In the last ten years, in particular, work in the field has grown rapidly and now covers a plethora of topics from the carnival (Browning 1995, Green 1999), pride (Carrara et al 2003), travestis and transgendered identities (Lancaster 1997, Kulick 1998, Prieur 1998) the meaning of machismo and the role of fighting in the construction of male identities (Lancaster 1997, Melo & Vaz 2006, Willis 2005). In spite of the increase in work on masculinity and sexuality in Latin America, the field is much less explored than work focusing on the Anglo-Saxon context, leading Gutmann (2004, p 1) to argue that we still know ‘too little about men-as-men’ in the Latin American context, maintaining that ‘we need studies that concentrate on men and masculinities, on men as engendered and engendering beings in Latin America. We may not always need them, but we do at the start of the twenty-first century’ (Guttmann 2003, p 1). Moreover, studies that take a spatial approach to understanding gender, sexuality and tolerance are rare27, leaving us with a partial understanding of how being a man is ‘done’ across

27 This is suggested by the fact that the only Brazilian-based language journal on this theme, the Revista Latino-Americana de Geografia e Gênero (Latin American Journal of Geography and Gender), was established in 2010.
and between various contexts in the region. Through considering the interaction of space, tolerance, gender and sexuality this study takes a fresh approach to a growing body of research on queer identities in Latin America and extends current, northern dominated, understandings of tolerance. The context for doing this is the city of Rio de Janeiro in South Eastern Brazil.

**Researching Sexuality and Masculinity in Rio de Janeiro**

‘Millions of people around the globe live in cities. This makes them extremely significant places’ argue Longhurst & Johnston (2010, p 80). They are both spaces of ‘illicit sexualities and nonconformist gender practices’ and ‘spaces which inscribe, or enforce’ gender and sexuality norms (*ibid.*). This study explores how such norms are conformed and contested across the urban fabric of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The choice of Rio de Janeiro as the context for this research was not accidental, but reflects the importance and dominance of the city in Brazilian society. Rio is home to almost ten million people, making it the second largest city in Brazil. About 5% of the country’s population lives in the city and it has a huge influence on Brazilian culture. Parker (1999) argues that the city has a ‘special’ position in the cultural production of the country, which can be seen in the city’s importance in areas such as music, film, television and newspapers. Rio de Janeiro’s unique and exceptional position in the process of Brazilian cultural articulation also includes the influence that it has on attitudes towards and understandings of sexuality in the country. This is the result of the many political and queer organisations located in the city, the globally renowned gay-friendly carnival events, and the fact that the city plays host to one of the largest gay pride parades in the world, which in 2009 attracted 2 million revellers. Thus, understanding gender and sexuality ‘on the ground’ in Rio de Janeiro is vital since it has consequences which stretch beyond the city’s urban space.

Secondly, Rio de Janeiro is an incredibly diverse city in terms of race and class, evident with the often shocking juxtaposition of abject poverty with excessive wealth. In many ways, the city is both physically and conceptually
at the cross-roads of the diverse social, cultural and economic influences that create 21st century Brazil. The city can be understood as the meeting point of various cultures and heritages, with influence from a vast array of groups including Afro-Brazilians, often originally from the North East, Indigenous and Portuguese-Brazilians and those that have arrived in overlapping waves of immigration such as the Italian, Japanese and German Brazilians. This is related to the huge class differences that exist side-by-side and create the urban mosaic that is Rio de Janeiro. Indeed, Goldstein (2003) comments that Rio can be understood as one of the most unequal cities in the world, and that this inequality epitomises Brazilian society generally with the city serving as a kind of film trailer for the country as a whole. The city portrays an image of, on the one hand, the cidade maravilhosa (marvellous city) where anything is possible and anyone can make it; and on the other hand, extreme poverty, hardship and discrimination, ‘both part of the multifaceted reality’ of the city (Goldstein 2003, p. 27). Whilst my aim is not to represent sexuality in Brazil generally, the mélange of races and classes that live side-by-side means that Rio is an exciting city in which to conduct research. It provides more opportunities than other cities for capturing the rich diversity of our gendered and sexualised identities and the way in which they interact with other aspects of our identity.

This study approaches the topic of tolerance, gender and sexuality from a fresh perspective in a part of the world where studies on men, and homosexual men in particular, are lacking (Gutmann 2004). Not only does this study add to the growing body of work on tolerance and space through taking an original approach to the topic, but it extends our current understandings of the way in which tolerance functions within a specific Latin American context. In doing so, an important goal of this study is to take a critical approach to predominantly Northern theorisations of the relationship between sexuality and tolerance and explore the extent to which current conceptions are useful for understanding the lives of a group of queer men in Rio de Janeiro. The previous two chapters have provided insight into the
methodological decisions taken and provided an introduction to the unravelling of the complex relations between tolerance, gender, sexuality and space that will be discussed throughout this thesis and will help to further our understanding of the functioning of tolerance within, and of, the queer community in Rio de Janeiro.
Chapter 3

Tolerating Class and Racial Performances Amongst Queer Men in the Zona Sul

O sol que brilha em Ipanema
E passa sobre as minhas veias
O sol bronzea Ipanema
E ao mesmo tempo o morro incendia
A vida está em Ipanema
Vamos até lá
Pra ver se vai continuar
Verdades, mentiras
Estão em Ipanema

The sun which shines on Ipanema
And passes through my veins
The sun tans Ipanema
And at the same time the hill (shanty town) catches fire
The life's in Ipanema
Let's go there
To see if it's going to continue
Truths, Lies
They're in Ipanema

(Papas da Língua 1995)

This chapter explores the ways in which race, class and place intersect with sexuality and the importance of these intersections for the construction of tolerant and intolerant spaces. More specifically, the following discussion considers how the experiences of queer men in one district of Rio, the ‘Zona Sul’, challenge the popular imagery of ‘diverse’ queer places as resisting processes of discrimination and exclusion. I begin by drawing attention to popular notions of the Zona Sul as a tolerant space for queer men and refer

28 A shorter version of this chapter was published in Espaço, gênero e masculinidades plurais. See Furlong (2011) in the bibliography for full details.
to participants’ comments that appear to support such an understanding.

Next, the construction of the Zona Sul as an unquestionably tolerant space is problematised. Participant discourse and experiences are presented that emphasise linkages between race, class, place and sexuality in ways that challenge straightforward notions of the Zona Sul as a tolerant area of the city. Overall, this chapter highlights the importance of challenging the taken-for-granted assumptions of specific ‘queer’ urban spaces as tolerant, and suggests that doing so actually represents a barrier to more open and accepting spatial manifestations.

**Race, Class and Tolerance in the Cidade Maravilhosa**

The metropolitan area of Rio de Janeiro is split into four districts: the Zona Sul (South Zone), the Zona Norte (North Zone), the Zona Oeste (West Zone) and the centro (city centre) (Corrêa do Lagoa & Cesar de Queiroz Ribeiro 2001). In popular contemporary Brazilian culture, the image of the neighbourhoods that make up the Zona Sul, such as Ipanema, Copacabana and Leblon, is of liberal and tolerant neighbourhoods, particularly compared with other areas of the city. Songs, such as the one above by Papas da Língua, reinforce the idea that whatever problems exist in the subúrbio, everything is fine in the Zona Sul – ‘the sun shines on Ipanema…the life’s in Ipanema’. Ever-popular Brazilian telenovelas (soap operas) based in Rio de Janeiro are similarly positive, positioning the Zona Sul as more liberal, accepting and tolerant than other areas of the city, especially in terms of sexuality. When the subject of homosexuality is broached in telenovelas, for example, it is generally situated in the tolerant and expensive gay bars and clubs, gay-friendly beaches and liberal middle-class families of the Zona Sul (Viver a Vida, Rede Globo 2010, Malhação, Rede Globo 2010).

Gay travel guides also represent the Zona Sul as an extremely tolerant area of the city. The Brazilian-produced ‘Rio Gay Guide’ focuses almost

---

29 Subúrbio is a term used to refer to poor areas that are situated a long way from the city centre. In Rio de Janeiro, the term is applied to neighbourhoods in the Zona Norte and Zona Oeste.
exclusively on the Zona Sul neighbourhoods of Arpoador, Copacabana and Ipanema. This region of the city is described as teeming with a mixture of lesbians, gays, celebrities and other ‘cosmopolitan cariocas’ who are ‘friendly with gays, lesbians and transgendered [sic.], making you [lesbians, gays and transsexuals] feel welcome, almost anywhere’ (Welcome to Gay and Lesbian Rio!, Rio Gay Guide 2010). By and large, the Zona Sul is constructed as safe, open and tolerant for queers in popular Brazilian discourse.

The branding of Rio de Janeiro’s Zona Sul as the most tolerant and permissive area of the city is not a new phenomenon. James Green (1999) contends that it was the 1960s when the city’s Zona Sul gained this reputation. The neighbourhoods of Copacabana, and then Ipanema and Leblon, were glorified as much more liberal than other parts of the city in newspapers and magazines, such as the *Pasquim*. They ‘promoted the easygoing lifestyle of the Zona Sul’ (Green 1999, p 264) based on the area’s tolerance of countercultural groups, specifically for those critical of the military regime, sex-workers and the carioca queer community. Due to word-of-mouth, legal and illegal publications the Zona Sul gained the reputation as the most socially progressive part of the city for queer men. Indeed, men from Rio de Janeiro and beyond gravitated to the Zona Sul whose beaches, cinemas, cafés and cruising grounds seemed to offer a ‘world of opportunities’ for those living in other areas of the city that were considered to be less tolerant and open to ‘queer’ lifestyles (Green 1999).

In addition to being imagined as more tolerant, the Zona Sul is also presumed to illustrate the more glamorous and chic elements of Rio, particularly when compared to the Zona Norte and Zona Oeste. It is the place to meet celebrities, wealthy foreigners and rich Brazilians (Rio Gay Guide 2010). Such assertions are not as exaggerated as they may seem, though they are perhaps more acute reflections of socio-economic status than they are of any innate quality of this area; statistics show that those living in the Zona Sul earn considerably more than their counterparts in the Zona Norte.
and Zona Oeste and have better access to health and education services (Câmara Rio 2010). Ten of the eleven neighbourhoods with the highest incomes in the city are located in the Zona Sul, whilst the five regions with the lowest incomes are all located in the Zona Norte and Oeste (Câmara Rio 2010). Studies show that the inequality gap between the richest and poorest in Rio de Janeiro has continued to grow in recent years (Goldstein 2003, p 70). Yet there are important exceptions to this apparent division between the wealthy south and poor north-east of the city. Most notably, the largest favela30 in Latin America, Rocinha occupies one of the largest hillsides in the Zona Sul and is the most impoverished neighbourhood in the south of the city (Câmara Rio, 2010).

Rio de Janeiro is situated between the predominantly black cities of the north and the predominantly white cities of the south of Brazil, and thus expresses a greater racial diversity than other cities in the country. For this reason, racial segregation is arguably more visible in Rio than in many other parts of the country, and the myth that Brazil represents a racial democracy, where mestiçagem31 is embraced, is strikingly exposed in the racial composition of its neighbourhoods. Large disparities in the racial composition overlap with the economic characteristics of the neighbourhoods that make up Rio de Janeiro. Indeed, whilst approximately 70% of those living in favelas identify as negro(a)(black) (Oliveria 1999, cited in Vargas 2005), only approximately 30% of those living in Rio’s wealthy neighbourhoods would categorise themselves in this way. Thus, the majority of those living in Rio de Janeiro’s Zona Sul, where there are fewer favelas, identify as branco(a) (white), whilst the majority of those living in the Zona Norte and Oeste, where most of the

30 The word favela is used throughout to refer to shantytowns. Although the preferred term in government discourse is comunidade, only the term favela was used in interviews and in the field. Participants from shantytowns always stated that they were from favelas. When I asked Pedro whether I should use the term comunidade or favela he responded ‘Whatever you say, the problems are the same. To say comunidade is just to maquiar (disguise) the problems that exist’. Thus, whilst I recognise the stigmatised nature of the term favela, it is used throughout the thesis to mirror the prevalence of the term in participants’ conversations and interviews.

31 Mestiçagem is used to refer to racial mixing and is described by Goldstein as ‘the reputed historical blending of indigenous American, Iberian and African peoples into a single national identity’.
city’s favelas are located, identify as *moreno(a)*32 or *negro(a)*. Racial differences between city neighbourhoods are so pronounced that they are described as ‘Brazilian apartheid’ by Vargas (2005).

This chapter focuses on linkages between race, class, tolerance and gendered and sexualised performances by exploring experiences of men in the Zona Sul region of the city. The popularly held view of a tolerant Zona Sul was a common theme arising in my research, and when asked which parts of the city were most significant in terms of their sexuality, seventy-eight of eighty participants identified the Zona Sul, whilst just two participants referred to other areas of the city. However, in this chapter I argue that impressions of tolerance are somewhat unhinged when considering how race and class cut across participants’ queer performances in the Zona Sul. Specifically, participants’ suggestions that the Zona Sul is a tolerant space for queer identity performances is both part of the ‘truths’ and ‘lies’ (Papas da Língua 2010) about the district that is, actually, simultaneously permissive and restrictive for non-dominant performances of gender and sexuality. (In)tolerance of queer identities in the Zona Sul intersects with raced and classed identities, and contributes to attempts to maintain this region of the city as the terrain of the middle-class, white, masculine gay, in opposition to the poor, non-white, effeminate gay. This chapter suggests that more attention must be paid to race and class as regulatory frameworks in future work on supposedly tolerant spaces.

**The Zona Sul as a Tolerant Space**

It is difficult to generalise about men’s experiences of tolerance across Rio de Janeiro. Nevertheless, for most men interviewed for this research,

---

32 Contemporary Brazilian racial discourse is extremely complex. Officially the government only recognises four categories: *preto(a)* (black), *pardo(a)* (mixed race), *branco(a)* (white) and *amarelo* (yellow)(Goldstein 2003, p 292). However, a plethora of terms were observed in and out of the field including *negro* (black), *moreno(a)* (mixed race and/or colour), although often used instead of negro to avoid offence, *moreno(a) claro(a)* (mixed race and/or colour with light skin), *mulato(a)* (mixed race and/or colour), although rarely used amongst participants. As Goldstein (2003) recognises, the diminutive –inho/a were often added to *negro(a)/moreno(a) to lessen the impact of calling someone black.
tolerance is associated with the Zona Sul region of the city. Indeed, when asked which areas of the city were most tolerant for non-heterosexual men, 52 participants referred to specific neighbourhoods, of which 38 referred to the Zona Sul, whereas only 14 participants did not see any differences in tolerance between Rio’s zones. Not a single respondent identified the Zona Norte or Zona Oeste as the most tolerant regions of the city. Thus, the vast majority of participants made a separation between the Zona Sul, which was understood as a safe, gay-friendly and generally tolerant for non-normative, homosexual identity performances, and the Zona Norte and Oeste, which were understood as restrictive and intolerant spaces for queer men.

Clayton reiterated this view, stating that the Zona Sul ‘is a place where more things are possible’. This was echoed by Flávio who commented ‘I think that the Zona Sul is more liberal than anywhere else…they are more open minded…people aren’t bothered about this [sexuality]’.

The physical landscape of the city plays a central role in the geographic imaginings of tolerant and intolerant areas. Reinaldo states that the tunnel linking neighbourhoods of the Zona Norte and Zona Sul represents the separation between areas where homosexuals feel comfortable and free, and areas where they feel constrained and restricted:

‘It’s as if when you go through the Rebouças tunnel, which separates the zones, gays feel more free. Because, that’s where the gay reference points are, like posto 8 – the gay part of Ipanema beach, gay bars, the gay street, gay clubs…It’s not that the Zona Norte doesn’t have these, but the clubs in the Zona Sul are more well known, more respected…but it’s always the thing of “after the tunnel”’.

Reinaldo’s quote about the geographical imaginary of the city also carries with it a hint of the importance of the Zona Sul as not only a tolerant, but also a desirable space. Yet the most common terms used to describe this part of the city were a vontade (at ease), which was used by 31 participants and confortavel (comfortable) used by 34 participants. In various ways, these

33 See the appendices for information regarding participants’ self-identified descriptions of their race, sexuality and class.
formulations present the Zona Sul as an area where queer men have freedom to demonstrate their sexuality openly. Other common descriptions of the Zona Sul were, *espaço tolerante* (tolerant space), and as *mais liberal* (more liberal) than other parts of the city, and having *menos preconceitos* (fewer preconceptions) than elsewhere. Many participants described Ipanema, Leblon and Copacabana as *bairros diversos* (diverse neighbourhoods) due to the *diversidade* (diversity) of people present in the neighbourhoods. The increased diversity of the neighbourhoods that make up the Zona Sul, compared with other areas of the city, was often linked by interviewees to a lack of concern about public acts of same-sex intimacy. For example, Teodoro commented that in contrast to other areas, he feels ‘good’ showing same-sex intimacy in the Zona Sul, which he described as an ‘extremely diverse’ area of the city. He added:

‘I can kiss someone here in Ipanema and I even feel good because I’m not doing anything wrong, but the problem is that people around you stare at you disapprovingly, making jokes, so I think that in the street here are very few places….and the Zona Sul for me, these are places where these rare moments happen’.

Participants emphasised three specific qualities that constructed the Zona Sul as the most tolerant part of the city for non-heterosexual men. Firstly, it was argued that those living there were *mais instruídas* (more educated) than those living in other areas. It was frequently stated that residents here were more liberal because they had been to university, in contrast to the majority of those from other neighbourhoods who, like most Brazilians, only have a high school education. When asked why he thought the Zona Sul was more tolerant, Teodoro explained:

‘Those living in the Zona Sul are better informed, they know that these types of attitudes [homophobic] are against the law, that they are preconceptions. And, with relation to the Zona Norte, obviously not everyone who lives there is prejudiced, but people there have a lot less education, they’re a bit *quadradas* (backwards) ’.
This was reiterated by Davi who stated:

‘The Zona Sul is where the families and the richest people live. And, the Brazilians that have more access to money are the Brazilians that are better educated and the cariocas from the Zona Norte are those that are poorest in the city. So because of a lack of education, a lack of studying they have more preconceptions’.

Secondly, those in the Zona Sul were generally seen as earning more, and having more disposable income, which increased the possibility that they would come into contact with those who are openly gay by frequenting bars and clubs, or travelling to other countries where homosexuality was more visible. Thirdly, these two factors together resulted in residents of the Zona Sul being described as more mente aberta/cabeça melhor (open minded and accepting) of homosexuality. Aldo states that since people are more open-minded in the Zona Sul the area is the most gay-friendly part of the city where ‘everybody’s equal, everybody’s treated the same’. In contrast, the Zona Norte and Oeste were described as less tolerant and locations where most participants felt pressure to restrict openly homosexual behaviours. For example, when I asked Enzo if the Zona Norte was tolerant for non-heterosexual men he replied ‘It’s more hidden, more closed, the people are more closed’.

For some men, however, the Zona Sul was not felt to be as tolerant as the guide books and popular discourse might indicate. Of the 14 interviewees who did not identify the Zona Sul as more tolerant than the Zona Norte or Zona Oeste, their explanations fell into two broad categories. On the one hand, some men commented that the risk of homophobia was fairly uniform across the city, thus it was impossible to identify one region that was more tolerant. For example, Gilberto stated ‘It’s just as likely that I could suffer physical aggression in Madureira [in the Zona Norte] as Ipanema, so homophobia exists in all places’. On the other hand, some participants indicated that tolerance in the Zona Sul was, in fact, uneven and inconsistent
across space. For example, when asked which parts of the city were more tolerant for non-heterosexual men Claudio commented:

‘You can’t just say that the Zona Sul is liberal and the centro of Rio is prejudiced, or that the centre is liberal and the Zona Norte and Oeste are prejudiced. It depends on the places and locations of each region of Rio de Janeiro. You have places or locations in the Zona Sul that are completely gay-friendly and free, and other locations where you can’t even think about passing through because you could be murdered’.

These comments are indicative of the limitations of straightforward notions of the Zona Sul at tolerant, and suggest a diversity of acceptance within this otherwise markedly ‘tolerant’ space. Indeed, understandings of the Zona Sul as unquestionably tolerant rarely reflected the everyday performances of gendered and sexualised identities across the city, and largely and ignored racial and class differences. By highlighting how race, class, gender and sexuality interacted to position certain participants as more worthy users than others in the Zona Sul, participants’ experiences in this region of the city reveal a more complicated picture of tolerance in the region than the discourse above suggests. Put simply, what it tolerated in the Zona Sul is influenced not only by sexuality, but also by the integration of class, gender, and race into imaginaries of the desirable and acceptable queer urbanite.

**The Bicha Pintosa and The Barbie**

Rather than having fixed meanings constrained only to sexuality, the labels deployed by research participants to describe particular kinds of queer performances are also important markers of acceptance and exclusion. This is particularly evident in the terms *bicha pintosa* and *barbie*, which acquire their meaning in part through connections to notions of what is desirable in terms of race, class, gender and sexuality. The term barbie was most often applied to queer men who express exaggerated masculine behaviours. The term originates from the American plastic doll and is used to refer to queer men who play sport, work out and take steroids in order to become extremely
muscular. In many ways, these hypermasculine behaviours aim to show that they are ‘mais homem do que os homens’ (more manly than the men) as suggested by Gontijo (2009, p 29). When questioned about the meaning of the term barbie, participants referred to such men in a very similar way, almost always describing them as forte (strong), classe alta (middle class) or masculino (masculine).

In contrast, the bicha pintosa, gay pintosa, or less commonly the bichinha, refer to gay men who act in a stereotypically feminine way, especially in terms of the way they walk, talk and the clothes they wear. The term pintosa literally means painter and carries the assumption that to paint one has to be ‘limp-wristed’. The bicha pintosas are, in many ways, the antithesis of the barbie in that these men are generally skinny, and neither work out nor take steroids to obtain an idealised muscular physique. The bicha pintosa is often understood as placing little importance on showing that they fulfil the prerequisites of being a ‘real man’. When explaining the term bicha pintosa, participants most frequently used the terms classe baixa (working class), pobre (poor), and afeminado\(^{34}\) (effeminate). The terms barbie and bicha pintosa thus carry strong class assumptions, as implied by Fabio who described Zona Norte bicha pintosas as ‘baixo nivel’, a term that, in addition to bicha pobre (poor faggot), was frequently deployed to describe poor gays who frequent Zona Sul locations. Literally translating as low level, the term baixo carries connotations of working-class, poor, lacking culture and bad-mannered. Whilst none of the men in this study self-identified as barbie or bicha pintosa, these categories were referred to by a significant majority, 61 of 83 participants, suggesting that they were important categories in the lives of queer cariocas.

\(^{34}\) Although the word afeminado does not officially exist in Portuguese, it was used much more frequently than the word efeminado when referring to male effeminate behaviour. For this reason the terms are used interchangeably throughout this thesis and the form used in original quotes is maintained in the discussion of interview quotes.
Not only is the bicha pintosa understood as poorer than the average resident of the Zona Sul, he is also considered darker and more effeminate by many in the Zona Sul queer community. The expression, bicha pintosa, is thus not racially neutral and is almost exclusively used to refer to black or moreno gays behaving *escandalosamente* (effeminately or scandalously).

Participants’ comments suggested that whilst it is possible for bicha pintosas to be white, the assumption is that they are black or moreno and from poor families in the Zona Norte or Zona Oeste. Enzo tried to explain the link between the effeminate bicha pintosa and being black within the queer community of the Zona Sul:

>'Black people are seen as a bit more effeminate, not in terms of effeminate gestures but in this case: when you are not sure if a guy is gay or not, whoever it is that sees him always says something like “Look at that, it has to be a black guy, it can only be something to do with niggers”. So, prejudices exist in that that being black is something to do with being gay. To hear things like this is really bad. It's really horrible’.

Comments by Enzo suggest a collapsing of race and femininity such that poor, black males are much more likely to be seen as effeminate and categorised as bicha pintosas than other queer men. This leaves non-white queer men as more likely to suffer from discrimination both within and outwith the Zona Sul queer community, as will be demonstrated later in the chapter.

The vast majority of participants suggested that characteristics and practices associated with the bicha pintosa were viewed more negatively than those associated with the barbie in the Zona Sul. Of the 61 interviewees that referred to the barbie and the bicha pintosa, 57 used terms that suggested that behaviours associated with the bicha pintosa were viewed disapprovingly in the Zona Sul, commenting that they were *mal-visto* (viewed badly), understood as *inapropriado* (inappropriate) and seen as a *falta de respeito* (lack of respect). Christiano stated that being ‘white, masculine and rich’ makes you ‘perfect’ in the Zona Sul. ‘The closer you are to this idea, the
fewer problems you’re going to have. Everything outside this [ideal] is seen as wrong’. In another interview, Reinaldo stated ‘I think what happens in the Zona Sul is that there is an ideal of the white, rich, male of European origin’. Like many interviewees, comments by Egor and Reinaldo showed aversion and concern towards bicha pintosa practices, and, more specifically, to the damage that they pose to the image of the Zona Sul queer man. Egor commented:

‘There are lots of guys that are effeminate, who are complete idiots and really tarnish, not only their own image, but they also tarnish the image of the homosexual as well, so I feel bad when I see a gay acting like that…walking past in the street, wanting to get everyone’s attention, talking loudly, even shaking their head, using lots of slang, so I think this is ugly, really really ugly’.

The four men who didn’t attach a negative judgement with the bicha pintosa label were more ambiguous, recognising that whilst practices associated with the bicha pintosa were generally understood negatively, there were times when they were viewed favourably too. This was reiterated on various occasions at ABIA and Arco-Íris when participants referred to bicha pintosas as engraçados (funny), animados (animated) and creativos (creative).

Preconceptions related to practices associated with the bicha pintosa were evident in the reluctance of queer men in the Zona Sul to leave this part of the city. Just one interviewee, Mirella35, mentioned that she travelled to other parts of the city to meet gay friends and socialise. Although the data collected was not sufficiently conclusive in answering why queer men from the Zona Sul seemed reluctant to leave this area, many participants’ comments demonstrated worry, concern, and at times disgust related to the

35 Throughout the thesis I refer to participants using the gendered pronouns ‘he’ or ‘she’ based on their own identification as a man or women. If participants identified as neither man, nor women, then he and she will be used in different sections of the thesis, unless participants used specific gendered pronouns to refer to themselves. For example, despite identifying as neither a man, nor a woman Mirella refers to herself using feminine pronouns. This is mirrored in the use of ‘she’ and ‘her’ in the thesis. Like Portuguese, the English language is restrictive and does not recognise the multiplicity of gendered and sexualised identifications individuals might have.
types of racial, class and gendered behaviours that they assumed were present in the Zona Norte/Oeste. Participants’ comments suggested a process of distancing, which marked those from the Zona Norte and Oeste as undesirable others in terms of their gender, race and class. Typical of other participants, Diego stated that he would never go to the Zona Norte neighbourhood of Madureira because ‘é um horror’ (it’s disgusting), referring specifically to it as ‘o ponto das bichas afeminadas’ (is an effeminate faggot place). The gay men present in Zona Norte/Oeste spaces were often described *doido* (crazy), *diferente* (different), *mal instuídos* (badly educated) and *esquisito* (odd). Queer men in the Zona Sul spatially and socially distance themselves from bicha pintosas giving non-normative performances of gender and sexuality as a result of their own prejudices and, seemingly, in an attempt to construct and protect the Zona Sul as the terrain of the white, masculine, wealthy male. Queer men in the suburbia are marked as different to men from the Zona Sul in terms of their raced, classed and gendered behaviours. Thus, the terms bicha pintosa and barbie are not just imagined, but have real, material effects on the dynamics of queer male behaviours across the Zona Sul and beyond. This was particularly evident in participants’ comments related to gendered and sexualised practices related to the body, and in particular, those related to beauty and consumption.

**Body Practices and Belonging to the Zona Sul**

We have seen that many of the concepts and ideas related to the bicha pintosa and barbie are related not only to gender and sexuality, but also to race and class. These terms and the raced, gendered, sexualised, and classist ideas linked to them, can be seen in the way in which the body is ‘done’ in the Zona Sul. Put differently, the way in which participants perform their bodies though styling it, dressing it, making it up and through exercising and consuming, imply raced and classed norms amongst users of the Zona Sul. These norms are used to identify queer men that are tolerated and seeing as belonging in the Zona Sul and those that were understood as out of place or not fitting in.
**The Beautiful Body**

Acosta-Alzura (2000) has shown that in Brazil, just as in Latin America generally, there is an almost complete absence of ugly or physically undesirable characters in telenovelas. In the case of Rio de Janeiro, the importance of the Zona Sul in Brazil’s film, music and telenovela industries is, at least in part, the reason for the association of the region with stereotypically beautiful bodies. Participants often referred to the entertainment industry when considering beauty in the Zona Sul. For example, Artur stated:

> ‘It [the Zona Sul] is really linked to the, kind of…to the physical, to appearance, to the beauty of being beautiful. More in the way that you’ve got to keep to the model of beauty set by telenovela actors and actresses from Globo...if you’re not within this model of beauty of Globo actors and actresses you aren’t beautiful’.

Whilst several participants referred, generally, to those in the Zona Sul as being the most attractive cariocas and as highly valuing their physical appearance, other participants were more specific and referred to notions of beauty within the Zona Sul queer community. Several participants referred to Zona Sul queer men as *gostosos* (hot) or as the *mais lindos/bonitos* (most attractive/beautiful) in the city. André explained physical appearance and the importance of being beautiful within the Zona Sul’s gay-friendly bars and clubs:

> ‘In the Zona Sul there is a type of common culture, because beautiful people like to go to places where there are other beautiful people, so this concentration and this difference still exists. If you go to the Zona Norte, you’re going to find a club with people with less money who aren’t as beautiful and like certain types of music like Funk, Axé etc., and you’ve got the other extreme The Week where they play tribal house, with DJs from Brazil and abroad’.

---

36 Globo is the largest television network in Brazil and has its headquarters in Rio de Janeiro. Globo is arguably the most dominant television producer in Brazil and consistently produces the telenovelas that achieve the highest viewing ratings in the county.
According to André, whilst the ‘beautiful people’ frequent the clubs of the Zona Sul, those going to the clubs in the Zona Norte are understood as less attractive, something which he relates to not having much money. Other participants identified the specific types of bodies that were understood as beautiful amongst the Zona Sul queer community. Often this was related to specific body characteristics, such as hairstyle, strength and skin colour. Men whose bodies were white, muscular and strong, as in the stereotype of the barbie, were most frequently described as beautiful by participants, whilst those that were black, weak and skinny were much more likely to be described as ugly, or not fitting the Zona Sul model of beauty. This was evident in a particularly disparaging description of Zona Norte bichas given by Damon:

‘These ugly bichinhas (effeminate faggots) get jealous because your hair is straighter, or you rob their boyfriends... but the ones that do all this, that curse and swear are the faggots without class’.

Although on the surface it would appear that Fabiano’s quote is simply referring to differences in hairstyle, something which featured prominently in participants’ comments of beauty in the Zona Sul, his comments carry racial connotations. His reference to straight hair is not incidental, but seems to reflect prevalent assumptions that straight hair is more desirable in Brazilian culture because it is read as a sign of one’s European or native-South American, as oppose to African, descent (see Chequer 2006). Like Fabio, several participants contrasted the unattractive bichinha’s tight curls, or pico hairstyle, more common amongst Afro-Brazilians, to the straight hair amongst the Zona Sul queer community. The preoccupation with having cabelo liso (straight hair) rather than cabelo ruim (tightly curled, literally, bad, hair)\(^\text{37}\) was evident in comments made by several participants related to the importance of using chapinha (hair straighteners) and chemical straightening products before frequenting clubs in the Zona Sul. For those without money,

---

\(^{37}\) See Roth-Gordon (2007) for discussion of stigmatisation of physical characteristics associated with blackness.
it is at least necessary to *pentear o cabelo* (to comb one’s hair) to avoid being called being called *relaxado* (too laid back) and being ridiculed for having a *bombril* (literally brillo pad hairstyle).

The theme of physical body strength also featured prominently in accounts related to beauty in the Zona Sul. Indeed, all interviewees who discussed the notion of beauty within the Zona Sul’s queer community made reference to the importance of being strong and muscular. Such characteristics were understood by the majority of interviewees as being aesthetically pleasing and desirable, and were associated with Zona Sul men. When asked if certain men are viewed as more attractive in the Zona Sul queer community, Diego responded:

‘They like strong men, don’t they? Tough men, you know, beautiful men….Gay guys, I think because of this cruising stuff…getting with one another, really have this culture of the body don’t they? This valuing [of the body] is something really big’.

In another interview Ryan referred to an ‘Ipanema beach ideal’ within the Zona Sul queer community. He stated, ‘The ideal of the gay carioca, of Ipanema beach, are guys without hair on their chest or stomach, always very strong and tall, this is the gay aesthetic of the beach and neighbourhood’. Similarly, Samuel commented that men that are ‘a bit muscley, good-looking, well-looked after and well-dressed’ are understood as more attractive in the Zona Sul.

Overall, participants referred to the Zona Sul as a space associated with beautiful male bodies. Being beautiful in the Zona Sul was achieved through obtaining a strong, white, muscular barbie-esque body form, which Gontijo (2009) argues is understood as representing desirable, occidental models of male beauty. Many respondents commented that it was important to *malhar* (work out) and try to *ficar sarado* (become muscular) if one is going to frequent the beach, cafes and bars of the Zona Sul. Although some interviewees were critical of this model of beauty, as will be explored further
below, all respondents who talked about beauty in the Zona Sul referred to being either strong, white or young as desirable body forms. This was reiterated in flyers handed out in the region (see Figure 1). Participants’ comments suggested that body form could be related to the process of belonging in the Zona Sul. Whilst, muscular, strong, bodies were highly valued (‘perfect’ according to Christiano) and tolerated, body forms not confirming to such norms were viewed as undesirable, unlikely to be tolerated, and, according to Christiano, viewed as ‘wrong’ and out of place in the Zona Sul.

Figure 1: A flyer for a nightclub popular with Zona Sul residents and promoted in the region showing a white, muscular, young Brazilian male
Consuming style
Consumption practices were also prevalent in participants’ descriptions of Zona Sul queer men. In particular demonstrating that one is able to suitably fashion the body was seen as important part of showing that one belongs in the Zona Sul. Participants stated that this was achieved through purchasing specific clothing brands and styles that were identified as preferable over others. In particular, clothes from North American or European brands were favoured, and were considered fashionable and chic. Several participants suggested that buying non-Brazilian clothes demonstrated an affinity to an international gay culture, implying not only that one has money, but that one is aware of gay fashions from, as one interviewee stated, the *primeiro mundo* (first world).

Many interviewees who described the Zona Sul gay culture referred to the pressure to buy expensive clothes. Flávio commented that gay men in the region felt pressure to buy garments from famous brands, such as Coute and Coca Cola. He added that the pressure to consume fashionable clothes is so great amongst the Zona Sul gay community that even those without the financial capabilities feel compelled to purchase them, commenting ‘Even poor homosexual Cariocas struggle to pay RS 10,000 [ca. £3,300] for Armani sunglasses, making them hungry and leaving them with just water to drink, and rice and eggs to eat’. Claudio argued that the ability to purchase fashionable clothes can be almost understood as part of your duty as a gay man from the Zona Sul, ‘Your role [as a gay man] is to have money, to go to a club, to buy branded clothes et cetera, for them this is what being a gay citizen is’. Evandro stated that queer men who go to the clubs in the Zona Sul are both well dressed and beautiful, ‘Everybody’s like this….really well dressed…the group there is like this, Everybody’s really concerned with how they appear’. This was reiterated in comments made by Zé, ‘At Le Boy [Zona Sul club] they use brands like Calvin Klein, Dolce & Gabana, the effeminate
faggot form Papa G [Zona Norte club] uses clothes from Citycol [low-cost Brazilian shop].

Whilst the quotes above suggest the existence of norms related to fashion in the Zona Sul, several participants extended this idea, suggesting that the ability to buy expensive clothing was used as a tool to define who belonged to the Zona Sul. Poorer queer men who were unable to keep up with the latest fashions were likely to marked as outsiders, and thus excluded in wealthy Zona Sul neighbourhoods. For example, when I asked how queer men in the clubs of the Zona Norte were viewed, Zé replied by comparing the nightclubs of Papa G in the poor Madureira district of the Zona Norte and Le Boy in Copacabana in the Zona Sul:

‘There are only afectado (effeminate, literally, affected) faggots, crazy and mad faggots and people that are a bit ugly in Papa G….in my opinion the people without class from Papa G don’t come here [to the Zona Sul]…I’m sure you’ve realised that the way that homosexuals from Papa G behave, like the clothes that they wear, the way that they speak is different to those in Le Boy. In front of Le Boy you don’t see bichinhas (effeminate faggots) being camp and girly (literally, with their fans open), but in Papa G you’re going to see a queue of homosexuals wearing sandals, being camp, being horribly effeminate and here [points to photo] in Le Boy there’s a set model, it has this Zona Sul model, but at Papa G the guys are really low class’.

Zé identifies several related traits of the bicha pintosa subúrbana\textsuperscript{38}, which differentiate them from queer men in the Zona Sul. He understands them as having less style, demonstrated in the clothes they wear, and in particular, due to their wearing sandals instead of shoes. Zé juxtaposes their poor fashion taste with their (horribly) effeminate and malouquinha (camp, literally, crazy little girl) nature with the fact that they are baixo nivel (low class) in order to differentiate the bicha pintosa from the Zona Sul queer. Zé’s quote suggests that certain practices, such as wearing fashionable clothing, which he identifies as part of the ‘Zona Sul model’, are more tolerated than others

\textsuperscript{38} From the Zona Norte and Zona Oeste. Linked to the word subúrbio.
and are used to define legitimate users of the region. In addition to wearing branded clothes, interviewees’ comments referred to the importance of avoiding tight, colourful clothes that could result in being categorised as a pintosa by other users of the Zona Sul. Doing so was described as *mal visto* (frowned upon) by several interviewees. Clothes that made queer men look more masculine and, supposedly, heterosexual were preferred by users of the Zona Sul.

Although references to wealth and the importance of consuming in order to be part of the Zona Sul queer culture were often related to bodily appearance and fashion, they were also extended to other practices such as paying for club entry and eating certain foods. Clayton commented that the Zona Sul gay is linked to ‘sophistication’ and that this is expressed through queer male consumption practices:

‘The Zona Sul gay is really linked to this aesthetic thing, this hedonistic idea, things linked to fun, brands, shopping, good places to eat and dance et cetera.’

In another interview, Stéfano stated that queer men in the Zona Sul were ‘very different’ to those elsewhere since they have much more money, allowing them to go out to more clubs than queer men elsewhere. The importance of having money to consume and be part of the Zona Sul club scene was identified as important by the majority of interviewees. This was reiterated in André’s quote above where he spoke of a Zona Sul ‘common culture’ within the queer community which revolves around clubs where people have more money than in other parts of the city.

Overall participants’ comments suggested that norms related to consumption, dress and beauty practices are prevalent within the Zona Sul queer community. Buying expensive and fashionable clothes, being smartly dressed, and styling ones hair appropriately were practices that were most likely to be accepted and tolerated, and enabled queer men to demonstrate that they belong in the Zona Sul. Participants’ discourses and experiences
suggest that specific bodily practices are used to identify Zona Sul queer men related to body form, consumption practices and wearing fashionable clothing. However, these behaviours are more than simply preferable in the Zona Sul, they are used to define desirable users and exclude those whose bodies are not performed ‘properly’. Moreover, the exclusion of those not behaving ‘properly’ occurs along gender, race and class lines and appears to reinforce the notion of the Zona Sul as the terrain of the white, masculine, middle-class barbie. In this respect the Zona Sul queer community can be understood as a field (in the Bourdieuanian sense) in which certain tastes and behaviours related to the middle class are privileged. White, middle class tastes and behaviours become the socialised, ‘common-sense’ norms or tendencies that guide queer male behaviour in the region. Thus, gender, sexuality and class become intertwined. Bourdieu argues that ‘sexual properties are as inseparable from class properties as the yellowness of a lemon from its acidity’ (Bourdieu 1986, p 106, see also Skeggs 2003).

Obviously, following the latest fashion and consumption trends was only possible for wealthier queer men, thus for poorer queer men, those who are unable to pay for club entry, straighten their hair or keep up with the latest fashion trends, the Zona Sul can represent an intolerant space where they face discrimination from within the queer community. This discrimination was evident in practices used to include certain queer men and exclude others in the Zona Sul, as will now be explored.

**Practices of Regulation: Putting People in their Place in the Zona Sul**

Raced and classed norms related to acceptable queer male behaviour had various effects on the gendered and sexualised performances of participants in the Zona Sul. A common feeling for men whose behaviour was marked as out of place in the Zona Sul was shame or embarrassment. Interview and field data highlighted many situations which aimed to induce shame and embarrassment, predominantly in poor, non-white queer men. Often this was achieved through joking within the queer community, name-calling and verbal homophobia. Such
behaviours appear to represent attempts to define the limits of acceptable behaviour in the Zona Sul and maintain an image of the Zona Sul as white, middle class space where bicha pintosa practices are not tolerated.

**Verbal Discrimination**

Name-calling and other forms of verbal discrimination were frequently used practices to define the limits of belonging in the Zona Sul. Virtually all interviewees mentioned that within and outwith the Zona Sul, queer community-specific terms are used in order to cause offence, embarrass and humiliate queer men who are understood as out of place. Often verbal discrimination was linked to the ability to consume. Those who lacked the financial means to participate in consumption practices were marked as undesirable and suffered verbal prejudice from within the queer community. Indeed, the majority of participants who talked about the Zona Sul referred to class-based preconceitos (prejudices) and discriminação (discrimination) directed at poor men in the Zona Sul. This discrimination was frequently described as making the Zona Sul a mais difícil and mais complicado (more difficult and complicated) space for poor queer men. Of 32 references to class in the Zona Sul, 30 referred to prejudice related to poor queer men, whilst just two were more positive and referred to a more equal situation in terms of class in this region of the city. Verbal discrimination towards poor men who do not have the money to frequent Zona Sul clubs was evident in comments made by Claudio:

“They create this idea that they, the barbies, are middle-upper class, and they make a point of upholding the idea that it [the Zona Sul] is really like this. There’s also another aspect – the gay pintosa who is from a lower social class. So, combine the two things, in other words, they’re [the barbies] going to say “Just imagine…as well as being a faggot, he is poor!”, and so this is where the discrimination starts from other gays…”Awww, poor thing, he doesn’t have any money to pay for the club”.

Claudio’s quote also suggests links between consumption and inclusion in the Zona Sul queer community. Poorer queer men who are unable to pay for
entrance to bars and clubs find themselves at the receiving end of verbal discrimination from those within the queer community and find themselves excluded from queer-friendly places that they are unable to access due to their poverty. Poverty thus functions both as a material and a symbolic limit to access to spaces that are tolerant of queer performances.

Preconceptions directed at poor and/or effeminate queer men in the Zona Sul were also highlighted in name-calling. This was emphasised in comments by Zé, implying prejudice within the queer community:

‘Effeminate queers from the Zona Norte are called, poor queers, bicha uô (horrible/disgusting queers). And, also, when people from the Zona Norte come to the Zona Sul they suffer lots of preconceptions from their own gay community’.

Being effeminate, poor and from outside the Zona Sul is understood as undesirable, horrible, disgusting and out of place. Such behaviours could be part of attempts by Zona Sul queer men to determine who belongs in this part of the city. An additional term, which was often noted during fieldwork was bichinha feia (ugly little faggot). The term shows raced and classed prejudices within the Zona Sul community and was used to refer to poor men from outside the Zona Sul. In particular, it was used to refer to queer men whose effeminate mannerisms made them ‘ugly’ or who were not physically attractive. Another common term that was often deployed in a tongue-in-cheek manner amongst gay friendship groups and in Zona Sul gay clubs, as part of drag performances, was bicha pão-com-ovo, literally ‘bread and egg faggot’. This derogatory term is used within the queer community to mock those who are understood as both financially and culturally poor (mirroring the simplicity of the food). The term, undoubtedly, carries racial connotations and was almost always applied to black queer men from the favela or poor periferia areas of the city. It was extremely common during shows in Zona Sul clubs and was usually used to embarrass members of the audience from

39 Areas a considerable distance from the city centre, often lacking the facilities of central areas of the city. The term is generally used to refer to poor areas of the city.
poor neighbourhoods in the Zona Norte and Zona Oeste. In the examples above verbal discrimination and name calling represent practices are used to determine the limits of tolerated behaviours in the Zona Sul and separate those who belong in the Zona Sul from those who do not.

**Humour**

My friends told me that comments, such as those above, were simply funny *piadinhas* (little jokes) that should not be taken seriously and were not meant to offend anyone. However, interview and field data suggests that humour provided a platform for articulating prejudices directed at queer men who were poor, non-white or effeminate, and were seen as not appropriate within the Zona Sul queer community. Jokes targeted at men who embraced bicha pintosa gendered and sexualised performances were pitched to make them feel out of place in the Zona Sul queer community. This was reinforced in comments made by Claudio referring to joking in drag shows:

> ‘Even things that drag queens do without realising, to be honest many people do it without really intending… they joke in a sarcastic way about the poverty of gays from the poor suburbs, like “So, are you going to take the train or the bus’ later bicha?”’.

On several occasions I witnessed the same joke repeated in various gay clubs and bars across the Zona Sul of the city. The crowd always cheered and sniggered at the expense of a bicha from a poor neighbourhood in the Zona Norte or Zona Oeste of the city who was unable to afford the taxi home and would have to take public transport. These incidents were interpreted as light-hearted and unimportant, but they had real consequences on the comportment of queer men in the Zona Sul. This was evident in the reluctance of my friends to discuss how they arrived at bars and clubs (unless they arrived by taxi) for fear of being ridiculed.

Although bicha pintosas were the subject of such jokes, it was not only men who fitted this stereotype, but queer men in general who were the subject of
this regulation. In one incident I decided to order a slice of pizza whilst handing out leaflets at a ponto gay in the Zona Sul and became the subject of a joke amongst fellow volunteers. There was no cutlery and so I used my hands to eat. Immediately, Robert, a young man from the neighbourhood, started laughing and saying ‘Oh my god, we might be poor but you’re eating like one of the faggots from the Favela!’, to which everybody began laughing. The message was that queer men might behave like this in other parts of the city, but this was not acceptable etiquette for the Zona Sul. Class prejudice in supposedly humorous incidents was reiterated by frequent occasions where joking was directed at members of Arco-Íris and ABIA for being from a favela or the subúrbio. This would often be in the form of short sarcastic quips, such as ‘How are you getting home to [name of favela] after the meeting’, or ‘Did you know this bichinha lives in the subúrbio Tony?’ The aim of these jokes, and countless others I witnessed, involving the pretence that another gay was from the favela, was to cause mild shame and humiliation. It appears that such embarrassment is an attempt to regulate behaviour within the Zona Sul queer community and delineate which queer men belong in this part of the city, and are tolerated, and which do not.

I also experienced many, supposedly humorous, incidents occurring in the streets of the Zona Sul that can be seen as attempts to reinforce notions of acceptable gendered and sexualised performances through causing shame or embarrassment. In one incident, I was walking through Copacabana having an animated conversation with my friends Gui and Pedro, when we were overheard by a passing tax-driver. He stopped his car and at the top of his voice shouted at Gui ‘Talk like a proper man, you bichinha! At which point, Pedro burst into laughter. He began pointing at and ridiculing Gui for not being manly enough. Several passers-by were also looking over and laughing at Gui, who was visibly embarrassed. In our conversation afterwards he commented that he was upset that others might think he was dando pinta demais (being too effeminate) in the street. Many similar incidents were written down in my fieldnotes - comments shouted out of
buses, insults called out on the street and jokes told between friends. The aim was always to ridicule those demonstrating characteristics associated with the bicha pintosa, particularly being poor and/or effeminate.

Stigmatising Pajubá

Oi mona! oi mona! Tá boa bonita? Oi mona! oi mona! Tá gongada! (Hey faggot! Hey faggot! How’s it going good looking? Hey faggot! Hey faggot! You’re ugly!) . For several months the words of this song by the drag queen Dimmy Kieer were being sung across Brazil in gay bars and clubs. They are the words to a popular Brazilian gay club anthem. The words ‘mona’ and ‘gongada’ are part of a specific queer vernacular called pajubá, bajubá or bate-bate spoken throughout the country. It is a slang that is widely spoken amongst the queer community (and, in particular, amongst travestis) originating from the African-Saharan languages used in the rituals of the Afro-Brazilian religion Candomblé (Pelúcio 2005, Teixeira 2008). Although certain words, such as mona, are understood by speakers of Brazilian Portuguese in general, many of the words are only used by the Brazilian queer community and specifically amongst poor queers (Jimenez & Adorno, 2009). Participants’ discourses suggest that discrimination related to the use of queer vernacular is one way in which queer men determine gendered and sexualised behaviours that are tolerated in the Zona Sul queer community. Participants stated that words whose origins lie in Afro-Brazilian religions, such as Candomblé are frequently used to identify those who belong to the Zona Sul based on race and class assumptions and exclude those that are understood as bichas pintosas.

Comments made related to pajubá were most frequently used negatively to exclude and discriminate in the Zona Sul. Several participants referred to the

40 Despite differences between cities, there are hundreds of common words that are intelligible for queer men that frequent the gay scene. Broadly speaking, the queer vernacular can be separated into two main camps. Firstly, words that have their roots in African-Saharan languages such as Iorubá Nagô that have made their way to Brazil through Candomblé, known as pajubá, or less formally bajubá/bate bate. Secondly, words that have become gírias gays (gay slang), but whose origins lie elsewhere such as pintosa or barbie. See appendices for a list of the most frequently used pajubá terms used by participants.
use of pajubá as a reason to victimise gay men that were poor, effeminate and spiritual in sites across the south of the city such as the beach, the street and the home. This was particularly evident in derogatory comments made regarding bicha pintosas. In one instance, we were on the beach during the carnival at an LGBT orientated night when my friend Pedro referred to a friend as an elzeira (humorous pajubá term for a thief). A man dancing next to us heard and began laughing with his friends, mocking Pedro and calling him a bichinha poc-poc (poor faggot). Pedro appeared to be embarrassed and immediately stopped speaking. The use of pajubá to discriminate along class lines in this way was pervasive within the Zona Sul queer community was reiterated in comments made by João:

João: Gays have a few prejudices about using it [pajubá]. Those that use them are marked as pão com ovo or poc-poc.

Tony: How is this slang related to class though?

João: More for the really openly feminine and noisy gay men. It's more to do with behaviour than economics. It's more for the bicha bafentas (loud and camp gay men), those that love causing problems by making really visible gestures. There is discrimination based on the slang, but the groups that use the slang are often discriminated by the so called bichas finas (posh gays). Those that try to create a cosmopolita (international), chic environment around them. What happens is that the gays that use pajubá are nearly always, at least, part of one of the three groups that gays normally discriminate against. Firstly, travestis or really effeminate gays, secondly poor gays who, according to the prejudice, are escandalosos (scandalous) and indiscrete and finally gays that are really spiritual. Thus, discrimination within the Zona Sul queer community manifests itself in the stigmatised nature of pajubá and, particularly, the association of the language with poor, effeminate queer men. In addition, since the use of pajubá was more common amongst non-white Brazilians, who make up the majority of those who follow Afro-Brazilian religions where the slang

41 Spiritual is often used as a euphemism for adherents of Candomblé or Umbanda. See chapter 6 for an expansion on religion and sexuality.
42 This appears in-keeping with Fry’s (1982) assertion that travestis and prostitutes using Pajubá are often associated with Candomblé and are viewed as inferior for doing so.
originates, the prejudice related to those using such terms was disproportionately directed at black queer men. At certain times, however, pajubá was also used to allow men to perform their sexuality openly without risking the verbal and physical homophobia highlighted throughout this thesis. Several participants referred to pajubá as a resource that facilitates secret and largely intelligible conversations about topics such as boyfriends, sex and attractive men. In this respect is can also be understood as allowing queer men to transform seemingly intolerant sites of the Zona Sul into permissive and welcoming spaces. In the majority of cases, however, participants referred to disapproval of the use of pajubá within the Zona Sul queer community and the stigmatisation related to using such terms. In general, it appears that the prejudice related to those using pajubá is part of efforts to regulate a practice associated with poor, non-white queer men in the Zona Sul.

**Uncomfortable Stares**

Often feelings of embarrassment and humiliation were caused by looks and stares directed at men who gave practices associated with bicha pintosas. Several participants commented that they disliked *sendo olhado/sendo olhado fixamente* (being looked/stared at) when they were in the streets, bars and clubs of the Zona Sul. Disapproving looks were described as originating from other queer men in the region and were directed at men who were behaving in a way that was seen as mal visto. Many participants from poorer neighbourhoods felt discomfort in the Zona Sul due to being looked at differently as a result of their inability to purchase expensive, fashionable clothes. Alexandre comments that he feels he is looked at in a ‘strange way’ in the Zona Sul:

‘I don’t see myself wearing a tight little t-shirt, I don’t see myself wearing fashionable trousers, with cool clothes and [because of this] they look at me in a strange way in the Zona Sul…I feel uncomfortable’.
Disapproving stares related to not wearing the ‘right’ clothes in the Zona Sul were extremely common. Participants’ comments highlighted that unpleasant looks and stares were also directed at queer men who had a body form which did not conform to norms that many interviewees associated with the Zona Sul. Interview data suggested that queer men who were thin, not strong, moreno or black were often subjected to what they considered to be disapproving stares in the Zona Sul. Evandro stated that he felt out of place due to his physical appearance:

‘Ipanema sometimes seems to be quite liberal, but actually within the gay community, gays often look at you like you’re an idiot. I don’t have the type of strong gay man body, shaved face…I enter somewhere like this [a gay bar in Ipanema] or go into the street and I feel so bad, as much as if I was in a straight place. I’m like “Fuck guys, everybody here’s a faggot too!” (da cú, literally, gives arse).

Stereotypically effeminate behaviours were also identified by participants as risking being looked at disapprovingly, or as several interviewees commented with an olho torto (literally, crooked eye(s)). One participant at ABIA highlighted the racial nature of such looks, commenting that when he was subjected to the olho torto by other queer men in the Zona Sul he felt like saying ‘So what, I’m not rich and white, that doesn’t mean I can’t live in Ipanema! Fala sério!’ (Be serious). Effeminate behaviours, often associated with the stigmatised bicha pintosa, were the most commonly identified practices understood as resulting in looks and states. This generally resulted in the self-regulation of such gestures and mannerisms in the Zona Sul. Rafael described his behaviour in the street in Copacabana:

‘You can’t behave effeminately [by making funny gestures] with your friends, play about with them, because people are going to look in a strange way at you, or they could do worse things…I feel trapped’.

In a few cases, this feeling of being watched was so strong that interviewees like Rafael commented that they ‘felt trapped’ since they had to constantly
avoid effeminate behaviour. Disapproving looks directed at those demonstrating behaviours and physical characteristics associated with the bicha pintosa, left many queer men who were (seen as) either effeminate, poor or not-white feeling out of place and uneasy in the Zona Sul. Looks and stares, and the discomfort they cause, appear to represent one way that bicha pintosa performances are restricted in the Zona Sul. Thus, it seems to construct the area as a tolerant space for those that are middle-class or masculine or white, but less intolerant for men that do not fit these categories.

Disapproving looks and stares, name-calling, stigmatisation related to pajubá and humorous incidents within the Zona Sul queer community often resulted in feelings of shame, embarrassment and being out of place for queer men who displayed physical characteristics and/or behaviours associated with the bicha pintosa. Research data and fieldnotes suggest that shame and embarrassment could be understood as attempts to make queer men that were either poor, black/moreno or effeminate feel out of place in the Zona Sul, and restrict the presence of practices associated with the bicha pintosa practices. Indeed, I did not observe, nor did interviewees disclose, a single instance of prejudice towards strong or masculine men, or relatively wealthy men from Zona Sul neighbourhoods. Whilst some participants conflated categories such as poor, black/moreno and effeminate and saw men who belonged (or, were assumed to belong) to all three categories as at risk of disapproving stares, jokes and verbal discrimination, in general participants’ comments discussed these separately. Thus, belonging to (or, being understood as belonging) to any one of these groups was sufficient to be subjected to the efforts of exclusion discussed thus far in this chapter.

Attempts to exclude in the Zona Sul are not directed solely at men who are black, effeminate and poor but also affect the effeminate white man and the rich moreno man, for example. This section highlights that although the Zona Sul is often considered a liberal and tolerant area of the city for all queer men, it is clear that for certain groups of queer men, this is not the case. The
strict exclusion and self regulation of bicha pintosa practices suggest that behaviours associated with the category are less valued and tolerated than middle-class, white, masculine gendered and sexualised performances in the Zona Sul and more likely to result in discrimination. This extends into and in some ways mirrors the relationship that queer men have with particular segments of heterosexual masculinity in the city.

**Pitbulls and Physical Homophobia**

The example of the *pitbull* in participants’ comments also complicates simple notions that the Zona Sul represents a tolerant space for queer men by emphasising how sexuality, race and class intersect in ways that serve to include certain queer men and exclude others in the Zona Sul. Interviewees frequently referred to the Zona Sul as the domain of the *pitbull*, a term that was used interchangeably with *playboy* and *pitboy*, to refer to white, macho, heterosexual residents who were described as showing intolerance towards various minority groups, including blacks, homosexuals, prostitutes and the poor. Such men were seen as aggressively masculine, taking pride in working-out at the gym and proving that they were stronger than other men through verbal threats and, at times, physical violence. Júlio offers his interpretation of the pitbull:

> ‘The playboy hangs around in a group. This gang have a system, and the system is the following: cars and more cars, nightclubs and more nightclubs, machos and more machos, women and more women, drinking and more drinking. So, they’re never going to let a gay get close to them….they’re sort of strong and muscley’.

The term pitbull also carries class assumptions, and was generally used by queer men to refer to those from wealthy families in the Zona Sul. For example, pitbulls were often described by interviewees with derogatory terms related to being wealthy and white, such as *filinhos de papai* (daddy’s little

---

43 All participants’ descriptions referred to at least one of these categories and the majority referred to all three in describing the pitbull.

44 See Roth-Gordon (2007) for a fascinating insight into race, language and playboy culture in Brazil, including discussion of performances that challenge norms related to the playboy.
boys) and *mauricinho* (snobby (little) boy). This was shown in comments by Nilton:

‘They go to the gym to get strong and use this [their body] as an instrument of fighting, of war…, they are ‘daddy’s little boys’ who are rich and come from a high social class, so they think they they’re better than everyone else…and they don’t just have prejudices against gays, but against prostitutes, blacks and the poor’.

The presence of the pitbull challenges the idea that the Zona Sul is necessarily tolerant space for queer men, since their violent performances of masculinity code this part of the city as dangerous and restrictive for those not demonstrating heteronormative expressions of gender and sexuality. Less stereotypically masculine men were described by participants as at more threat of a pitbull attack than those understood as more ‘manly’, such as barbies who were often able to avoid this risk, seemingly by passing as pitbulls. The threat of a pitbull attack left many participants feeling unsafe when in the Zona Sul at night. Christiano commented:

‘In the Zona Sul it’s more tolerant, but at the same time it isn’t because there are areas that aren’t tolerant…there are times when you don’t know what’s going to happen. Up until recently pitboys were going to Bofetada bar to beat up homosexuals’.

The majority of participants who referred to pitbulls commented that they avoided situations where they would be alone in the Zona Sul as a way of reducing the threat of being attacked. Several interviewees, such as Aldo, stated that this fear extended to Ipanema’s ‘gay-street’, *Rua Farme*45. Aldo comments that he dislikes the LGBT clubs in the Zona Sul, including those on Rua Farme, because of the threat of homophobic attack from the pitbulls:

‘I don’t like to LGBT places, like Le Boy, because they’re really tense places. I just go once in a while. They are places where the pitboys go just to have a fight.

45 *Rua Farme* is a street in Ipanema containing several gay-friendly bars and clubs (Rio Gay Guide, 2010). The street leads to the gay-friendly section of the beach and was identified by participants as one of the city’s most well known gay points.
There’s a club, for example, that gays don’t enter…it’s right on Farme street, called the ‘Club of Death’, when you leave in the early hours they go after you’.

Despite its reputation as a gay-friendly neighbourhood, the threatening and homophobic behaviour of pitbulls codes certain spaces of the Zona Sul as intolerant and repressive for non-heteronormative sexuality and gender performances and for those who are non-white and working class. Several participants referred to media reports which designated the Rua Farme as ‘Farmeganistão’ (‘Farme-stan’) due to the Afghanistan-like war situation that had been created by pitbull attacks in the Zona Sul. The feeling of danger created by such attacks around Rua Farme was reiterated in comments made by Fabio:

‘Even on Rua Farme de Amoedo there’s a bar there on the corner that has always been frequented by playboys who want to beat up gays even though they know that it’s a gay place. So, for me it’s something really crazy…it’s [Rua Farme de Amoedo] a really tense place, and even on top of the tension created by gays wanting to fuck each other, wanting to hook-up with one another, there’s still this tension of a kind of violence’.

The case of the pitbull demonstrates how queer men in the Zona Sul experience interrelated racialised, sexualised and class norms. Heteronormative, stereotypically masculine, middle-class performances by white males are deemed acceptable and often go unnoticed by pitbulls, whilst non-heteronormative gendered and sexed practices and non-middle class practices are understood as dangerous and risk being verbally and physically attacked. Men that were effeminate, black or moreno and poor were identified by participants as the target group for pitbulls and were described as more likely to be chased, threatened or attacked by pitbulls in the Zona Sul. The racial and class dimension of risk of pitbull attack was reiterated by Fernando, a member of the ABIA workshop. Asked whether he thought it was dangerous to show affection in the Zona Sul, he resolutely responded, 'Don't worry they won't beat up a gringo, if they do this they know they'll be in a lot of trouble. They always attack black guys'. Since the term
gringo carries connotations of wealthy, white foreign man, it suggests that I was at a lower risk of pitbull attack than a poor, black man in the Zona Sul. Beating up a comparatively wealthy white man would lead to more ‘trouble’. By trouble, he clarified that he meant the police would treat homophobia much more seriously if it occurs to someone white and wealthy, than someone black and poor. Many participants made similar comments which showed the linkages between race, class, intolerance and specific behaviours that are likely to result in discrimination.

More commonly than race or class, however, participants that referred to pitbull attacks made reference to effeminate men as a target group. Indeed, all comments regarding pitbull violence referred to effeminate behaviour. This was reiterated by Aldo who stated, ‘if you to go the Zona Sul and say that you’re gay, or walk like someone who seems to be gay, they [the pitboys] are going to chase after you and beat you up’. He clarified that seeming to be gay entails *dando pinta*. Similarly, Fábio said that pitbulls just ‘take a dislike towards effeminate faggots and want to give them a thump’. Reinaldo agreed, claiming that due to the presence of pitbulls in Zona Sul clubs, ‘It’s suicide showing your sexuality’. When I asked what he meant by showing your sexuality, he stated that pitbulls attack men who behave effeminately to show their own masculinity. This was confirmed by Alexandre who stated that particular practices, such as walking, gesticulations, the use of certain clothes and a certain *jeito de falar* (way of speaking), were used as markers by pitbulls to identify those that were effeminate and/or poor. Alexandre identified queer men from the Zona Norte and Zona Oeste as principal targets for pitbull attacks. When I asked how pitbulls identified queer men from these regions, Alexandre replied, ‘By the way they dress, by the way they speak, the topic of conversation and also how men ‘respect themselves’, they are very different’. Alexandre proceeded to describe that

46 Several interviewees, like Fernando, emphasised differential police treatment of cases of homophobia in the Zona Sul, which seem to imply racism and class-prejudice within the way the police deal with such cases. The data obtained in this study is not sufficient to make assumptions about racial and class preconceptions apparent in the treatment of those involved in non-homophobic crimes.
by ‘respect themselves’ he meant not behaving in a ‘camp’ or ‘effeminate’ manner or dressing like a *bicha pobre* (poor queer). This was reiterated in a story, which Júlio, recounted regarding an incident where his friend was beaten up:

‘One of my friends was a victim [of a homophobic attack], he was walking, talking on his phone and laughing, because he is really scandalous/openly effeminate, like, 3 playboys walked past and thought my friend was coming on to them, so they came back and beat him up and he didn’t do anything. But, they really beat him up, he had two black eyes, broke a tooth, they ripped his ear and broke his nose’.

The implication in Júlio’s quote is that his friend was beaten up, not only because the playboys thought he was ‘coming on to them’, but also because he was *escandaloso* (scandalous), a term used to refer to men who were loud, effeminate and, by association, poor.

Thus, whilst pitbulls were understood as generally homophobic, their discrimination was especially directed towards people who were also considered by wealthy queer men to ‘not belong’ in the Zona Sul, such as the expressly effeminate, poor and non-white. In addition, participants’ comments suggested that there is a compound impact evident in pitbull discrimination. Whilst those who were black, effeminate and poor were at risk of pitbull attack, queer men that were understood as belonging to two or three of these categories were even more likely to experience discrimination. Consequently, being effeminate and wealthy was described as much less of a problem than being effeminate and poor.

When I asked if there were class differences in homophobia in the Zona Sul Fábio remarked:

‘I think that if you have a lot of money, you can be what you want socially. You can be the most crazy, effeminate faggot in the world, going out wearing a skirt one day and trousers the next’.
The compound nature of pitbull discrimination was also suggested in Guilherme’s response when asked him whether pitbull attacks were related to race or class:

‘For those that have money, they have is easy (estar com a faca e queijo na mão) …white, heterosexuals, from rich families have a lot more freedom than a black homosexual from a poor family’.

The example of the pitbull implies that in terms of monitoring and enforcement, both within and outwith the gay community, it is poorer, effeminate and non-white queer men that are subject to the most severe treatment. These queer men were more likely to have to restrict overtly homosexual behaviours due to the scrutinisation of their gendered and sexualised performances by the pitbull. Thus, participants’ comments suggest that, at least in part, Barbie performances can help some queer men avoid pitbull discrimination. Whilst pitbull performances can be understood as attempts to construct the Zona Sul as tolerant space for those that are either white, masculine, middle-class and those outside such categories as belonging elsewhere, this process is always incomplete and contested. A minority of participants behaved in ways which challenge notions of desirable Zona Sul behaviour, reminding us that this area of the city is open to other, non-normative ways of doing gender and sexuality. Such comments suggested a more complex understanding of the Zona Sul than merely a white, masculine and middle-class space as experiences related to the pitbull seem to imply.

**Resisting Intolerance in the Zona Sul**

Although many participants referred to the Zona Sul, with its palm fringed white beaches and expensive clubs, as the terrain of the white, middle class Barbie *par excellence*, several participants suggested that such an understanding was overly simplistic, making comments that imply resistance to the intolerance explicit in many participants’ quotes. For these men the Zona Sul represented a relatively tolerant part of the city, despite displaying
behaviours that challenged the norms of this part of the city. In addition, several participants’ comments recognised the existence of raced and classed norms in the Zona Sul but were critical of them. For example, five participants made comments that were disapproving of behaviours associated with the barbie. This was implied in comments made by Claudio:

‘The barbies suffer prejudice from the pintosas, the pintosas also don’t like the more macho guys, the macho guys hate the pintosas. It doesn’t make sense, they confuse physical behaviour with sexual orientation and social behaviour. They mix everything together’.

Claudio goes on to state that both barbies and pintosas are critical of one another in ways that rely on a collapsing of gender and sexuality. From the perspective of the pintosas, exaggerated masculinity is understood as demonstrating homosexuality, and from the perspective of the barbies, exaggerated femininity is associated with homosexuality. Claudio’s comments mirrored those made by several participants who demonstrated ambivalence towards the barbie and were critical of assumptions that middle-class, white, masculine performances of gender and sexuality were necessarily performed free from stigma in the Zona Sul. For example, when asked about his opinion of barbies Miguel commented:

‘Most...there are a lot of machista gays. I think that this group ‘I’m man and I like men’ really damages gay culture as a whole’.

Other participants were more strongly critical of the middle-class norms associated with queer men in the Zona Sul and made comments suggesting that this affected their behaviour in the region. Caio commented that he purposefully avoids befriending barbies, who he identifies as constituting the majority of men in Zona Sul clubs and berates them for their snobby attitude:

‘At Le Boy there isn’t a big mix of people, people from Le Boy are more barbies, they are really stuck-up. They think that they are better that everybody else there [in the Zona Sul], they always think that they are better than you. Le Boy is a place
where I go to dance, I don't feel like meeting anyone there because I know that everyone is snobby…there are a lot of gay men in Rio de Janeiro who like to social climb, to be better than other people. Sometimes, just because they have a car, or they are wearing better clothes than you, they think they're better than you'.

Several interviewees made comments which suggested a dislike of the raced, gendered and class performances of the barbie in the Zona Sul. Various participants commented that they thought barbies were overly *nariz em pé* (toffee nosed) and wanted to show that they had money to spend. Caio stated ‘they always think they are better than you, so I don’t feel like meeting anyone’. In reaction, he states that he pays such men little attention and is reluctant to meet them when in clubs in the Zona Sul. Zé was similarly critical of the barbies present in Zona Sul clubs, commenting that ‘These people are really stuck up, just because they have money they think they are better than everybody’. Other respondents disapproved of the physical way in which barbies behaved in the Zona Sul. When I asked André what he thought of Zona Sul clubs, commenting ‘I wouldn’t say very much because there you just find barbies and most of them are drugged up, falling on the floor’.

Participants who were critical of the barbie made comments suggesting that they were not influenced by the regulatory behaviour of others, within and outwith the queer community, in the Zona Sul. In this respect, their behaviours appear to resist powerful discourses of (in)tolerance that put people in and out of the Zona Sul and are used to determine who does/does not belong in the region. Often such participants made comments implying that they were ‘indifferent’ to gendered, sexualised, raced and class norms of behaviour in the Zona Sul. For example when I asked Júlio whether the presence of pitbulls in the Zona Sul affects his behaviour with his boyfriend, he responded: ‘I think I’m completely indifferent. I always say ‘Fuck-it!’ If I have to do something, I will do it’. Other participants, displayed behaviours which more strongly challenged Zona Sul gendered and sexualised norms, such as several respondents
who stated that they wear ‘feminine’ or ‘pintosa’ clothes in the Zona Sul without worrying about unwanted looks, stares, verbal or physical homophobia. Mirella commented that she leaves the house wearing feminine clothes, unlike her travesti friends who are too scared to actually do so:

‘They say they’re going to use lipstick, wigs and go out in the street to break this stigma. I say this to the girls. “We need to go to the hospital when we’re ill and not worry about whether people are going to laugh or not, not worry about whether the doctor is going to call you by your masculine name”. They have to say “I’m not going to worry about this”. I always say to the travestis, “What I think is funniest is that you don’t worry about going out into the street in the middle of the night selling your body, and going with guys you’ve never seen before in your life, but you’re scared of walking in the street, scared of going to the supermarket, scared of going to the hospital, scared of studying. You can tell (I’m like that). Look at the dress that I’m wearing [very short mini-skirt] and look at what time it is. I walked all the way here and nobody said anything’.

When I asked Joel whether he was concerned about pitbull attacks in this part of the city he laughed and maintained that he knew how to defend himself: ‘Even if they said “Little effeminate faggot, go and dar (give) your nigger arse. You can’t stay around here!” I’d respond ‘Cheers big macho guy”. This is like a hit on the head for them, you have to know how to defend yourself with words’. Likewise, Mirella recounted an incident where she retaliated to a homophobic comment in a Zona Sul shop:

‘I was looking at the electrical products and I heard an assistant say “He’s a viado (faggot, literally deer) and this day I was quite emotional. There are days when I’m not in the mood to put up with these little jokes, because travestis take hormones and this messes with your head. So, when I heard the assistant say this I went up to him and said, “What did you say?” The assistant said “No, I didn’t say anything”. I said, “My love, I’m just going to explain something, viado is a little animal, I don’t know if you know? By any chance, are you seeing some little animal here shopping? Tell me. I’d like to know. You have to get your head seen to ‘cos you shouldn’t be here. Get the manager”. And, everybody said they were the manager, and I said “This guy’s crazy, he can’t carry on working here”. I have some
girlfriends who would leave it and wouldn’t say anything. But, I always say you can’t just leave it. You have to say something. You can’t just put your head down. I’m really cool, but when I have to say something, honey, I say it’.

Such behaviours reiterated comments made by Valéria related to the importance of standing up for yourself in instances of homophobia: ‘A guy’s already tried to beat me up, but I was stronger than him. Before he could hit me, I was already hitting him. Before he could hit me I was holding an ashtray. Then I threw it at him’. Several other participants also referred to their physical retaliation in similar instances of homophobia in the Zona Sul. The above experiences suggests that at certain times participants behave in ways that resist normative constructions of the Zona Sul as tolerant space for white, middle class, masculine men.

**Discussion – (Re)thinking Tolerant Spaces**

Perhaps it is not hard to understand why the idea of the Zona Sul as the most tolerant area of the city for queer men is so compelling. It fits nicely into common discourses promoted in music, television and film and it is, after all, the area where the queer community is most visible – rainbow flags fluttering on Ipanema beach, flyers advertising gay clubs on the walls and an abundance of LGBT bars, clubs and saunas are all noticeable in the region. However, I have shown that that the opinions and experiences of a group of queer men challenge such straightforward links between a visible queer community and tolerance of queer gendered and sexualised performances. Interview and fieldnote data suggests that tolerance of gendered and sexualised behaviours is cut across with race and class, and paints a more complicated picture than the unquestionably accepting, gay friendly Zona Sul as portrayed in popular Brazilian culture. Participants’ comments have revealed that the Zona Sul image of the wealthy, white, fashionable, masculine male has another side – intolerance of its opposite, the poor, black, unfashionable and effeminate man. Norms exist in the Zona Sul that mark certain behaviours and physical appearances as more desirable than others. and those
conforming to behavioural ideals are more likely to experience the Zona Sul as a tolerant space and to feel comfortable openly performing their homosexuality in this part of the city.

Specific practices, such as achieving a muscular physique, wearing fashionable clothing and the ability to consume high value goods are linked to norms associated with the barbie and linked to the Zona Sul. Whilst less desirable behaviours that do not conform to these norms are linked to the bicha pintosa. These practices are raced and classed, since those associated with the barbie are linked to wealthy, white men, and those related to the bicha pintosa are associated with poor, black and moreno men. Norms related to desirable gendered and sexualised practices are reinforced through humour, name-calling, discrimination towards those using pajubá and looks and stares and by physical homophobia from (seemingly) heterosexual pitbulls. These behaviours reinforce notions of the Zona Sul as wealthy, white space and often result in poor, non-white queer men experiencing the area as intolerant and restrictive. However, this does not mean that queer male behaviours passively and unthinkingly reinforce such norms. Indeed, several participants showed resistance to Zona Sul norms through behaviours which were, at times purposefully, outside the limits of ‘desirable’ behaviour. Nevertheless, it is clear that for many men the Zona Sul does not represent a tolerant space where gendered and sexualised performances are played out in an unrestricted manner, but, rather, it is a site where behaviours were often self-regulated as a result of related raced, classed, gendered and sexed norms. By focusing on queer male behaviours that are marked as belonging to the Zona Sul we can see that tolerance and prejudice are raced, gendered, sexualised and classed.

The favouring of particular white, upper class masculine norms in the Zona Sul echo recent work on racial and class discrimination in the gay districts of Cape Town, New York and Sydney (Manalansan 2004, Rink
Like Calya (2009) argued for the Sydney gay scene, Rio de Janeiro’s Zona Sul does not represent a utopic space where all gendered and sexualised behaviours are tolerated, but, rather, a space of racial, and I would argue, class fixing. It is a space where behaviours associated with those that are wealthy and/or white are marked as more desirable than those associated with the non-white and poor. Calya reminds us that, ‘racial (and again, I would add, class) regimes and signs function in seemingly tolerant spaces’. Rink’s study of de Waterkant in South Africa (2007) concludes that due to the impact of racial and class hierarchies ‘it is impossible to view gay enclaves as utopian spaces, in which we are free to express our identities as we choose’, but, more accurately, they can be understood as ‘dystopian and exclusionary environments’. Although the Zona Sul does not represent a gay enclave, as such, it could be argued that it is understood as a utopian-like space – tolerant for queer men and free from strict regulation and restrictions on gendered and sexualised performances. Participants’ comments highlight racial and class norms that challenge such an understanding, pointing to a much less tolerant understanding of the Zona Sul than is widely imagined.

This chapter has shown that we must question what we think we know about the nature of seemingly tolerant spaces, not only in Brazil, but around the world, from the Castro in San Francisco to the Ni-chome district of Tokyo. We must avoid taken for granted popular imaginings of such spaces as unquestionably tolerant for the queer community. Rather, we must recognise that tolerance of gendered and sexualised behaviours is cut across with race and class and acknowledge that questions regarding the tolerance of gendered and sexualised behaviours are also questions about race and class. In doing so, we need to avoid simply identifying racial and class norms present in such spaces, but rather,

47 In contrast to studies which attempt to understand tolerance by focusing solely, or primarily gendered and sexualised practices, see Grube 1997, Wolfe 1997, Sibalis, Cavalho 2004 & 2010.
interrogate their privileged status across such sites. Only in doing so can we achieve more liberal manifestations of urban spaces whose tolerant nature we too readily assume. The view that we must not assume tolerance in seemingly tolerant areas due to racial and class norms is further complicated by overlapping spaces, such as the home and the workplace, that constitute the spatial experiences of queer men. The relationship between such spaces, tolerance and respect are considered in the next chapter.
Chapter 4

Respectful Performances

How do men behave respectfully? This ostensibly straightforward question is framed differently within different cultures and societies. In some cultures it is marked through providing food and financial support for the family, or through restricting sexual behaviour to the bedroom, away from grandparents, children, aunts, uncles and other relatives. Sometimes, notions of respect and disrespect affect homosexual men in different ways to heterosexual men. A heterosexual man walking along Ipanema’s promenade in short shorts, showing his chest and flirting with a passing girl is unlikely to be seen as disrespectful, for example, but a travesti wearing a short skirt and high-heels, checking out other men would almost certainly be categorised as disrespectful. Indeed, the latter is unlikely to be tolerated and is likely to result in the kinds of stares, jokes and homophobic comments highlighted in the previous chapter. This chapter seeks to explore the relationship between respect and tolerance across various sites of the city.

In chapter three it was argued that race and class were important factors in determining whether a particular space of the city are experienced as tolerant or intolerant. This chapter suggests that notions of respect and disrespect contribute to or undermine tolerance across various sites of Rio de Janeiro. Respect was one of the most frequently mentioned terms in interviews. Indeed, the term *respeito* (respect) and the idea of being *respeitável* (respectable) were referred to by 71 of 83 interview participants. This is particularly notable given that they were not terms used in semi-structured interview questions. This chapter explores the meaning of respect and being respectful for a group of carioca queer men and the effect that being respectful has on gendered and sexualised practices across the city. The spatial and social dynamics of being respectful are considered, focusing on notions of respect in the context of four specific groups - the elderly, children, parents and workmates - and two particular spaces, specifically the family
home and the workplace. I argue that thinking about respect as a spatial and social process is important for understanding tolerance of certain gendered and sexualised behaviours amongst Rio de Janeiro’s queer community. The interviews suggest that the performances of gender and sexuality and their variance across related urban spaces of Rio de Janeiro, as well as the ways these performances are related to the tolerance process, are connected to perceptions of what constitutes respectful queer behaviour. This chapter demonstrates that respect and tolerance are related since respect and being respectful is primarily about separating behaviours that are accepted and wanted, from those that are not. It is argued that respect is one of the ways in which gendered and sexualised behaviours are organised into those that are tolerated and those that are not across various sites of the city.

**Conceptualising Respect, Gender and Sexuality**

The Oxford English Dictionary defines respect as ‘to treat or regard with deference, esteem, or honour; to feel or show respect for’ (Oxford English Dictionary 2010). Although this definition provides a useful, general description of respect, it does not fully capture the dynamics which are described by the word when used in reference to the context of Latin America, as elaborated in work by Archeti (1996), Prieur (1996) and Barriga (2004). For these authors, respect refers to the specific gendered and sexualised behaviours that are seen as most valued and desired. Despite their multifaceted approaches, three broad themes can be identified from Latin American work on respect, and as I suggest in this section, these works indicate that respect is also intimately linked to the power that people or groups have for asserting standards of respectful behaviour.

---

48 Respect is described as a process based on the Princeton University WordNet (2010) definition of a process as a ‘A sustained phenomenon or one marked by gradual changes marked through a series of states’. This chapter demonstrates that respect is a constant factor in the gendered and sexualised lives of queer men, but also that it is variable across social relations and spaces and open to change. Describing respect as a process highlights the fluidity of the term that this chapter seeks to emphasise.
Firstly, many studies argue that it is possible to draw links between respect and feelings of embarrassment or shame, known as *vergonha* in Portuguese and *vergüenza* in Spanish. From this perspective, being respectful is not a ‘rational’ process simply related to following gendered and sexualised norms and devoid of emotion, but is, rather, tied up with strong feelings and emotions related to shame, pride, humiliation and embarrassment (Archetti, 1996; Prieur 1996, Barriga 2004). Feelings of embarrassment are thus linked to gendered and sexualised behaviours resulting from a loss of honour related to a failure in demonstrating that one is a ‘true male’ through gendered and sexualised practices (Archetti 1996, Prieur 1996, Cruz-Malavé 1996, Prieur 1998, Barriga 2004, Fuller 2004, Reis dos Santos 2010). For instance, Barriga argues that, in Chicano\(^49\) families, male failure to become a ‘proper’ *jefe de familia* (head of the family) often results in an intense shame and sense of failure.

Archetti (1996) and Prieur (1996) claim that feelings of shame and embarrassment are common place in Latin American football, particularly in instances where one team’s fans try to humiliate their opponents’ fans by making reference to their homosexuality. While the masculine heterosexual male is seemingly respected and accepted amongst football fans, the effeminate, homosexual male is seen as disrespectful and is humiliated through homophobic chanting, shouting and derogatory comments. Humiliation and embarrassment that result in an inability to give a respected performance of gender and sexuality demonstrate the power that stereotypically masculine men, such as those that are aggressive, assertive and strong, have in defining what is an acceptable male gendered and sexualised performance. Due to acute feelings of vergüenza linked to loss of honour, men generally restrict their gendered and sexualised behaviours so that they behave respectfully. In this vein, shame and embarrassment act as

\(^{49}\)Chicano/a is a term used to refer to Mexican-American people and culture. Use of the term is contested and it has been used negatively in discrimination towards Mexican-Americans, and positively as part of political movements, such as Brown Power. See Keefe and Padilla (1987) for an excellent introduction.
tools for controlling gendered and sexualised comportment. In addition, implicit in studies by Barriga (2004) and Achetti (1996) is the assumption that respect is a spatial phenomenon. The football field and the family home represent specific places where certain gendered and sexualised performances are respected more than others, although this is not explored in their work.

Secondly, other studies argue that respect is best understood as an aspect of male domination. Research by Manzelli (2006) in Argentina, and Reis dos Santos’ (2010) and Cechetto (2004) in Brazil have shown that certain male behaviours, such as being strong, stereotypically masculine and confident are seen as moral and respectful, and are generally respected, whilst those that are weak, unconfident and stereotypically feminine are generally seen as immoral and disrespected. Barriga’s (2004) study of gender in Chicano literature concludes that, in general, masculine behaviours are more respected than feminine behaviours and that men who exhibit effeminate behaviour are marked as undeserving of respect. Barriga (2004) sees the process of respect as upholding dominant gender and sexuality norms related to men as masculine, a process which works to the detriment of homosexual men and women in particular. Barriga (2004) states that:

‘Respect comes with a set of rules so that social categories and hierarchies will be kept in order. Respect is reserved for la abuela (the grandfather), papa (father) and el patron (the boss), those with power in the community. Women are at the bottom of the ladder, one rung above deviants’.

According to Barriga (2004), respect is a power-imbued process that reinforces wider gendered and sexualised norms. Heterosexual, masculine men are positioned as normal and meriting respect, whilst homosexual and effeminate male behaviours are positioned as abnormal and disrespectful. This is evident in Posso’s (2003) review of Brazilian literature on the topic of homosexuality and seduction, which states that homosexuality, in particular, can be understood as a ‘challenge to order and respectability’. Similarly,
Prieur (1996) proposes that being a respectful man ‘stands for power, strength, independence and authority. This reduces the other to something less than a man, to a homosexual and implies an enhancement of one’s own masculinity, while showing that the other is unable to defend his masculine identity’. Focusing on his field experiences with a group of travestis, Reis dos Santos (2010) argues that the further participants strayed from ‘male’ bodies, hairstyles and clothes the less respected their behaviours were and the more disapproving the reaction to it. Using breast implants, make-up and wearing feminine clothes were understood as particularly unacceptable and disrespectful male performances. In contrast to work by Prieur (1996), Posso (2003) and Barriga (2004), which argues that non stereotypically masculine male performances are seen as disrespectful, but are not enforced through the social context, Carrara et al’s (2003) study of experiences of attendees of the Rio de Janeiro pride parade suggests that disrespectful behaviours, such as male effeminacy, often result in active attempts to define the limits of acceptable behaviours through verbal and physical homophobia.

A third theme within Latin American research suggest that respect is a social process. Such work argues that respect does not exist alone, but occurs within our social relations and networks. Respect is simultaneously dependent on what other people think, and on our own internalised beliefs, regarding gendered and sexualised practices and norms (Manzelli 2006). Feeling ashamed or embarrassed for not behaving respectfully is not simply related to our own sense of correct gendered and sexualised behaviour, but is also influenced by others’ opinions and reactions, particularly those of our family, friends and workmates (Barriga 2004, Fuller 2004, Helborn 2004, and Manzelli 2006). The social nature of respect is reiterated in Fuller's (2004) study of gender identity among urban Peruvian males, in which he argues that respect from others is an important part of being a ‘true man’. Fuller adds that qualities such as courage, self-confidence and strength are understood as signs of manliness and ‘command respect from other men’ (emphasis added, Fuller 2004, p 139). Men who do not fulfil such
requirements will ‘never be respectable and in this sense will never be viewed as ‘true men’ by others in the community’ (emphasis added, Fuller 2004, p 143).

The idea that respect is generated out of our relations with others is also reiterated by Barriga’s (2004) conclusions related to Chicano perspectives on shame. Barriga argues that values associated with shame and respect are relational, ‘shaped by one’s internal sense of dignity and acting responsibly within a community’ (Barriga 2004, p 261), ‘they involve both belonging and/or contributing to a community and maintaining an internalised sense of right and wrong’ (p 277). Latin American studies have emphasised links between respect, shame and social networks involving family, friends and the local community. In doing so, such studies theorise respect as both an individual, internalised process and also as a product of social interaction, created in our relationships with others.

In general, these three approaches in Latin American studies demonstrate that respect is tied up with gendered and sexualised power relations. Although it is difficult to generalise Latin American studies on respect, the majority of studies rely on two suppositions. Firstly, there is an implicit assumption within the studies cited above that there are fixed ways in which one is respectful. In contrast, Melhuus & Stølen (1996) paint a more complicated picture arguing that respect and honour are always incomplete processes since behaviours that are understood as respectful are neither fixed nor static, but are ambiguous and dynamic. In their study of machismo and oppression/subordination in various Latin American contexts, they demonstrate that at certain times and places, non-macho, effeminate homosexual males may also achieve respect. This echoes Althus-Reid’s work that (2003) urges us to acknowledge that at times it is not necessary to hide (homo)sexuality in order to achieve respect. Through taking a spatial approach to theorising respect, the present research seeks to extend such
work through challenging a static understanding of respect by focusing on the ways in which respect varies across various sites of the city.

Secondly, regardless of the specific focus, studies from a Latin American context suggest that respect is generally achieved through active control of gendered and sexualised behaviours through acute vergüenza (Barriga 2004, Fuller 2004, Manzelli 2006) or through verbal (Prieur 1996, Achetti 1996) and physical (Carrara 2004) homophobia. However, as the following chapter illustrates, the research participants in my study largely suggested that respect is a more implicit process reinforced through more subtle forms of control related to worries over disapproving looks and concerns from others and that these generally ensure that participants behave respectfully across urban space. Rather than being a consequence of active attempts to restrict gendered and sexualised behaviours, I argue that respect is actually largely internalised and that it perpetuates participants’ self-regulation of their gendered and sexualised behaviours by providing justifications for behaviours and perspectives that would otherwise be viewed as homophobic.

Throughout this chapter, I illustrate how Foucault’s (1979 & 1990) notion of normalisation and the panopticon represent possible ways of rethinking the role and consequences of respect in the lives of queer men. Normalisation is used by Foucault to refer to social control through imposing specific norms. Norms are the practices we deploy to modify or affect the self with the aim of achieving certain results that are seen as normal and natural. This chapter demonstrates that respect can be understood as a discourse enforced through norms which seek to define the limits of and regulate accepted gendered and sexualised behaviours. In this vein, respect is used within the queer community as a way of reinforcing the normal and excluding the abnormal across various sites of Rio de Janeiro. Finally, despite focusing on notions of wanted and unwanted, acceptable and unacceptable behaviours, Latin American research into respect, gender and sexuality does
not draw links between respect and tolerance. This chapter thus focuses on such connections with particular attention to participants’ spatial gendered and sexualised performances. It will be argued that notions of respect help us to understand the spatiality of tolerance of gendered and sexualised performances.

**Being a Respectful Queer Male in Rio de Janeiro**

Although respect and the idea of being respectful were discussed in multifaceted ways by interviewees, being respectful was generally used by research participants to refer to gendered and sexualised practices that would not offend others. The majority of participants referred to respectful behaviours as those that would not *ofendir* (offend), or *deixar chateado* (make others upset). When I asked Renato what behaving respectfully entails for him as a gay man, he responded saying that it was important to ensure that his behaviours does not *ferir a honra e integridade*\(^{50}\) (offend). In another interview, Davi commented that his university is somewhere that you have to behave respectfully, adding ‘there aren’t prejudices here, but you can’t do things that are viewed badly, that are going to offend heterosexuals’. Thus, the term offence was central to the concept of respect, and behaviours that were seen as likely to cause offence were often understood as disrespectful.

It is possible to identify three overlapping types of behaviour that participants identified as disrespectful. Firstly, the most frequently identified disrespectful quality was male effeminacy. Of the 35 participants who attempted to define the term respect, 22 referred to effeminate behaviours. For the majority of these participants, male effeminacy was understood as disrespectful because it was seen as an overt demonstration of homosexuality. This was most clearly highlighted in comments made related to a photograph (Figure 2), selected by the majority of interviewees, showing a man in drag at the Rio

---

\(^{50}\) Literally damage the honour and integrity [of other people]. Renato was the only respondent to make explicit links between honour and respect. Thus, while I acknowledge links between honour and respect, this chapter will not focus on honour explicitly.
de Janeiro pride parade. Without being questioned, almost all participants described the photo as showing disrespectful behaviour. When interviewees were probed as to why they thought the man in the centre was being disrespectful, the most frequent response was that wearing feminine clothing is *demais* (over-the-top/too much), vulgar and *decnesário* (unnecessary). In addition, many participants referred to the man in the photo as being *sem noção* (without tact/awareness) and as purposefully setting out to offend those around him.

![Figure 2: Man in Drag at 2008 Rio de Janeiro Pride Parade](image)

The majority of interviewees who selected the photo were vexed by it and blamed such disrespectful behaviours as damaging the image of the city’s
queer community. For example, Thiago seemed both angry and disgusted during a conversation about the photo, commenting that the man’s behaviour showed a *falta de respeito* (lack of respect). When I asked him to explain why this was disrespectful, he commented:

‘It’s just that they are showing an image that scares society, a bad image...who’s going to let a child be adopted by someone who’s in the middle of this, without any idea of what they’re doing?’.

Without being prompted, Thiago made links between a man wearing female clothing, ‘without any idea of what’s going on’ and adoption. Not only was the man in drag understood as disrespectful and as denigrating the image of the queer community, but also as inappropriate for a father wanting to adopt a child. Thiago’s quote suggests that disrespectful male behaviour – in this case, effeminate and risqué – is incongruent with notions of the family and parenthood.

The idea that effeminate behaviour is disrespectful was also ubiquitous in interviewees’ comments not related to this photo. For example, Martim stated that in order to be respectful ‘You’ve got to keep a more masculine posture, more correct, much more restrained and solid’. Caio juxtaposes his own respectful behaviour and the disrespect shown by effeminate queer men:

‘I try to be respectful when I go to places. I think that your personality makes a difference. But, there are lots of people who, when they arrive in a public place they start to *fazer escândalos* (be loud and effeminate) and shout “Hey, what’s going on fag?” [puts on a high-pitched voice]. I’m completely fed up with things like this. I’m not like that. If somebody wants to know about me, fair enough. I feel like I have to live my life being more polite with people, like, “Good evening, how are you?” And, when I say to someone that I’m gay, maybe they’re going to think “Wow, he’s gay but really doesn’t seem it, this guy knows how to respect people, he’s polite”. So, I think it’s really important to be polite. I don’t think that you have to show who you are to everyone. I try to maintain a level of respect,
so that other people will respect me. So that people won’t joke about with me, like “Oh, look at that little faggot going to the club”.

Like many participants, Caio is critical of other queer men who behave effeminately. He equates male effeminacy (*fazendo escândalos*) with being rude and disrespectful. Caio’s comments also place importance on what other people think in terms of whether behaviour is respectable. He states that he tries to ‘maintain a level of respect’ so that other people will respect him. Effeminacy is seen as unacceptable in social relations because it acts as an overt signifier of one’s homosexuality, mirroring the way in which participants talked of the bicha pintosa in the previous chapter.

A second characteristic of respectful behaviour was related to restricting same-sex intimacy and same-sex sexual behaviour, practices that were described as disrespectful behaviour by 15 of the 35 participants who defined the term respect. Same sex intimacy was most often seen as disrespectful in spaces that were not coded as gay, where participants described showing affection between two men as imposing (homo)sexuality on others. A third practice understood as disrespectful was discussing homosexual sexual behaviour, or homosexuality. 15 participants referred to such behaviours as disrespectful and it was described as inappropriate across a variety of sites, such as the street, shopping centres and parks, and most commonly in the family home and workplace. When asked how he behaved respectfully, Marcelo responded ‘I don’t feel comfortable to suddenly talk about that [sexual behaviour], it’s not a good idea’. During a conversation with Bruno, about sexual relationships, he stated that whilst he is ‘out’ to his mum, he does not approach the ‘disrespectful’ subject of sex to avoid shocking his family, going on to say:

‘At home you can’t say whatever you want about that [sexual relationships] because relatives get shocked. Even though my mum knows, because I told her last year, my other relatives don’t’.
Broadly speaking, participants’ comments demonstrated three related understandings of the ways that respect becomes socially embedded and thus performed in different networks and spaces. Firstly, some men made comments suggesting that behaviours such as same-sex intimacy, male effeminacy and discussions of homosexuality are seen as disrespectful by those within the queer community. For example, like many participants Enzo was critical of queer men who he describes as ‘wanting to show themselves too much, wanting to levantar a bandeira (to show one’s sexuality, literally to raise the flag), a group that he feels represents the majority of Rio’s gays. Queer men that unrestrictedly displayed same-sex intimacy were categorised as overly direct, insensitive and inconsiderate by participants and were positioned as purposefully aiming to offend those around them. Lucas commented that it is important to ‘be respectful’ and know when and where to ‘act gay’. When I asked him what he meant by this he replied, ‘You’ve got to ter um jogo de cintura (be tactful), do you know what I mean? Because, for example, I can’t kiss my boyfriend close to my house, it’s wrong’. Queer men themselves stress the importance of self-regulating disrespectful gendered and sexualised performances compared with for their heterosexual relatives.

Secondly, other participants’ comments suggested that certain gendered and sexualised behaviours were avoided because they were positioned as disrespectful by those outside the queer community. Being respectful was described as a consequence of what other people think and related to the risk of offending others, rather than participants’ own understandings of what constitutes being respectful. This was illustrated in comments made by Miguel:

‘Unfortunately, the majority of heterosexuals think that demonstrations of affection between gays and lesbians are disrespectful. It’s strange, but they have this idea that it’s a lack of respect and that they deserve to be respected. They have this vision that gays and lesbians can only have relationships locked
up, closed away, without anybody seeing. You’re allowed if it’s like that, but not out in the street, no!”.

Behaving respectfully was often understood as conforming to wider, heterosexual norms, as was suggested by Enzo:

‘When I talk about disrespect, it’s not respecting, but in terms of conforming to society’s looks. Because society sees this as an abuse [same-sex intimacy], seeing people of the same sex kissing in front of their house, or in the street’.

Whilst both heterosexual and homosexual couples were likely to conduct sexual relations outside the family home, the comment above suggests that homosexuals did not feel that they had the same freedom to bring sexual partners home. Indeed, doing so was seen as disrespectful, inappropriate and inconsiderate by other family members. When asked whether he would bring a boyfriend or sexual partner to his house Marcelo replied ‘No, my Dad earns the money and I have to be respectful’. He restricts his behaviour based on the assumption that it would be understood as disrespectful by his Dad. Thus, queer men are disproportionately subject to a sexualised version of normalcy related to intimacy and sexual behaviour since heterosexual intimacy does not have to be restricted to the same extent.

Thirdly, other participants made comments suggesting that concerns about respect shaped their own gendered and sexualised behaviours. When I asked Vitor why he and his boyfriend did not show affection in public, he replied ‘It’s like I told you, just as I like people to respect me, I also respect their space’. Questioned as to what he meant be respecting their space, he responded by saying that he is not embarrassed showing affection with another man, personally, but he thinks it is not respectful and might embarrass other people; thus he avoids such behaviour. In a conversation with Daniel he referred to a recent incident related to two lesbians kissing in the Big Brother house which suggested that notions of same-sex affection as disrespectful behaviour is constructed by those within and outwith the queer
community. Daniel suggested that, like the queer community, the general public were shocked when two lesbians kissed in the house and showed their anger by complaining about the disrespect and ‘not correct’ way in which the woman had behaved. Daniel claimed he thought the reaction was justified and stated that he thought their behaviour was uma putaria (fucking dirty).

In general, gendered and sexualised behaviours understood as respectful were similar to those identified by Heilborn’s (2006) study on male identities in Buenos Aires, which identified effeminate overtly homosexual, formas de vestir, de caminar y de gesticular (ways of dressing, walking and gesturing), and forma de hablar’ (ways of speaking), as disrespectful across various sites of the city. They were understood as inappropriately forcing one’s homosexuality upon others and as likely to cause offence. In contrast, gendered and sexualised practices that were more discreet and that did not openly levantar a bandeira (demonstrate their homosexuality) were understood as more respectful by participants. Although participants’ comments illustrate that it is possible to loosely define respectful gendered and sexualised behaviours, the characteristics identified as respectful, not being effeminate, avoiding same-sex intimacy and discussing/engaging in homosexual sexual relations are the most general and also the most basic understandings of respect. Participants’ comments suggest that being respectful is more complicated and must also be understood as a response to related social and spatial contexts. In this vein, and in extending Heilborn’s (2006) argument, I contend that the importance of behaving respectfully for queer male participants is not uniform, but is dependent on two related factors: who else is present and the specific location within the city that one is in. These factors will now be discussed.

Who Should Be Exposed to Disrespectful Behaviours?
Although being respectful is essentially based on the characteristics outlined, it is also sensitive to those people who should, or should not, be exposed to
specific gendered and sexualised practices. Being respectful is more important in social interaction with certain groups than others. The majority of participants’ comments suggested that, in particular, the elderly, children, parents and workmates should not be subjected to disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours. Indeed, when participants identified specific individuals with whom they should behave respectfully, 53 of 61 instances made reference to at least one of these three groups. Nevertheless, a minority of participants stated or showed behaviour, which suggested that being in the company of children, the elderly, parents and workmates does not automatically result in respectful gendered and sexualised performances, suggesting that norms related to respectful behaviours are neither fixed nor insurmountable. Rather, they are dependent on and vary depending on the social context and spatial context.

Respectful Performances and Children
Children were identified more often than any other category as a group with whom participants felt they ought to behave respectfully. Of the 53 participants who referred to a specific group that should not be exposed to disrespectful behaviour, 19 referred to children. Participants’ comments generally discussed respect in relation to children in two ways. Firstly, several participants suggest that children ought to be protected from disrespectful gendered and sexualised practices and that this reflects wider, societal discourses related to respectful and disrespectful behaviours. For example, Miguel states that understandings of same-sex affection as wrong and disrespectful in front of children are commonplace outwith the queer community. He explains that ‘they [heterosexuals] have this idea that it’s a lack of respect and they deserve to be respected. They have this vision that gays and lesbians can only have relationships locked away, out of sight from

---

51 Eight participants referred to the need to be respectful when in the company of other groups such as neighbours, church members and other gay men. Due to the infrequency of comments related to these groups, compared with the elderly, children, parents and workmates, they will not be discussed in this chapter.

52 In the interview he was talking about heterosexuals, although it is possible that he meant homophobes here.
anybody. So, this is ok, but not openly in the street! They use absurd arguments, like “this is going to affect children”.

Comments by Miguel suggest that wider societal assumptions that, in contrast to heterosexual intimacy, homosexual affection should not be displayed in front of children. Rather, it should be restricted to private spaces that are out of sight of, seemingly impressionable, children. One possible explanation for the positioning of children as in need of protection, mentioned by several participants, was that through observing disrespectful homosexual performances, the sexual orientation of seemingly asexual children could be influenced, and they could be made gay. Consequently, openly homosexual behaviour ought to be restricted when in their presence. This was reflected in an interview with Miguel:

‘They [the general public] make the argument that a child is obviously going to become homosexual [when viewing same-sex intimacy at home] which is absurd because homosexuals themselves come from heterosexual families!’.

In contrast with most participants, Miguel views the concern that same-sex intimacy turns children gay as emerging solely from heterosexual norms.

The framing of overtly homosexual behaviours as disrespectful amongst the wider public was highlighted when I was sitting in a café with other volunteers, waiting for Rio de Janeiro’s largest pride parade to start. We were wearing shirts with rainbow motifs and text showing that we were pride volunteers. This aroused the attention of an elderly lady who was sitting behind us. She seemed very annoyed that the pride parade was happening on Children’s Day and loudly exclaimed (seemingly to make sure that we heard), ‘I don’t have anything against the gay parade, but why don’t they just do it on another day? It’s disrespectful. It’s just not right on Children’s Day!’

---

53 Since the 1920s 20th October has been celebrated as Children’s Day in Brazil. Small commemorations are held at home and the local government runs a series of free activities. Children often receive presents from friends and relatives.
The woman went on to make comments implying that the organisers had purposefully chosen to hold the event on Children’s Day. Her comments suggest that she understands children as a group that should be respected and that behaviours encountered at the gay pride parade are not ‘right’ or respectful for children. In his discussion of cruising, Joel also implied societal understandings of children as in need of protection from disrespectful, homosexual behaviours:

Tony: But, why would you say that cruising happens in dark side streets?  
Joel: Because of peoples’ preconceptions. They’re going to be really shocked if they see these things. Principally because of their children, and for themselves. They don’t want them to see these types of things. For them we aren’t normal, we are like animals. We have to respect their children.

Like the old woman’s comment, Joel’s quote suggests that the assumption that overt homosexuality is disrespectful in front of children is prevalent in wider society and is evident in ‘peoples’ preconceptions’, related to cruising.

The majority of participants, however, made comments that implied that queer men and women also subscribe to the idea that children need protecting from same-sex affection and should restrict their behaviour accordingly. For example, Marcos commented that he avoids affection with other men in public, such as on the metrô (underground), due to the possibility that children could be present. When I asked him what he meant by being respectful he replied ‘I would describe it saying this – I don’t force my sexuality on others’. Damon stated that, like almost all gay men, he doesn’t hold hands with his boyfriend ‘because of this idea of respect for children and old people’. Several participants commented that whilst children can be ‘exposed’ to heterosexual intimacy across various sites of the city, they thought same-sex affection was inapropriado (inappropriate). Children were seen as too innocent, naïve and impressionable to be exposed to disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours. This has been noted by Luza (2009) who recognises that dominant discourses of the ‘purity of
children’ emphasise the need to guard them from homosexuality, which is positioned as immoral and abnormal. Consequently, failure to self-regulate disrespectful behaviours in front of children was understood as behaving insensitively by many participants, as seen in further comments made by Flávio:

‘I think that children are still very innocent, they don’t need to know about these things [homosexuality], like I didn’t know about this when I was little. I think it’s good, to maintain this innocence and to remember that’.

Other participants simply commented that homosexuality was something that is separate from and should not involve children. Flávio stated, ‘I don’t think that any child at all ought to know what this [homosexuality] is, because childhood isn’t the time to know about this type of thing’. Participants’ comments did not specify that it was not sexuality per se that should be hidden from children, but homosexuality in particular. In general behaviours viewed as disrespectful, such as anything viewed as overt homosexuality, affection and male-effeminacy, mirrored comments referring to wider society.

Whilst dominant discourses undoubtedly position overtly homosexual performances as disrespectful, dangerous and capable of influencing, seemingly innocent, children, this was not always the case. At times overtly homosexual behaviours were expressed openly in the company of children. The presence of many children at the pride parade is perhaps the best example of this. When asked what he thought of the pride parade, Miguel commented ‘It’s great, you see many straight couples and families at the parade’. This was in-keeping with comments made by several interviewees, such as Samuel:

‘My cousin took her son who’s eight years old to the pride parade...so that he starts to have an awareness that there exist various ‘sexual options’, that not everybody is the same’.
Rafael stated that most of those watching the pride parade accept and enjoy the event, including many parents who take their children to ‘educate them about sexuality’. At the pride parade, there were a significant number of middle-aged women, seemingly mothers or aunts, with teenage boys, presumably sons or nephews\textsuperscript{54}. The fact that some of the teenage boys were probably being supported by their elder relatives implies that some parents do not share the preoccupations expressed by the majority of participants that children were too innocent to witness non-normative, disrespectful performances of gender and sexuality. Whilst the pride parade was described as a child-friendly event by Júlio who stated that ‘parents go out with their children to the pride parade, to take photos’, he also commented that he felt distressed that some queer men show a falta de respeito (lack of respect) through flirting, kissing and touching. He argues that such behaviour ought to be restricted due to the diverse audience which consists of many minors.

**Respectful Performances and the Elderly**

‘It’s obvious you have to behave respectfully, you’re in a residential home with other old people!’ João shouted out amongst the laughing coming from the ten or so men at the ABIA meeting. He was responding to a story told by Antônio whilst we had been discussing discrimination faced by carioca travestis. Antônio had recounted a recent case in which an eighty year old travesti was thrown out from both male and female elderly care homes in Rio de Janeiro for expressing his sexuality ‘openly’ by wearing female clothing, make-up and jewellery. Due to the discrimination experienced he had to ‘go back into the closet’ and apply to a different care home. Whilst agreeing that this story was shocking, participants acknowledged that most travestis would not even attempt to overtly express their sexuality in this situation due to the lack of respect is shows, and unease it causes for old people. Several

\textsuperscript{54} When questioned, co-volunteers said they thought that the situation most likely represented liberal parents who were showing support for their non-heterosexual sons. Although the opposite could be true (and the children could be nephews/sons showing support for their mothers/aunts or showing support for each other).
members agreed, seemingly positioning the elderly as a group who would unquestionably find such behaviour disrespectful and inappropriate and show their disapproval.

The elderly were frequently identified as an additional group that should not be exposed to disrespectful gendered and sexualised performances. Twelve out of the 53 participants who discussed respect, referred to the importance of being respectful towards the elderly. There were similarities and differences in the way respect was discussed regarding children and the elderly. One commonality was the directionality of the respect process. Queer men were positioned as responsible for showing respect to the elderly through restricting certain gendered and sexualised behaviours. Like comments made regarding children, being respectful also entailed restricting effeminate behaviours, avoiding same-sex intimacy or sexual behaviour and restricting conversation related to same-sex sexual activity. Many participants spoke of their efforts to regulate their gendered and sexualised behaviour, in an effort to behave respectfully in front of the elderly. Davi commented that he restricts affectionate behaviour with other men in public in order to remain respectful and to avoid disapproval from the elderly, adding:

“So, this is my politics of respect [avoiding same-sex affection] to avoid being condemned. They would criticise me, give me bad looks, and think it’s bad. For example, a few days ago I was going down into an underground station in Copacabana and there was a homosexual couple kissing, and I saw two old women commenting, saying ‘What a horrible thing, ‘How ugly’.

By specifically referring to the two old women, Davi’s example suggests that the elderly are, perhaps, more likely to disapprove of disrespectful behaviours. Whilst comments made regarding children suggested that their innocence was the principal reason for restricting disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours, with the elderly the need to avoid disrespectful behaviour was related to the assumption that they might feel uncomfortable
or react with disgust or distaste. Although Davi avoids disapproval by behaving respectfully, and he claims that other queer men giving non-normative performances of gender and sexuality are not so fortunate and experience offensive comments and disdainful looks. In another interview, Alexandre stated that he felt the need to restrict same-sex affection in front of his Aunt and Gran to avoid making them uncomfortable. Again, their age is seen as the reason that they need to be shielded from disrespectful behaviours:

‘They wouldn’t accept me trying to be affectionate, like kissing, hugging…you have to always be respectful, respectful. Wherever you go, you have to be respectful. For example, my Gran is an old lady, she accepts it, but she wouldn’t be very comfortable seeing me being affectionate with another man so I prefer to be affectionate in whatever way in my bedroom, it’s more relaxed like that and my aunt and Gran don’t get annoyed with this’.

The assumption that disrespectful behaviours leave the elderly feeling uncomfortable and result in disdainful responses was highlighted in Eduardo’s comments in a city centre café. I began joking about his tireless efforts to find me a partner in Rio. Eduardo was horrified and told me to ‘keep my voice down’. At first I did not realise what had happened and asked him why he insisted that we whisper. He immediately gestured to a man in his fifties who was sitting behind us and became very embarrassed. He quietly, but firmly said to me, ‘You have to respect older people. Not everyone agrees that this [being homosexual] is a good way to live your life. He poderia ficar com nojo! (might be disgusted!)’. Eduardo added that whilst same-sex intimacy is accepted on the ‘gay street’ Rua Farme, elsewhere queer men have to ‘respect unspoken roles’ that restrict such behaviour so as not to offend the elderly:

‘You’re not going to do this sort of stuff [showing same-sex intimacy] in front of an 80 year old woman who doesn’t know anything about this behaviour, but if you’re in a place where it’s accepted, on Rua Farme or in a club I don’t think there’s any problem at all. It shouldn’t be this way, but since the world isn’t the way we would
want it to be, we have to respect the rules, not written rules, but social rules of living together’.

Eduardo’s comments imply that not only are the elderly a group who require respect from queer men and women, but also suggest that the ‘social rules’ related to being respectful vary across the city. Thus, in keeping with Alexandre’s comments, Eduardo’s quote suggests that space is an essential factor in understanding social norms related to respect. Participants’ comments suggest that respect is not equal and smooth across the city, but is striated by space resulting in peaks and troughs of sites where respectful norms are stronger and weaker, and that the presence of elderly is an important factor in these differences. In addition, Eduardo’s discomfort and his feeling that we ought to monitor our conversation also suggest that the notion of respect for the elderly influences the way both heterosexuals and queer men perform their gender and sexuality across the city centre.

The complexity of being respectful when in the presence of the elderly was also highlighted by incidents where expectations related to respectful behaviour were resisted. Mirella, if measured by participants’ comments at the start of the chapter, could be understood as expressing her gender and sexuality extremely disrespectfully. Born as a male, Mirella lives her life, according to herself, as ‘neither a woman, nor a man’, plainly stating that ‘nobody’s going to think I’m a woman’. I conducted an interview with Mirella on a weekday afternoon in the garden of Rio de Janeiro’s presidential museum. The park was teeming with elderly couples out for a stroll or enjoying the shade from the searing afternoon sun under the park’s leafy palms. Mirella arrived, 6 foot 2 inches, wearing a short skirt, and make up, her lips shining with bright red lipstick and arms adorned with gold bangles; she did not go unnoticed. But, as she pointed out as we were sitting down, ‘I prefer to go out in the street to break stigmas, to break down barriers’. Despite the presence of elderly in the park, Mirella does not restrict disrespectful gendered and sexualised practices.
Whilst Mirella is aware of notions of disrespect and, the shock and disgust that inappropriate behaviour can often evoke, she purposefully sets out to challenge such norms. In fact, she uses the very notion of non-masculine male behaviours as being disrespectful to create her own identity and contest gendered and sexualised norms. For Mirella, it can be argued that abjection, evident in the fact that she did not ‘go unnoticed’, is a constructive process which allows for non-normative gendered and sexualised performances to be played out, even when in the company of the elderly. Mirella goes on to say that her appearance does not lead to problems, as she is well-known and liked by the elderly of the neighbourhood she lives in:

‘Wherever I go to I’m really well respected, I go to the supermarket and talk to a few old women. I talk about rice, beans, about food; there are some old women that stop me in the supermarket and say to me “ah my daughter, take these beans here, they’re really good and easy to cook”.

Mirella’s case suggests that whilst the majority of queer men strictly regulate the way they perform their gender and sexuality to ensure that they are ‘being respectful’ in front of the elderly, a minority do not, and are not apologetic for not doing so. Mirella’s behaviour challenges dominant notions of appropriate and respectful performances, yet she still feels accepted amongst elderly cariocas. Her behaviour implies that assumptions that the elderly will necessarily disapprove of disrespectful gendered and sexualised practices are simplistic, despite representing undeniable powerful modifiers of behaviour. Thinking in terms of the directionality of respect, Mirella’s comments contest assumptions that respect is necessarily shown by queers towards the elderly and that disapproval is necessarily shown by the elderly towards queers behaving disrespectfully. In fact, it can be argued that this directionality is reversed – with Mirella behaving disrespectfully, at least in the way in which most participants understood the term, yet she achieves respect from a group of local elderly women. Mirella’s case suggests that even if norms related to being respectful are generally associated with specific groups, this does not mean that they are fixed. Rather, they can be
challenged and contested in queer male gendered and sexualised practices. Nevertheless, for many participants the elderly are identified as a group that warrant respect. Whilst authors such as Barriga (2004) have related respect for the elderly to notions of patriarchy and masculine domination, arguing that it is elderly males in particular, and principally la abuela (the grandfather), that are positioned as warranting respect, participants’ comments suggest a broader understanding implying that elderly women are also seen as deserving respectful gendered and sexualised performances. Thus, in contrast to implications of work such as Barriga’s (2004) age appears more important than gender in understanding which groups are understood as deserving respectful performances.

In reflection, comments made related to children and the elderly suggest that age is an important factor in notions of respect. Whilst age is often ignored (Melhuus & Stølen 1996, Achetti 1996, Posso 2003, Santos 2010) or just paid lip service (Barriga 2004, Fuller 2004) in much of the literature on gender, sexuality and respect, it appears to have a significant effect on the way in which queer men perform their gender and sexuality across the urban landscape of Rio de Janeiro. With children, their young age is interpreted as innocence, and with the elderly, their old age increases the likelihood that they will be uneasy with, and show disapproval of, disrespectful gendered and sexualised practices. In both cases, queer men generally internalise these concerns and self-regulate their behaviour accordingly to behave respectfully. Active attempts to restrict disrespectful behaviours by the elderly and children are generally absent in participants’ comments. Finally, whilst most participants positioned the elderly and children as groups that need to be protected from overtly homosexual, disrespectful performances of gender and sexuality, they failed to recognise that the elderly or children might identify as homosexual or that those belonging to these groups could also behave disrespectfully. This was particularly surprising since many interviewees demonstrated awareness of their homosexuality from being a child/teenager, and because many participants could be thought of as elderly
themselves. Consequently, whilst respect is often tied to the gendered and sexualised practices of children and the elderly, disrespectful behaviours are linked to homosexuals and those who are neither elderly nor children.

**Respectful Performances and Parents**

Whilst the age of children and old people appears to be a significant factor in their positioning as respected groups, parents, seem to warrant respectful behaviours for other reasons. Their position as home owners and having comparatively high incomes were identified as possible factors which meant that they were positioned as deserving respectful gendered and sexualised behaviours, as will be discussed. Twelve of the 53 participants who mentioned respect, referred specifically to restricting disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours in front of their parents. The term parents\(^{55}\) is used here as a translation of the Portuguese term *pais*, which can be thought of as a broad term incorporating all guardians. In addition to biological parents, this often referred to other family members such as grandparents, uncles and aunts who were responsible for the upbringing of participants.

Eight of the twelve participants who referred to the importance of behaving respectfully in front of their parents claimed that they *moderar/policiar* (moderate/police) their sexuality when in their company. When asked whether his behaviour was different in front of his parents, Ryan made implied that he behaves in a much more restrained manner in their presence:

'I try to police myself in terms of playing around. Also, I respect their [his parents] sexuality, like they certainly respect mine. At home, I try to moderate myself a bit, not to be totally who I am. I’m freer in the street with my friends. At home I’m trapped'.

---

\(^{55}\) Mostly the term parents was used rather than *mãe* (mum) or *pai* (dad). This is the result of two factors. Firstly, in interviews questions were asked using the word *pais*, thus participants were probably more likely to use the term in their responses. Secondly, because the majority of participants were young the majority still had two parents that were living. Thirdly, most participants lived with both of their parents.
Participants most frequently related disrespectful behaviour to avoiding expressions of same-sex affection in front of their parents. For example, when Damon was asked whether his parents accepted his sexuality he replied:

‘Today they don’t comment on the subject. They respect me, you know? I respect their space and they respect my space and we don’t fall out about this...I never kiss anybody in front of my parents. I don’t like to cross over the line’.

Damon adds that other forms of same-sex affection are beyond the limits of respectable behaviour with his parents including hugging and holding hands. Interestingly, although Damon understands respect as mutual – he should be respectful towards his parents and they should be respectful towards him – being respectful carries different meanings for him than for his parents. Whilst they show their respect through not commenting on the subject of his homosexuality, for him it entails restricting same-sex affection. Damon’s comments suggest that the discourse of respect is more restrictive for queer men than their heterosexual counterparts. Whilst he must strictly regulate his gendered and sexualised behaviours in order to be perceived as respectful, the same is not true for his parents or siblings. He comments that his siblings can ‘kiss each other without any problems when they’re with my parents’ he comments. This disparity in behaving respectfully was referenced by several participants and suggests an asymmetry which means queer men must ‘work harder’ to avoid being categorised as disrespectful by their parents than their heterosexual siblings.

Whilst some participants referred to restricting explicitly homosexual behaviours, such as same-sex affection, bringing people home and male effeminacy, others stated that even more implicit homosexual behaviours, such as discussing one’s sexuality, should be avoided to show respect to one’s parents. Leonardo commented:
'I respect them. I try to avoid it [showing his sexuality]. I really try to avoid it, because it's embarrassing for them and for me as well. It’s not a cool subject to talk about because they feel hurt by this'.

In Leonardo’s case it appears that through behaving respectfully and not raising the subject of his sexuality he can avoid both embarrassing and hurting his parents. He adds that he is aware his sexuality is ‘not what they want for my life’ and knowing this feels the need to restrict overtly homosexual gendered and sexualised behaviours when in their presence. As in the case of comments made regarding the elderly and children it is clear that respect is a gendered and sexualised process and being respectful is (at least partly) about restricting overtly homosexual behaviours.

Like the majority of participants, Damon and Leonardo’s quotes do not provide any obvious explanation for the need to behave respectfully when with their parents. However, several participants referred to their parents’ position as the principal breadwinners at home and their position as homeowners in discussions on respect. Since the majority of participants lived in the family home, it can be assumed that they were, at least partially, financially dependent on the income of their parents. This was identified by several participants as the reason that parents deserved respectable behaviours. When I asked Cesar whether he felt able to bring other gay men, such as friends or boyfriends, back to the house he shares with his dad he commented. ‘It’s my dad who brings in the money and I have to respect him. I don’t have any desire to change this space [the home], to create problems all of a sudden’. In Cesar’s case, the fact that his dad earns money and the house belongs to him means that his behaviour must be respectful by avoiding bringing homosexual men home. Cauê was one of several respondents who made reference to home ownership and respect, stating ‘To be honest at home I am really respectful. It would be different if I had my own place’. Although, the association of respectful practices with parental ownership and income do not provide enough evidence to conclusively suggest that earning differences or ownership alone can explain behavioural
differences (since they were only mentioned by a few participants), they do represent an interesting trend that warrant further investigation. Participants referred to a variety of factors, including the fact that their parents owned the house they were living in, their financial dependence and a desire to avoid embarrassing or hurting their parents as possible reasons for behaving respectfully when with their parents. Despite differences in the reasons for behaving respectfully, there was broad consensus among participants' that overtly homosexual behaviours were disrespectful and should be avoided when in social interaction with their parents.

Latin American literature considering queer individuals living with their parents (Brandão 2003, 2004, Heilborn 2004, Heilborn and Cabral 2006, Filho 2007) demonstrates the restricted nature of the performance of non-normative gendered and sexualised behaviours in parent-child social interaction. From having sexual intercourse in the home to discussing homosexuality, it appears that children, and especially queer children, feel the need to restrict gendered and sexualised practices when with their parents. Brandão (2004) argues that even in cases where parents have respect for juvenile autonomy, it doesn't exclude the parents' regulation in the gendered and sexualised behaviours of their children. Whilst results of this research chime with these studies, they extend such conclusions by suggesting that discourses of ownership and income might be used as powerful mechanisms for determining whether disrespectful gendered and sexualised practices can be openly expressed. Although ownership and income appear to distinguish the nature of respect for ones parents from respect for children and the elderly, at least from the perspective of queer children, one commonality is that like the elderly and children, parents rarely made active efforts to ensure that their children behaved respectfully. Rather, queer men generally self-regulated their own gendered and sexualised behaviours in order to be respectful. The respect discourse appears to be internalised by queer men and functions in a panopticon-like (Foucault 1979) manner (see discussion section) where concerns over the observation of the
elderly and children are enough for queer men to keep their behaviour ‘in-check’ with norms around respect.

**Spaces of Respect**
In differing ways both the family home and the workplace represent spaces of respect. They are spaces where respectful gendered and sexualised behaviour are expected and disrespectful practices are, on the most part, not tolerated. In both spaces the dynamics of age, ownership and income, as outlined in previous sections, influence queer male behaviours. But, in extending the conclusions drawn thus far, this section demonstrates that notions of control are significant components of respect. The home and the workplace are discussed here as they appear to represent fulcrums where the interrelated relationship of respect and age, ownership, income, control and tolerance is highlighted and their influence on gendered and sexualised performances is apparent.

**Respect, the Family and the Home**

‘At home you’re with your family, it’s different. There’s a different atmosphere at home. I can’t being anyone back to the house because they don’t agree with it [his sexuality] so I have to respect that’. - **Lucas**

The family home was mentioned more frequently than any other site when participants identified specific locations where they felt the need to behave respectfully. Of 44 participants who referred to respect, 23 did so in relation to the family home. For the majority of participants, the family home was the site where disrespectful gendered and sexualised performances had to be most strictly regulated. Thus, it represents a relatively restrictive and intolerant site.

---

56 In addition, twelve participants referred to the workplace, which is discussed in this chapter. Nine participants referred to others spaces, most commonly the pride parade, gay clubs and the street. Due to the infrequency of such comments they are mentioned throughout where appropriate though the thesis, rather than in specific chapter sections.
Participants’ comments suggest that the social relations shape the family home as respectful space. In particular, social interaction with elderly family members, children and parents in the family home meant that most participants avoided disrespectful gendered and sexualised practices that were understood as inappropriate in front of these groups. This was reiterated by participants’ comments that suggested a difference in the experience of participants living in the family home from those living in non-family homes – such as those living with partners, friends or alone. Those living with their families were much more likely to restrict gendered and sexualised behaviours that were understood as disrespectful. Participants’ comments imply that such differences can be understood as a result of a lack of spatial control in family domestic space compared with those living elsewhere.

The vast majority of participants live with their families. Of those that explicitly referred to their home situation, 31 stated they live in the family home (with other relatives) and twelve live independently. This was most common with participants who were in their twenties, and several participants commented that they thought this was due to a lack of financial resources for young Brazilians to set up home independently, and an assumption that (at least initially) money earned should be used to support one’s parents rather than establishing one’s own home. Participants’ comments suggested that respect was achieved in various ways in the family home, such as through not discussing sexuality, not bringing sexual partners home, restricting same-sex affection, not joking about the same topics as when with queer friends and policing internet conversations. Due to the ubiquitous nature of such avoidance behaviours, it can be argued that the family home represents a relatively intolerant space for most participants, where they lacked spatial control and restricted gendered and sexualised behaviours in order to remain respectful. Participants identified parents and the elderly as groups that had control to determine which behaviours were acceptable.
This was reiterated when I attended an Entre Garotos meeting focused on homophobia in the home. Although the experiences of the young men were diverse, they were, by and large negative. Whilst some men were out to their friends and family and felt a vontade (at home or at ease), the majority were not. Most group members shared similar experiences of the family home, which showed that overtly homosexual behaviour was seen as unacceptable and disrespectful. For some men this created significant problems. For example, one of the group’s members, Lázaro, was thrown out of the family home at fifteen. He stated that ‘it was dangerous to come out’ and described the family home as somewhere you cannot be open about being homosexual, but as a place ‘you have to respect others’. Group members nodded, seemingly in agreement with what was being said. At this point he became emotional and turned towards the group asking, ‘How was I meant to support myself as a 15 year old child, without a house, job, nothing? My mum turned her back on me!’ Whilst Lázaro’s case was worse than most research participant’s and might seem rather extreme, his experience of being thrown out of the family home for not respecting others and overtly displaying his sexuality, was not unique, and similar cases were related by several participants. Even if their parents accepted their sexuality, most participants felt obliged to self-regulate overtly homosexual behaviours in the family home due to concerns regarding the assumed reaction of others present. In this way the normalisation of respectful gendered and sexualised behaviours can be understood as self-internalised and maintained in self-politicing amongst queer men.

In another interview, Rogeiro commented that despite his parents’ permission to bring boyfriends and sexual partners back to his house, he would avoid this if they were present, commenting ‘If I were to take my parents out of the house, it would be the place where I feel most comfortable because I know they’d be annoyed’. Although some participants referred to the presence of parents as necessitating respectful behaviour in the family home, others referred to the presence of the elderly and children and the
influence this had on their gendered and sexualised behaviours. For example, Wagner stated that since his gran and aunt disapprove of his sexuality, he ‘polices disrespectful behaviour’ at home. He defines being disrespectful as showing behaviour that ‘offends’ his gran and aunt and comments ‘I try to control myself to the maximum possible, I don’t like to live ‘uncontrolled’, so I really keep myself to myself [in terms of his sexuality]’.

Through considering participants’ comments related to parents, and relatives and friends who are elderly or children, it becomes apparent that the notions of respect as linked to specific ‘worthy’ individuals, as highlighted in the first section, have spatial consequences. The home is constructed as a specific respectful space that is intolerant for disrespectful gendered and sexualised performances, and thus a marked heterosexual space. This is highlighted by the fact that in comparison with other spaces of the city, most participants stated that they felt most restricted and uncomfortable expressing their homosexuality in the family home. This intolerance was captured by Ryan’s comments above where he states he restrains himself at home and does not feel as free there as he is with his friends in the street.

Although recent Latin American studies have drawn similar conclusions regarding the restricted nature of queer performances in the family home (Brandão 2004, Filho 2007, Reis dos Santos 2010), they offer no explanation for this. Participants’ comments suggest that the home is experienced as a more intolerant space than elsewhere due to notions of spatial control. Several participants made comments that suggested that their lack of spatial control compared with others users of the space meant that they felt obliged to behave respectfully. Parents, the elderly and to some extent, children were understood as controlling gendered and sexualised (dis)respectful performances in the family home and able to define the limits of respect and tolerance across the space. This was implied by Nicol, an ABIA participant, who discussed what he sees as his unorthodox living situation – living in a small house next to his mother’s home. He told me that whilst in his mother’s
house he would never talk about his sexuality or show affection with any other men. He added that, recently, his mum had banned him from inviting other gay men back. When I asked what he thought about the situation he shrugged his shoulders and said ‘Well it’s her house, so I have to respect that, *ela manda* (she rules) at home’. He went on to tell me that he lives with a close friend who he is intimate with and sleeps with, but maintains that their affection is strictly limited to his own house where his mother ‘doesn’t know what’s happening’. The reason that he restricts same-sex intimacy is a consequence of his mother’s ownership of the home. This appears to give her control in the space, evident in her ability to *mandar* (rule/give orders). Mathieus made links between control and respect more explicitly. After saying that he did not show affection at home because he felt the need to be respectful, he added, ‘I’m comfortable showing my sexuality anywhere, as long as my mother’s not nearby. She’s in control at home!’

Nevertheless, there were several exceptions where queer men did feel able to express their homosexuality relatively openly in the family home. A minority of men did feel able to bring boyfriends back or discuss issues related to their homosexuality, such as dating, sex and homophobia without being understood as disrespectful. For example, Carlos commented that his mum was ‘very chilled out’ (‘*super tranquilo*’) and that he felt comfortable inviting sexual partners home and being affectionate in front of his parents. Similarly, Danilo commented that the family home represented as space where he can behave ‘openly’ and invite guys back, adding, ‘I talk about boyfriends, about guys that I think are hot, about going to the gay pride parade’. Such experiences appear to reiterate conclusions drawn by Gorman-Murray (2007) that homes are paradoxical since they can be both homophobic and oppressive sites where heteronormativity is reproduced and resisted. However, in contrast to Gorman-Murray’s (2007) study, participants’ experiences in this research suggest that, sadly, the home is experienced as an intolerant space where disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours have to be restricted for most participants.
Whilst those living in the family home frequently mentioned the need to behave respectfully, those living alone or with friends did not. Indeed, not a single participant outside the family home made links between respect and domestic space. Participants’ comments suggest that differences between experiences of the family home and those living independently are related to spatial control. Whilst those living in the family home suggested that they had little spatial control and had to modify certain gendered and sexualised behaviours in social relations with the elderly, children and parents, participants that lived outside the family home behaved much more openly. This suggests that domestic space is experienced as much more intolerant for queer men living in the family home than those living elsewhere. Cuaê explains the difference in his behaviour in his mother’s house and in a hypothetical situation in which he is living out of the family home when I asked him if he takes his boyfriend back to his parent’s house:

‘No, to be honest, I’m very respectful in my house because my mum is still in the process of accepting the gay world. In this sense it’s hard work, so, being her house, I respect her space. But, if it were in my house, if I were to have my own space I wouldn’t have any problem whatsoever bringing my boyfriend back, to show society that I live with him’.

Whereas those living in the family home made comments related to curbing disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours and feeling restrained and uncomfortable, those living outside the family home most commonly described their homes as somewhere they felt ‘at ease’, ‘comfortable’ and ‘free’ and did not make comments related to the need to give specific gendered and sexualised performances in order to be respectful. This difference was highlighted when Renaldo, a respondent living with university friends, discussed his new found freedom to bring other men home since moving out of the family home. He stated that he feels ‘super comfortable’ since he has more privacy and claims his sexuality is ‘nothing to do with’ his flatmates. Similarly, Daniel commented that since he moved out of his
parents home in Minas Gerais, and into his partner’s flat he has ‘much more freedom’ and feels more ‘at ease’ in his ‘own space’, compared with his parents home where he had seemingly little control and ‘had to hide his sexuality’:

“To begin with they did this whole psychological trauma, putting me with a psychologist to make me straight. After that she [the psychologist] said ‘Daniel’s just like this’. After, when they realised there was nothing they could do they monitored the calls to find out who was calling for me, they cut my money each month. They didn’t want to let me work so I couldn’t leave the house. After that they set fire to everything I had and put me on the street with nothing. So, I put my head down and got out [of his parents’ house]. I started to respect myself. I’m gay. I work. I have my own house. You have to respect yourself and not worry about what other people are saying. I don’t worry about prejudices today, I don’t worry about that. Nobody pays my bills, I pay them. So, it’s like this: before when I lived with my parents I used to think they were going to accept me…”

In contrast to respecting one’s relatives, as mentioned by the majority of those living in the family home, Daniel talks about being able to respect himself through not worrying about what other people think, since leaving the family home. Like the majority of participants who lived outside the family home, Daniel does not mention the need to be respectful to anyone else and experiences the home he shares with his partner as a much more permissive, tolerant environment where he can perform his gender and sexuality more openly than in the family home. In addition, Daniel’s quote suggests that his parents’ control in the family home might be related to their income and ability to pay utility bills and his dependence on them. Links between ownership, control and respect were evident in comments made by several participants who described their own home as permissive site and as meu espaço (my space), in contrast to the family home which was often described as o espaço dos meu pais/da família (my parents’ space/family space).
Although the majority of participants seemed freer to perform their gender and sexuality as they chose outside the family home, in a minority of instances this was not the case. During an ABIA meeting-session, Ramiro recounted a case where his landlady unexpectedly visited his house and saw him and his boyfriend being affectionate whilst watching a film. When she asked whether they were relatives, Ramiro replied that they were boyfriends, to which the landlady became furious, asking them to leave the house and claiming what they were doing was wrong and sacrilegious in her home. This example implies that in certain cases there may be ramifications of disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours, even outside the family home. The landlady’s ownership of the home meant that she felt the right to intervene and prevent the disrespectful behaviours occurring. Seemingly, even an ‘independent space’, such as a rented flat, can be reclaimed if it is not entirely in the control of the individual. Ramiro’s quote also suggests that the attitudes of those present in the home and the way in which these attitudes are assumed are attributed to the gendered and sexualised performances of queer men in social relations with others, rather than simply the result of notions of ownership.

For the vast majority of participants the family home was experienced as a space where disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours had to be restricted in an effort to show respect for other family members. In contrast, the majority of participants who lived independently, and with friends and/or partners, felt more at ease and able to express their sexuality freely. Since performances of gender and sexuality were strictly restricted in the family home it represents an intolerant space for the majority of participants. It is a space where gender and sexuality cannot be performed freely and openly, thus contrasting with the tolerant experience of domestic space for those living elsewhere. Participants’ comments imply that the need to behave respectfully in the family home is a consequence of social interaction with those who are understood as having control over the space, something

57 The cross-cutting influence of religion and the expression of sexualised identities will be explored in more detail in a chapter six.
which several participants related to income and ownership. Finally, participants’ comments suggest that their behaviours are largely dictated through internal notions of suitable, respectful behaviours, rather than active attempts of others present to stipulate acceptable practices, such as through verbal or physical homophobia by these groups.

**Being Respectful in the Workplace**

After the family home, the workplace was the next most commonly identified space seen as requiring respectful gendered and sexualised behaviours. Almost all participants felt able to come out to workmates, and 32 of the 46 participants who talked about the workplace had done so; but this did not mean that participants felt able to express their homosexuality entirely openly in the workplace. Indeed, regardless of whether they were out or not, all participants who referred to respect in the workplace commented that they had to restrict their gendered and sexualised behaviours when at work. Effeminate behaviour such as same-sex intimacy and discussing same-sex sexual behaviour was again understood as disrespectful in contrast to heterosexual intimacy and discussion of heterosexual sex which was normalised. As with discussion of the home, it appears that lack of spatial control was an important factor in the need to be respectful in the workplace, but unlike comments made related to the family home, in the workplace this was also linked to notions of being professional and notions of public/private behaviours.

The need to behave in a stereotypically masculine manner in order to be respectful when with work colleagues was highlighted by all participants who discussed respect in the workplace, and was illustrated in comments made by Agnaldo regarding his behaviour at the English school he teaches at: ‘There [at work] you have to have a masculine posture. More correct. Much more restrained behaviour, more solid is needed to command respect’. At times, behaving in an effeminate manner had more severe consequences.

---

58 Ten of the 53 participants who identified specific individuals as requiring respectful gendered and sexualised behaviours referred to workmates.
than simply being viewed as disrespectful. Lucas related to his own
discrimination towards effeminate men and the pressure put on him by his
managers to recruit men who are more masculine:

‘Disrespectful behaviour can distract the work of other people [employees] and
hold them back from their work. So, if you go to a company to have an interview,
for example, for a managerial position, a director’s position, for example, you
can’t be effeminate. In the majority of company and corporate jobs, you need to
be serious, to ‘have an appearance’, appearance matters a lot, you know? So,
people used to arrive there [at his workplace] speaking in a high-pitched voice,
wear different clothes than other men, so for these reasons we ended up not
letting them through to the next round of interviews, or not giving them the job.
It’s not something that I do personally, it’s something that’s shaped by society,
do you know what I mean? I can’t, for example, call this person up to work
because I could lose my job’.

Lucas associated being disrespectful with stereotypically effeminate
behaviour such as ‘wearing different clothes’ and talking in a high pitched
voice. Not only was such behaviour seen as disrespectful, but also as
potentially jeopardising applicants’ employment prospects and his own job
stability. Effeminate males were seen as unlikely to get a job because their
disrespectful behaviour was viewed as neither serious nor professional
enough for the position. Lucas’ quote suggests that respect is a powerful
process which has tangible, discriminatory consequences in the workplace.

One of the principal differences between respect in the workplace and the
family home is that it is often linked appearing professional in the former, as
suggested by Lucas. The majority of those who discussed respect in the
workplace commented that disrespectful gendered and sexualised
behaviours were unprofessional. Lucas went on to describe effeminate
behaviour, which he describes as ‘showing your homosexual side’, as
inappropriately frivolous in the workplace, adding that through staying in the
closet queer men can behave professionally, even if this can be difficult at
times:
‘You try to maintain a professional relationship, but since you’re there every day with the same people you end up making bonds. So, when I have a problem, I always have to change ‘him’ for ‘her’ and this is crap isn’t it?’. 

Changing the sex of partners from ‘he’ to ‘her’ in order to avoid arousing suspicion in work are part of Lucas’ efforts to maintain a level of professionalism and respect within the workplace. Several other participants reported that they do the same when with work colleagues. Participants’ comments suggest that by allowing participants to pass as heterosexual, such tactical behaviours might allow queer male performances to be understood as respectful and professional amongst workmates, even if those workmates already know a man’s sexuality.

Many participants referred to the maintenance of a separation between private behaviours and the public space of the workplace as necessary in order to be professional and respectful. For example, engaging in same-sex intimacy, discussing one’s sex life or behaving effeminately were seen as, unsuitably, demonstrating aspects of one’s identity which were too personal and private for social interaction with participants’ workmates. This was illustrated by Alexandre who commented that he separates his work life, where he behaves ‘professionally’ and ‘respectfully’ and his ‘sexual life’ where he is more open. He went on to state that a failure to maintain this separation would result in him ‘losing respect’ of the 240 supposedly heterosexual men that work with him. When asked how he maintains this separation and avoids losing respect from his workmates he responded:

‘You have to be dry; you have to be professional, to be a ‘man of ice’. Outside, you can tell a few jokes, you can be more relaxed. You can play about more. You don’t have to take everything so seriously’.

The importance of separating private, overtly homosexual and public from heterosexual practices was more explicitly highlighted by José. When asked whether he was open about his sexuality at work he commented:
'I am completely private about my life, because it is important. Basically, something that’s important is to have a certain amount of respect, it's even important personally, to be private about your life...so I keep on lying'.

Expressing supposedly private homosexual behaviours in the public space of the workplace was frequently described as ‘unnecessary’ and ‘unprofessional’ in front of workmates and participants often self-restricted such behaviours to avoid being seen as disrespectful. This was reiterated in comments made by Rogeiro regarding his first day at work in one of the city’s museums. He was advised by a friend that his homosexuality should remain ‘private’ and that he should ‘avoid revealing his sexuality without good reason’. Rogeiro took this as good advice and from this point onwards, avoiding discussing his sexual orientation and his homosexual relationships. This self-restricting became his way of dealing with, what he identified as, the ‘heterosexual nature of the museum’. ‘It’s not something I’m open about, and I also keep quiet about my personal relationships’ he explained.

Although there was a consensus in participants’ comments related to the need to behave respectfully in their seemingly intolerant workplaces, most participants did not allude to why this was the case. However, their comments implied two seemingly related explanations for the respectful behaviour of queer men at work: their lack of spatial control and embarrassment/humiliation resulting from disrespectful performances. In particular, participants referred to the ability of other employees, particularly those in more senior positions, to define the limits of acceptable behaviour in the workplace. For example, when I asked Pedro why he felt obliged to behave respectfully in the travel agents he works in he replied ‘Because it’s the manager who’s in charge! He decides if I passar dos limites (cross the line), or not!’ One way of enforcing spatial control appears to be through causing embarrassment as highlighted above, or through not giving positions or promotions to those seen as behaving disrespectfully or unprofessionally as highlighted by Lucas. Both practices appear to represent ways in which
Managers control the gendered and sexualised behaviours of employees in the workplace by marking non-heteronormative practices as disrespectful and unprofessional.

Renato was among several participants who referred to embarrassment and humiliation. When I asked him why he thought queer men should avoid talking openly about their sexuality at work, (the principal behaviour he identified as disrespectful) he replied:

‘To be honest gays suffer preconceptions, they are really made to feel embarrassed often when they talk about sex, but straight people often spend all day talking about it and aren’t made to feel embarrassed. They aren’t repressed like gays are…It’s because the job market is part of the wider logic of society that is heteronormative. It’s like this: everything that is outside the model of behaviour considered ‘normal’ is thought of as disrespect, anti-ethical and immoral’.

In addition to suggesting that the job market is intensely homophobic and that talking about one’s same-sex sex life is generally seen as disrespectful and inappropriate amongst workmates, Renato’s comments imply that notions of respectable behaviour are reinforced through embarrassment and humiliation in social relations with one’s workmates. Concerns related to behaving in a way that would result in disapproval and humiliation and being marked as abnormal, immoral and disrespectful, appears to increase the likelihood that participants perform their gender and sexuality respectfully when with work colleagues. In this respect, embarrassment and humiliation appear to represent an element of spatial control ensuring the participants behave respectfully. The role of embarrassment in identifying and restricting behaviours that are unacceptable and inappropriate are flagged by McDowell’s (1995) study of UK merchant banks and Gusmano’s (2008) research into homophobia in the Italian job market. They recognise the workplace as intensively homophobic which results in strict self-regulation, mirroring most participants’ comments in this study.
Whilst most participants stated that it was necessary to behave professionally and avoid private behaviours in the workplace in order to be respectful, a minority of participants, working as teachers, students and professors, and those in beauty and hairdressing, felt that they had more freedom to behave disrespectfully. Bar one participant, those working in these areas made no reference to the need to self-restrict certain gendered and sexualised behaviours in order to be respectful. Even participants who did not refer to respect specifically, made comments that suggested they could perform their gender and sexuality disrespectfully when in the workplace. Most participants described the university as ‘very’ or ‘extremely tolerant’ like João who went on to describe it as a ‘super accepting rainbow’. Similarly, despite behaving in a way that most participants understood as disrespectful, Mirella had a positive experience at her Zona Norte university:

‘I did a university course at Estácio de Sá in the Nova Iguaçu neighbourhood. Imagine, in the poor suburbs of Rio, and this area has lots of really poor people and the prejudices are a lot worse. So imagine a travesti like me, dressed as a woman, with a really short skirt on, but nobody said anything and I ended up making friends with everybody. People actually really admired me. I was even surprised about that and even got a bit worried. I thought ‘My God, isn’t anybody going to make fun of me, nobody’s going to call a TV reporter, nothing?’ Ha ha ha… but, it was actually completely the opposite, I ended up becoming friends with all of the professors’.

In another interview, Jadilson, a teacher at an English college, states that he feels extremely comfortable at work in terms of his sexuality. He commented that he can use gay slang, talk about meeting other men and use effeminate gestures without feeling uncomfortable:

‘I feel like a butterfly you know? I fly, I’m myself. I’m like this with my workmates, with the teachers, with my boss you know? I think this is really nice….on Monday after the weekend you speak openly about what you did at the weekend. I went out with a friend to a gay club, got with a guy, it was cool’. Everyone listens to you,
they give their opinions, useful opinions, do you know what I mean? It's somewhere that's also [liberal]. It's a rainbow.

For the majority of those working in universities and colleges, disrespectful performances of gender and sexuality could be expressed relatively freely and openly. Thus, for some participants the workplace represents a tolerant space where gendered and sexualised practices do not have to be self-restrained. On the whole participants did not allude to an explanation of difference in the need to behave respectfully across various workplaces, however, João’s quote implies that the reason might be related to notions of social control. In contrast to the experience of most other participants where those higher up in the workplace had control in defining the limits of acceptable gendered and sexualised behaviours, the school appears to represent a more democratic space where ‘everyone listens to you’ including the managers.

Similarly, participants working in beauty and hairdressing did not feel the need to curtail certain gendered and sexualised behaviours so as to appear respectful. This was highlighted during a post-ABIA workshop session, when Stéfano stated that it is unacceptable to express your homosexuality in most work environments, but that working in beauty is more ‘gay friendly’. He dryly remarked, ‘well, who else is going to give bichas (effeminate queer men) and travestis jobs?’ Participants’ comments suggested that social relationships with workmates for queer men in beauty and hairdressing were less restrictive and, consequently, the workplace was experienced as a tolerant space. The tolerant nature of jobs in hairdressing, compared with other work environments, was implied in comments made by Cesar. When asked whether queer men face discrimination in the workplace he responded:

‘In my work, or in any other place that isn’t a club is limiting and is just somewhere that it’s not ok to be gay because it’s not a place where people expect you to be gay, unless you’re a hairdresser because then, yeah people are going to expect you to be gay. Or, whatever other profession at all, anything at all where people don’t expect you to be different, you’ve got to try to fit in’.
Data presented in this section has shown that being respectful is not the same across all spaces, and, whilst the gendered and sexualised behaviours understood as respectful with workmates are similar to when they were with the elderly, children and parents, in the family home, there are also significant differences in the way respect is ‘done’ with one’s workmates. In particular, in the workplace respect is achieved through behaving professionally and privately, terms that were absent when participants discussed other spaces. Outside of those working in colleges, universities, or beauty and hairdressing, participants’ comments suggest that the biggest concern for the workmates of queer male participants is not whether their colleagues are out of the closet, but whether their behaviour is respectful, professional and suitably private. Indeed, as long as queer men behaved respectfully, through avoiding behaviours understood as explicitly gay, their sexuality was likely to be accepted by workmates. The majority of participants behaved in such a manner and found their same-sex sexual orientation accepted in the workplace. Nevertheless, workmates were generally positioned as a group with whom participants felt they had to strictly regulate openly homosexual performances of gender and sexuality in order to be respectful. Participants’ comments suggested that, like in the home, this was linked to notions of spatial control, thus extending current studies on gender, sexuality and the workplace (McDowell 1995, Gusmano 2008). Overall, the need to self-regulate gendered and sexualised performances in order to behave respectfully demonstrates the intolerant, restrictive and homophobic nature of the workplace for most participants, except for those working in schools, universities, fashion and hairdressing.

**Discussion**

Ethnographic and interview data has shown that respect is a gendered and sexualised process and certain gendered and sexualised behaviours were understood as more respectful than others. In general, overtly homosexual and effeminate behaviours were understood as disrespectful in social
relations with children, the elderly, workmates and parents. More specifically, being respectful involves restricting effeminate male behaviour, not discussing or engaging in same-sex sexual behaviour and restricting same-sex affection. Despite these similarities, the reason for being respectful varied depending on the specific social and spatial contexts. For example, age was understood as an important factor when with the children and the elderly. In the case of children, the need to self-regulate disrespectful gendered and sexualised behaviours was related to their innocence, which was understood as a result of their youth. For the elderly, old age was seen as resulting in discomfort when confronted with disrespectful behaviours and in some cases resulting in offence and disapproval. In the case of parents, participants’ comments suggested that income and ownership might be reasons for behaving respectful in their presence. In contrast to these groups being respectful with workmates was related to being professional and restricting behaviours that were understood as private.

Related to this it has been argued that respect is a spatial phenomenon varying across the urban fabric of the city. When participants referred to respect it was almost always in the context of the family home or in the workplace. However, participants’ comments suggest that rather than having innate, respectful characteristics, the spaces of the family home and workplace are constructed as respectful as a result of the spatial control of others present. In family domestic space, other relatives were positioned as having control in determining the limits of respectable gendered and sexualised behaviours, and in the workplace this control was attributed to other employees. As a consequence of their (perceived) lack of spatial control, most participants self-regulated disrespectful gendered and sexualised performances in the home and the workplace. Nevertheless, a minority of participants did perform disrespectful behaviours in the family home and workplace, demonstrating the contested and dynamic nature of respectful spaces. This chapter suggests that thinking of respect as a spatial phenomenon highlights links between respect and tolerance. Spaces where
notions of respect were more likely to dictate a change in gendered and sexualised behaviours, such as the family home and the workplace, were experienced as intolerant for most participants. In these intolerant spaces participants often felt more restricted than their heterosexual counterparts. Interestingly, there were no clearly observable racial or class differences in the way that respect or being respectful were discussed, nor in terms of those who were understood as behaving respectfully. However, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, certain behaviours that were identified as disrespectful, particularly behaving effeminately, were associated more with non-white queer men, from outside the wealthier Zona Sul of the city. Nevertheless, participants did not make such links explicit in their discussions of respect.

Many Latin American studies suggest that respect is both a social and individual process and is the result of social interaction with others and internalised notions of being respectful (Archetti 1996, Prieur 1996, Fuller 2004). This section argues that, for the most part, respect can be understood as an internalised process whereby queer men self-regulate their gendered and sexualised behaviours in ways that reinforce heteronormativity. When participants behaved respectfully, they generally did so based on their assumptions of others, and how they might perceive their comportment, and rarely as a result of the actual, comments or physical reaction of others. For example, participants’ comments and experiences suggest that whilst the need to behave respectfully in social interaction with the elderly, children, parents and workmates is felt by the majority of participants, attempts are rarely made to actively enforce respectable behaviour by such groups. Indeed, notions of respectful behaviour appear so firmly internalised that participants rarely questioned their own assumptions of what constitutes respect and the need to behave respectfully was often self-justified, even if it resulted in feeling restricted.
In order to understand how respect functions it is useful to think of discipline, discourse and normalisation as theorised by Foucault (1979, 1990).

According to Foucault modern societies are based on discipline, which he describes as a mechanism of power which regulates the behaviour of individuals in order to assure the order of human beings and increase their docility and utility (Foucault 1979). Foucault (1979) argues that various discourses, which he understands as the groups of topics that provide a language for talking about and representing a topic, have disciplinary power over the subject and result in their ordering and regulation. One of the ways that this is achieved is through normalisation of the subject (Foucault 1990). This is the construction of an idealised norm which is reinforced through rewarding when we conform and punishing when we deviate from it. Thus, Foucault (1979) argues that normalisation is a form of social control used to regulate individuals and populations. One example of normalisation, according to Foucault (1990), is the discourse of sexuality. Certain types of sexual behaviours, such as homosexuality and prostitution are viewed as abnormal and those who participate in such acts are marked as sexually deviant.

This chapter has shown that respect can also be thought of as a discourse – brought into being and known since it is talked and thought about by queer men, their friends and families. The discourse of respect regulates gendered and sexualised performances of queer men and can be understood as a mechanism for normalisation. Through the respect discourse certain gendered and sexualised behaviours are normalised and privileged, whilst others are devalued and restricted. This was illustrated in this chapter when certain disrespectful behaviours, such as being effeminate and showing same-sex affection, were marked as abnormal and wrong whilst others, such as male masculinity and talking about heterosexual sex are rewarded and normalised, particularly in specific settings such as the family home and workplace. Through this process of normalisation the discourse of respect is
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strengthened and queer male behaviour is controlled and kept within the limits of acceptability and respectability.

According to Foucault (1979, 1990), norms in relation to discourses, such as sexuality, are seen as internalised and self-regulating. They are operated by subjects over other subjects and demonstrate that power works in a bottom-up fashion. Foucault (1978) uses the panopticon to demonstrate how a discourse, such as respect, is instilled in subjects who then self-regulate their behaviour in line with discourse norms. The panopticon was a model prison proposed by Jeremy Bentham and used by Foucault (1978 & 1990). It is ‘all seeing’ since prisoners may be observed at any moment without being aware of their observation. Consequently, prisoners regulate their behaviour based on the assumption that they could be being watched. Foucault (1978) refers to this as the ‘internalisation of the gaze’. Foucault (1979 & 1990) uses the panopticon as a metaphor to describe societal surveillance and consequent self-regulation of behaviours. In this vein this chapter has show that queer men are not simply objects of dominant discourses of respect, but they are self-regulating subjects. They internalise norms related to respectful behaviour through a panopticon-like effect where they internalise the all-seeing gaze of disapproving elderly, children, parents and workmates, and monitor themselves in an effort to conform to these norms. By hiding, shielding and restricting overtly gay performances of identity, such as same-sex affection or discussing sexuality in certain spaces, and in front of certain groups, queer men themselves reinforce notions of certain gendered and sexualised practices as more respectful than others, and specific spaces as open and tolerant and others as intolerant for disrespectful identity performances.

Consequently, queer male behaviours ensure, bar a few brave exceptions, that (hetero)normative notions of respect are maintained or strengthened across various sites of Rio de Janeiro and that practices are ‘in-check’ with dominant norms related to respect discourse. Queer men are implicit in the
maintenance of the respect discourse. Thus, the discourse of respect exerts control on queer men, without having to be actively enforced by others through the panopticon-like way in which it functions. Foucault refers to this process as the ‘automatic functioning of power’ (1990, p 201), arguing, ‘the perfection of power should tend to render the actual exercise unnecessary’. Queer men self-regulate their own behaviours to ensure they are behaving in line with respect norms. In terms of the data presented in this chapter it may be argued that the discourse of respect does not need to be actively enforced though physical/verbal homophobia or loss of honour as some studies imply (see Archetti 1999, Carrara et al, 2003). Rather, this study implies a more subtle process where internalised notions of norms related to respect discourse lead to self-regulation amongst queer men and shape their gendered and sexualised behaviours. This is not the same as saying that queer men are their own oppressors, but rather that sexual politics in Brazil are especially effective at coercing gay men to internalise heteronormative regulation and behave respectfully.

Whilst queer men continue to behave in ways which hide their homosexuality across sites such as the family home and the workplace, they will continue to be aggressively heterosexual and intolerant sites for disrespectful performances of gender and sexuality. Although it is not easy, or even always possible, queer men have a role to play in challenging norms related to respectful behaviour. Through discussing their sexuality more openly, being less restrictive in expressing their same-sex affection and effeminate behaviours, queer cariocas can help redefine notions of respectable behaviours across a variety of social contexts. This chapter has demonstrated that whilst most participants referred to the importance of being respectful through strictly self-regulating performances of gender and sexuality across spaces such as the home and the workplace this was not always the case. Several cases show that queer male gendered and sexualised practices challenge dominant discourses of respect through non-
normative gendered and sexualised behaviours. On this note Foucault (1979, p 101) reminds us that:

‘discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it…We must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces is, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it’.

This chapter has demonstrated that the discourse of respect can be used to control, regulate and restrict certain gendered and sexualised performances, but, as Mirella’s comments illustrates, it has also shown that it can allow, permit and enable gendered and sexualised behaviours in certain social contexts and spaces.

Although respect is often ignored in work on tolerance, gender and sexuality (França 2003, Brown 2006), this discussion has shown that it is an important component of tolerance. Respect is about allowing certain gendered and sexualised behaviours and denying others, tolerating and not tolerating (Binnie and Bell 2004). Largely internalised discourses of respect are used to organise gendered and sexualised behaviours into those that are tolerated and those that are not. They are deployed to include certain behaviours and exclude others, and to restrict when and where queer men disclose their sexuality. Since respect plays an important role in determining the gendered and sexualised behaviours that are permitted across urban space it is an important factor in the construction and experience of spaces as tolerant and intolerant. Thus, in order to understand how tolerance functions across the city, it is vital to consider notions of respect. Whilst the term respect was rarely used by participants to refer to their experiences on the gay scene, the next chapter shows that the way in which certain behaviours were talked about implies that here too certain behaviours are seen as more respectful
than others and shows how these discourses are used to define the limits of ‘acceptable’ expressions of gender and sexuality.
Chapter 5

(In)tolerance of Queer Performances in Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT Spaces

The gaypridebrazil.org website defiantly states that Rio de Janeiro is ‘a city that is already worldly (sic.) known for its great tolerance to the LGBT community’ (Bookers International 2010). The Rio de Janeiro pride parade, and the gay scene in general, are widely understood as tolerant spaces for the queer community. However, despite this general rhetoric of tolerance towards diverse gendered and sexualised identities and behaviours across LGBT sites, this chapter suggests a more complicated and less optimistic understanding. Participants’ comments suggest that LGBT bars and clubs, organisations, beaches and virtual spaces are often not experienced as the tolerant spaces they might appear. Rather, they imply that understandings of LGBT spaces as tolerant over-simplify the way in which they are experienced, ignoring ambivalence related to certain gendered and sexualised behaviours. It is suggested that ambivalence is observable in performances across Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT spaces and is highlighted through the way in which certain behaviours are seemingly tolerated and viewed disdainfully simultaneously. Consequently, it is argued that understanding LGBT spaces as ‘queer’ in its most useful sense as open to alternative, non-heteronormative gendered and sexualised behaviours is inadequate and represents an oversimplification of the reality of queer male behaviours occurring through such sites.

This chapter will focus on queer gendered and sexualised performances across Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT spaces61. Firstly, the notion that LGBT sites represent tolerant spaces is identified as pervasive in the way participants discuss such spaces, and it is argued that this is reflected in the rhetoric of queer organisations. Secondly, interviewee quotes and fieldwork experiences
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61 The term LGBT spaces is used to refer to spaces associated with the city’s lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans community, such as queer organisations, pride, gay bars and clubs, the gay beach and gay virtual space.
suggesting tolerance and intolerance within the queer community across a variety of physical and virtual LGBT spaces are presented and nuances in the specific gendered and sexualised behaviours that are viewed as desirable across such sites are identified. LGBT spaces are constructed as ambivalent, tolerant and intolerant, permitting and restricting for certain gendered and sexualised behaviours. The goal of this chapter is therefore to challenge notions of LGBT sites as necessarily tolerant for the queer community. I suggest that more plausible, and useful, understandings of Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT spaces are needed recognising their ambivalent nature. Only in doing so can we begin to consider how we can achieve more tolerant and inclusive LGBT sites in Brazil and beyond.

**LGBT Sites as Counterpublics: The Tolerant Rhetoric**

Most of Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT spaces are both promoted, and understood, by participants as tolerant spaces that are open to a large range of gendered and sexualised behaviours. Participants’ generally identified LGBT spaces as the most *tolerante* (tolerant) and liberal sites in initial discussion. They were identified as sites where performing non-normative gendered and sexualised practices, such as same-sex intimacy, effeminate behaviours and discussing one’s homosexual sexual behaviour were felt to be accepted by others. In this respect it could be argued that Rio’s LGBT sites represent counterpublics (Fraser 1992, Warner 2002). Counterpublics can be understood as spaces where subordinated groups, such as the queer community, can create their own spaces of address, which allow for the expression of gendered and sexualised behaviours that are considered beyond normal. Warner (2002, p 206) uses the term to describe places of increased tolerance for the LGBT community (amongst others) and refers to gay bars and clubs as examples of counterpublics of queer life. According to Warner, counterpublics represent sites where the subaltern, queer community can re-articulate norms related to natural/unnatural, right/wrong, acceptable/unacceptable gendered and sexualised behaviours. In this vein,
homosexual counterpublics can be understood as tolerant and permissive sites.

The tolerant rhetoric of LGBT sites is implied in the first few lines of the Arco-Íris website stating the organisation’s aim: ‘Yes let’s do it, say yes to life, everybody fighting against prejudice and discrimination’. The website affirms that the organisation aims to increase self-esteem and community feeling by creating a tolerant space free from preconceptions. The importance of the organisation, and the various groups it runs as being tolerant was also outlined in the description of the group’s Entre Garotos programme (Arco-Íris 2010):

'We talk about the emotions and perceptions of young people, seeking to minimise the damage of prejudices experienced at school, in friendship groups, in the family, in religious and work environments'.

Unlike other sites and social situations across the city, such as the home and the workplace mentioned in the last chapter, Arco-Íris seems to represent a space free from prejudice. This notion of the group’s headquarters as a particularly tolerant space was reiterated by most interviewees frequenting meetings and projects. When asked to describe the way he feels at Arco-Íris Cauê responded: ‘I’m really descontraído (relaxed), really loose, I don’t have to ficar colocando mascaras (keep hiding who I am). The space of the organisation seems to allow him to ‘be himself’ and reduces the need to remain closeted about his homosexuality.

The understanding of Arco-Íris as a tolerant space was evident in comments made by the group leader Claudio. In an interview with the popular LGBT magazine, Jornal do Sexo he commented: ‘It’s important to reiterate that the organisation is non-governmental, there isn’t an owner. It ought to be a democratic and open space’ (Jornal do Sexo 2008). The notion that Arco-Íris represents a tolerant space was often reiterated in participants’ comments regarding the organisation. When asked what the objective of the
organisation was, Claudio reiterated comments made during the interview above, stating:

‘To have meetings with people in a democratic manner and to talk about sexuality without guilt or worry. Because, we realised back at that moment [when the group was formed] that there wasn’t any other group that was concerned with self-esteem, with the construction of identity’.

Claudio expanded on the importance of Arco-Íris as a democratic space, describing it as ‘a space for the construction of links with others…to be able to say things without guilt of worry’. In initial comments, all of the groups’ members showed similar understandings, describing the organisation as a tolerant space where queer individuals can perform their gender and sexuality openly. In one meeting I asked Herbert why Arco-Íris was important for him, and he replied that ‘It’s a space where you can come to meet other people, share gossip, flirt, *dar pintar* (be effeminate), make yourself at home. It’s a liberal space where you can act freely’. When I asked another of the group’s members, William why he frequented Arco-Íris, he stated that the organisation is free of repressive heteronormative models related to the way men are ‘supposed’ to behave:

‘Gay men, bisexual men and travestis exist in a spontaneous way, in the same chaotic way as human sexuality manifests itself, they lack models. But, we live in a society based on models and heterosexual models specifically. So, for everyone, the behavioural code, the correct posture in western society, in the western world is normalised because of this heteronormative culture. I think that the role of organisations like Arco-Íris is to reduce worries related to these models, and even to help rethink these models about what type of behavioural model we can adopt. Arco-Íris is a space free of this’.

William’s quote implies that the role of Arco-Íris is to broaden the range of acceptable gendered and sexualised behaviours outside the ‘correct heteronormative posture’, which he understands as causing anxiety amongst the LGBT community. In this respect, Arco-Íris can be thought of as a
tolerant space for gendered and sexualised behaviours that are generally marked as abnormal or undesirable.

Participants’ comments suggesting the tolerant nature of LGBT organisations were mirrored by those who attended events at ABIA. When I asked Renato why he frequented ABIA he commented that, in addition to the pride parade, it was the ‘mais tolerante’ (most tolerant) space of the city. He added, ‘Just because they’re not going to discriminate against me because of any sort of prejudice and they are going to value what I bring to the group’. Renato said that since finding out that he was HIV positive, ABIA has provided him with a site of support that is free from stigmatisation, particular regarding homosexuality and seropositivity:

‘When I first came to ABIA I was psychologically very weak. Because of everything that had happened. But, all of a sudden I discovered that everything wasn’t that bad after all. Not as bad as people say, in terms of stigmatisation’.

In general, LGBT organisations such as ABIA and Arco-Íris were understood as safe spaces through which queer men can construct their non-heterosexual identities. Fabio, one of ABIA’s members of staff, commented:

‘I think there are also the organisations that work with these populations, these groups, the gays. The organisations also give them meaning, because I think the organisations that help… I think they’re the cais seguro (safe ports) where people can also find answers to their questions, or try to find them and there’s lots of support, I think this is important’.

Caio suggested that it was the presence of other queer men, who he positions as accepting a wide range of gendered and sexualised behaviours, that made him feel at ease; ‘I feel comfortable in ABIA, because everybody there is homosexual’. He expanded upon these comments later in the interview saying that when he is amongst other gay men, such as in ABIA, he can be less discreet about his sexuality without running the risk of prejudice:
Tony: So, would you say that gay men who show their sexuality more suffer more prejudice?
Caio: Yes, a lot of prejudice, in the bus, in work, so to avoid these types of prejudices I keep myself to myself, I am more closed, when I’m with a group of GLS people then I really let myself go, I play about more...
Tony: Like at ABIA?
Caio: Yes, because when I’m there, it’s a gay orientated environment...but if I’m in another place, like here where we are for example. Even if they know that I’m gay...actually some people could be unsure about me. ‘Is he really gay, but he behaves properly, he speaks normally’. They’re going to always have this doubt because I’m more discreet. There are still a lot of prejudices.

In contrast to spaces where he has to restrict his gendered and sexualised practices, like on the bus or at work, Caio understands ABIA as a tolerant space. Other participants focused on other LGBT spaces such as Rio’s gay beaches, bars and clubs. Again, in descriptions many participants described such spaces as especially tolerant sites where queer men did not have to worry about prejudices or preconceptions regarding their gendered and sexualised behaviours. Davi commented:

‘I feel at ease with them in that part of Ipanema’s gay beach because it’s orientated towards my people. So, there I feel at ease...you can kiss your partner, give him a hug, and mess about in whatever way you want. So, I feel more at ease’.

Davi’s comments suggest that the gay beach is a tolerant space since he is able to behave more freely. This understanding was mirrored in comments made by Egor who, like many participants, stated that he was able to behave effeminately on the gay beach, ‘I feel good on the beach because if I, all of a sudden, started to behave effeminately, nobody’s going to recrima (criticise) me. It’s a place where I feel good, there are only homosexuals. It’s a cool place’. Likewise, when I asked Mauro why he felt more comfortable on the gay beach he stated that the gay public make him more at ease meaning
that he feels able to speak with a high-pitched voice, ‘se soltar’\(^{62}\) (to let himself go) and be affectionate with other men. Most participants who referred to the gay beach made similar comments related to the increased freedom to saltar a franga (act effeminately) and be affectionate with other men compared with in other spaces.

Tolerance regarding non-normative gendered and sexualised behaviours was reiterated in comments related to LGBT bars, clubs and the city’s gay-friendly streets, Rua Farme and Madureira’s Rua Bicha (literally, Faggot Street). When asked which sites are more liberal for homosexual men Eduardo responded, ‘Some can be seen as more tolerant, for example, to hold hands, or kiss, but really liberal, there’s nowhere that equals Rua Farme’. Caio commented that he feels comfortable on Rua Bicha stating that ‘People passed in front of the bars and didn’t discriminate because they knew it was somewhere for the gay community. Every time I went there I used to feel really relaxed’.

Participants’ descriptions of LGBT spaces, such as ABIA, Arco-Íris, the gay beach and gay bars, clubs and streets positioned them as the most tolerant spaces of the city for queer men. They were understood as sites where participants could talk openly about their sexuality, behave effeminately, kiss other men, discuss their sexuality and dance without worrying about prejudices. However, my own experiences through fieldwork with ABIA and Arco-Íris and participants’ comments related to their behaviours through LGBT spaces suggest that some gendered and sexualised behaviours across these spaces are less openly performed. In various ways research data implies that preconceptions specific to certain gendered and sexualised behaviours are prevalent across Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT sites, with some gendered and sexualised practices tolerated more than others, leaving many queer men feeling out of place or excluded in gay bars, beaches, clubs and organisations. In terms of broader research objectives this chapter furthers

\(^{62}\) Se soltar can be translate as ‘to let oneself go’, but was generally used in the specific sense of behaving effeminately by participants.
understandings of the spatiality of tolerance across Rio de Janeiro through focusing on largely ignored LGBT organisations, and later, gay beaches and virtual spaces, and challenges notions that LGBT sites represent necessarily tolerant spaces.

**Tolerance and Intolerance in Ambivalent LGBT Sites**

We have seen that participants’ initial quotes regarding Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT sites show that they are generally assumed to represent tolerant spaces where queer men feel comfortable openly expressing their sexuality. However, when probed further about the meaning and importance of LGBT spaces and their behaviours through such sites, most participants referred to personal cases of discrimination and prejudice across such sites. Both interview and fieldwork data suggest that certain groups of queer men – the stereotypically effeminate, travestis and sexually passive – are likely to suffer preconceptions in Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT sites. Such men were often ridiculed and at times made to feel deviant, or excluded from these spaces, generally by others in the queer community. Although it is possible to identify common behaviours and individuals that were understood as abnormal or undesirable in the city’s LGBT sites, there were also important differences, which I now consider across the five main queer spaces that participants discussed during interviews: LGBT organisations, the pride parade, the gay beach, virtual space and gay bars and clubs in an effort to increase our understanding of tolerance across LGBT sites.

**LGBT Organisations**

The first time I went to Arco-Íris, it was an unusually sultry and oppressive October evening. A combination of the heat and my own apprehension about what awaited me at the organisation left me feeling uncomfortable, almost causing me to turn back home. However, after reminding myself of the e-mail commitments already made to various members of the group, I continued

---

63 In addition several respondents referred to cruising areas. Whilst they could also be considered LGBT sites they are not discussed her due to the infrequency with which they were referred to in interviews and the small amount of data gleaned about them.
climbing the steep, winding streets of Santa Teresa neighbourhood. I was unaware that I was about to feel much more uncomfortable. Disorientated and dripping with sweat as I approached the Arco-Íris centre, I was unsure which of the overlapping, aged houses was the one I was looking for. Luckily, a young man, who I would later come to know as Bruno, came to my aid, confirming that I was in the right place. He led me to the door and pressed the door bell. The door was opened by a middle aged man who kissed both of us, welcomed me and insisted that I *fica a vontade* (make myself at home). For a moment I was feeling calm and relaxed. I could hear laughing and joking from the room below as we walked down the stairs. At first it seemed good natured, jovial and welcoming, but as I reached the bottom I realised that this wasn’t the case. A young, skinny boy of about eighteen was being ridiculed by several other boys of about the same age. They were pointing at him and mocking his tight-fitting clothes, and imitating his effeminate mannerisms and high-pitched voice. Several participants shouted that he was a *bicha passiva* (passive faggot). The scene reminded me of schoolyard bullying and left me feeling extremely uneasy. It was certainly not what I expected, especially since a few hours before I was reading that the group operates *sem qualquer forma de discriminação* (without any form of discrimination) (Arco-Íris, 2010) on their website. Yet it was a situation that I would become familiar with over the coming months.

Although it is difficult to generalise regarding men’s experiences at ABIA and Arco-Íris, it is possible to draw commonalities in the gendered and sexualised behaviours that resulted in discrimination in both organisations. The most commonly stigmatised behaviour was sexual passivity. In all meetings I attended at both organisations, negative comments were made related to sexual passivity. Men who discussed their sexual passivity openly, or who were assumed to be sexually passive, were often ridiculed and comments were made implying that such behaviour was repulsive, immoral and unmanly. Indeed, referring to the sexual passivity of others in a disparaging

---

64 The term passive is used to refer to the non-insertive sexual partner in male-male sexual relations. This is commonly referred to as the ‘bottom’ in English-speaking countries.
manner was endemic to group meetings and was typically mentioned five to
ten times during activity sessions lasting for an hour or two. Although it
appeared light-hearted *zoação* (joking about), referring to sexual passivity
was actually used as a way of ridiculing others and was almost guaranteed to
‘get a laugh’ from other group members.

During the interval of an Entre Garotos session, two young men were play
fighting on the floor in the middle of the main meeting room. In the middle of
the tussle one of the men fell down with his bottom raised slightly into the air,
and the other man fell awkwardly on top of him. One of the more vocal
members of the group, Yago, shouted out, ‘Two passive guys trying to fuck,
how disgusting!’ His comments were followed by raucous laughter by the ten
or so men that were in the room. Renaldo, who seemed to find the situation
particularly amusing, added, ‘*I knew* that you were a *bicha passiva* (passive
faggot)!’ The two men fighting looked embarrassed, brushed themselves
down and got up from the floor and one of them exclaimed ‘It’s not me who’s
the passive one, no!’ Although the play fighting was relatively uncommon in
Arco-Íris, the comments were typical of the *papo* (chat/conversation)
amongst group members during less-structured parts of the meetings. Such
incidents were often seen by participants as light-hearted, but the examples
above imply that they have negative consequences for those subjected to
ridicule. Ultimately, they cause embarrassment and shame, which often
results in denial of one’s sexually passive role. In turn, this appears to
reinforce notions of the active male sexual role as normal.

Similar instances to those above were also common at ABIA meetings. In
one session, two fellow members were arguing with each other regarding
their sexual preferences, both calling each other *bicha passivas*. I took the
opportunity to ask one of the group’s workers, Henrique, why they were
arguing about this point. He replied, ‘Nobody wants to be the *bicha passiva.*
Everything is related to being a man. If you’re active and gay it’s kind of OK,
but if you’re not then it’s kind of bad. It’s something funny’. The idea that
sexual passivity is something negative was reiterated in many instances where I was told, ‘Don’t listen to him he’s just a bicha passiva’ during group disagreements. The implication being that men who were passive were not worthy of attention. Insults related to one’s sexual role at ABIA and Arco-Íris imply that not only was being sexual passive understood as something humorous, but also as something less valued and less manly. This was reiterated in comments made regarding Francisco, a member of ABIA who self-defined as a heterosexual male. All the other men at the meetings identified as gay or homosexual and this was used as grounds to question his sexuality. This was achieved through frequent comments to the fact that Francisco was, in fact, *total flex or gilette*\(^\text{65}\), both derogatory terms meaning bisexual. When I asked Caio why they insisted that Francisco was bisexual, he replied ‘Because he likes to *dar* cu (be sexually passive, literally, to give his arse) too!’ At which point the other men in the room began laughing and Francisco turned red, but did not reply.

During the interval of an Arco-Íris meeting, one group member, Kevin stated that he had a funny story to share with the group. He claimed that he had gone out at the weekend with a friend to a gay club and his friend was ‘hit on’ by a travesti. He imitated the way the travesti walked over to him, with a wide gait and acted as if he were cupping his breasts. The other volunteers were all laughing at his story, and, as their comments suggested, at the idea that a homosexual man would let a travesti flirt with him. After several minutes, a couple of men implied that the story was actually about him and not a friend as Kevin suggested. Immediately Kevin stood up and pointed over to Renaldo, stating ‘It wasn’t me who was chatted up by the travesti, it was that bicha passiva there!’ The room erupted into laughter and Renaldo looked

\(^{65}\) The term *total flex* is used to refer to cars that run on duel fuel, accepting either petroleum or methanol/ethanol. Amongst the queer community it is also used for men who are sexually attracted to both men and women. The term *gilette* is used to refer to the popular brand of razors, but amongst the queer community it also means bisexual. When using a razor you cut both sides of your face, not just one. This has been applied to sexual attraction, such that, when a man declares that he is sexually attracted to men and women he is sometimes called a gilette.
embarrassed. He tried to make a comeback quip, but it went unnoticed amongst the sniggers and verbal mocking.

Importantly, such instances were not simply sexually active men ridiculing those that were sexually passive. Many of the men who ridiculed other group members for being passive told me in informal discussion and interviews that they also identified as passivo. For example, Caio, who mocked Francisco for being passive in the quote above, suggested in another meeting that he was passive. Thus, the way in which queer men identified their sexual role, whether ativo, passivo, or, less commonly, versátil, appeared to have little influence over whether participants used the term offensively or not. However, such comments were always directed at men who were known, or assumed to be sexually passive. Indeed, disparaging comments related to sexual passivity were never made related to being sexually dominant at Arco-Íris or ABIA.

Whilst the term bicha passiva was undoubtedly used as a term of offence, often with the aim of making those within ear range laugh and resulting in embarrassment for the individual identified as such, this was not always the case. At other times, the term was used in a more ambiguous manner at Arco-Íris and ABIA. For example, the expression was sometimes used as a term of endearment, evident in the greeting, ‘Hey, bicha passiva!’ prevalent amongst group members. In this way, it seems that the term passiva was affectionate and, as several respondents stated, carinhoso (caring). This was suggested by the fact that the term was only used as a greeting between close friends and was almost always accompanied by hugging and kissing. Indeed, whilst I noticed that nobody referred to me as a bicha passiva in initial meetings, this changed within a month or two as I got to know group members, and eventually, I too had seemingly become one of the bicha passivas. Therefore, whilst participants’ comments imply that references to passivity generally occur as part of zoação aimed at stigmatising passive
sexual behaviour, the term is also deployed in a positive way amongst queer
men.

There were numerous cases that suggested effeminate male behaviour was
also devalued in social interaction in ways that were unrelated to sexual
passivity at ABIA and Arco-Íris. Most memorably, this was highlighted when
we were interrupted during a presentation at Arco-Íris by a high-pitched
scream in the street. This was followed by shrill cries and shouting from what
seemed to be a young male. Kevin exclaimed ‘Sounds like some bicha
pintosa is being beaten up!’ Everybody began laughing and one volunteer
shouted, ‘Slap him bicha!’ and pretended to imitate a limp-wristed attempt at
a strike. Most of the men continued laughing and made no attempt to
discover whether the male was actually in danger or not. In other cases,
prejudiced comments were made regarding the effeminacy of other group
members. Most commonly, manners of speaking and gesticulating that were
understood to be effeminate resulted in teasing. This was highlighted in a
group play-writing task at Arco-Íris. Miguel suggested his ideas regarding the
play to our group and was chastised for speaking in a high-pitched voice and
elongating his vowels and stressing nasal sounds common in Portuguese.
Miguel became annoyed, asking other group members why they were
mocking him, to which Marco replied ‘Just because you’re the most
effeminate guy at Arco-Íris!’ He proceeded to imitate his voice and made
limp-wristed gestures. Despite seeming angry at first, telling other members
of the group to ‘shut up’, Miguel decided to remain silent and refused to
assist in the group assignment, seeming rather uncomfortable. At both Arco-
Íris and ABIA it was common to witness similar instances where those
thought to be overly effeminate were ridiculed. Often this was achieved
through calling group members pintosa or adding the word to common
phrases. A common example was evident in phrases like, ‘Just like that
pintosa just said’ or, ‘What’s wrong with you pintosa?’ It would appear that
such phrases were used to cause embarrassment and humiliation by making
other members of the group laugh at a stereotypically effeminate man.
At other times, the effeminacy of group members was valorised and mocked simultaneously, resulting in both, derogatory, disapproving comments and recognition and respect, particularly for being humorous. In one example, myself and other volunteers from Arco-Íris were waiting in a city centre square for the arrival of other group members before beginning a day of leaflet and condom distribution. Suddenly, our friend Kevin appeared at the other side of the square. He was walking towards us, shaking his hips and moving his head from side to side, wafting his long straight hair. As he got closer I noticed he was swinging a hessian bag forcefully with one hand and rearranging his large, aviator style glasses with the other. He walked past some street sellers, directed a couple of pirouettes towards them and carried on walking towards us, shaking his head even more. The response from other volunteers was a mixture of disgust, amusement and respect. Many of the volunteers were cheering, clapping and whistling in encouragement, whilst someone at the back shouted out ‘Que horror!’ (How awful)! Renaldo replied ‘Que malouca!’ (Crazy girl), as if both horrified and amused. When he approached us most of the volunteers were laughing, but Jorge shouted out ‘You’re a bicha pintosa (an effeminate faggot), do you know that?’ The reaction of the other members of Arco-Íris was ambiguous; his dando pinta left some members shocked and upset, whilst others seemed to admire Kevin’s courage and audacity and found the situation to be amusing. The example suggests that whilst effeminate behaviours were generally marked as undesirable and inappropriate within social interaction at queer organisations such as Arco-Íris, this was not always the case, and at times such behaviours commanded respect and admiration from fellow members.

In addition to passivity and effeminate behaviours, travesti gendered and sexualised performances were generally viewed negatively amongst members of Arco-Íris and ABIA. Disapproving comments related to travesti behaviours were generally made once or twice in group sessions. The intolerance of travesti behaviours overlaps with that of effeminate male
behaviours, since they were often associated with effeminate practices such as wearing stereotypically feminine clothing and talking in a high pitched voice. However, one difference between prejudice directed at travestis in Arco-Íris and ABIA and other forms of discrimination was that the former was often related to social class. This was highlighted by the fact that queer men who behaved rudely and abruptly were often categorised as travestis baixas (working class, literally, low travestis) or as travestis sem classe (no class travesties). In one example, several members of ABIA were discussing their trip to a small island off the coast at the weekend. When I asked if they had a good time, Breno replied, ‘Tony you’re never going to guess what happened. We were all sunbathing using our sungas (tight beach shorts) and this bicha baixa’ [pointing to Caio] turned up wearing his calçinha (female knickers)! I swear it’s true. Didn’t you know he’s a travêca (derogatory term for a travesti)? Sunbathing, wearing his calçinha, bicha pobre (poor faggot)!’ At first I thought Caio was a travesti, as I had only just met him. But, when I asked Renato he started laughing, saying ‘No, it’s just sacanagem (piss taking). They always say he’s a travesti from the favela!’ This example suggests that preconceptions related to travesti identities at ABIA were related to gender, sexuality and class. Being poor and effeminate becomes equated with being a travesti, something which most of the men found extremely humorous in itself. This was reiterated in rumours at Arco-Íris that one of the group members was a travesti prostitute at weekends. Not only did the possibility that he might identify as a travesti result in secretive conversations where group members stated their shock, disapproval and disgust, but these were almost always related to the fact that he is from a poor family in the Zona Norte. In general, participants’ comments suggest that derogatory remarks related to travestis in Arco-Íris and ABIA can be understood as simultaneously misogynist, homophobic, and related to class preconceptions.

In other instances discrimination towards travestis was less related to class, but instead related to other factors, such as effeminate behaviour or sexual passivity as highlighted in Kevin’s story that his friend had been ‘hit on’ by a
travesti. Although such instances may be interpreted in various ways, I suggest that they represent attempts to mark travesti behaviours as abnormal and less desirable in LGBT organisations. Travestis rarely attended workshops or meetings at Arco-Íris or ABIA and I would suggest that this is, at least in part, a consequence of the intolerant nature of such organisations for them and the high level of discrimination they face from those within the queer community.

Overall, general intolerance of passive sexual behaviour at ABIA and Arco-Íris seemed to be related to disapproval of male effeminacy. This was implied through the feminine -a, termination of the word passive when it was used to refer to the sexuality of others in a derogatory manner. This contrasted with the masculine term passivo, which was always used when participants referred to their own sexual role. How can we understand this? Parker (1999) identifies the widely held idea in Brazilian society that in sexual relations the male is active, dominating and powerful, whereas the female is passive, vanquished and dominated. He states that the implication is that if a man is passive, he effectively loses his masculinity and is no longer behaving as a man. Consequently, he effectively becomes a woman and is understood as passiva, rather than passivo. It can be argued, then, that social interaction between most queer men in ABIA and Arco-Íris reinforces gendered and sexualised cultural norms linking males with masculinity and an active sexual role.

**Gay Beaches**

There are two main gay beaches in Rio de Janeiro – one in Ipanema at the end of Rua Farme and the other in Copacabana, known as *Bolsa da Copacabana*. The majority of interviewees made reference to these places when discussing their sexuality, suggesting that they were important locations for the performing of queer male identities. On the face of it, gay beaches seem like extremely tolerant spaces for queer men, with visible rainbow flags, same-sex couples openly displaying affection and travesti
deck chair sellers adding to what Carvalho (2007) sees as the ‘multifarious nature of the [carioca] beach’. However, personal experiences and participants’ comments suggested that the reality of Rio’s gay beaches was less tolerant. Fifteen interviewees specifically referred to prejudices on the gay beaches, whilst just nine interviewees saw them as locations that were free from prejudice. Certain gendered and sexualised practices were disapproved of and marked as undesirable and out of place on the gay beach. In contrast to queer organisations, where passive sexual practices were the most commonly disapproved of, on the gay beach male effeminacy that was most likely to result in adverse responses from other group members. Moreover, despite the notable absence of travestis on the gay beaches, there was relatively little evidence of trans discrimination, thus contrasting with comments related to queer organisations.

Comments and actions from those within the queer community often suggested that openly effeminate behaviours were understood negatively on the gay beach. Indeed, 12 of the 15 respondents who discussed prejudices on the gay beach referred to male effeminate practices negatively. I experienced this first hand in comments made by the gay couple I was living with for several months. On many occasions, they would make reference to what they saw as the excessive number of effeminate queer men on Ipanema’s gay beach. When I asked one of the men whether there were many attractive guys at the beach he replied, ‘Yes, but there are too many barbies that look hot, but they have a high pitched voice when you speak to them, it’s horrible!’ The association of the gay beach with male masculine behaviour was referenced by many participants and was often related to the body image associated with the site. For example, when I asked Agnaldo what sorts of people go to Ipanema’s gay beach he responded, ‘They are really worried about beauty, about having toned and muscular bodies. I feel really out of place….They are barbies and aren’t very discreet so I don’t feel good’. This was reiterated in comments made by Nilton that ‘They use a sunga to show that they are really muscular, that they have been taking
steroids’, he goes on to describe this as the fantasy model of the ‘real man’. Not only did comments made related to the gay beach highlight a preference for muscular physique and stereotypically masculine behaviour, but they also suggested the marking of white bodies as most desirable than others, as highlighted in chapter three. Thus, preconceptions related to non-masculine behaviour are also tied up with racial norms on the gay beaches as elsewhere in the Zona Sul.

Prejudices directed at effeminate queer men was also evident in the reaction to weekly dance sessions performed by a group of adolescent teenage boys on Ipanema’s gay beach. The boys would perform a synchronised dance to North American or European pop music, moving their bodies like the female singers whose music they were playing. Whilst many men on the beach would stop and watch the routine, this was almost always accompanied by shouts and jeers referencing their effeminate jeito (behaviour). For example, typical comments that frequently overhead included, ‘Look at the faggots saltando franga/dando pinta (being effeminate)!’ ‘Nobody deserves that’! ‘How horrible!’ When Pedro exclaimed, ‘Look at those little faggots there, crazy girls!’ the group of men I was with started laughing. Gui simply added, ‘How awful!’ The reaction that the dancers received on the gay beach was, in many ways, akin to Johnston’s (2007) understanding of abjection. Those present were simultaneously disgusted and shocked, and intrigued and interested in the effeminate way in which this group of dancers were acting on the beach. Despite their curiosity, most men made negative comments, which suggested their disapproval of male effeminacy. Such instances appeared to represent attempts to assert their own masculinity over that of less stereotypically masculine men.

Nevertheless, in some ways, the mere presence of the dancers every week and their reluctance to desist in spite of the discrimination they faced, can be seen as an act of resistance against dominant discourses of acceptable behaviour on the gay beach. In addition, a minority of participants
demonstrated understandings and behaviours that challenged the assumption that stereotypically masculine behaviours were necessarily normalised on the gay beach. This was highlighted in chapter three in comments that suggested ambiguity related to the image of the macho barbie amongst some queer men. Whilst many participants strived for a stereotypically masculine, muscular body form and were proud to show their bodies, others joked about such images and commented that they purposefully behave in a non-stereotypically masculine manner. Similarly, the way in which several of my friends used language on the beach indicated that they were not concerned about behaving in a masculine manner on the beach. For example, Gui and Pedro would go to the beach to meet their closest friends, and would almost always feminise their names by changing the final –o to –a. Whilst on the beach. Thus, my name was often switched from Antônio to Antônia/Tonia. Whilst this is noticeable to Portuguese speakers, such behaviour rarely attracted any attention from those around us, suggesting that it was possible to behave in a non-masculine manner on the beach without disapproval from others present.

Although less prevalent than in queer organisations, on several occasions queer friends and others present on the beach used derogatory terms related to travestis and travesti behaviours. It was relatively common for friends to joke that someone they knew had ‘got with’ a travesti, or, more commonly, um traveca. In addition, travestis were almost always discussed in an offensive manner and conversations often related to their status as failed women through references to their fake breasts, badly applied make-up and possession of a penis. Like in ABIA and Arco-Íris, my homosexual male friends would sometimes ridicule each other through referring to one another as o travesti/trava/traveca. This was frequently combined with a negative qualifier, such that the most common combinations were ugly, fat and poor travesti, suggesting that gendered, sexualised and classed preconceptions are linked. Overall, prejudices in conversation and mocking between queer men, imply that gay beaches represent relatively intolerant sites for travestis.
This might offer some insight into the almost total lack of travestis present (even) on the gay sections of Ipanema and Copacabana’s beaches.

Prejudice related to sexual passivity on the gay beaches was common, although observed with less frequency than in Arco-Íris and ABIA sessions. However, on several occasions I observed queer men referring to each other as bicha passiva and this was often done in a similar manner as in LGBT organisations. Although it seemed to be used both as a term of offence and as a term of endearment between close friends, the connotation was that being sexually passive was something humorous, negative and abnormal. When it was used in a semi-joking manner, the term passive was often applied to men who were not physically strong, again emphasising linkages between sexual role and gender. This was apparent in comments made by Ryan:

‘I don’t know if you use these terms in your country, macho66 (male) and fêmea (female), passive and active. Most of the time, especially there on the beach, these people, or rather these gays who have worked-out bodies, without hair, they are the machões (big macho guys), the active guy...There’s a certain repulsion towards the effeminate gay guys, who are the women’.

Ryan’s comments are in-keeping with those highlighted in chapter three that suggest a muscular physique is seen as more desirable in the Zona Sul. However, extending on these comments, Ryan implies that on the beach the masculine, muscular body is also linked to being sexually active. It appears that the strong, masculine body is read as a signifier for an active sexual role, resulting in those who are effeminate and weak being chastised for being sexually passive. Thus, in many ways participants’ comments suggest that the gay beach is not a straightforwardly tolerant space for queer gendered and sexualised behaviours. In particular, effeminate male behaviours, and to

66 Although terms macho and fêmea are translated as male and female, they are generally used figuratively or are applied to animals. When talking about people, the terms masculino/feminino or homem/mulher are more commonly used. The use of the terms macho or fêmea for people is generally seen as disrespectful due to the animal link, or can be used to stress that a man is extremely stereotypically masculine or feminine.
a lesser extent travesti and sexually passive practices, which were viewed disparagingly on the gay beach. Overall, queer male behaviours appear to uphold dominant gendered and sexualised norms on the gay beach, which leave effeminate men particularly more likely to suffer in-group prejudice. On several occasions, however, I also observed homophobic comments from those outwith the queer community at the gay beach. On one occasion I overheard seemingly heterosexual men who were being affectionate with girls, referring to other men as viados and bichas, seemingly in-place of words like, ‘guy’. In addition to stating that the use of such terms was extremely homophobic, my friends claimed that they were efforts to demasculinise their male acquaintances. Pedro commented, ‘He’s trying to say his friend’s not a real man’. In another instant, two gay men were fighting on Ipanema’s gay beach, shouting at each other between punches: ‘Come here you viado’, ‘I’m going to smack you, you bichinha’. When I asked Gui why the men were using these terms, he replied, ‘They’re just saying that the other one’s like a little girl. That he can’t fight because he’s a bicha’. Thus, it would seem that gendered and sexualised norms, which privilege the masculine heterosexual male, were privileged by both queer and non-queer users of the gay beach.

**Pride Parade**

Pride parades were important events for most participants. Of the 56 participants that mentioned such events, 51 stated that they attend at least one neighbourhood pride annually. Initial comments often referred to the supposedly tolerant nature of pride parades, especially for those at the margins of queer community such as travestis. However, further probing suggested a more complicated picture. Whilst Rio de Janeiro’s pride parades represented locations where dissident gendered and sexualised behaviours could be openly performed without risk of physical homophobia, events at the São Paulo 2009 pride remind us that even these events can become sites of attacks against the LGBT community. The São Paulo pride was marred by the explosion of a home-made bomb, stabbings and a violent attack resulting in severe head injuries of one attendee, all were thought to be homophobic in nature. For a
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67 Although Rio de Janeiro’s most popular pride parade was free from reported incidents of physical homophobia, events at the São Paulo 2009 pride remind us that even these events can become sites of attacks against the LGBT community. The São Paulo pride was marred by the explosion of a home-made bomb, stabbings and a violent attack resulting in severe head injuries of one attendee, all were thought to be homophobic in nature. For a
overly simplistic to understand them as completely tolerant spaces where queer men are free to perform their gender and sexuality without restrictions. Participants’ comments suggest a less optimistic account of pride parades as representing sites where non-normative gendered and sexualised practices were often stigmatised by those within and outwith the queer community. Like comments made on gay beaches and queer organisations, many participants suggested that intolerance of travesti and effeminate male gendered and sexualised behaviours at pride parades. However, in contrast to these locations, there was no evidence of discrimination against passive men.

Of the 56 respondents who discussed the pride parade, 28 referred to the presence of travestis and 22 of these made comments showing disapproval. The majority of participants seemed averse to the presence of travestis at the pride, many of whom blamed travesti behaviours for sullying the image of the city’s queer community. This was highlighted by comments made in reference to a photo chosen by many participants showing the travesti trio elétrico (carnival car) at the 2008 Copacabana pride parade (figure 3). Whilst discussing the photo many participants commented that the image of a group of about thirty travestis dancing on top of the trio elétrico, mostly wearing bikinis and a couple without tops on was ‘over the top’, ‘dirty’ and ‘beyond the limits’ of acceptable behaviour. Several interviewees referred to the image as showing disrespeito, a term which I had become more accustomed to hearing in connection with non-LGBT spaces, as discussed in the previous chapter. Whilst I was in the street, the passing of the travesti trio elétrico seemed to evoke similar comments amongst those watching. A male couple holding hands behind described it as horrible, whilst one of the pride volunteers working with me was more critical describing it both as ‘nufento’ (disgusting) and ‘estranho’ (strange). Such disapproving, understandings of the presence of travestis at the pride parade were reiterated in interviewees’

Mauro disapproved of the travesti presence at the pride parade because they were seen as too vulgar, especially compared with the ‘political parts’ of the event. Interestingly, whilst many participants commented that travestis wearing revealing clothing or dancing topless was uncouth and too overt at the pride parade, similar situations involving women at the carnival, such as dancers on carnival school trio elétricos were not seen in the same way and respondents never described this behaviour as improper or too explicit. Thus, it would appear that it is not the behaviour, being scantily clad, that is viewed as a problem; rather, it is travestis behaving in this way that is disapproved of.

Figure 3: Travestis at Copacabana Pride
Many participants commented that the travesti community did more harm than good to the campaign for gay rights, which most respondents understood as the political aim of the pride parade. The presence of travestis was described by several participants as atrapalhando (hindering) the progress of the city’s queer community. For example, when questioned as to why he disapproved of the travesti float at the Copacabana pride Robson commented, ‘Lots of people are fighting to achieve their rights and then this day [pride parade] of the year arrives and they ruin everything by acting so strangely’. The idea that travestis damage the likelihood of achieving gay rights was common when I asked respondents of their opinion of the pride parade. For example, when I asked Enzo whether he was in favour of the Copacabana pride, he picked up the photo of the travestis on the float and stated:

‘At all the gay pride parades in the world, you’re going to see that there are aberrations. People that are really insulting gay power, doing damage to the words of gays with strange types of clothes. Who’s going to want to go out in the street with their children amidst these types of people that scare you more than horror films. There’s no way to accept this! I would never vote in favour [of gay rights].

Participants’ comments, such as Enzo’s, suggest that travestis, with their ‘strange clothes’ and ‘weird behaviours’, damage the image of the queer community and hinder the realization of gay rights because they are too shocking for the general public to abide. However, six participants were more positive about the presence of travestis at the pride parade suggesting that the event gave travestis, who were extremely rarely seen in the day, needed visibility. In addition, they implied that their different clothes, strange way of acting, and unusual bodies are treated with intrigue and are widely anticipated at the pride. For example, André commented:

‘The travesti float, most with their breasts out, showing why they are there and completely breaking down this question of gender, of masculine and feminine. It is always the float that’s most looked forward to, and the one most seen by the old
women of Copacabana. All of them want to see the travesti float. They sit on the pavement on their deckchairs to see the travesti float.

In another informal interview one respondent commented, 'the pride is one of the only moments they can show themselves, feel happy, be seen, dance and be winners’. Nevertheless, the majority of participants’ comments related to the pride parade demonstrated widespread prejudices related to travestis. The cruel reality for Rio de Janeiro's travesti community is that in addition to the extreme verbal and physical homophobia they encounter in their day to day lives (de Almeida 2006), they also face huge preconceptions at supposedly queer-friendly pride events. For most travestis, the pride parade does not represent a marvellously tolerant spaces where they suddenly find their gendered and sexualised behaviours accepted, but is instead a site imbued with unequal power relations that often result in stigmatisation and discrimination of their non-normative gendered and sexualised practices.

An additional, related behaviour that was often viewed negatively at the pride parade was male effeminacy. Of the 56 participants discussing the pride, 20 made reference to preconceptions against effeminate men. This included, but was not restricted to, travesti gendered and sexualised behaviours. Participants generally linked male effeminacy to three specific behaviours: wearing female clothing and make-up, moving, dancing or walking in a stereotypically female manner, and speaking in a high pitched voice. Effeminate male behaviour was most commonly criticised by suggestions that it ‘estraga’ (ruins) the image of Rio de Janeiro’s queer community. As in the case of travestis, many participants positioned effeminate behaviour as counter to the gay rights movement. It was often suggested that effeminate behaviour is not serious enough for an event that is concerned with fighting homophobia and discrimination. This was implied in comments made by Cauê:

‘It’s a somewhere we go to defend our rights. It’s just a shame that a lot of the people that frequent pride still don’t get this. They just want to go and dar pinta. I
think that they don’t think much or pay attention to the meaning of the pride parade. It isn’t just a party, behind the party it’s about rights’.

Wanderson was similarly disapproving of the effeminate men present at the gay pride parade:

‘It’s like this: there’s somebody fighting for my rights. So, I’m not going to fight, I’m going to drink and let them fight for my rights. People just go to be effeminate. They don’t participate’.

According to Wagner’s comments, those frequenting the pride parade just go to dar pinta and can be separated from those fighting for gay rights. Wanderson and Cauê’s comments suggest that behaving effeminately was seen as holding back the gay rights movement. When I asked Teodoro why he thought that effeminate men might do damage to the queer community’s image, he responded:

‘Look, I don’t have anything against it, but I think that there are some [homosexual men] who exaggerate too much at pride. They’re too effeminate. There are gays who wear over the top costumes. They end up differentiating themselves from the heterosexual world’.

Teodoro’s comments are less critical than those of other participants, but his understanding of such behaviour as too exaggerated suggests that he too disapproves of effeminate male behaviour. Whilst most quotes have demonstrated intolerance of effeminate male behaviours amongst the queer community, Teodoro’s comments that queer men behave in a way that is different from the ‘heterosexual world’ suggests that effeminate behaviours might also be viewed negatively amongst heterosexuals present at the pride parade.

Interestingly, although most participants identified the pride parade as a site where sexual and non-sexual same-sex intimacy can be relatively openly displayed, 19 of the 56 interviewees showed disapproval of, or discriminated
against, queer men showing such behaviour. The majority of these were particularly disdainful of what they saw as an excess of *pegação* at the pride parade. Peret (2010, p 73) defines *pegação* as the ‘term used in the heterosexual milieu to define the search for partners at parties, gatherings and nightclubs’. He goes on to state that ‘It has, however, its origins in the gay world, in which it indicates the anonymous, immediate and impersonal search for intimate or sexual satisfaction, generally in discreet or closed places within public spaces’. This scornful attitude towards *pegação* was highlighted in comments made by Lorenzo:

‘The first time I went to a gay pride parade it was the only thing that I saw: people going to party that didn’t have any specific reason to be there. Many [homosexual men] go to be able to *levantar a bandeira* (openly display their homosexuality, literally, raise the flag) and just stay there doing *pegação*. So, I said “It’s just about this, they say this gay pride is to give visibility to gays, lesbians etc…They also say that it’s a fight for your rights. But, if I’m going to stay underneath a big flag, grabbing any guy that I see, doing *pegação*, I’m going to be fighting for which right? In other words, when it’s time to party they call us, but when it’s time to fight for your rights, they don’t need us! I know that I’ve done my part, but that doesn’t count for anything, it’s hardly anything, and the majority just want to know about partying. They just want to know about *pegação*.’

Generally participants disapproved of *pegação* for two reasons. Firstly because it was understood as damaging to the fight for gay rights and secondly, related to this, due to concerns that such behaviour would be, as many participants commented, *mal visto* (frowned upon), by those outside the queer community. Lorenzo states that the majority of queer men are disinterested in the political objectives of the pride parade and are more concerned with partying and meeting other men. Most participants were critical of men who were preoccupied with hooking-up rather than gay rights. For example, when I asked Clayton why he didn’t like the gay pride parade he said that there was ‘too much *pegação*’, stating ‘gays go to the pride parade with the intention of dancing, as if he were going to carnival, going to kiss two, three, four, five, six people’. Similarly, Alexandre claimed that
‘I really like to have fun with my friends, I think it’s important, but sometimes the gay pride parade loses its focus. The pride parade is there for you to ‘lift up the flag’ and defend your case. Lots of people there aren’t bothered about the cause. They are there to have fun more than anything else, to do pegação. I want to defend a cause – equality, more respect. People lose their focus, they do things and think that everything is liberal on that day and they end up crossing the line of what would be judged normal behaviour’.

Alexandre went on to comment that heterosexuals, such as his friends, are shocked by the level of pegação that takes place:

Tony: What do you think about the pegação, that you said is damaging for the queer community, that happens at the pride parade?
Alexandre: I’m going to give you the opinion of my friend. She was completely shocked by the way people were behaving. Like I said, people cross over the line. It’s ugly to see this, to encounter this behaviour around you happening in an aggressive way. This is what she said to me...those that go out of curiosity get shocked and even form bad opinions sometimes, depending on what they saw and experienced at that moment.

His quote implies that same-sex affection and flirting is disapproved of both within and outwith the queer community at the pride parade. Comments made related to the pride parade, in general, suggest that the event does not represent a site of unlimited tolerance, as is sometimes portrayed, rather it is a space through which certain gendered and sexualised behaviours are stigmatised. Participants’ comments suggest that travesti behaviours, in particular, and to a lesser extent male effeminacy and same-sex affection/pegação are particularly mal visto at the pride parade. In contrast to other LGBT sites, it appears that such behaviours are often viewed negatively because they are seen as circumventing the political aim of the pride parade. Thus, for many queer men, then, the pride parade does not represent a special tolerant site where gendered and sexualised practices
are performed unrestricted, but as somewhere there are limitations in the
gendered and sexualised behaviours permitted.

**Gay Bars and Clubs**
The majority of participants who were asked to identify where they felt most *confortavel* (comfortable) or *a vontade* (at ease), referred to gay bars and clubs. However, surprisingly perhaps, participants’ comments also suggest that there are strict limitations on the gendered and sexualised behaviours that are tolerated across the gay scene. In particular, effeminate male behaviours, and to a lesser extent, travesti performances and sexual passivity were identified by most respondents as stigmatised behaviours in such spaces. Being effeminate was often seen as overly displaying one’s sexuality, and participants’ comments suggest that this often resulted in disdainful looks and comments. When I asked Marcos whether certain queer men face more prejudices than others on the gay scene he replied:

‘The sort of person who doesn’t draw attention to themselves, who doesn’t have
an effeminate voice, who doesn’t flounce about. When this sort of person goes
out, and he goes clubbing, not drawing attention to himself, he’s going to meet
people with effeminate mannerisms. Because of this there are really severe
prejudices in relation to these, effeminate people in general’.

The notion that effeminate queer men face preconceptions from within the
queer community was reiterated in comments made by Antônio. In contrast
to Marcos, he commented that prejudices within the queer community are
particularly directed at travestis:

**Antônio**: People that demonstrate their homosexuality, people that are effeminate
and also travestis are really discriminated against. I think that these two groups,
because of the voice, clothes…for some [gay men] that are effeminate there is a
lot of prejudice. There are lots of comments, like, “Ahh, look at the little faggot
walking past, the little girl” I think these two groups face the most discrimination
even in gay bars and clubs. There is discrimination against gays who are
effeminate.

**Tony**: So, you would say that within the gay community there are also prejudices?
Antônio: Yeah, I think some people say that in there isn’t any. But, in my opinion there exists a lot of discrimination against effeminate men.

In-keeping with data presented in chapter three, Antônio’s comments suggest that queer men use visual and auditory clues in order to determine effeminate behaviours. When such signs indicate effeminate behaviour, queer men may experience verbal discrimination from within the LGBT community. The idea that male masculinity is privileged on the gay scene was also implied in comments presented in chapter three related to the body. Most participants who referred to body form and the gay scene commented that the strong, white masculine and muscular barbie is understood as more desirable than those that are stereotypically effeminate, black and weak. However, this varied over the gay scene. It was in the most expensive bars and clubs such as The Week, Le Boy and 00 that the macho barbie was viewed most positively and the effeminate gay was identified as more likely to suffer prejudice. This was suggested in comments made by Damon, who, pointing to a photo of Le Boy stated ‘In my opinion the people from Papa G [Zona Norte nightclub] don’t enter here’. He went on to describe them as those ‘little faggots who are too effeminate’. Thus, although participants’ comments suggested that preconceptions related to effeminate behaviour were prevalent across Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT clubs, they also implied that they were stronger in clubs frequented by wealthier cariocas, mostly in the Zona Sul.

Like comments made by Antônio, several participants suggested that gendered and sexualised practices associated with travestis were less tolerated in Rio de Janeiro’s gay bars and clubs than many other spaces. However, unlike other participants, Mirella claims that the preconceptions are reciprocal and travestis also show intolerance towards other members of the queer community on the scene:

Tony: Are there some places that are less tolerant for travestis?
Mirella: Even in gay places, like bars and clubs there exists this problem. I work for a group called transreveloução and I think that we need to start breaking down preconceptions within our own community. So, they aren’t places where travestis are basically accepted, because even in our own gay places, that both gays and travestis frequent. They show prejudices towards travestis. Just like the travestis show prejudices towards the gays. So there are still these problems. There are gays who don’t like to go out with travestis.

My own experiences support the majority of participants’ comments that indicate that travestis face discrimination on the gay scene. Whilst in a city centre club called Cine Ideal Pedro looked over and saw a travesti dancing behind us. ‘What a horrible thing!’ he exclaimed, adding ‘she has the jeito (way) of a man, how disgusting!’. Gui and João both started laughing, and Pedro continued to make critical comments, seemingly related to the travesti’s failed femininity. He continued, referring to her poorly applied make-up, fake breasts and masculine behaviour. It seemed that the travesti had heard as she looked over, glared at Pedro and moved away. I heard similarly offensive comments whilst in the company of homosexual men in several LGBT bars and clubs, but never encountered any sort of retaliation on behalf of the travestis. Even when travestis were performing in gay bars and clubs the atmosphere was rather ambiguous with some men showing support and cheering, whilst others were making offensive quips, often related to the, supposedly, overly masculine dress or behaviour of the travesti. Thus, for many travestis it would appear that gay clubs represent intolerant sites where their gendered and sexualised behaviours were stigmatised through homophobic and misogynistic comments.

Although sexual passivity was not mentioned frequently in the context of gay bars and clubs, two participants did state that they thought such behaviour was stigmatised on the gay scene through users’ conversations and behaviours. For example, when I asked whether prejudices are prevalent on the Rio gay scene, Claudinha Boca Doce commented:
‘There’s this division between active and passive. So, these effeminate faggots feel out of it...left out of this milieu [gay club] and most effeminate faggots don’t admit that they are passive, despite their effeminate gestures. ‘Ahh my boyfriend is my man, he is completely active but he only come (fucks, literally, eats) me. So, I think that the effeminate faggots with this air about them don’t have the slightest chance among modern gays’.

Claudinha’s comments imply that even on the gay scene, queer men feel ashamed to admit their sexual passivity. On several occasions I experienced similar instances, where even when men were open about being sexually passive, it was often stressed as something they do not normally do, or they reluctantly do to please an active partner. Thus, prejudices within the gay scene, related to one’s sexual role appear to have tangible consequences on queer male behaviour across such sites – primarily through, hiding/denying their sexual passivity, and in some cases causes feelings of embarrassment and shame. Claudinha’s comments also suggest a conflation of effeminate behaviour with sexual passivity. On numerous occasions similar situations were observed where effeminacy was read as a signifier of a preference for a passive sexual role on the gay scene. For example, considering discrimination on the scene, Egor commented:

‘Even gays do this “Look at the pintosa. Look at the passive girl! So, the main preconceptions that exist are against the effeminate guys. All fags that are pintosas (effeminate) are categorised as being passive, people already call them passivas (passive girls)’.

While I was with Pedro in a nightclub a young, a slim man had started dancing on the stage. He shouted out ‘Look at the bicha passiva dancing, horrendous!’ I was unsure who he was talking about, but the other men with us immediately looked at the young man behaving in a stereotypically effeminate way and started laughing, making comments about him wanting to dar cu. This linking of effeminacy and passivity in situations like this often resulted in queer men experiencing prejudices related to being sexually passive, regardless of their actual sexual
preference on the gay scene. As in the case of gay organisations, the linking of effeminacy and sexual passivity was also illustrated through the use of the female term passiva rather than the masculine passivo.

In various ways, participants’ comments demonstrate that gay bars and clubs represent ambivalent sites where many queer men feel accepted, comfortable and at ease, but are also sites where certain groups face discrimination and intolerance from within the queer community. In particular, men who are identified as belonging to the overlapping and related categories of effeminate gay man, travesti and, to a lesser extent, sexually passive, were more likely to face discrimination on the gay scene, even if their behaviours were accepted in certain situations. For many queer men the gay scene is not an oasis of tolerance, but a site where gendered and sexualised behaviours must be strictly regulated if one is to avoid discrimination from within the queer community. In the Zona Sul this combines with the threat of physical homophobia from pitbulls, and the racial and class based regulatory framework identified in chapter three to create LGBT spaces that appear to be extremely intolerant for certain groups of queer men.

**Virtual Spaces**

Many aspects of prejudice towards travestis, effeminate and passive men within the physical LGBT community were mirrored in the virtual LGBT world. The most popular website amongst the LGBT male community in Rio de Janeiro is, undoubtedly, Manhunt, whilst less popular sites are Disponivel and Gaydar\(^68\). The majority of men I knew had a profile on these sites and used them for a variety of reasons, from meeting other LGBT people, to having romantic or sexual relationships. Seven of fifteen respondents who discussed LGBT sites implied that preconceptions exist against certain groups of queer men online. Fabio commented that it is effeminate men who are discriminated against on such websites:

‘I think that currently there is a certain valuing, within the gay community, of a type of homosexual masculinity that is more approved. I recognise this a lot on the internet: “Are you effeminate? I don’t like effeminate guys”, “I’m looking for guys who aren’t effeminate”. And, when they don’t ask, it’s written in their description text. So, sometimes you meet up with a guy who, for me, is effeminate, but he says that he isn’t! So this is a really subjective topic isn’t it? But, I see it like this: there is disapproval of more effeminate behaviour and the really macho guy is successful. It really is a case of more defined guys with muscular bodies, really stressing their masculinity. Even the little skinny guys, except for a few cases, are mirroring the same styles as much as possible to be thin without suffering these types of prejudices’.

Although Fabio’s comment suggests that it is masculine men who demonstrate preconceptions towards stereotypically effeminate men online, he also implies that effeminate men may emulate stereotypically masculine behaviour to avoid discrimination. In this respect, it could be argued that practices by queer men in general, rather than simply those of more masculine men, reinforce dominant discourses of masculine male behaviours as normal and desirable on the internet. From Fabio’s quote it is clear that prejudices towards effeminate men in the virtual world, have real impacts on the gendered and sexualised behaviours of queer men offline. His assertion that effeminate queer men mirror the style of more masculine men was reiterated in comments made by Cesar:

‘Gays see the adverts on the internet of people who don’t want to meet effeminate guys. So, gay men try to distance themselves from this and this means that the prejudices are directed, ever more, at whoever has a feminine appearance or behaviour. I think that it’s the feminine man who suffers most preconceptions’.

Like many respondents who discussed physical LGBT sites, Cesar and Fabio’s quotes imply that travestis and effeminate queer men are more likely to experience on-line discrimination. However, one difference in comments made about physical and virtual LGBT spaces, was the apparent lack of prejudice towards sexual role on LGBT websites despite its presence across
physical LGBT spaces. This does not imply that discrimination is entirely absent and does not occur in chat rooms and forums, but rather, that it is not overtly visible on member profiles, which was the topic most discussed by interviewees. The reason that sexual passivity appears more acceptable in virtual LGBT space could be a consequence of the raison d’être of the most popular website, since they are used, at least in part, for arranging sexual relations. Thus, it would seem counter-productive for discrimination along the lines of sexual role to be openly expressed. Nevertheless, participants did not offer an explanation for this difference.

Although almost half of participants who considered the internet referred to prejudice on popular websites, this did not mean that they were not important for carioca queer men. In contrast, most participants who mentioned the internet commented that there were extremely significant in enabling same-sex dating and sexual relations. In particular, they were generally seen to offer opportunities to meet partners that might not exist in the physical world. André, for example, stated that ‘virtual spaces permit a lot – it’s [sic.] a flux of bodily liberation’ and when I asked which locations are most important for queer men, he replied:

‘Today I think the biggest spaces are on the internet. The biggest space where you meet lots of partners easily...where you see the product before buying. It’s not just gay behaviour, maybe. Gays have the biggest possibility in these virtual spaces, mainly because of a lack of physical space, and because of their living situation. Heterosexuals can get with people anywhere, homosexuals can’t’

For many participants internet sites provide more freedom to meet other queer men than exist across the physical space of the city. On the one hand the increased access to other members of Rio de Janeiro’s queer community implies permissive virtual space, opening up opportunities of behaviours often seen as undesirable elsewhere, such as same-sex sexual activity. On the other hand participants’ comments imply that many prejudices apparent
in physical LGBT spaces, particularly those against effeminate queer men are prevalent in virtual LGBT space too.

**Discussion: Ambivalent Spaces of Possibility (Not Queer Counterpublics)**

Notions of tolerance are often connected to LGBT sites across Rio de Janeiro, as was shown in participants’ comments and in the rhetoric of LGBT organisations discussed at the start of the chapter. Nevertheless, my own field experience and further probing of participants’ practices reveals the tolerance rhetoric to be, at best, an optimistic misrepresentation of the city’s LGBT sites. In various ways, participants’ comments suggest that the notion of LGBT sites as tolerant is inaccurate since it masks gendered, sexualised, race and class preconceptions within the queer community, primarily directed at effeminate and passive queer men, and travestis. LGBT sites can be understood as largely ambivalent for these groups, although there were important differences in the particular gendered and sexualised practices that were met with prejudice and/or disapproved of across such spaces.

Intolerance of effeminate male behaviours was ubiquitous across diverse LGBT sites and in virtual LGBT space, but other preconceptions varied significantly over such sites. For example, prejudices against sexual passivity were widespread in social interaction occurring in Arco-Íris and ABIA, but was less common at the gay beach and in gay bars and clubs and non-existent in respondents’ comments and experiences at the pride parade and in virtual LGBT space. Similarly, whilst prejudices against travestis were prevalent at the pride parade, they were less common in LGBT organisations, at the gay beach and in gay bars and clubs, and were not evident in comments made related to on-line LGBT communities. Moreover, preconceptions directed at same-sex affection and sexual behaviour were extremely common at the pride parade, but not evident across other LGBT sites. Even where the same behaviours resulted in prejudice, across various sites, the nature of this discrimination was often very different. For example,
whilst preconceptions related to travestis were often related to class in gay organisations, this was rarely the case in other LGBT sites, and whilst discrimination towards effeminate males and travestis was linked to assumptions that their behaviours were circumventing the political aims of the pride parade, in other settings, such as on the gay beach, they carried very different meanings related to the body or sexual role. In spite of these differences, it is clear that Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT sites do not represent tolerant spaces for many within the queer community.

This does not, however, mean that the (in)tolerant nature of LGBT spaces is fixed. On the contrary, this chapter has presented several examples indicating that behaviours that often result in prejudice and disapproval, are, at times, understood and experienced in ways that are not stigmatised. Most notably, in queer organisations and at gay bars and clubs effeminate behaviour was viewed as desirable because of its humorous qualities, and across several LGBT sites the term (bicha) passiva was used as a term of endearment between close friends. Thus, this chapter has shown that whilst behaviours occurring through Rio’s LGBT sites often result in discrimination towards various members of the queer community, the nature and extent of this discrimination varies from site-to-site and at times queer men performing stigmatised gendered and sexualised practices are viewed favourably. This suggests that Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT spaces be thought of more in terms of ambivalent, rather than straightforwardly tolerant or intolerant sites.

Ward (2002, p 57) understands LGBT sites, such as gay and clubs, as homosexual counterpublics where ‘new forms of gendered and sexualised citizenship’ occur ‘meaning active participation in a collective world’. LGBT locations are seen to represent inclusive spaces where queer men and women have freedom to perform their gendered and sexualised identities in ways that challenge oppressive heteronormative discourses. They are progressive places for those excluded by dominant discourses of gendered and sexuality where ‘the visceral intensity of gender, of sexuality, or of
corporeal style in general no longer needs to be understood as private’ (Warner 2002, p 63). However, from interview and observation data, it is clear that notions of LGBT spaces as tolerant counterpublics do not reflect the lived realities of queer carioca men.

Rather, tolerance varies across LGBT sites in ways that both allow and permit specific gendered and sexualised practices as a result of different repertoires of ambivalence across the spaces of the LGBT organisation, the beach, bars and clubs and online. Interview and ethnographic data presented over the last three chapters, implicitly and explicitly, suggests that the discourse of safety could offer an explanation for the varying spatial nature of tolerance and ambivalence across the city. For example, earlier chapters have suggested that effeminate behaviours carry the risk of verbal and physical discrimination in public spaces, as highlighted in the case of pitbull attacks. This chapter has demonstrated that male effeminacy is the most important component in the way queer men organise and perform their gendered and sexualised identities in public spaces such as the pride parade and the beach. This is demonstrated though the high levels of ambivalence towards travesti and effeminate male behaviours across these spaces. In contrast, in seemingly safer, semi-private spaces where the risk of physical violence is lower, such as in LGBT organisations, gendered and sexualised identities are generally ordered in terms of sexual role. Consequently, one possibility is that the way in which queer men negotiate their gendered and sexualised identities across LGBT spaces is linked to notions of safety and means that the nature of ambivalence varies significantly between pubic and private spaces. The exception to this appears to be virtual space where it is the use of websites to arrange sexual encounters that appears to influence the way in which gendered and sexualised identities are worked through. Thus, intolerance towards effeminacy is evident, but not towards sexual role.

Although queer men did not refer to the term ‘respect’ explicitly when talking about LGBT spaces, as they did when they discussed the family home and
the workplace, there are parallels in the way gendered and sexualised behaviours were talked about in this chapter with the previous one. In both, participants have identified specific gendered and sexualised behaviours that are most frequently privileged, such as stereotypical masculinity, and those that are not, such as male effeminacy and male passivity and have shown that this is often an internalised process. Thus, gay and bisexual men frequently self-regulate their performances so as to avoid less-privileged gendered and sexualised behaviours. However, in contrast to the last chapter where queer male performances were generally only kept ‘in check’ through a panopticon like process related to participants’ concerns of how others view their behaviours (as respectful, or not), in LGBT spaces queer men often policed their gendered and sexualised behaviours as a result of tangible experiences of discrimination from those within the queer community, which manifested itself in joking, humiliation and embarrassment and influenced the experience of these sites as tolerant/intolerant.

The findings of this study would suggest that Rio de Janeiro's LGBT sites are much less disruptive than is often assumed; rather than representing spaces through which dominant gendered and sexuality norms are straightforwardly challenged, re-worked and re-articulated, they are actually sites where dominant discourses are, reinforced and contested simultaneously, or, even, reiterated. LGBT spaces are not sites of unrestricted freedom for queer men, but are ambivalent sites where behaviours may contribute to hegemonic norms. As Payne states, 'The “scene” becomes understood as a scene of power and subjection and not as a space of liberation from these dynamics' (Payne 2007). LGBT sites, including organisations, bars, clubs, beaches and virtual spaces are imbued with ambivalence that organises suitable behaviours across such spaces. Ambivalence within the queer community serves to mark the limits of those who can partake in the construction of LGBT spaces and denies the full participation of certain queer men and women. LGBT sites are not, then, inclusive sites of unlimited possibilities but
spaces through which gendered and sexualised behaviours are strictly regulated and organised through varying repertoires of ambivalence.

Consequently, instead of unquestioningly assuming that LGBT sites, in Brazil and beyond, represent tolerant counterpublic spaces where queer men and women can perform their gendered and sexuality unrestricted and free from prejudice, we must acknowledge that they are sites of ambivalence, even if this challenges the way such sites are generally understood and promoted. We must pay more attention to the processes of homophobia, sexism and misogyny that occur through LGBT spaces and, even more importantly, we must identify the specific groups that are targets of prejudice across such sites and are, all too frequently, left feeling victimised and excluded. Doing so will allow us to better understand the workings of normative frameworks of gender and sexuality in LGBT organisations within Brazilian society and elsewhere.

This chapter has suggested that we should not rest on our laurels by assuming that queer, counterpublic spaces have already been achieved simply through the increasing presence of gay bars, clubs, beaches and organisations across our urban spaces around the world and of LGBT websites in our lives. We must recognise that practices, which operate through LGBT sites, often, actually resist their queering. Queer implies that gendered and sexualised norms are challenged, contested and re-worked in ways that challenge hegemonic discourses. Queerer LGBT sites would be brought into being through behaviours that resist, rather than strengthen normative gendered and sexualised frameworks. Rather, LGBT spaces can be thought of as ambivalent spaces. They are sites that allow and restrict simultaneously. Taking an ambivalent understanding does not mean that we should necessarily see LGBT spaces negatively though. As Bondi (2004, p 5) states recognising the ambivalence of spaces is also about acknowledging their openness, 'ambivalence is not about sitting on the fence, but it is about creating spaces in which tensions, contradictions and paradoxes can be
negotiated fruitfully and dynamically’. Recognising the ambivalent nature of LGBT spaces involves recognising both the tolerant and intolerant nature of such sites. It should be an important part of efforts to make LGBT spaces more open, inclusive and tolerant, whilst also recognising that the radical counterpublics that Warner (2002) optimistically describes are nothing more than idealistic dreams that fail to reflect the reality of queer lives. In this vein, assuming that we have already accomplished inclusive and tolerant gay bars, clubs, beaches, organisations and virtual spaces risks perpetuating potemkin notions of LGBT spaces and runs the danger of ignoring the experiences of millions of queers who rely on social relations through such sites for support and protection, leaving them disenchanted, or worse, discriminated and victimised in Brazil and around the globe.

Whilst the previous chapters have drawn attention to the dominant race and class discourses that are related to tolerance of gendered and sexualised behaviours in the Zona Sul generally, this chapter has shown that differences also exist across specific types of LGBT spaces within the Zona Sul and beyond, in other areas of the city. The complex linkages between gender, sexuality, race and class through LGBT spaces at times reinforce and at times challenge the privileged masculinities and sexualities identified amongst the Zona Sul queer community highlighted in chapter three. The previous two chapters suggest that whilst it is possible to identify specific gendered, sexualised, race and class behaviours that are privileged in the Zona Sul, this varies across specific LGBT spaces such as the beach, the gay club or the LGBT organisation and at times behaviours that were tolerated in LGBT spaces reinforced those that were generally tolerated in the Zona Sul and at times they were different or even contradictory. Indeed, as the next chapter illustrates, the location of tolerant and intolerant spaces can often appear quite antithetical to received wisdom about where queer men can find acceptance and positive reception to their sexualities.
Chapter 6

‘My sexuality isn’t going to interfere with my love for God’: Religion and Performing Queer Identities

Having entered my local Catholic church at the end of mass to speak to the Priest about interviewing him for my research I could see he was talking to a group of ten or so people in the sacristy. The conversation seemed light-hearted and good-natured; there were lots of hand-shakes, smiles and laughing. The atmosphere seemed welcoming and friendly. As I approached the Priest he turned round and asked how he could help me, probably noticing that I had not been to the church before. I explained my research project and politely asked if he could spare some time for an interview. He thought for a second, and then responded loudly and emphatically saying ‘I’ll see you at confession tomorrow. We can do the interview then’, adding ‘You’re very lucky that I’m agreeing to this, most priests would tell you to get lost (sair daqui), and tell you that homosexuality is wrong, that it’s the work of the devil! I have a lot to say to you tomorrow, you should schedule at least two or three hours’. The chitter-chatter around me had already become quieter when I mentioned the word homossexualidade, but now there was deathly silence. It was at this moment I was first struck by the pertinence of questions of sexuality to religion and the possibility that religion influences the way gender and sexuality are performed by queer cariocas.

A year earlier, in 2007, the polemical nature of the relationship between sexuality and religion was highlighted when the Visão Nacional Conscienciacristã (VINCC) (National Christian Conscience Vision) erected various billboards in the city of Campina Grande, Paraíba, stating ‘Homosexual: God made a man and woman and saw that it was good’. The gay rights organisation, Associação Brasileira de Gays, Lésbicas, Bissexuais, Travestis e Transsexuais (ABGLT) (Brazilian Association of Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals, Travestis and Transsexuals), reacted angrily, declaring that the billboard infringed on citizens’ rights and took legal action to have the signs
removed. The VINCC were outraged, making the exaggerated claim that ‘We're seeing the resurgence of a new type of dictatorship in Brazil, this time of gays!’ (VINCC 2010) and fought to protect their freedom to express homophobic opinions. Perhaps most interesting about the event was the way in which both movements positioned the gay and Christian communities as being mutually exclusive, in opposition to one another and as having different needs and objectives in exchanges that followed the incident. This was highlighted when the VNCC added an article to their website titled ‘What's allowing the homosexual minority to dominate the Christian majority’.

Like the two examples above this chapter problematises notions that religion and sexuality can be easily separated by exploring the multifaceted ways in which religion influences the way participants perform their gender and sexuality across the city (see also Prior & Cusack 2008). Indeed, separating religion from sexuality leaves us with an incomplete understanding of the way in which queer men behave across the urban landscape of Rio de Janeiro and how this relates to tolerance. The first part of my discussion presents participants’ discourses suggesting that, excepting for Afro-Brazilian religions such as Candomblé and a few select gay-friendly religions, religious institutions are perceived as intolerant for homosexuals. Spaces of worship associated with major religions, such as Evangelism and Catholicism are assumed to be restrictive and homophobic and are understood in opposition to the tolerant and permissive terreiros of Afro-Brazilian religions. However, participants’ lived realities suggest that this division between tolerant and permissive religious institutions on the one hand, and those that are intolerant and restrictive on the other, does not reflect queer male behaviours through spaces of the church and the terreiro. For many queer men, religious sites associated with intolerant religious institutions represent important spaces where they can meet other queer men and express their sexuality.

---

69 Terreiros are the religious buildings of Umbanda and Candomblé. They are often situated in houses in residential neighbourhoods that are used for religious practice. From my experience they often represent simple, unassuming buildings and, apart from a small sign next to the door, it is not usually clear what these buildings are used for. See figure 4 for a photograph showing the inside of a terreiro.
relatively openly and feel comfortable and protected. The second part of the chapter thus considers the role of religion and religious belief in participants’ gendered and sexualised performances in seemingly profane spaces, such as the home, workplace and the street. Religious beliefs influence participants’ experiences of these sites as tolerant or intolerant in diverse ways. Throughout this chapter it is argued that religion, sexuality and tolerance are mutually constituted and interrelated, and that further research focused on religion is required to better understand the spatial nature of tolerance.

**Religion in Brazil Today**

‘All Brazilians have a cultural obligation to follow a religion,’ Leonardo resolutely stated when asked whether religion was important for LGBT men. Although this could be understood as hyperbole, religion is an undeniably important aspect of Brazilian life. Signs of religion are ubiquitous across the physical landscape of Rio de Janeiro. From the brightly coloured saints displayed in almost all *lanchonetes* (snack bars), to the *pais-de-santo* (male priests of Afro Brazilian religions) selling religious artefacts in the street and the Evangelical billboard posters on street corners. As in many other Latin American countries, the vast majority of Brazilians claim to have religious faith and almost all believe in God (IBGE 2010). Like elsewhere in the continent, Catholicism is the most widely followed religion. The latest census data shows that 73.6% of the population self-identify as Catholic. Catholicism arrived in Brazil with the first waves of Portuguese immigrants in the sixteenth century. Although it was the compulsory religion until 1891, when the Brazilian republic was established, it has been the *de facto* state religion since and has a great influence on the country today. Romero (1989) captures the pervasiveness of the Catholic church when she describes it as the 4th sphere in Latin America society, composing of the state, the market, civil society and the Catholic church. The influence of the Catholic church in
wider issues of gender and sexuality in Brazilian society was highlighted by the fact that divorce was illegal until 1977.\(^70\)

Despite being arguably the most powerful religion in Brazil, the Catholic church does not encompass the religious diversity in the country today. 15.4% of Brazilians identify as Evangelical (Three quarters as Pentecostal), 1.3% as Spiritualist and approximately 0.3% as Umbandistas and Candomblistas (IBGE 2010). In addition, 7.2% of Brazilians state that they have no religion. Whilst the Evangelical church is, numerically, the second largest in Brazil, these statistics do not attest to the rapid growth of the Pentecostal branch of the church in recent years.\(^71\) Such churches barely had a foothold in Brazil forty years ago, but today it is the fastest growing religion in the country. Burdick (1993) understands this exponential growth as a consequence of their radical egalitarianism, particularly in terms of gender and race, something that even the most progressive Catholic churches lack. Due to the continuing growth of the Evangelical church this figure of approximately ten percent from the 2000 census is, almost definitely, an under representation of today’s figure.

The African slaves brought with them their own religious beliefs and practices. These have incorporated aspects of Catholicism to varying extents and evolved into the Afro-Brazilian religions of Umbanda and Candomblé.\(^72\) Whilst statistics show that only 0.3% of the population are adherents of Afro-

\(^70\) Despite the power of the Brazilian Catholic church, it does not represent a unified institution. Rather, it is composed of many factions, including the radical, and somewhat controversial CEBs (comunidade ecclesial de base) that take a liberation theology approach concerned with ‘social justice and the democratisation of religious authority’ (Burdick 1993, p 1).

\(^71\) Whilst it is recognised that the Pentecostal church represents one branch of Evangelism, the term was not used in interviews and rarely used in the field. Instead, the overarching term ‘Evangelical’ was used to refer to Pentecostal churches. Throughout this section I use the term Evangelical to reflect the term as it is commonly used in Brazilian culture.

\(^72\) Here I refer to both religions as Afro-Brazilian since they are both based on, at least in part, traditions and beliefs brought to Brazil by African slaves. However, whilst Candomblé existed in a similar form in various parts of Africa, Umbanda was created at the start of the 20th century and incorporates Indigenous, Gypsy, Spiritualist and Esoteric ideas and practices. In addition to spirit possession, other commonalities include similar clothes and use of the atabaque drum.
Brazilian religions, this, almost definitely, represents an underestimate of the true number of those practising such religions due to their stigmatisation in Brazilian culture.73 Indeed, despite the fact that up to half of Brazilians have consulted terreiros and up to twenty million actively participate in terreiro activities, Afro-Brazilian religions are rarely discussed or admitted in public (Brown 1994). Much of the negative understandings of Afro-Brazilian religions come from the generally incorrect assumption that they are used for macumba, where individuals perform witch-craft-like rituals to realise specific wishes and desires.74 The linkages between Afro-Brazilian religions and macumba are apparent in everyday Brazilian discourse where Umbandistas and Candomblé are referred to pejoratively as macumbeiro(a)s. Finally, in interpreting these statistics it should be noted that they do not reflect the fact that many Brazilians practise more than one religion. In particular, this appears to be the case with Catholicism and Afro-Brazilian religions, something that is implied in the popular adage that beneath the Catholic saint in a Brazilian’s house you will often find a hidden Umbanda or Candomblé saint.

Since statistics suggest that religious belief is an important part of Brazilian life, with almost all Brazilians professing a form of religiosity, it was not surprising that even in spite of the well recited tensions between Christianity and homosexuality, religion was mentioned as a significant component of many participants’ lives. Of the 35 respondents who mentioned religion, 33 said that they were religious.75 15 participants stated that they were Catholic.

73 This stigmatisation is suggested by results of a recent study showing that 57% (Datafolha 2010) of those questioned stated that they thought Umbanda was ‘something of the devil’. In addition, I experienced numerous instances where the term Macumba was deployed pejoratively. Most commonly, when friends had bad luck they would often blame it on other who had ‘done a Macumba’ or were accused of being macumbeiros. This was done with the intention of poking-fun at others.

74 Although Macumba can be used with a positive goal, such as in helping to win the lottery, assisting in getting a girlfriend/boyfriend, or negatively, such as to cause death or illness to others, it is more often considered negatively and associated with causing harm.

75 It should be noted that although this number represents just under half of the participants in this study, this figure still appears high, especially given the fact that I did not raise the subject of religion in interview questions. Indeed, religion was only discussed when participants referred to it.
five said that they practised Candomblé, three stated they were Evangelical, ‘had religion’ or adhered to their own religion, respectively, and four respondents said they were Buddhist, Spiritual, Athol oste or Wicca. Yet, bar a few exceptions (Fry 1986, Giumbelli 2005, Natividade 2005, Reis dos Santos 2010, Mayblin 2010) studies considering gender and sexuality fail to acknowledge the influence of religion or religious belief on gendered and sexualised performances. The handful of studies have been conducted on the topic can be separated into two broad approaches: those focused on religious spaces, such as the church (Natividade 2007, Reis dos Santos 2010) or the terreiro (Fry 1986, Cornwall 1994, Moutinho 2005) and those concerned with the influence of religion in other spaces (Van der Port 2005, Gontijo, 2009).

In terms of the former, one of the earliest studies into homosexuality into Brazil was Peter Fry’s (1986) groundbreaking work on Salvador’s Candomblé terreiros. Like more recent work (Natividade 2007, Reis dos Santos 2010), Fry’s study highlighted the importance of religious spaces in the construction of sexualised identities. He demonstrated that queer men, such as the effeminate bicha, who are discriminated across most spheres, may experience the space of the terreiro as tolerant. In particular, Fry related this to the special place that bichas have in rituals such as dancing and spirit possession. The fact that bichas were less likely to have children meant that they could channel more energy into the physical and social space of the terreiro and, consequently, they often occupied positions of importance, particularly that of pais-de-santo or specific spirit mediums. Understandings of the terreiro as a tolerant space for queer men and travestis was reiterated by Cornwall (1994) who, like Fry, draws attention to the fluidity of masculinity and femininity in the terreiro and the importance of bichas in certain rituals, such as possessing spirits or orixás. Whilst suggesting that the terreiro represents a tolerant space for queer men, she takes a more nuanced understanding of the site than Fry (1986), recognising that hegemonic norms related to gender and sexuality also impinge upon the terreiro. The terreiro is
not separate from wider social norms, rather these influence gendered and sexualised behaviours through its space. Fry (1986) and Cornwall’s (1994) studies also set up a binary of tolerant religious spaces linked to Candomblé or LGBT religious organisations and other, intolerant religious spaces. Moutinho (2005) warns against such an approach and, focusing on the space of the terreiro, argues that whilst it appears that the terreiro represents space that is accepting of homosexuality, actually there are strict restrictions on the way in which gender and sexuality are performed. Moutinho argues that queer male behaviours associated with the effeminate bicha and same-sex flirting are discouraged and marked as disrespectful in the terreiro. Moreover, the subject of homosexuality was identified as causing unease amongst the pais-de-santo who often viewed the topic as taboo, even if they identified as homosexual themselves (Moutinho 2005). Whilst homosexual behaviours are not forbidden in the terreiro, Moutinho’s (2005) study implies that nor are they totally accepted nor tolerated.

More recent work has suggested that religious spaces can be both tolerant and intolerant. Natividade (2007) argues that the Evangelical church can be understood as simultaneously allowing and denying the construction of queer identities. Many respondents in his study conceived the space of the Evangelical church as facilitating sexual and non-sexual same-sex relationships by allowing socialisation between queer men. Reis dos Santos (2010) considers the bibliography of the travesti Denise Martins who is positioned as struggling with her own internal conflicts reconciling her travesti and religious identities. She finds solace in the Catholic church ‘A Pastoral da Mulher Marginalizada’, which is described as providing a tolerant and welcoming space for travestis and becomes an important space for her as a travesti. Studies by Fry (1986), Reis dos Santos (2010) and Natividade (2010) challenge widely held assumptions, recognised by (Santos & Curtos 2008) that the church is necessarily homophobic and restrictive for members of the queer community.
Other studies have illustrated the influence of religion on gendered and sexualised behaviours outside religious spaces. For example, Gontijo (2009) argues that various aspects of the life trajectory of queer men, such as coming out, dealing with relationship problems, and accepting one’s own sexuality, are affected by religion. In one example, a participant’s homosexuality was accepted within the family home due to the fact that they had previously been helped by travestis practising Candomblé who had performed ‘magic’ and helped one of their sons (Gontijo 2009, p 119). Also focusing on the family home, Seidler (2006) reminds us that Catholicism plays an important role in sexual relationships, particularly the nature of sexual relations, and in decisions over pregnancy and family relations once children are born. These are linked to understandings of shame and sin that are identified as important components of the religion. In a different vein, Van de Port (2005) demonstrates how religion is actually integrated into the gay scene through events such as ‘Candomblé with beer’ and the exhibition of the God Exu at pride parades. He argues that Candomblé influences gendered and sexualised practices occurring in the gay scene and pride parade, such as listening to music, dancing and sexual behaviour. Nevertheless, studies focusing on the influence of religion on queer performances outside religious sites are sparse in Brazilian sexuality studies, and the majority of work is focused on queer behaviours in the terreiro or the church and with an emphasis on Candomblé (Fry 1983, Van de Port 2005, Moutinho 2005, Gontijo 2009) and Catholicism (Gontijo 2009, Reis dos Santos 2010). My research contributes to these studies with a focus on Evangelical Christianity and its effects on gendered and sexualised behaviours outside religious spaces.

**Religious Institutions and an Order of Tolerance**

Whilst the Evangelical church is popular in the United States and growing in Western Europe, it is at its most fervent in the developing world. From the slums of sub-Saharan Africa to the barriadas of Lima and favelas of Rio de
Janeiro the Pentecostal arm of the Evangelical church is expanding rapidly\(^76\). Many participants referred to the Evangelical church as significant in their lives. Of the thirty-three participants who discussed religion, fourteen identified the Evangelical church as an important site in terms of their gender and sexuality. Whilst the Evangelical church has a reputation for tolerance in certain respects, often viewed as empowering of the working-class, the non-white and women, this tolerance does not appear to stretch as far as homosexuality (Martin 2004). At Arco-Íris and ABIA meetings, the Evangelical church was often described as aggressively homophobic, intolerant and positioned as the principal enemy to the Brazilian gay rights movement. This perception was shared by many interviewees whose comments identified an order of tolerance related to religious institutions. The Evangelical church was described as least tolerant for queers, the Catholic church as slightly more tolerant and Umbanda/Candomblé as most tolerant. All 22 participants who referred to the Evangelical church referred to its intolerant nature by describing it as a ‘cancer’, ‘plague’ and ‘completely closed’. Fábio exclaimed ‘I think that you can do anything anywhere, except for the Universal [Evangelical] church. You can’t kiss your boyfriend there…they’re going to want to excommunicate you!’ Comments made by the pastor of an Evangelical church reiterated participants’ comments that it represents a homophobic and intolerant religion:

'We don’t have a prejudiced posture. However, the church is not in favour of the homosexual act because the bible says that this act is sinful. So, we can’t accept something in our church that could be sinful and not lead to salvation. Instead, we try to lead that person to be harmonised with God and leave this homosexual life because it’s written in the bible that it’s something sinful'.

\(^76\) Although adherents of the Evangelical church are growing across all classes in Brazil (IBGE 2010), it is amongst the working-class where this increase has been most noticeable. Martin 2004, p 109) suggests that this is because it ‘efficiently correlates itself to the survival needs of the working-class, organising self-help networks for poor women, offering faith healing as para-medicine, providing recovery from alcoholism and addiction, insulation children from the temptations of the street’. 
In general, the Catholic church was also described as homophobic and intolerant of queer men. For example, asked whether religious spaces were liberal for queer men, Douglas responded:

‘I don’t think so because the important religion is Catholicism really, and for them homosexuality is something wrong, and the idea is that a man has to get with a woman et cetera. Because of this, it’s not somewhere for you to frequent and to show that you are gay. These places are not locations that gays frequent’.

Although Douglas did not expand on the exact reasons why queer men would choose not to frequent the Catholic church, he explained he is most ashamed about his sexuality in the church due to the idea of homosexuality as sinful. This was reiterated by several respondents. When asked about whether the Catholic church was important for Rio’s queer community, André reiterates Douglas’ sentiments stating:

‘People need to have certain limits, because if not people lose their own limits…but, care has to be taken because often religion goes beyond this question of fear and is linked to guilt. So, instead of creating people that could be schizophrenic, you create people that are stressed and scared of everything and ashamed of themselves’.

Despite being seen as intolerant, the Catholic church was understood as more tolerant than the Evangelical church. Cesar stated that the Evangelical church is, ‘worse than the Catholic church because they persecute gays and at least in the Catholic church if you don’t say anything everything’s OK because, they don’t say anything against gays too’. Homophobia was described as less explicit and more hidden in the Catholic church, as suggested in comments made by Nilton:

‘The Catholic church would be more open, despite the fact that they are against homosexuality. It’s something more velado (veiled). But, for example the Universal church they’re going to try to tie you up. They’re going to want to make a chain, to exorcise you, to say that you’ve got the devil inside you, say
that you've are a person with negative energy…They will want to know where you come from, what it is that you do, they’re going to marginalise you. To enter this type of church you have to adapt yourself. If they see me, or any other type of gay on the street they say that they have the devil in their body, that you’re going to hell, that you’re a malignant person’.

The difference in tolerance between the Catholic and Evangelical churches was related to the likelihood of open discrimination against queer men. Whilst this was common in the Evangelical church, it was rare in the Catholic church. More specifically, although the attitude within the Catholic church is homophobic, homosexuals are welcome and are unlikely to be actively excluded as in the Evangelical church. One Catholic priest, when interviewed, commented that ‘there is no problem with homosexuality in the church’ and that homosexuals were welcome, as long as they realise that their sexual behaviour is sinful. He added that others present at congregations ‘do not worry about homosexuals at the church because there are lots of other sinners like macumbeiros, adulterers and thieves that attend too’. Thus, despite being positioned as homophobic, and positioning homosexuality as a sin and homosexuals as sinners the Catholic church was understood as more tolerant than the Evangelical church since it is unlikely to actively intervene in the lives of queer men or cure them from their homosexuality. According to the Catholic priest the church has ‘nothing to do with’ the private lives of its members.

In contrast to the Evangelism and Catholicism, Candomblé and Umbanda were generally understood as more tolerant of queer men. During an interview with an Umbanda pai-de-santo he stated that the religion accepts homosexuals and is free from negative moral judgments:

“We understand that homosexuality is a human being’s option. So, we don’t have any type of prejudice or restriction. As long as the person behaves in a correct way here. Because, if the person doesn’t behave in a correct way, it doesn’t make any difference whether they are homosexual or heterosexual, they’re going to have to follow the rules here in our house in the same way,
regardless of their sexual option. Umbanda, which is the religion that we profess, is a religion free from prejudices, prejudices of race, colour, sexuality, religion. Umbanda is universalist, it embraces all ‘tendencies’, all people, regardless of their options. So, we understand homosexuals as our brothers, just like heterosexuals too are our brothers’.

The tolerant nature of Afro-Brazilian religions was reiterated in comments made by Ryan, suggesting that both Umbanda and Candomblé are free from preconceptions related to sexuality and more open to homosexuals than other religions:

‘Let’s say that the Protestant and Catholic religions in Brazil they definitely prohibit the practice of this sexuality [homosexuality] that is different from there’s. Candomblé and Umbanda are religions that are apt. They have a certain amount of freedom for you to exercise your sexuality. They are more receptive with effeminate or masculine gays. They don’t have prejudices amongst themselves. They’re receptive to whatever type of social practice. I don’t know if they have preconceptions, but they accept in someway, the expression of your sexuality’.

Like many participants’ comments Ryan relates the freedom to ‘express ones sexuality’ to the ability to behave effeminately without experiencing discrimination as a principal indicator of the tolerance nature of Afro-Brazilian religions. Whilst such behaviours might result in homophobia in other religions, Candomblé and Umbanda were described as accepting male effeminacy (in particular). Migration to Afro-Brazilian religions amongst the queer community and taking important roles in the religion were stated by several participants as evidence of their tolerance. Cesar commented that lots of gays ‘end up migrating to other religions,’ often joining ‘Afro-Brazilian religions where there is an enormous acceptance of homosexuality and it’s really common that the priests are gays’.

Whilst most participants who had religious faith identified as Evangelical or Catholic, Evangelism and Catholicism were positioned as homophobic and intolerant institutions in participants’ discourses. This contrasted with
Candomblé and Umbanda that were understood as tolerant and open to homosexuals. It might appear, then, that non-normalised gendered and sexualised behaviours would be strictly restricted across sites associated with the Catholic and Evangelical churches and performed openly only in the terreiros (see figure 4) associated with Afro-Brazilian religions. Participants’ lived realities, however, point to a more complicated understanding than their discourses on religious institutions might imply. Firstly, they suggest gendered and sexualised behaviours are self-restricted in the Umbanda and Candomblé terreiros and, secondly, they show that queer performances of gender and sexuality are actually prevalent through Rio de Janeiro’s churches and that they are often experienced as meaningful spaces, as will now be discussed.

Figure 4: Umbanda terreiro prepared for a trabalho (service).
Rethinking Tolerant and Intolerant Religious Spaces

Intolerance and tolerance in the Terreiro

The terreiro can be understood as a site where queer men are welcomed and hold important roles in religious *trabalhos* (services) and rituals, and go to meet and socialise with others in the queer community as suggested by Pedro: ‘lots of gays from the subúrbio go because they can meet other gays’. Other participants stated that the terreiro was an important space of support where problems related to coming out, relationships and sex could be openly discussed, such as Caio who explained that after a break-up to he decided to go to a terreiro: ‘I went back to the spiritual centre because I even made new friends. Going to the spiritual centre, it’s such a good culture for gay men.’

However, in contrast to such comments and, seemingly, their discourses on religious institutions, the lived realities of the majority of participants implied that the terreiro is actually both tolerant and intolerant, permissive and restrictive. Interviewees flagged restrictions on the gendered and sexualised behaviours that can be performed through the terreiro. This was implied in an interview with the pai-de-santo:

*Pai de Santo:* Yes, it’s tolerant. Not only for homosexuals, but for everyone. But, this tolerance has limits, because a discipline exists. There are rules. The house [terreiro] has spiritual and material rules and as long as this discipline exists, then there is also ample tolerance.

*Tony:* So, as long as the person behaves respectfully, correctly?

*Pai de Santo:* Yes, like I said at the start, people behaving normally, within the correct procedure, in a form that the spiritual part would like. But, their sexual options are the last thing that’s going to matter [laughs], it’s not important.

Although the pai-de-santo doesn’t explain what ‘behaving normally’ might entail, his comments suggest that there are limits of tolerance in the terreiro and suggests that not all queer male performances are tolerated here. Other respondents made comments that identified specific gendered and sexualised behaviours that are not tolerated and viewed as *inapropriado*
(inappropriate) in the terreiro. When I asked Pedro why the priest I had
interviewed said that tolerance is limited he replied ‘Maybe a lot of pegação e
paquerando (cruising and flirting) goes on there...because it’s like a sacred
place’. The idea that sexually playful behaviour and flirting was outside the
remits of tolerant behaviour in the terreiro was reiterated by many
respondents, such as Felipe:

Felipe: It could be something like this: He [the pai-de-santo] is heterosexual
and doesn’t need to be watching two people kissing, you know?
Tony: The pai-de-santo, or everybody there?
Felipe: Well, it could be everybody...I think that it would be considered
inappropriate if two guys were acting like lovers in an environment like this
[the terreiro]. Even if the religion tolerates the fact that they behave in the way
that they behave, due to the explanation that they could be ‘possessed’ by a
more feminine spirit, in other words more effeminately due to the influence of
those spirits.
Tony: But, do you think that if they dão pintademais (are too effeminate), this
could create problems as well?
Felipe: No, don’t think that this would be a problem. I think that the problem
would be if they were acting like lovers.

Several interesting points emerge from this dialogue. Firstly, Felipe’s
comments imply that other attendants at the terreiro, including the
presumably heterosexual pai-de-santo, would take offence at overtly
affectionate behaviour, such as kissing and flirting. Secondly, in-keeping with
other participants’ comments, whilst being open about one’s homosexuality
and behaving effeminately are tolerated in the terreiro, pegação and
affectionate same-sex behaviours were not. Thirdly, it is suggested that this
could be explained by their positioning as profane behaviours in what Pedro
described as a sacred place. Effeminate behaviour was, seemingly, accepted
because it was part of the sacred rituals occurring at the terreiro, particularly
spirit incorporation, but, since same-sex intimacy and pegação were not,
they were not tolerated and understood as inappropriate and too profane.

77 Several comments referred to same-sex intimacy as common amongst heterosexuals at
the terreiro, but not amongst queer men and women.
Although Afro-Brazilian religions were understood as tolerant of homosexual men, participants highlighted that there are restrictions on the gendered and sexualised behaviours permitted in the terreiro, as argued by Moutinho (2005). Although Moutinho (2005) found intolerance for both effeminate behaviours and pegação/flirting, participants in this study only identified the latter as not tolerated in the terreiro. In addition, whilst Moutinho (2005) draws attention to embarrassment related to wider social-stigmas of homosexual behaviours as a principal factor for queer men restricting their gendered and sexualised performances, comments by participants in this study stress the importance of notions of the space as sacred in modifying behaviours.

**Queer Behaviours in the Church**

‘There are some places where a lot is spoke and preached against gays, but in the middle of these people that are preaching against gays, there exist gays who are fazendo pegação (cruising).’

Cauê’s remarks were not atypical of the comments that queer men made related to the church. Whilst most participants who discussed the Evangelical and Catholic churches as institutions claimed that they were restrictive and intolerant for queer men, comments related to gendered and sexualised behaviours imply that queer men feel welcome and comfortable with their sexuality there. In addition, they suggest that they are not heterosexual spaces, devoid of queer practices, but are imbued with non-normative gendered and sexualised behaviours. Cauê’s quote suggests that despite the homophobic rhetoric of the Evangelical church, the site represents a place where some queer men go to ‘cruise’ and meet other homosexuals. After conducting an interview with Gui, he stated that he was not very open about the importance of religion in our conversation. When I asked what he meant, he explained that he did not feel comfortable talking openly about his sexuality in the local Evangelical church because of a ‘contradiction’ that
bothered him. Whilst the pastors and many other members of the congregation made it clear that they thought that homosexuality was wrong, meaning that he had chosen to remain closeted to most members, it was also an important location for meeting other queer men. He added that his first sexual experience was with another church member with whom he *brincou* (played about with sexually) at the back of the church. He went on to state that he discovered gay organisations, such as Arco-Íris through other queer men that he had met at church.

This was reiterated when conducting fieldwork at Arco-Íris itself, where I noticed that several of the regular attendees were also introduced to the organisation through church friends. In addition, several respondents made comments that implied the Evangelical church represents a site of protection and support for queer men, most commonly using the word *acolher*, translating simultaneously as to welcome/greet and shelter/protect. This was highlighted in comments made by Teodoro:

*Tony:* Would you say that most homosexual men are religious in Brazil?
*Teodoro:* Yes, the majority of gay men are part of the Evangelical church, because the Evangelical churches try to *acolher* (protect) you a bit more...
*Tony:* Than other religions?
*Teodoro:* Yes, before they know that you’re gay. Because, the homosexual is looking for this, somewhere that *acolhe* (protects you).

Teodoro’s quote suggests that the Evangelical church might actually represent a safe-harbour for queer men where they feel protected and sheltered. In this respect, comments such as Teodoro’s mirror conclusions by Altus-Reid (2003, p 4) who states that ‘popular spiritualities are not just dissenting, but help people ‘cope’ with the aberrancies of the heterosexual system’. Although many men understood the Evangelical church as extremely intolerant, for others it represents a space of respect and support. For queer men, who are often excluded from certain contexts of everyday life such as in work or in the family home, the Evangelical church can represent
a secure space where they feel sheltered and at ease, even if their homosexuality is not openly accepted. This was suggested in comments made by an Evangelical pastor, ‘The church achole (welcomes/shelters) all different types of people, gays, bisexuals, homosexuals…the doors of the Evangelical church, and even Catholic church, are open’. Although he does not consider homosexuality specifically, such comments appear to reiterate Burdick’s (1993) argument that the Evangelical church is becoming increasingly popular in Brazilian society, and with young people seeking to escape the pressure of youth society, because of its concern with those who experience suffering and discrimination.

Whilst some participants behaved in ways that challenged the heteronormativity of the space of the Evangelical church, attending to meet partners, flirting and have sexual experiences, all men commented that they were not out to non-homosexual members of the churches. In an Entre Garotos meeting Teodoro commented that one of the group’s volunteers ‘is a pastor of the Assembly of God Church, but it’s just that nobody knows about this there, he’s not out to anyone’. Thus, it is also important to recognise that the majority of men for whom the church represents a meaningful space, in terms of expressing their homosexuality, were actually in the closet. It appears that the church is experienced as both an intolerant space where queer men must remain closeted, but it is also an important space. When I asked Júlio why he felt ‘at ease’ in the Evangelical church despite not being out he commented that although he knows that the church states that homosexuality is the ‘work of the devil’, like most of those at church he was indifferent to this, commenting ‘my sexuality is not going to interfere with my love for God’.

Like the Evangelical church, the Catholic church also represents an important space for the construction of queer identities for many participants. Eight respondents made reference to the importance of the Catholic church in terms of their sexuality. Although this is less than those making similar
comments regarding the Evangelical church, it nevertheless emphasises the need to question straightforward assumptions that the church is a completely restrictive, intolerant and unimportant site for the queer community. The significance of the Catholic church was evident in comments made by Artur related to the role of the church in coming to terms with the fact that he is HIV positive:

Artur: My life was completely awry, completely lost without religion, but now I feel much happier.
Tony: Since you started going to the church?
Artur: Yeah, I feel more centred, more level headed, more aware of everything, with my obligations, both with myself and with others.

For some men, the Catholic church actually helped them deal with issues related to their sexuality, such as discrimination and homophobia at home, at school and elsewhere. Nilton commented that the church was a space where he could go when he was pra baixo (feeling low) about his sexuality. When I asked him what it was about the church in particular that made him feel better, he commented:

‘All churches have a certain atmosphere. You go in, you pray and you feel at peace. You could be really upset and sad and you could just be in the church for just thirty minutes or an hour and you leave really light and clean’.

Thus, for some participants the Catholic church represents a space of release from their problems and in particular those related to their sexuality. It is somewhere queer men stated that they can think through and pray about issues that cause them distress, leaving them feeling more at ease with their problems and making them more calm and relaxed. In addition to the mental release after visiting the Catholic church several respondents commented that they had queer friends with whom they were able to socialise and seek support. Pedro stated that the Catholic church was important because whenever he was chateado (upset) or triste (sad) about his sexuality he
knew he could meet his queer friends and talk openly about his problems. The social aspect of the church was reiterated by Bruno:

Bruno: Because I feel a lot better when I leave. I really like going to the Catholic church, I have some gay friends who also go and they really like it.

Tony: Have you talked to other people at the church about your sexuality, or do you keep yourself to yourself?

Bruno: No, I’ve never said anything. I always keep myself to myself.

Tony: Have you seen guys flirting with each other at all at the church?

Bruno: I’ve never seen this in the Catholic church. But, there are lots of guys in the church that enjoy getting with other guys outside the church.

Tony: Guys that have met at the church?

Bruno: Hmm, no. Well, some of them might have done, yeah.

Like quotes related to the Evangelical church, Bruno’s comments suggest that the Catholic church can represent a space where queer men socialise with other homosexuals and flirt with other members. Interestingly, although the Catholic church was described as more tolerant than the Evangelical church, certain types of gendered and sexualised behaviours, such as pegação and meeting gay friends were less prevalent. Bruno was the only respondent that suggested that flirting exists between queer men in the Catholic church. In addition whilst the feeling of being acolhido (protected/sheltered) was common in participants’ commented related to the Evangelical church it was not mentioned by participants’ comments in relation to the Catholic church.

**LGBT Religious Spaces**

‘Aqui todos e todas são LIVRES para adorar a Deus... sem acepção de pessoas!’ (Here all men and women are FREE to love God...without preference for anyone!)’ states the website of the Betel Protestant Church (Betel 2010). The religious space understood as most tolerant in participants’ discourses were undoubtedly those of ‘gay-friendly’ religious groups. The two churches that were specifically mentioned in participants’ comments were the Betel Protestant Church and the *Igreja Cristã Contemporânea* (Contemporary Christian Church). When I asked Caio to describe the church he commented:
‘It’s in the city centre, it’s a church that’s directed at gay people, even the pastor is gay. It’s really nice this, I really like it. I love to go to the church to read the bible and the hymns make me really emotional…it’s good, it’s really cool!’. 

Various reasons were given for the popularity of LGBT churches, with the most commonly mentioned factors being that they represented more aberto (open) and liberal spaces than other churches and that they were livre de homofobia (free from homophobia). They were also seen as spaces where the LGBT community were better treated than in other spaces since homosexuality was not viewed as wrong or sinful. For example, Cauê commented ‘There are some denominations that lots of gays frequent, they feel good there, they are well treated’, adding,

‘My church is almost like the ACM78, it’s really well accepted [homosexuality]. The word of God is preached, but it has a different perspective. It is liberal for all different types of people, there they accept all types of people’

Positioning LGBT churches as tolerant spaces free from discrimination was also evident in an interview with the pastor of the Betel church:

Tony: What are the objectives of your church?
Betel Pastor: Firstly, to include people from the LGBT community in the Christian faith. To be a safe and healthy space, free from Christian religions homophobia, so that Christian LGBTs can live out their spirituality in peace, free from self-condemnation of their sexuality.

He continued to describe the Betel church in opposition to less tolerant religious spaces, such as the Evangelical church:

Tony: What do you think about the churches like the Universal Church that are, supposedly, completely against gay rights?

78 Associação Brasileira Cristã de Moços – Brazilian branch of the YMCA.
**Betel Pastor:** I think it’s horrendous! [laughs] All types of fundamentalism, whether they are Christian, Jewish, Islamic or Buddhist ought to be combated. Nothing good exists in religious fundamentalism, except discrimination, hate, intolerance and inequality.

Like the pastor, other participants suggested that one of the reasons that queer men frequent the Betel Church is the homophobic discrimination experienced in other religious spaces, such as the Evangelical church. Renato shares this understanding and described discrimination in other churches as the ‘principal reason’ that queer men choose to frequent the LGBT church:

**Renato:** Most of the frequentees were brought up as Christians, but because they’re gay they suffer prejudices. They continue as Christians, they continue believing, but they prefer the gay church because there isn’t any discrimination.

**Tony:** They’re discriminated against where, in their original churches?

**Renato:** Yes, in the heterosexual Christian churches

**Tony:** Is this the Evangelical church or the Catholic church?

**Renato:** Both

LGBT churches appear to offer a space where queer men can be sure that they will not suffer homophobia because of their sexual orientation. They seem more important than ever with the Brazilian media publishing stories that reaffirm this notion of the Catholic and Evangelical churches as intensely homophobic. In 2010, Globo released a story quoting the pope’s comments that paedophilia is linked to homosexuality. Maybe it should not be seen as a surprise, then, that the LGBT churches are growing amongst the city’s queer community. In spite of their seemingly tolerant nature, however, certain behaviours appear to be missing from these spaces. In particular, participants did not mention LGBT churches as sites they frequented to meet other gays, to flirt or to be openly effeminate. This might explain why many participants did not attend LGBT churches, preferring be part of Evangelical and Catholic churches where these behaviours appear to be more common. However, due to the small number of men that discussed LGBT religious spaces, more research is necessary to determine whether queer men use
the space of the LGBT church for different reasons than other religious spaces.

**Religion in ‘Profane’ Spaces**

This chapter has focused on the relationship between religion and gendered and sexualised performances in religious spaces. However, it would be too simplistic to assume that religion only has importance in the churches and terreiros of Brazil. Rather, faith permeates other seemingly profane spaces, such as the gay bar, the home, the workplace and the pride parade, and impacts the gendered and sexualised performances of queer men across these sites. This understanding of religion as affecting one’s comportment in non-religious sites was captured by Mirella:

*Tony*: With relation to your day-to-day life, do you think that religion is important outside of religious spaces?
*Mirella*: Yes, it’s really important that you believe, whether it’s something natural or not it doesn’t mean it’s not a religions. To have faith in nature, throwing an offering in the sea to *lemanjá*[^79], saluting the full moon or the starry sky. I think that religion, whichever type, is really important for human beings

Mirella’s quote implies that spirituality is prevalent in everyday life through small rituals. Although she does not relate such behaviours to her gender or sexuality, the practice of making offerings to Lemanjá is most common amongst queer men and women since she represents one of the orixás (saints) of Umbanda and Candomblé, both religions associated with the queer community. Other participants made links between their gender/sexuality and religion more explicitly across four specific ‘profane spaces’: the family home, the workplace, the gay scene and the street. In particular, religious belief appears to have a large impact on the decision to stay closeted across various sites in the city, including the family home, the street and the school. Related to this, religion and religious belief are important components of the tolerant or intolerant nature of these spaces and

[^79]: Lemanjá or Yemanjá is the Umbanda and Candomblé orixá (Goddess) of the sea, lakes and fertility.
represents one factor that influences behaviours that are permitted or restricted.

**Religion, the Family Home and Coming Out**

In the family home the influence of religious belief on participants’ gendered and sexualised behaviours is, perhaps, most evident in decisions over whether participants disclosed their sexuality or stayed in the closet. The religious views of participants’ families often influenced their decisions to reveal their homosexuality. In particular, those with Evangelical relatives stated that their families’ beliefs clashed with their sexuality and often resulted in discrimination. Their sexuality was not accepted in the family home and was consequently, self-restricted. In some cases the decision to remain closeted to their family was related to explicit conversations in which disparaging and disdainful comments were made related to homosexuals being ‘sinners’, ‘ungodly’ or ‘possessed by the devil’, or by the pomba gira.\(^{80}\) Caio stated that due to the discrimination he experienced at home he hid his homosexuality and almost got married to a woman:

> ‘I was from the church, so they [his family] criticised me a lot. Because of their attitudes I had to hide myself and show a person that wasn’t me. I created a character for my family, for society and for the pastor of the church. I got engaged to a woman and I was even doing to marry her, but after I thought, ‘Oh my God, which direction am I taking my life in? I’m in the church and I’m going to marry a woman and this isn’t who I am. I’m living as somebody that isn’t me!’.

The way in which the church criticised homosexuality led to Caio’s decision to stay in the closet across a variety of spaces and social contexts, including the family home. In other instances, participants experienced more subtle forms of discrimination and pressure from Evangelical family members. When I asked why he had not yet told his parents about his sexuality Artur related an incident from this childhood:

\(^{80}\) See following pages for description of the pomba gira.
'Because when I was a child my parents left a book next to me talking about homosexuality and God and I read this book. It was a book about religion. In the book there was advice about how to prevent homosexuality, so in the book it said that men were not means to use loose clothes and be careful because this was a sin etc. To be honest I read this book, but I never followed its advice'.

In other cases religious beliefs influenced the reaction that family members, and in particular, parents, had when their sons came out. Many participants had negative coming-out experiences, and many of these related this to the fact that their parents were Evangelical. Roberto claimed that his mum was unable to accept his sexuality due to her Evangelism. As a result he stated that she sent him to see someone in the church thinking ‘it would be better for me because they would take this out of my head’. Renato was thrown out of the house after coming out to his mother (on three occasions) amidst shouting that ‘This [homosexuality] isn’t something of God, it’s something of the devil. It’s not something of a man!’ In another case, Christiano stated that his mum found it difficult to accept his sexual orientation; ‘She kept thinking that it was something to do with the devil, she thought that I was leading myself down a ‘bad path’. Davi had a similarly difficult experience, and when asked whether he had come out to his mum he replied:

‘I’ve already tried to tell her. To be honest, I’ve really told her, but she thinks that it was a phase, to do with my age. But, my family are Lutheran Protestants, so because of their religion it would be really difficult for them to accept it. My mum said that she couldn’t accept this, that I have to fight against this…that these things aren’t right and that it’s a sin and I’m going to hell and that God wouldn’t accept this. But, to be honest, this situation happens a lot in Brazil. They say that gays in general are beings that are going to hell, that this is against the will of God and I think that if God didn’t exist, gays wouldn’t be God’s creatures’.

The consequences of living with parents whose religious beliefs meant that they openly rejected their son’s sexual orientation had varying consequences
on participants’ behaviour in the family home. Some participants left home entirely, whilst others refused to bring boyfriends home or were not permitted to discuss their sexuality openly. When Damon was asked why he felt unable not to talk about his homosexuality at home he referred to his coming out experience:

’Well they’re pastors of the church [I ask which church] The Orthodox Methodist church. My dad, my mum, and my brothers, so it’s an Evangelical family. It was really complicated at the time because they said that it was ‘prostitution of the body’, that it wasn’t OK, that it was something bad and that I ought to ‘fix’ myself because I’d grown up in the church and I know the word of God perfectly well, about the artes (practices) of religion and I said to them that maybe it could be a phase and that I would like to live this moment and that I was happy like this. Obviously I told them this! My mum and dad even cried a lot and today they don’t talk about the topic’.

Damon’s efforts to ameliorate the situation by saying that his homosexuality could be a phase and his parents’ decision not to raise the subject of his sexuality after his coming out represent ways of negotiating the juxtaposition of religious and homosexual identities in the family home. As a consequence of the religious beliefs of his parents the family home is constructed as an intolerant space, where his sexuality is neither accepted nor talked about.

Several participants referred to discriminatory comments relatives made referring to the pomba gira, the Candomblé/Umbanda deity associated with female beauty, sexuality and desire. She is often represented wearing a blood-red dress, wearing heavy make-up and jewellery. Whilst the pomba gira does not necessarily carry negative associations within Afro-Brazilian religions, and is seen as helpful in dealing with shame related to sex and sexuality and finding lovers (Burdick 1993, Conner & Sparks 2004), for many Evangelicals she represents the epitome of inappropriate sexual comportment. Natividade (2007) comments that within the Evangelical church, the pomba gira spirit is particularly blamed for homosexuality, lesbianism and promiscuous female behaviour. In my experience the term
pomba gira was almost always used in the family home where it was a derogatory way to refer to homosexuals and, in particular, effeminate homosexuals. The use of the term often influenced participants’ decisions to hide their sexuality and was referred to in reactions of family members to coming out. Renato stated that his gran had told him that the ‘pomba gira had taken him’ when he came out and that the ‘devil was inside him’ before throwing him out on the street.

The religious beliefs of those whose families were Evangelical generally constructed the home as an intolerant space where it was difficult to come out, or where discrimination was likely after participants disclosed their sexuality. Those who came out to Evangelical parents frequently suffered discrimination or rejection. In the worst experiences like Renato’s, it resulted in being thrown out of the home and in less severe cases it was demonstrated through parents’ denial or reluctance to accept their child’s homosexuality. Whilst comments made regarding the influence of Evangelism on gendered and sexualised behaviours were often related to the private sphere of the family home, the influence of Catholicism appeared stronger in the public sphere, and in particular in the spaces of the street, school and university.

When asked whether he had come out to other students at Santa Teresa, his university, Samuel explained, ‘No because there’s the burdensome Catholic regime.’ When I asked what he meant, he stated ‘You can’t start messing around at university, if you do they’re going to summon you to the head’. The implication was that due to the Catholic nature of the university, he was not able to disclose his sexuality at school. This was reiterated by several other students who went to Catholic schools and universities such as Cesar who commented that he ‘had lots of problems related to his sexuality’ and was unable to come out because his university was ‘very conservative Catholic’. Catholic religious beliefs also influenced the decision not to come out in other, non-educational spaces by a handful of respondents. For
example, when I asked Luís why he hadn’t come out to people before moving from his small home town of Teresópolis to Rio de Janeiro, he commented,

‘Because it’s completely conservative, homophobic...people there don’t like gays. The guys there aren’t free. They always have to be stay in ghettos, always hiding themselves because it’s very Catholic’.

Comments like those above suggest that the Catholic church modifies the way in which gender and sexuality are played out and in the public space of the street and affects the decision to come out. Although this might not be surprising given the pervasiveness of Catholicism in Brazilian society (see Romero 1989) it does contrast with comments made by the Catholic priest, who, when asked whether the church affected the way queer men behave outside the church angrily replied, ‘Religion does not give rules about how to live your day to day life. You can do what you want, the opinion of the church is not important!’ Participants’ comments suggest a less easily defined spatial limit to the influence of the Catholic, (and as shown, Evangelical), churches, suggesting that they influence decisions regarding the disclosure of sexuality far beyond the physical space of the church.

It has been suggested that Evangelical and Catholic beliefs influence gendered and sexualised performances and the decision to come out in public and private profane spaces such as the family home, the street and the school. They lead to the construction and experience of certain spaces as tolerant and others as intolerant, permitting certain gendered and sexualised behaviours, but restricting others. Interestingly, whilst participants suggested that Evangelical beliefs shape performances through the family home and the Catholic beliefs in performances through the school, university and street, there was no discussion of the influence of Afro-Brazilian beliefs in spaces outside the terreiro. Consequently, this study shows no evidence of conclusions drawn by Gontijo (2009) that Candomblé and Umbanda faith might help queer men come out by increasing the likelihood that family
members will react positively. Although the reasons for this were not explicitly stated, it might be a reflection of a reluctance to discuss Afro-Brazilian religions in interviews due to the stigmatised nature of the subject, as stated earlier, rather than necessarily reflecting the actual lack of influence of Candomblé or Umbanda outside the terreiro. Whereas participants’ performances in spaces such as the family home, school, university and the street suggests the separate influence of Catholic beliefs, or Evangelical beliefs, the workplace represents a space where beliefs of both religions influenced participants’ behaviours, as will now be discussed.

Religion in the Workplace

‘Obviously if everyone’s Catholic at work they’re going to make fun of you, you’re going to have to hide it a bit, not be so effeminate’ said Pedro when I asked if it was difficult to be out at work. Religious faith appeared to have an important impact on the performance of gender and sexuality in the workplace and in the construction of the workplace as (in)tolerant for non-normative gendered and sexualised behaviours. Participants’ comments suggested that whilst the religious faith of others was generally restrictive, their own religious faith was enabling. Those who discussed working with others who were Catholic or Evangelical suggested that the religious beliefs of others often cause fear of discrimination, which results in their remaining closeted. For example, Teodoro stated:

‘So, I work for the TV channel Record. It’s an Evangelical channel. Our boss doesn’t have anything against homosexuality and he treats everybody really well, but since he’s the owner of one of the churches called Universal (It’s bishop Macedo who’s my boss) and the fieis (faithful) might not like it, he asks the staff not to talk about our sexuality’.

The Evangelical faith of workmates was also seen as constructing the workplace as an oppressive environment in comments made by Gui. When asked about the effect of working with a group of Evangelical women at the Norwegian consulate, he commented ‘It’s the place where I feel most
repressed, because I can’t talk because I don’t have anything to talk about because I know that I can’t talk about me because of the prejudices’. Having Evangelical workmates appeared to result in self-regulation of conversations related to homosexuality, or those that could imply one’s homosexuality. Due to such self-restrictions the workplace was experienced as an intolerant and oppressive place for most respondents working with Evangelical colleagues.

When participants discussed their own personal faith, however, it was often referred to as a way to negotiate the intolerant nature of the workplace. For these participants, their religious belief provided them with a feeling of protection and support. Of the three participants who made comments suggesting that religion helped them deal with homophobic work environments, two worked as prostitutes. For these individuals religion seemed to offer security, in what is, otherwise, an extremely dangerous job (see film by de Almeida, 2006). For example, when I asked Valeria whether religion was important for her when she is in the street working she responded:

‘You hear little insults, but it’s nothing that ever reaches absurd levels and you can disclose it [her sexuality] and thanks to God I’ve also never suffered any physical aggressions. Nobody’s ever tried to hit me or been violent in any way whatsoever and I always ask God to prevent any situation like this before starting work’.

Nilton described the shop that he works in as ‘restrictive’ and claims that although he is out to his workmates, it is difficult to discuss his sexuality openly and is often the subject of piadinhas (little digs) related to his homosexuality. When asked how he manages the homophobic situation at work, he went on to make comment that his religious medals give him strength:

‘I’m really a devotee of Saint Anthony. So, there’s that church of Saint Anthony over in the city, by the carioca arch and when I’m on holiday I like to go there. I have little
Thus, Catholic and Evangelical belief can either deny the open expression of homosexuality in the workplace, or provide support for queer men in dealing with the homophobic nature of the work environment. In this respect, religion represents both a tool used to restrict homosexuality and an important coping mechanism, and can reinforce the intolerant and restrictive nature of the workplace or manage this intolerance and even lead to the workplace as a permissive or tolerant environment.

Religion in LGBT Spaces
After standing in the queue for over two hours to enter Cine-ideal, the super club that is the self-proclaimed ‘temple of house music’, we were welcome of any distraction, even if it came in the form of the hundreds of flyers that were being distributed. One flyer in particular, of the Betel gay Evangelical church, caught our attention. Pedro commented that he had some friends who went there and Lucas stated that the church was *muito legal* (very cool), since it accepts gay men. These comments were followed by several minutes of discussion about the importance of the church and its role in Rio de Janeiro’s gay community. This was a common occurrence. Indeed on several occasions I saw similar flyers being distributed and witnessed conversations akin to ours in the queues of various nightclubs. What was surprising was the lack of cynicism that I had come to expect amongst my own friends in Scotland related to religion and the queer community. Nobody mocked Lucas’ comment, nobody refused to take the leaflet and there were no suggestions that handing out such leaflets might be inappropriate or strange in a gay club as would most likely have been the case back in the UK. It was through instances like this that I became aware of the presence of religion in Rio’s gay scene.

I want to return to the start of the thesis and the Catholic church’s support of the major’s decision to cancel the Duque de Caixas pride parade, moving it
to a nightclub where it would seemingly cause less offence. Taking this incident at face value, it might seem that religion is something entirely separate and absent from LGBT bars and clubs. Ethnographic and interview data and personal experience, such as that above, suggest that this is not necessarily the case. In certain ways religion and religious belief were present in LGBT spaces and events such as the International Day Against Homophobia, the pride parade and in bars and clubs. Their presence was felt through various practices such as making speeches, distributing leaflets and holding banners promoting religious institutions (see figures 5 and 6).

Figure 5: A São Paulo pride postcard – The text reads: All love brings us closer to God, any violence distances us from him.
This was highlighted in Cauê’s recollections of the involvement of a Catholic church at the Copacabana pride parade:

‘This church is totally open. I don’t remember its name, but the priest was at the gay pride parade wearing his priest’s clothes. He got on the float and said “God loves gays. God doesn’t condemn gays. Live whatever type of expression of love and loving because God isn’t against gays”. The priest also prayed and made a request to God for everything to happen without any problems at the pride parade and for it to set off with the support of God and it was a success. So, from my point of view God isn’t against gays, nor hates them. What I see is that it’s about a lack of information of people that are the base of the religion that say things to try to denounce and sully the image of gays, but I believe that God isn’t against gays’.
Cauê’s quote suggests that the inclusion of the church in events such as the pride parade could be extremely important for the majority of respondents who identify as Catholic. It is a gesture that shows that despite popular understandings to the contrary, certain churches support and accept homosexuals, and place importance on being part of the pride. The presence of the church at the pride parade probably represents a reassuring act for Rio de Janeiro’s many queer Catholics who, based on earlier comments, often suffer discrimination based on their ‘sinful’ behaviour in other locations such as the school and university.

However, it is not just the Catholic churches that were present at events such as the pride parade and the International Day Against Homophobia march. The gay Evangelical churches, Betel and the Igreja Cristã Contemporânea also had a visible presence at these events (see figure 6). A group of approximately ten young men around twenty years old were in the middle of other LGBT organisations marching down Ipanema promenade. Most of them were securing banners or flyers advertising the Betel church and holding the flowers that made up a huge rainbow flag. The group of young men were playful, flirting with passers-by, making eye contact and handing out their numbers to the gostosinhos (hotties). The men around them were curious, but, seemingly, not surprised by the presence of an Evangelical church at the pride. They took leaflets, asked questions about meeting times and made positive comments about the church being maneiro and legal (cool). The upbeat reception of the church contrasted with Claudio’s comments in the organisational meetings at Arco-iris when we were told that the church have ‘nothing to do’ with the day and were ‘extremely closed minded’.

The juxtaposition of Christianity and homosexuality was also present in less explicit ways in LGBT spaces too. For example, at the pride parade, most of the men I was with made the sign of the cross as we walked past one of the
Amongst Brazilian Catholics and observed everywhere, but its presence at the pride parade was mixed with other performances that participants identified as being sinful in the eyes of the church – men holding hands, kissing same-sex partners, using Candomblé slang. On the gay scene, too, the influence of participant’s religiosity was evident in ostensibly banal and unremarkable practices. Most noticeably, many of my friends would feel bad blaspheming, often apologising after doing so and making reference to the fact that they were bom menino católicos (good Catholic boys), but they would proceed to use terms from pajubá and continue their hunt for men with whom they could have sex with later that night. Such experiences demonstrate the cultural tenacity of Catholicism and Evangelism and the presence of the religions in the gay scene, and suggest that religious belief influences the way in which queer men behave through LGBT spaces. In this respect religious belief is an important element of tolerance, since it can both justify and permit queer behaviours, such as same-sex affection or effeminacy and be used to restrict and chastise them. Finally, rather than simply embracing Catholic and Evangelical tradition participants’ comments highlight that they are also adapted or queered as they are combined with other aspects of their gender and sexuality, suggesting the dynamic nature of religion in the everyday lives of queer cariocas.

**Discussion: Religion, Homosexuality and Tolerance – Dislocating Dichotomies**

Common assumptions that there is an order of tolerance are evident in participants’ comments related to religious institutions in Brazil. The Evangelical church is imagined as least tolerant of the queer men, followed by the Catholic church, which is slightly more tolerant and then Afro-Brazilian religions that are imagined as the most tolerant. However, participants’ lived realities suggest that the terreiro can represent an intolerant space where certain queer behaviours, such as same-sex flirting, are self-restricted and that the Catholic and Evangelical churches also represent sites of resistance.
through which queer men meet other homosexuals, cruise and even engage in sexual behaviour. In some cases they even represent tolerant spaces where participants felt welcomed and accommodated. LGBT religious spaces were also identified as relatively new, important sites that provide tolerance and support for an increasing number of queer men in Rio de Janeiro, although perhaps for different reasons than the Evangelical or Catholic churches.

It has been illustrated, however, that religion does not simply impact queer gendered and sexualised behaviours in religious spaces. On the contrary, religion has concrete effects on queer male practices in seemingly profane spaces too. In particular, participants suggested that religion is present and influences the behaviour of queer men in LGBT spaces, the workplace and the family home. From references to the pomba gíria amongst the family, to conversations about religion in the queue to queer clubs, it is clear that religion imbues the everyday life of queer cariocas and is an important component determining whether spaces are experienced as tolerant or intolerant. This was most clearly highlighted in the coming out process where the decision to divulge one’s sexuality, or not, and the reaction to coming out were influenced by the Evangelical beliefs of family members. Religion is important for many queer cariocas. However, whether religion holds a substantial, little or no significance at all, this chapter has shown that it has tangible impacts on the gendered and sexualised performances of queer men across various urban spaces of the city.

Whilst current research into sexuality often focuses on specific religious sites such as the terreiro (Fry 1986, Cornwall & Lindisfarne 1994), this research suggests that religion influences the performance of gendered and sexualised identities outside of such spaces. Through attention to the coming out process in the family home and performances in the workplace, school and street, this chapter has shown that religion is present across many social contexts and spaces, thus problematising the division between religious and
non-religious spaces that much of the literature unwittingly implies. In many ways this is linked to ideas of being respectful, as highlighted in chapter for, which are linked to Christianity in work, school and the street. This chapter has shown that the separation between religious and non-religious space, implied in much of the literature on sexuality, is unhelpful and often leads to inaccurate assumptions that religious behaviours are neatly confined in religious spaces and lead us to ignore the role of religion in non-religious sites. A more useful understanding would recognise the even seemingly profane spaces such as the gay club, the home or the workplace are permeated by religious beliefs and practices. In addition, homosexuality should not be understood as something separate from religious spaces. Rather, homosexual performances of gender and sexuality flow between profane and religious spaces blurring them together. This is, perhaps, most clear in the searching for boyfriends and sexual partners and queer friends through the space of the church, making it difficult to know where the religious space of the church ends and the non-religious space of the gay club begins. Even if sites are understood as intolerant and homophobic, such as the Evangelical church, we must recognise that this does not mean that they are devoid of non-normative gendered and sexualised performances. Building on the conclusions of the last chapter, this section has showed the importance of resisting assumptions about the tolerant nature of LGBT spaces and intolerant nature of other spaces of the city.

Whilst many studies have pointed to a separation between the tolerant and permissive space of the terreiro and the intolerant and restrictive nature of other religious spaces (Fry 1986, Cornwall & Lindisfarne 1994, Reis dos Santos 2010), this chapter suggests a less straightforward understanding. At certain times other religious spaces outside of the terreiro can also provide tolerant sites where queer men feel protected, supported and can meet other homosexuals. In particular, the Evangelical church, which is often assumed to be an extremely tolerant space for queer men, is an important and at times permissive (if not, tolerant) site for queer men, as argued by Naitvidade.
In keeping with Moutinho (2006), this study has demonstrated that the space of the terreiro also represents a space where there are strict rules related to the gendered and sexualised practices that are viewed as acceptable. Consequently this study suggests that current research must move beyond current dichotomous understandings of the tolerant terreiro and the intolerant church to acknowledge more useful notions of all religious spaces as queer and LGBT spaces as religious. Through ignoring homosexuality in religious spaces outside of the terreiro (Natividade 2005 as an exception) and religion in LGBT spaces we are left with an incomplete understanding of these sites and particularly, the role that religion plays in constituting sites as tolerant and intolerant.

This chapter has suggested that we need to rethink the relationship between religion and tolerance. Religion and religious spaces, such as the Candomblé terreiro and Evangelical and Catholic churches are not just intolerant, incompatible and incongruent with homosexual identities, but can actually provide respect and support for queer men and women and represent sites where homosexuality does not have to be hidden. Because of this, I argue that we must challenge ideas of the heterosexual nature of major religions in Brazil and elsewhere. We must take religion out of the closet. In doing so we can recognise and incorporate those expressing alternative genders and sexualities more fully into the religions that queer men and women are often dependent on for their well-being. Although such changes would be radical, they are vital in creating more tolerant religious institutions and spaces. Profane spaces, such as the gay scene also need to be outing, not in the sense of sexuality, but through an acknowledgment of their religiosity. In recognising the role of religion in the gendered and sexualised behaviours occurring through such sites we can begin to consider how profane sites can be made more tolerant for the open expression of queer identities. Overall, this chapter has demonstrated that religion, sexuality and tolerance, and religious and profane spaces must be understood as mutually constituent and interrelated. In taking such an approach we can gain a more complete
understanding of how and why our gendered and sexualised identities are performed in specific ways across certain spaces and how this is related to tolerance.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

The purpose of the thesis has been to make a contribution to work on sexuality by extending current understandings on the spatiality of tolerance through considering the gendered and sexualised performances of queer men, whether bichas, gays, bissexuais, travestis, homossexuais or other categories, in Rio de Janeiro. In doing so, I have sought to highlight the complex ways in which tolerance is constructed and contested in queer male performances across spaces including the home, religious space, the workplace, the street and the gay scene and shown how space in instrumental in the process of tolerance.

Chapter three considered performances of race, class, gender and sexuality in the Zona Sul of Rio de Janeiro. Through reference to the bicha pintosa, the barbie and the pitbull it was shown that participants’ experiences challenge notions of the region as tolerant for the queer community as a whole. Rather, behaviours that are marked as acceptable and desirable in the region are classed and raced. In addition, it was argued that the way in which participants perform their bodies though styling it, dressing it, making it up and through exercising and consuming, suggest raced and classed norms amongst users of the Zona Sul and practices of consumption and beautification in the region privilege white, middle class queer male performances. It was argued that notions of white, middle class behaviour as the acceptable queer are also reinforced through regulation practices of those within the queer community through verbal discrimination, humour, stares and stigmatisation of the Afro-Brazilian dialect of pajubá. This often results in feelings of discomfort, shame and embarrassment for poor, non-white queer men in the Zona Sul. The examples of the pitbull and physical violence in the region were also identified as attempts by those outwith the queer community to reinforce the white, middle class and masculine nature
of the region. However, this process is incomplete and many queer men also behave in ways that challenge intolerance of poor, non-white, effeminate behaviours in the region. The chapter argued that we must resist assumptions of seemingly queer-friendly spaces, such as Rio’s Zona Sul and elsewhere as tolerant spaces for the queer community and consider how tolerance is a classed and raced process across such spaces.

Chapter four considered the relationship between space, tolerance and respect. Three specific types of behaviour were identified as showing disrespect – being effeminate, same-sex intimacy/sexual behaviour and openly discussing homosexuality. However, whilst it is possible to identify specific characteristics of respectful behaviour the chapter also argued that being respectful was dependent on social interaction and space. It was argued that the elderly, children, parents and workmates were identified by queer men as groups that deserved respectful behaviour. Children were generally seen as too innocent, impressionable and naïve to be exposed to homosexuality, whilst the elderly were often seen as likely to be offended and show disgust to openly homosexual behaviours. The way participants referred to children and the elderly suggest that age is a key factor in terms of meriting respect. This contrasts with parents who were seen as warranting respectful performances because of their income and home ownership status. The directionality of respect was seen as the same for all groups with participants positioning queer men as responsible for ensuring the respectful nature of their behaviour. The family home and the workplace were identified as spaces of respect, where respectful behaviour was seen as most important and non-respectful behaviours were restricted. As a result of the constrained gendered and sexualised performances through such spaces it is argued that they represent intolerant sites for many queer men.

Throughout the chapter it was argued that for research participants respect is a more implicit process reinforced through subtle forms of control related to worries over disapproving looks and concerns from others, rather than being
a consequence of active attempts to restrict gendered and sexualised behaviours as some Latin American studies have suggested (Barriga 2004, Reis dos Santos 2010) and that these generally ensure that participants behave respectfully across urban space. Related to this, I argue that respect is actually largely internalised and that it perpetuates participants’ self-regulation of their gendered and sexualised behaviours by providing justifications for behaviours and perspectives that would otherwise be viewed as homophobic. Due to the self-regulatory nature of respect it is argued that Foucault’s (1991) model of the panopticon is useful for understanding the way in which respect operates amongst queer male participants. This chapter also argues that respect (and notions of being respectful) can be understood as a Foucauldian (1978) technology of power which seeks to regulate accepted and normal gendered and sexualised behaviours and define their limits. Respectful gendered and sexualised performances are normalised and largely tolerated, whilst those that are disrespectful are marked as strange, abnormal and undesirable.

Chapter five has focused on the nature of tolerance and intolerance through Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT spaces. It is argued that the reality of queer male performances challenge notions of such sites as tolerant counterpublics (Warner 2002), which is present in the rhetoric of LGBT groups and in participants’ discourses. Actually LGBT spaces represent ambivalent spaces where certain groups of queer men – the stereotypically effeminate, travestis and sexually passive – are likely to suffer preconceptions. Such men were often ridiculed and at times made to feel deviant, or excluded from these spaces, generally by others in the queer community. Whilst intolerance of effeminate male behaviours was pervasive across all LGBT sites, other behaviours that were/were not tolerated varied between location. Participants’ comments demonstrated that the nature of ambivalence varies significantly between public and private spaces. High levels of ambivalence towards travesti and effeminate male behaviours are apparent in public LGBT spaces whereas in seemingly safer, semi-private spaces where the
risk of physical violence is lower, such as in LGBT organisations, gendered and sexualised identities are generally ordered in terms of sexual role. Thus, it was suggested that one explanation for this is that the way in which queer men negotiate their gendered and sexualised identities across LGBT spaces is linked to notions of safety.

Chapter six focused on the relationship between religion, tolerance, gendered and sexualised behaviours and problematises notions of religion and homosexuality as separate and incompatible with one another. It was argued that participants’ lived realities demonstrate the influence of queer gender and sexuality in religious spaces. In contrast to conclusions in much of the literature on gender, sexuality and religion (Fry 1986, Cornwall 1994), research participants often gave queer gendered and sexualised behaviours in religious spaces and this was demonstrated in a variety of practices in the church from flirting to being openly effeminate and finding same-sex sexual partners. The chapter also emphasised the role of religion and religious belief in participants’ gendered and sexualised performances in seemingly profane spaces, such as the home, workplace and the street. Religious beliefs influence participants’ experiences of these sites as tolerant or intolerant in diverse ways and was suggested through reference to various behaviours such as coming out in the family home, same-sex intimacy at the pride parade and discussing one’s sexuality and negotiating homophobia in the workplace. Chapter six suggests that current research must move beyond current dichotomous understandings of the tolerant Candomblé terreiro and the intolerant church to acknowledge more useful notions of all religious spaces as queer and LGBT spaces as religious. It is argued that through ignoring homosexuality in religious spaces outside of the terreiro (Natividade 2005 as an exception) and religion in LGBT spaces we are left with an incomplete understanding of these sites and particularly, the role that religion plays in constituting sites as tolerant and intolerant.
Empirically, the thesis contributes a diversity of new qualitative data exploring the lives of urbanite Latin American queer men across various sites, including 83 in-depth interviews with over 150 participants, and 11 months of ethnographic field engagement with a population that is still relatively unrepresented in geographical scholarship. Theoretically, the thesis has aimed to contribute to understandings of the intersections between tolerance and sexuality, and though building upon and complimenting existing theoretical approaches, the study is important for two main reasons: firstly, it considers a context – that of Brazil and, more broadly, South America – for which understandings of sexuality and tolerance have been scarce in English geographic literature; and secondly, it questions whether queer spaces are necessarily tolerant spaces, an assumption that underpins much of the research on queer spaces. It thus offers some elaborations upon work by Skeggs (1999), Binnie (2006) and Rink (2008) which identify class and race discourses through LGBT spaces such as the gay scene as challenging their supposedly tolerant nature, but expands on it by focusing on less-studied LGBT spaces such as gay beaches, gay-friendly churches and virtual spaces and by considering the relationship between additional components of identity and tolerance, such as age and religion. Thirdly, this thesis has explored the day-to-day lives of queer men through mundane spaces that remain largely understudied in Latin America sexuality literature such as the home, the workplace and the church (see Heilborn 2004 & Natividade 2006 for exceptions). By demonstrating the tensions and paradoxes in the performances that men gave through such sites this thesis has extended the limited studies that exist on sexuality in mundane spaces and illustrated the similarities and differences in the nature of tolerance across various sites that constitute Brazilian urban space.

To conclude, here I briefly reflect on three key implications of this research for geographical understandings of tolerance, and then bring together some of the threads that run throughout this thesis. Firstly, I contend that there is

---

81 This is an approximate figure that represents the number of interviewees plus the number of participants who attended Arco-Íris and ABIA group meetings.
value in taking a spatial perspective to understanding tolerance, as it highlights how gendered and sexualised performances are denied and allowed through spatial processes. By examining experiences in the home, workplace, school, and religious spaces, this thesis has shown that inclusion and exclusion, approval and disapproval, and respect vary across different spaces of the city and result in peaks and troughs in tolerance of queer male performances across different sites of Rio de Janeiro. Tolerance is not experienced equally across urban space, but varies depending on the social relations that occur through different spaces. Whilst this study confirms that the (in)tolerant nature of urban spaces is the outcome of performances that take place through them and that the (in)tolerant nature of urban space is neither static nor uncontested, it also suggests that, in the words of Michael Brown (2000, p 147) ‘We should not forget the real fixity of absolute space, and its utility in explaining oppression. Certain spaces do conceal, erase and deny the existence of marginalised groups’. This research has suggested, for example, that the family home and the workplace are often experienced as particularly intolerant spaces where queer males feel the need to restrict their gendered and sexualised behaviours, due to their own internalised understandings of appropriate behaviour and the disapproval of those around them. However, other spaces that have often been presumed to be intolerant of queer performance, such as the Evangelical Church, demonstrate greater flexibility in the crafting of tolerant queer places, often in spite of intolerant institutional views. Thus, this research suggests that social theorists must rethink connections between tolerance and sexuality in terms of the ways that individuals both encounter and construct space. Tolerance is not an aspatial phenomenon, as recent work seems to imply (Brown 2006), but occurs through the physical spaces of our towns and cities with an unevenness that is often overlooked by researchers and policy makers.

Secondly, this thesis has shown the importance of cross-cutting factors of race, age, class, religion and respect when thinking about tolerance, gender and sexuality. While gender and sexuality are critical categories for the
analysis of tolerance, they do not constitute all encompassing meta-values in every single context. Discourses on gender and sexuality and sexualised inequalities are related to – and can order and be ordered by – other discourses. Thus, as Melhuuss and Stølen (1996 p 2) suggest, ‘differences that exist between men and women can be made to stand for other forms of differences.’ I have indicated that which gendered and sexualised performances are tolerated, in what spaces, and how these become justified and reasserted through racist and classist stereotypes and ideals. A person’s experience of tolerance, even in presumably tolerant spaces, is shaped by whether one is negro or branco, velho (old) or joven (young), rico or pobre. Studies of tolerance in relation to gender and sexuality cannot, fruitfully, remain focused on gender or sexuality alone, but must be explored in terms of the role that interrelated factors of race, age, class, religion and respect play in influencing behaviours that are tolerated/not tolerated.

Perhaps what is highlighted more than anything else is the incoherence of gendered and sexualised performances that are tolerated/not tolerated within their queer community. There is not one group, nor one type of gendered and sexualised behaviour that is tolerated or not tolerated.

However, what this study suggests is that certain codes of tolerance become reinforced and perpetuated across the space of the city, with some forms of intolerance – particularly those related to race and class – being found across a range of spaces, including those that are dedicated to generating tolerance on behalf of queer men. These codes are clearly linked to wider social and historical processes which mark out the desirability and undesirability of particular markers of identity (Green 2000, Löwy 2003, Goldstein 2005 and Vargas 2005) This thesis suggests that intolerance doesn’t just influence the queer community; it can also be reproduced within and through it. In the case of queer spaces in Rio, it reproduces what might be regarded as heteronormative, colonised images of idealised masculinity.
Thirdly, I have argued that tolerance is something that is open and unfixed, and despite the very powerful influences of dominant masculinities, remains something which can be creatively challenged in often unexpected places. The aim of this thesis has not been to produce a comprehensive overview of the differences of tolerance in specific spaces, but to provide stories, experiences and comments that prompt new ways of thinking about the relationship between sexuality and tolerance as constantly (re)worked in different spaces and at different moments of time. By discussing topics such as religious beliefs, notions of respect and LGBT spaces, this thesis challenges focuses by geographers and researchers in Latin America that suggest certain gendered and sexualised behaviours are tolerated, whilst others are not (see, for example, Stevens 1973). Instead of a fixed understanding of tolerance, I advocate an approach that recognises that what is/is not tolerated is dynamic and constantly challenged in our gendered and sexualised performances, and reflects changing spatial compositions. Such an approach is not only preferable, but is necessary if we wish to bring about manifestations of tolerance that are more inclusive for the queer community because it allows us to recognise that even seemingly tolerant spaces can be experienced as intolerant at certain times and by certain individuals and, to think through how the intolerant nature of spaces can be challenged or re-imagined.

An additional important contribution of this thesis has been a rethinking of the relationship between tolerance and homonormativity. Through considering the way in which norms are structured in a Brazilian context and the way these are related to tolerance this thesis has demonstrated three key points. Firstly, spaces of consumption, such as gay bars, clubs, cafés, stores and bathouses are not experienced as unique tolerant spaces for many white, middle-class queer Brazilians as much of the literature on homonormativity argues (Sears 2005). Rather, non-commercial spaces such as the Evangelical church, terreiro, LGBT organisation, which are not focused on neo-liberal practices of consumption, are often important and tolerant spaces
for queer men. Geographers must continue to challenge assumptions that paying spaces associated with the gay scenes of the global north necessarily provide meaningful and tolerant spaces for queers in the global south (see Visser 2008 for one example of this) and explore the relationship between tolerance and gendered and sexualised behaviours in non-commercial spaces in the global north and south. Related to this, researchers must question the notion that neo-liberal, capitalist practices are all-encompassing in the lives of queer men (Sears 2005, Puar 2006). This study has demonstrated that other, non-homonormative practices, such as making an offering to Yemenjá or using Afro-Brazilian gay slang, can be equally or more important than homonormative practices in constructing one’s identity as a gay or bisexual man and must be considered to build on current understandings of the spatiality of tolerance for queer men.

Secondly, this thesis has shown that in understanding queer male experience of tolerance attention must be paid to the way queer men move between homonormative, neo-liberal, capitalist spaces that are associated with the queer community, such as the Zona Sul gay club, and those that are linked to the queer community but non-paying and (in many ways) non-homonormative, such as the beach, terreiro or Evangelical church. Queer men do not statically occupy homonormative or non-homonormative spaces and their experience of tolerance in urban space is influenced by their movement between such spaces. Thirdly, despite some similarities norms amongst the queer community in Rio de Janeiro are ultimately different to those that have been documented in global northern contexts. Religion, notions of respect, language nuances, culturally specific racial terms (such as whether one is moreno escuro or moreno claro) and sexual role all structure norms amongst the queer community and influence whether one is tolerated or not across different homonormative and non-homonormative spaces of the city. Such factors influence the experience of tolerance in Rio de Janeiro in ways that are not explored in literature on the global north (Bell & Binnie 2004, Sears 2005 Brown 2006). This research suggests that future
work on homonormativity must look beyond the frequently studied triad of race, class and sexuality and consider other factors such as these in order to understand the way in which tolerance functions within the queer community.

In summary, by taking a spatial approach to tolerance and sexuality, this study has highlighted the need to rethink current approaches to theorising tolerance. This research has shown that whilst much of the literature on tolerance is concerned with whether tolerance is beneficial and necessary, or not, we need to challenge assumptions present in both of these approaches that queer men represent a group requiring tolerance from the wider intolerant society. This research demonstrates that within the queer community, and spaces associated with it, there is evidence of tolerance and intolerance, approval and disapproval of certain practices associated with specific groups of queer men and women. From the terreiro, to LGBT organisations, the gay scene and the gay beach queer men are constantly drawing limits around the behaviours that are tolerated and are drawing on discourses of gender, sexuality, race, religion, class and respect to do so. It is imperative that future research considers the nature of tolerance within queer communities, and in other groups that are positioned as requiring tolerance, not only to better understand the nature of tolerance and linkages between tolerance, sexuality and space, but to acknowledge that intolerance is something that occurs within the most tolerant groups and spaces in our towns and cities.

I end, then, by returning to the start of the thesis, and the decision to cancel the pride parade in Duque de Caixas. The reaction towards the event can be understood more clearly with reflection on the diverse experiences and understandings of the spatiality of tolerance weaved throughout this thesis. The cancelling of the pride parade was about more than the unease of openly homosexual behaviours in the street. It was also about the religious beliefs of those attending and observing, about notions of respect and the family, about ideas of class and race which shape each other. As shown
elsewhere in this thesis tolerance functions through including/excluding queer men based on the interrelational nature of their identities and not on one specific aspect of their identity, such as sexuality. Where and when we are permitted to express our gender and sexuality (that is, the limits of tolerance), and in what way, is inextricably tied up with these related factors. Disapproval of certain gendered and sexualised behaviours associated with the pride parade, from cross-dressing to using gay slang or talking with a high pitched voice cannot be understood as, simply, elements of intolerance towards the queer community, but must be read as attempts to restrict certain, interrelated religious, class, racial and disrespectful practices. Thus, the cancelling of the pride parade highlights the entangled nature of race, sexuality, gender, religion and class in the decision to cancel the pride parade and demonstrates that tolerance of the queer community draws on various, interrelated aspects of our identity. The mayor’s decision to refer to the family and the church, amongst other factors, in his decision to cancel the pride parade is not just incidental, but demonstrates how tolerance of the queer community functions through drawing on interrelated discourses of race, gender, class, sexuality, religion and respect to delineate behaviours that are acceptable and those that are not.

Though these insights are important, they are also constrained by some of the limitations of the present study. Although my research is focused in an urban setting, I am sympathetic to calls from Brown and Knopp (2008) that research into queer subjectivities needs to pay more attention to the lives of queers living in rural areas and, particularly, the way in which tolerance and intolerance are constructed and contested in such spaces. However, with the queers, arguably, representing a ‘difficult to reach’ community (Silenzio et al 2009) and gay organisations, protests and pride parades virtually non-existent in Brazil’s rural areas the task of conducting such research would be difficult for a PhD project. Anecdotal evidence from my research does suggest that rural spaces are important spaces in queer men’s experiences. The gay-friendly pousadas (guest houses) of the state’s mountain towns, the
soaring peaks of the interior’s national parks and the lush forests and wide open spaces of rural areas were all referenced by participants as vital to the well-being of carioca queer men. This serves as a reminder that the city is a convenient but sometimes insufficient location for understanding sexuality and tolerance in Latin America and elsewhere. In addition, whilst this research has highlighted the importance of the travesti category in thinking about the way in which queer men perform gendered and sexualised behaviours that are (not) tolerated, the experiences and perspectives of travestis are, unfortunately, underrepresented in this study. This was largely the consequence of the composition of the groups where I conducted ethnographic research, but was also a reflection of the difficulty I had contacting those from the travesti community through friends and LGBT organisations. Thus, whilst this study adds to studies on sexuality in Latin America, more, however, remains to be done in rural areas and with the travesti community if the task of creating knowledge about tolerance and sexuality can be realised.

Sibley (1995, p 121) argues that it matters who produces knowledge and where it is produced. Put differently, all knowledge is positioned, and it always comes from somewhere. This research must be understood as a consequence of research from a group of queer men in Rio de Janeiro and coming from me as a researcher within the overlapping Latin American and Anglo-American theoretical schools on gender and sexuality. Both of these factors have influenced the findings presented in this study, indeed, a goal throughout has been to extend work in these areas. But, through doing so a key aim of this study has been to make conclusions about tolerance that give new insights into other settings too, that might illuminate the relationship between tolerance, gender and sexuality in locations long away from the Zona Sul or the gay scene of Rio de Janeiro’s centro.

Whilst I am hesitant to give a prescriptive answer related to future research, participants’ stories and experiences suggest several important areas of
future research. Firstly, as tolerance of the queer community is becoming increasingly important in political agendas around the world, one of the most salient questions in coming years will be, what sort of tolerance do we want and need, and how – and who - will play a role in defining it? We must consider not only how such spaces represent safe, liberal sites, but acknowledge how notions of tolerance may be detrimental and lead to the exclusion of those within the queer community if we seek to glimpse an alternative to current manifestations of tolerance. Secondly, this study suggests the importance of understanding the diversity of sexualities represented in religious spaces that are often presumed to embody heteronormativity. Research findings mirror recent work by Vanderbeck et al (2011) suggesting the need to challenge dichotomous understandings of conservative vs. liberal religions and, instead, consider the diverse repertoires of ways in which religion allows and constrains queer identity performances. This study has demonstrated that more research must be conducted showing that religion is not simply contradictory to, but can and does give meaning to queer lives, that it can enable queer performances to be tolerated at certain times and spaces whilst denying them in others. Thirdly, throughout this thesis the importance of not presuming tolerance in supposedly tolerant spaces has been emphasised. It has been argued that in addition to factors such as race and class, which have been explored, particularly in LGBT spaces, (see Binnie 1998, Skeggs 1999 and Rink 2009), other factors such as language choice, home ownership, age and religious affiliation impact the experience of seemingly tolerant spaces as such. More social research must explore factors that influence the spatiality of tolerance in order to fully understand the way in which tolerance functions across urban space.

Finally, this research has shown that more research is needed into the relationship between tolerance and sexuality in Latin America to broaden our understanding of the variant cultural factors that influence the spatiality of tolerance. From the Brazilian-Portuguese queer vernacular, to constructions
such as the barbie and bicha pintosa and culturally prevalent ideas such as being ativo or passivo, this research has emphasised that the relationship between tolerance and sexuality in Brazil is ultimately different from that of other contexts such as Europe, North America and Australia, where current research is focused. More research on the relationship between tolerance, space and sexuality in less studied corners of the world is needed. This will allow for a better understanding the multifaceted socio-cultural factors that influence the nature of tolerance and further our knowledge of the way in which tolerance functions in different settings around the world.

At the time of writing, there is an air of optimism amongst the LGBT rights organisations in Brazil. Dilma Roussef has taken office from the ever-popular Lula and has promised that the partido dos trabalhadores (Workers’ Party) will introduce new legislation related to gay adoption and marriage (Globo 2010b). Debates regarding the specific gendered and sexualised behaviours, that are accepted and not, are relevant to contemporary Brazil, as in many other countries. To take tolerance seriously, then, is important. Whilst the inauguration of seemingly gay-friendly politicians brings hope and may be interpreted as the ushering in of a new tolerance, it is through the lived spaces of the home, the workplace, the street, the gay organisation and the church that tolerance interacts with and influences (and is influenced by) the lived realities of queer men and women in Brazil and elsewhere. A continued interrogation of tolerance in such spaces, with a particular emphasis on tolerant sites, is necessary if we are to understand the functioning of tolerance and think about the consequences of new legislation for the everyday realities of queer communities. Geographers can play an important role in the rearticulation of sexuality to acknowledge issues of tolerance and space, and in considering the generation of more tolerant forms of tolerance, not only for the gay men at ABIA and Arco-Íris or the travestis working on Copacabana beach, but for queer men and women around the world.
Appendices

Informants Cited in the Thesis
For reference, and to avoid cluttering the text, I have included an alphabetical list of the respondents’ pseudonyms cited in this thesis and/or interviewed for this study. At their first mention a brief description is sometimes made and thereafter I refer to the respondents by name only. The information below includes the sexuality, age, social class, race, home neighbourhood and ‘out’ status, and is based on respondents’ self-identification. Data has been changed where it might jeopardise an informant’s anonymity and omitted where it was not provided.

AGNALDO: Thirty-seven years old, moreno, gay, out to family and some co-workers and friends. Agnaldo lives with his parents in Paracambi, a small town 76km from Rio de Janeiro. He is an English teacher. Agnaldo spends a lot of his free time in Rio de Janeiro and knows the city well.

ALDO: Nineteen years old, gay, out to friends and some of his family. Aldo is from the Rhocinha favela in the Zona Sul. Aldo was brought up in a practising Evangelical family.

ÁLVARO: Thirty years old, gay, works for a small NGO in the city. Álvaro is HIV positive and is a militant supporter of rights for HIV positive men.

ALEXANDRE: Twenty-six years old, white, gay, out to friends and family.

ANDRÉ: Thirty-two years old, gay, out to friends and family. André works for Arco-íris and lives in Tijuca.

ÂNGELO: Twenty-two years old, moreno, gay, out to everyone. Ângelo is currently a university student and living in student accommodation.
ANTÔNIO: Twenty-six years old, homofetivo (homoaffective), out to everyone.

ARTUR: Thirty-four years old, white, homosexual, out to friends and family. Artur works as a barman in a Zona Sul bar and lives in the centro. He is HIV positive.

BRUNO: Twenty-years old, gay, out to his closest friends and mother, but not to the rest of his family. Bruno is working part-time and a university student, He is from a ‘down to earth family’ and lives in the Zona Norte of the city.

CAIO: Thirty-three years old, moreno, HIV positive. Caio is a keen member of ABIA. He is out to his parents and to some friends. He lives in a small house in Madureira and lives next to his parents, uncles and aunts.

CARLOS: Eighteen years old, black, and ‘likes men’. He is out to his mother and friends, but not to his dad. He lives in Copacabana, where he is at secondary school.

CESAR: Twenty-six years old, white, gay, out to parents and closest friends. Cesar’s family is Italian-Brazilian and he was brought up as a strict Catholic, including attending a Catholic secondary school. He is now a university student and lives with his family in Tijuca.

CHRISTIANO: Twenty-three years old, black, out to closest friends and to his mother. Christiano was brought up as a Mormon and still has lots of friends through the church. He lives in Maria da Graca and is a full-time student.

CLAUDIO: Pride co-ordinator and political activist at Arco-iris. Claudio is also a member of the state government where he works in areas concerned with human rights.
CLAYTON: Twenty-nine years old, gay, out to everyone, lives on Ilha do Governador.

CUAÊ: Twenty-one years old, bisexual, out to friends and some of his family. Cuaê is a member of the gay-friendly ‘ACM’ Evangelical church and lives in Penha.

DAMON: Twenty-nine years old, homosexual, out to family and friends. Damon was brought up in a strict Evangelical family. His dad is a minister and he identifies this as the reason they didn’t accept his sexuality.

DANIEL: Twenty-one years old, moreno, gay, out to everyone. Daniel moved to Rio de Janeiro from Minas Gerais and worked as a prostitute in the Zona Norte to make ends meet. He is from a poor family, but is now living in an upper-middle class street in Botafogo.

DANIEL: Twenty-five years old, homosexual, out to friends and family. Danilo works in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo and is an editor for a Brazilian LGBT magazine.

DAVI: Twenty-years old, white, homosexual, but feels some attraction towards women. He is out to friends, but not to his family. He is from a ‘well studied’ family that ‘have money’ and was brought up in the costal town of Angra-dos-Reis. He is now a university student in Rio and lives in Flamengo with a friend. Davi was brought up as a Lutheran Protestant and his family are religious, but he is not religious now.

DENILSON: Eighteen years old, black, white and indigenous. He defines his sexuality as ‘something to be discreet about’ and is out to his family and friends. He is studying a university student. Denilson is from a lower-working class family and lives in Tijuca.
DIEGO: Twenty-one years old, white, more gay than bisexual, out to his friends and family. Diego is a ballerina and lives in a shared house with other dancers in the city centre. Originally he is from the Madureira neighbourhood.

DOUGLAS: Twenty years old, moreno, homosexual, out to family and friends. Douglas was Catholic and now identifies as Agnostic.

EDUARDO: Twenty years old, white, heterosexual, Eduardo lived with his Dad who he describes as very laid back. He was originally from Búzios, a small coastal town, where he used to live with his conservative mother. He was brought up as an Evangelical, but became extremely cynical about religion. He studied at university and had a mixture of homosexual and heterosexual friends. He lived in Gloria until his death in 2010.

EGOR: Twenty-years old, defines his sexuality as a ‘challenge’, is out to a few close friends and to his family. He is a military police officer and lives with his parents.

ENZO: Forty-six years old, black, gay. Out to parents and friends, but not to workmates.

EVANDRO: Twenty-nine years old, gay, out to everyone except his father.

FABIANO: Forty-three years old, moreno, bisexual, out to some friends, but not to family. Fabiano lives in with his elderly mother in the Zona Norte and works in a shop in the centro.

FABIO: Forty years old, gay, out to friends and family. Works at ABIA and is from Marcanã.

FELIPE: Twenty-eight years old, gay, out to all friends and family. He lives in Niterói where he studies Psychology.
FLÁVIO: Twenty years old, gay, out to family and friends. Flávio is an actor and has recently moved from Duque de Caixas to São Conrado.

GABRIEL: Nineteen years old, black, more gay than bisexual, out to closest friends. He is a student and is living in the Penha neighbourhood in the Zona Norte.

GILBERTO: Fifty-four years old, gay and out to everyone. Gilberto is a magazine editor and identifies as middle class.

GUI: Twenty-one years old, moreno, completely gay, out to his friends and sisters, but not to his parents. He works in a travel agents and is from a middle class family in Copacabana.

GUILHERME: Thirty-two years old, black, gay, out to closest friends. He works for IBM. Guilhereme is HIV positive and has only told a few people. He is from a poor family in the Zona Norte.

GUSTAVO: Researcher for the São Paulo based Perceo Abrama foundation. Gustavo worked on a recently published article considering homophobia in different regions of Brazil.

HUGO: Homosexual, living in Recreio, out to family and has two brothers who are also out homosexuals.

JADILSON: Twenty-one years old, gay, out to friends, but not to family. He currently works as an English teacher and lives in Copacabana. He is from a middle-class family.

JOAQUIM: Eighteen years old, gay, out to close friends, but not to family. He is a university student.
JOÃO: Thirty-one years, black, gay, out to friends but not to family. João lives in Nova Iguacu which he describes as a ‘very poor neighbourhood’ and he works in telemarketing. He is HIV positive.

JOEL: Nineteen years old, moreno, bisexual, out to closest friends but not to family. Joel lives in a village in the interior of Rio de Janeiro state where he works on and off in a garden centre.

JÚLIO: Twenty-three years old, black, he doesn’t ‘waste time’ defining his sexuality, but is more sexually attracted to men. Júlio was thrown out of his family home at thirteen and considers his friends his real family. He performs drag shows in clubs around the city and lives in the lower-middle class neighbourhood of Jacarapagua and is from a poor family.

LEONARDO: Eighteen years old, moreno, bisexual, out to friends and family. He is from a low income area in the Zona Norte. Leonardo is currently at secondary school. He defines his religion as ‘spiritualist’.

LEOPOLDO: Twenty-eight years old, white, gay, out to family and friends. Leopoldo is from a liberal family who accept his sexuality and his father is also gay. Leopoldo frequents Candomblé temples and finds the religion tolerant, although does not identify with any religion.

LORENZO: Twenty-six years old, bisexual, out to closest friends at university, but not at work nor to family.

LUCAS: Twenty years old, moreno, homosexual, but dated a woman for three years, living in Copacabana. He is out to closest friends, but not at work or to his family. He is an administration assistant in an office.
LUÍS: Twenty-two years old, gay, out to some of his family and virtually all of his friends. Luis is very proud to be gay. He is from a town in the interior of Rio de Janeiro state and moved to the capital at nineteen seeking more independence and a job. He lives in Gloria. Luis is studying part-time and working as a tax assistant. He was brought up as a Jehovas Witness and now defines his religious beliefs as agnostic.

MARCOS: Thirty five years old, bisexual, out to family and some friends.

MATHEUS: Twenty-five years old, white, he is against using the word gay which he finds dehumanising and states that in terms of sexuality he ‘likes to enjoy life’. He is out to some friends and to his brother, but not to his parents. He is living in Barra da Tijuca.

MAURO: Forty-one years old, gay, white, out to family and friends. Mauro works as a shop assistant.

MIGUEL: Eighteen years old, gay, but not part of the gay ‘cultural category’. Miguel is out to everyone, including his parents who sent him to a Psychologist in an attempt to cure his homosexuality. He is a psychology student.

MIRELLA: Thirty-eight years old, morena, travesti out to family and friends. Mirella works for one of Rio de Janeiro’s trans groups. She works in the centre and lives in Glória. Religion is important to Mirella and she recently became a Buddhist.

MOURILO: Eighteen years old, Copacabana, out to family and friends, college student.
NILTON: Thirty-seven years old, moreno from a lower-working class neighbourhood in São Cristavo. Nilton describes himself as ‘a man who likes other men’. He works in a shop in Copacabana.

PEDRO: Twenty-one years old, light moreno, gay, out to friends and brother, but not workmates. He is a student and lives in Copacabana.

RAFAEL: Nineteen years old, moreno, bisexual, out to friends, but not to his family. Rafael lives with his adopted family in Tijuca.

RAMIRO: Preacher at one of the Igreja Universal Evangelical churches in the Zona Sul.

REINALDO: Twenty-four years old, university student living in Vila Isabel. He is out to his family and friends and does not self-define his sexuality in any particular way.

RENATO: Nineteen years old, moreno, homosexual, out to his family and friends. Renato lives in Penha and works in an army barracks. He recently found out he was HIV positive. His family have struggled to accept both his HIV status and his sexuality and have thrown him out of the house on several occasions. Renato’s family are devout Evangelicals, but he is spiritual and practises wicca.

ROBERTO: Twenty-six years old, black, *transformista*. Roberto stated that he would not use a word like gay or bisexual, but defined his sexuality as ‘very happy’. He lives in Queimados and performs drag shows around Rio de Janeiro state.

ROBSON: Nineteen years old, white, homosexual, but emphasises that his sexuality is fluid. Robson is out to most friends and his family. He is working
in one of Rio’s consulates and is a part-time student. Robson lives with his family in Flamengo.

ROGEIRO: Twenty-one years old, white, middle class, homosexual, out to friends and family. Rogeiro works in a museum and is a part-time student and lives with his family in Santa Teresa.

RUAN: Forty-three years old, white, homosexual, out to everyone. Ruan is from a poor family but is now a wealthy, established artist who is living in Rio de Janeiro and Paris.

RYAN: Twenty-four years old, gay, out to friends. Ryan is a full-time university student. He is religious, but does not identify with any particular religion.

SAMUEL: Twenty-five years old, homosexual, out to everyone. He is from Meier where he recently graduated from a Catholic university.

STÉFANO: Forty-one years old, gay, out of the closet to everyone. He works for an NGO in Ramos and conducts research into discrimination against travestis as part of a university course. He lives in Duque de Caixas.

TEODORO: Eighteen years old, gay, out to closest friends. Teodoro is an actor in a telenovela on an Evangelical channel in Brazil. He used to attend an Evangelical church along with all of his family. He is still religious now, but does not frequent any church.

THIAGO: Twenty-six years old, Japanese-Brazilian, gay, out to everyone except his father. Thiago lives in the coastal town Cabo Frio, where he works in the family restaurant. He also works in Rio de Janeiro at an industrial designer and spends most of his free time in the city.
VALÉRIA: Twenty-nine years old, morena, travesti, out to family and friends. Valéria works as a prostitute at various sites in the city centre and lives with her boyfriend. She is originally from a poor family in Rio Grande do Norte and moved to Rio de Janeiro to live with her sister. After suffering homophobia she moved into a shared house with other prostitutes and now lives in the city-centre with her boyfriend.

VINÍCIUS: Bisexual, from a middle class, Evangelical family in Niterói. He is out to some of his friends and his mum, but not to the rest of his family.

VITOR: Twenty-three years old, white, bisexual. Until recently he identified as gay, but has started to identify as bisexual since having a long-term relationship with a woman. Vitor is out to his friends and family, but not his workmates. He is from São Paulo and recently moved to Rio de Janeiro and is living in Ipanema. Vitor is from an extremely religious and conservative family.

WALDER: Eighteen years old, likes men and is out to some of family and friends. Walder lives in the Zona Norte with his family, but suffered physical and verbal homophobia from his parents and left to live in the city centre with his aunt.

WANDERSON: Twenty-three years old, black, gay, out to everyone. He lives in Piedade. Wanderson describes himself as poor and being from a poor neighbourhood. He works in a call centre in the city centre. Wanderson is not religious, but he identifies as Catholic.

WILLIAM: Twenty-four years old, gay, employee of Arco-íris.

ZÉ: Twenty years old, moreno, homosexual, out to friends and family. Zé is from a poor family and lives in Cavalcânti.
Interview Transcripts
The original Portuguese excerpts for the interview material presented throughout the thesis are given for each chapter. The order under the heading relates to their position within the chapter, such that the first excerpt presented in the appendices represents the first excerpt in that chapter and so forth. I translated the material myself, although assistance was given by friends in Brazil. Please see the methodology chapter for a brief discussion of translation issues.

Chapter 3
The Zona Sul as a Tolerant Space

Reinaldo
‘É como se como quando atravessamos o túnel Rebouças que dividem as zonas, os gays se sentem mais livres. Porque lá tem referências gays, como posto 8, a parte gay da praia de Ipanema, os bares gays, uma rua gay, as boates gays... Não que na Zona Norte não tenha, mas as boates da Zona Sul são mais conhecidas, respeitadas... Mas sempre tem essa coisa do “depois do túnel”.

Teodoro
‘Eu posso beijar alguém aqui em Ipanema e até me sinto bem porque eu não estou fazendo nada de errado, mais o problema é que tem pessoas em volta de você que ficam olhando de cara feia, fazem piadinhas então acho que na rua são pouquíssimos lugares, e zona sul para mim são os lugares onde se pode ter esses poucos momentos’.

‘Os moradores da zona sul tem mais informações e sabe que esses tipos de atitudes é crime, é preconceito e com relação a zona norte claro nem todo mundo que mora lá é preconceituoso mais as pessoas de lá não tem muita informação, são pessoas quadradas’.

Davi
‘A Zona sul é onde vivem as famílias e as pessoas mais ricas. E os brasileiros que tem mais acesso ao dinheiro são os brasileiros mais informados, e os cariocas da zona norte são as pessoas mais pobres da cidade. Então por falta de informação, falta de estudo tem mais preconceitos’.

Claudio
‘Não da pra dizer que a zona sul é liberal e o centro do Rio é preconceituoso ou o centro é super liberal e o subúrbio ter preconceito, depende dos lugares e dos territórios de cada região do Rio de Janeiro, você tem lugares ou territórios na zona sul que são
altamente gayfriendly e livres e outros territórios que não pode nem pensar em passar por aquele local que você pode até ser assassinado’.

**The Bicha Pintosa and The Barbie**

**Enzo**

‘Você vê uma pessoa negra um pouco mais feminina, não com jeitos efeminado mais nesse sentido e: você esta na dúvida se ele é gay ou não, quem vê sempre fala “ olha lá tinha que ser negro, isso só podia ser coisa de gente preta. Então existe um preconceito em ser negro associado que as pessoas são gays, ouvir coisas assim é muito, ruim, é muito revoltante’.

**Egor**

‘Tem muitos garotos que são afeminado que são escrotos e se sujam muito alem de esta sujando a imagem dele, também esta sujando a imagem do homossexual também então eu em sinto mal quando vejo um gay agindo assim....esta passando na rua ele quer chamar a atenção fica falando alto, ainda rebolando, fica falando muitas girias então eu acho feio, muito feio mesmo’.

**Body Practices and Belonging to the Zona Sul**

**The Beautiful Body**

**Artur**

‘É muito ligado ao tipo, ao físico, ao externo, ao belo que é o ser belo, mais você tem que tem que manter um padrão de beleza dos artistas das novelas da rede globo, então...se você não estiver dentro dos padrões de beleza do artista da globo você não é bonito.’

**André**

‘Na Zona Sul tem uma certa cultura comum, porque gente bonita gosta de ir para lugares onde tem gente bonita, então essa concentração é essa diferença que ainda existe. Se você for na zona norte voce vai encontrar boipe com pessoas com poderes aquisitivos mais baixos e nao tão bonito e que gostam de uns certos tipos de musicas como funk, axe, etc., e voce vai ter o extremo que e a the week que toca tribal house, com DJs de fora e dentro do Brasil’.

**Damon**

‘Essas bichinhas ficam com inveja por que seu cabelo é mais liso, ou você rouba os namorados deles, mais essas que fazem isso tudo, xingam, dizem palavrões são as bichas mais baixas’.
Diego  
‘Eles, eles... gostam né, de homens fortes, sarados, né, bonitos... o gay, acho que por ter muito esse negócio da pegação... de ficar, aí tem muito essa cultura do corpo mesmo, né, essa valorização passa a ser uma valorização maior ainda’.

Ryan  
‘O padrão da forma do gay carioca, da praia de Ipanema, são os caras sem pelo no peito e na barriga, sempre forte sarado e altos, essa é a estética gay tanto da praia do posto’.

Consuming Style  
Zé  
“Papa G” só tem bichinhas afetadas, bichas maluquinhas, bichas doidinhas e um pouquinho de gente feia...Na minha visão as pessoas baixas da “Papa G” não entra aqui...você deve ter percebido o jeito dos homossexuais da papa g como eles se vestem, o jeito de falar, como é que eles são diferente da “Le boy”. Na frente da “Le Boy” você não vê bichinhas dando pinta com leque aberto, mas na “papa g” voce vai ver um fila de homossexuais, de chinelo, com leques aberto, dando pinta horrores e aqui na “le boy”...porque a “Le Boy” ela é padronizada, ela tem um padrão zona sul, e a papa g são para jovens que são de baixo nível’.

Clayton  
‘O homossexual da Zona Sul é muito ligado a essa parte estética, essa parte hedonista, essa coisa muito ligado a prazer, marcas, vitrines, bons lugares para comer, dançar etc’.

Practices of Regulation: Putting People in their Place in the Zona Sul  
Verbal Discrimination  
Claudio  
‘Gera esse imaginário de que elas as barbies tem uma classe alta, e eles fazem questão de manter essa ideia de que é assim mesmo, agora tem outro aspecto tambem o gay pintosa ainda é de classe econômica inferior então combina as duas coisas ou seja eles irão falar “imagin.. alem de ser bicha é pobre” e então já começa a descriminação pelos outros gays “ah coitada não tem nem dinheiro para pagar a boite’.

Zé  
Bichas da zona norte eles chamam de bicha pobre, “bicha uô”, e também quando as pessoas da zona norte vem para a zona sul também sofrem muito preconceito dos próprios gays’.
Humour
Claudio
‘Ate mesmo cosias que drag queen e transformistas fazem sem perceber, mais na verdade é que muitas fazem com intenção mesmo...mais falam com um humor sarcástico da pobreza dos gays do subúrbio “ah vai pegar o trem, o ônibus mais tarde?”.

Stigmatising Pajubá
João: Gays tem um pouco de preconceito sobre usando ele. Aqueles que usam são marcados como “ pão com” ovo or “poc-poc”.
Tony: Mais como e esse giria ligado ao classe?
João: Mais pelos gays muito abertamente afemindados ou os bichas bafentas. Tem mais a ver como o comportamento do que economic. E mais pelos bicha bafentas, aqueles que adoram causar problemas fazendo gestos muitos visíveis. Tem preconceitos baseados na giria, mais os grupos que usam a giria muito são frequentemente discriminados pelos, nomeados, bichas finas. Aqueles que tentam criar um ambiente cosmopolita, chic environment ao redor deles. O que acontece é que os gays que usam pajubá fazem, quase sempre, parte dos 3 grupos que os gays discriminam. Primeiro, travestis, ou gays muito afeminados, segundo, gays pobres que, segundo o preconceito são escandalosos e indiscretos e, finalmente, gays que são muito espirituais’.

Uncomfortable Stares
Alexandre
‘Não me visto com uma blusinha baby look, não me visto com uma calça da moda, com uma roupinha mais transada e eles me olham de uma forma diferente na Zona Su. Não me sinto confortável’.

Evandro
‘Ipanema parece ser bem liberal, mas na verdade dentro da comunidade gay os gays olham pra você como se fosse um idiota. Não tenho o corpo gay musculoso, barba cortada...Quando entrar num lugar assim ou entrar na rua e sinto tão ruim como se fosse um lugar hetero. Falo assim, ‘Porra gente! Tudo mundo aqui da cu tambem!’.

Rafael
'Você não pode fazer gestos engraçados com seus amigos, brincam com eles, por que pessoas vão olhar para você de um jeito estranho, ou podem fazer coisas piores...Sinto preso'.

**Pitboys, Pitbulls and Playboys**

**Júlio**

'O playboy anda numa trupe, essa turminha tem um sistema o sistema e o seguinte, carors e carros, noitadas e noitadas, machos e machos, mulheres e mulheres, bebidas e bebidas, então eles nunca iriam permitir um gay chegar perto deles' ...são tipo fortinho, musculosinho'.

**Nilton**

'Ele entre na academia pra ficar sarado e usar isso como um instrumento de briga, de guerra ....são pessoas filhinho de papai, com um poder aquisitivo maior, um nível social mais alto e então eles acham que estão acima e o preconceito deles não é só com os gays e sim com prostitutas, negros, pobre'.

**Christiano**

'Na Zona Sul é mais tolerante, mas ao menos tempo não porque tem áreas que não são...são períodos que você não sabe o que vai acontecer. Até pouco tempo Pit boys começaram a ir no bar Bofetada e agrediam homossexuais'.

**Aldo**

'Eu não gosto de me misturar em ambientes GLS, tipo Le boy, porque são pesados mesmo, que eu vou de vez em quando. Só que tem lugares que os Pitboys vao só para arrumar confusão. Tem boate hetero por exemplo, que gay não entra. Tem uma em Ipanema, uma na Farme mesmo, pixada como “Boate da Morte” quando voce sai de manhã eles vão atrás de voce'.

**Fábio**

'Na própria Farme de Amoedo tem um bar ali na esquina que sempre foi freqüentado por Playboys que batem em gays e mesmo sabendo que ali é um lugar gay, então é uma coisa que pra mim é muito louco...é um território com muita tensão e alem da própria tensão gerada pelos gays querendo comer um ao outro, querendo pegar o outro, ainda tem essa tensão de uma certa violência'.

**Júlio**
'Eu tenho um amigo meu ele ja foi vítima, ele tava andando conversando no celular rindo, proque ele e escandoloso tipo ‘3 playboys passaram e acharam que esse meu amigo estava mexendo com eles ai os 3 voltaram e bateram nele e ele nao fez nada... mais bateram mesmo, os dois olhos dele ficaram roxo, quebrou um dente, rasgaram a orelha dele, quebraram o nariz dele’.

Fábio
‘Eu acho que se você tem muito dinheiro você pode ser o que você quiser socialmente, você pode ser a bicha mais louca do mundo andar de saia num dia e andar de calça no outro’.

Guilherme
‘Para que tem dinheiro, eles estão com a faca e o queijo na mão... Heterossexual branco de família rica ele tem muito mais liberdade do que um homossexual negro de uma família pobre’.

Resisting Intolerance in the Zona Sul
Claudio
‘As barbies sofrem estigmas das pintosas, as pintosas também não gostam dos mais macho, os mais macho odeiam as pintosas, é uma coisa absurda e confundem comportamento estético com orientação sexual e com comportamento social. Então eles misturam tudo’.

Miguel
‘A maioria... existem muitos gays machistas. Eu acho que essa denominação “eu sou homem que gosta de homens” é meio renegando toda a cultura gay’ .

Caio
‘Na Le Boy já não tem muita misturas, as pessoa na Le Boy são mais Barbies, nariz em pe, acham que são melhores que todo mundo ali e ninguém é igual ali, eles sempre acham que são melhores do que você, Le Boy é um lugar que eu vou para dançar e eu não tenho vontade de conhecer ninguém ali porque eu sei que todo mundo ali é metido... há muitas pessoas do publico gay no Rio de Janeiro que gostam muito de crescer, ser mais que os outros, as vezes só porque tem um carro, porque tem uma roupa melhor que a minha, porque acha que fala melhor do que você etc’.

Mirella
Disseram que vão usar batom, peruca, e sair na rua então quebraram esse estigma, e é isso que eu falo para as meninas (travestis) que agente deve ir ao hospital quando estiver sentindo alguma dor e não se importar se as pessoas irão rir ou não, não pode se importar se o médico te chamara pelo seu nome de homem. Tem que dizer “Eu vou e não ligo pra isso” eu sempre falo para os travestis o que eu mais acho engraçado é “vocês não tem medo de ficar de madrugada em uma pista vendendo seu corpo, e saindo com homens que nunca viram em suas vidas, mais tem medo de andar de dia na rua, medo de ir ao supermercado, medo de ir ao hospital, medo de estudar. Você pode perceber olha o vestido que estou usando e olha a hora que são, e andei isso tudo até aqui e ninguém falou nada”.

Mirella
‘Estava olhando os eletrodomésticos e eu escutei quando um vendedor disse “ah é viado” e nesse dia eu não estava emocionalmente legal e tem dias que nem to afim de ouvir qualquer tipo de gracinha porque as travestis fazem trabalhos hormonal então isso mexe muito com a cabeça da gente, então quando escutei o vendedor dizer isso, eu cheguei bem perto dele e disse “O que você falou?”. “Não falei com você não”. “Meu amor, eu só vou te explicar uma coisa, Viado é um bichinho, não sei se você sabe, por acaso você esta vendo algum bichinho aqui fazendo compras? Vai me diz? Eu quero saber, você tem que fazer algum tratamento de cabeça, porque não era nem pra você esta aqui. Chama o gerente...” e todo mundo disse nós somos o gerente. E eu falei “oh ele é maluco e não pode mais continuar trabalhando”. Tem algumas amigas minha que deixam pra lá e não ligam, mais eu sempre digo que não pode deixar pra lá, tem que falar sim, não pode abaixar a cabeça não, eu sou muito legal, mais não hora que eu tenho algo pra falar meu amor, eu falo’.

Chapter Four
Respectful Performances

Being a Respectful Queer Male in Rio de Janeiro

Thiago
’Só acho que eles esta mostrando um visão que espanta a sociedade, uma visão ruim...quem vai deixar uma criança ser adota por alguém que esta ali no meio sem noção do que esta fazendo?’.

Caio
‘Eu tento sim, eu tento chegar em um ambiente com respeito, eu acho que o caráter faz a diferença, mais tem muito gente que quando chega em algum ambiente publico começa a fazer escândalos e falar gritando “Eae bicha, tudo bem?” eu já não tenho mais saco pra
isso, eu não sou assim, se a pessoa quiser souber de mim tudo bem bem se não quiser tudo bem também, eu preciso viver minha vida cumprimentar as pessoas mais educadamente “Boa noite? Tudo bom?” e quando eu revelar pra essa pessoa que eu sou gay talvez ela pense “nossa ele é gay mais nem parece, é um cara que respeita as pessoas, é educado” então eu acho que ter educação é o principal, acho que você não precisa mostrar pra todo mundo quem você é.eu tento manter o respeito para as pessoas me respeitarem, para as pessoas não ficarem fazendo piadinha tipo “olha lá a bichinha indo pra boite”.

Bruno
‘Em casa você não pode dizer qualquer coisa assim porque os familiares se chocam. Apesar de que minha mãe sabe, porque eu contei pra ela ano passado. Mas os outros familiares não sabem’.

Miguel
‘Infelizmente, a maioria dos heteros acha que demonstrações de afetos entre gays e lésbicas são desrespeito. É surreal, mas eles têm esse pensamento de que é uma falta de respeito... E eles merecem ser respeitados. Eles têm a visão de que gays e lésbicas só podem se relacionar trancados, fechados, sem ninguém ver. Assim pode, mas quando vai pra rua, não!’.

Enzo:
‘Quando eu falo em desrespeito não é em termo de não respeitar, mais conforme a sociedade vê, porque a sociedade enxerga isso como um abuso em ver pessoas do mesmo sexo se beijarem em frente de casa ou na rua’.

Daniel: Eu vi na TV outro dia o Leo Aquila, sabe quem é? Um travesti, bem conhecido. Ele falou o seguinte: no mundo gay, pra conseguir respeito é muito demorado. Se você faz uma manifestação correta, consegue.

Tony: O que é uma manifestação correta para você?

Daniel: Cara, você não precisa chocar... por exemplo, aquelas duas garotas do Big Brother, que fizeram a campanha do beijo, não sei se conhece? As duas, que são lésbicas, mas não assumem, deram um beijo na boca e todo mundo falou, uma coisa tão boba de uma pessoa que não sabe o que tá fazendo, que se tornou e fudeu toda um religião de gays militantes, entendeu? Então é isso, tem que ser moderado, tem que moderar. Se você faz uma coisa escrachando, na putaria, estraga tudo o que muita gente demorou para conquistar, entendeu? Então é isso, para mim o correto é isso, não tem que ter putaria.

Who Should be Exposed to Disrespectful Behaviours?
Respectful Performances and Children
Miguel
‘Usam o argumento de que a criança, necessariamente, vai ser um homossexual, o que é um absurdo porque os homossexuais mesmo vêm de famílias heterossexuais!’

Tony: Mas, porque rola pegação entre homens nesses lugares na sua cidade, nesses becos escuros?
Joel: Por preconceito das pessoas, elas vão ficar muito assustadas de verem essas coisas por causa de filhos e de elas próprias, elas não querem ver esses tipos de coisas, pra eles não somos normais, nós somos bichos. Temos que respeitar os filhos deles.

Flávio
‘Eu acho que a criança é ainda muito inocente, ela não tem que saber certo tipo de coisas, como eu não soube quando era menorzinho. E eu acho aquilo bom, guardar pelo menos a inocência daquilo’.

Samuel
‘Minha prima levou o filho dela de oito anos para a parada gay...para ele começar a ter ciência de que existem opções sexuais, que todo mundo não é igual’.

Respectful Performances and the Elderly
Davi
‘Então, essa é minha política de respeitar para não ser condenado, mais quando eu vejo que o local é propício e eu posso fazer tudo bem eu vou fazer.....elas recriminariam com olhar de maldade, achariam ruim, por exemplo esses dias eu estava descendo na estação do metro de Copacabana e tinha um casal de homossexual se beijando e eu vi duas senhoras comentando e dizendo “que coisa horrorosa, que coisa feia”’.

Alexandre
‘Elas não aceitaria eu tendo um laço de carinho, como beijando, abraçando ...sempre respeitando ate onde a capacidade de um possa ir, respeitando..Minha avo é uma senhora de idade, ela aceita mais ela não ficaria muito confortável de me ver com qualquer laço afetivo com outro homem, então eu prefiro ter qualquer laço de carinho dentro do meu quarto mais tranquilo e minha tia, minha avo não ficam chateado com isso’.

Eduardo
‘Não vai fazer esse tipo de coisa na frente de uma senhora de 80 anos que não conhece esse tipo de comportamento, mas se você está num lugar que aceite, na Farme ou numa boate, acho que não tem problema nenhum. Não deveria ser assim, mas como o mundo
não é do jeito que a gente gostaria que fosse, a gente tem que respeitar regras, que não são escritas, mas são regras de convivência social’.

Mirella
‘Em qualquer lugar que eu vou sou super bem respeitada, eu vou ao supermercado converso com algumas senhoras, falo sobre arroz, feijão, sobre comida, tem algumas senhoras que me param no supermercado e me dizem “ah minha filha leva esse feijão aqui ele é ótimo, fácil de cozinhar’.

Respectful Performances and Parents
Ryan
‘Eu procuro me policiar nas brincadeiras...eu respeito também a sexualidade deles como eles certamente devem respeitar a minha...Em casa eu tento me moderar mais um pouco, não ser totalmente o que eu sou, mais livre na rua com meus amigos e em casa eu sou preso’.

Damon
‘Hoje em dia eles nao tocam no assunto. Eles me respeitam neh e eu respeito o espaço deles e eles respeitam o espaço meu e nós não ficamos em guerra com relação a isso. Nunca beijo ninguém na frente deles. Não passo dos limites’.

Leonardo

Spaces of Respect
Respect and the Family Home
Lucas
‘Em casa você está com família. É diferente. É um ambiente diferente. Em casa eu não posso levar ninguém em casa, porque eles não concordam, então eu tenho que respeitar’.

Cuaê
‘Não, na verdade na minha casa eu respeito muito, porque minha mãe ainda está nesse processo de aceitar mais o mundo gay, ainda esta sendo um pouco trabalhado nesse sentido. Então sendo a casa dela, eu respeito o espaço que é dela. Agora, se fosse na minha casa e eu tivesse meu próprio espaço eu não teria nenhum problema de levar meu namorado, de mostra pra sociedade que eu moro com ele’.
Daniel
‘Primeiro fizeram uma tortura psicológica tremenda em mim, me puseram numa psicóloga para me fazer hetero, ela falou “Marcelo se assim”. Depois quando viram que não tinha mais jeito, colocaram identificador de chamadas no telefone de casa para saber quem ligava para mim, cortaram meu dinheiro, minha mesada, não queriam deixar eu trabalhar para não ter dinheiro para sair, depois, bem no final, puseram fogo em tudo o que eu tinha, me puseram para fora de casa sem nada, colocaram fogo em tudo que eu tinha. O que eu fiz? Abaixei a cabeça e sai, me dei o respeito. Eu sou gay, trabalho, tenho a minha casa. Tem que se dar o respeito, não se preocupar com o que os outros falam. Eu não ligo pra preconceito, hoje eu não ligo. Ninguém paga minhas contas, sou eu que pago. Então assim, antes quando morava na casa de meus pais eu achava que eles iriam aceitar...’.

Being Respectful in the Workplace
Lucas
‘Comportamento desrepeitado, pode chamar atenção, atrapalhar o trabalho de outras pessoas dentro da empresa. Agora, você ir numa empresa, fazer uma entrevista, por exemplo, para um cargo gerencial, um cargo de diretor, por exemplo, você não vai poder ser feminino...A maioria dos cargos empresariais, corporativos, você precisa ser sério, ter uma aparência, aparência conta muito. Entendeu? Então chegavam pessoas lá que falavam fino, que se vestiam diferente dos outros meninos, então por esses motivos a gente acabava não convocando para fazer o novo processo ou até mesmo para trabalhar. E isso não é uma coisa que eu faço, é uma coisa que é moldada pela sociedade, entendeu? Eu não posso, por exemplo, chamar essa pessoa para trabalhar porque eu posso perder o meu emprego’.

‘Você tenta manter uma relação só profissional, como você está ali todos os dias, com aquelas mesmas pessoas, você acaba criando um vínculo. Então quando eu tenho algum problema, eu tenho sempre que estar mudando o “ele” por “ela” e isso é chato, né?’.

Alexandre
‘Tem que ser seco, ser profissional, ser um homem de gelo. E fora, você pode falar uma piadinha, você pode ser mais descontraído. Você pode brincar mais. Levar as coisas mais na flauta’.

José
'Eu privo minha vida completamente, porque é importante. Basicamente existe uma importância pra você: ter um certo respeito, até mesmo é importante que você, prive sua vida...então eu mantenho sempre mentindo'.

Renato
'Na verdade os gays sofrem preconceitos e são coagidos muitas vezes quando falam do sexo, mas os heteros muitas vezes vivem falando e não são coagidos ou repreendidos como os gays são e porque o mercado do trabalho está insendo na logica da sociedade que e heteronormativa'.

Mirella
'Fiz um curso na faculdade Estácio de Sá em Nova Iguaçu imagino no subúrbio do Rio, e nessa região tem muitas pessoas humildes e o preconceito e muito mais pior, então imagino uma travesti como eu, vestida de mulher, com vestidos muito curtos e ninguém me falou nada e acabei fazendo amizade com todo mundo, as pessoas ficaram admiradas comigo e ate fiquei preocupada" meu Deus ninguém vai me chamar a atenção não, ninguém vai chamar o repórter, ninguém vai fazer nada rsrsrs" mais foi muito pelo contrario acabei fazendo amizade com todos os professores'.

Jadilson

Cesar
'No meu trabalho ou estar em qualquer outro lugar que não seja a balada e um limitador e justamente um lugar onde que não da pra ser gay porque não e o lugar que ninguém espera que voce seja gay , a não ser que você seja cabeleireiro porque ai sim vão esperar que você seja gay ou qualquer outra profissão qualquer outra coisa que não se espera que você seja diferente, você tem que tentar se encaixar'.

Chapter 5
(In)tolerance of Queer Performances in Rio de Janeiro’s LGBT Spaces
LGBT Sites as Counterpublics: The Tolerant Rhetoric
Entre Garotos Website

‘Falamos sobre as emoções e percepções dos jovens, buscando minimizar os danos do preconceito sofrido na escola, entre amigos, familiares e em ambientes religiosos e de trabalho.’

Claudio

‘De reunir as pessoas de maneira horizontal para falarem sobre sua sexualidade sem culpa e sem medo, porque a gente tinha percebido naquele momento que não tinha nenhum grupo que dava esse tratamento da auto estima, da construção de identidade’.

William

‘Homens gays, bissexuais e travestis eles surgem de uma forma expontanea da mesma forma caotica que a sexualidade humana se manifesta, faltam modelos e agente vive numa sociedade baseada em modelos e modelos heterossexual, entao pra todo o codigo de comportamente e postura da nossa sociedade ocidental, no mundo ocidental ele e normatizado apartir de uma cultura heteronormative…eu acho que o papel das organizacoes como o do arco-iris e diminuir um pouco essa angustia desses modelos e ate a ajudar a repensar que tipo de modelos, que tipo de padrao de comportamento que agente pode adotar. E um espaço livre disso’.

Renato

‘Quando eu conheci ABIA eu estava muito fraco psicologicamente. Por conta de tudo o que aconteceu, só que de repente eu descobri que não era nada de tão pesado assim, como as pessoas acham, estigmatizam por ai’.

Fabio

‘Eu acho que tem as organizações enfim que trabalham com essas populações, os grupos, os gays, as organizações que tambem dão sentindo para isso porque eu acho que os organismos que ajudam apesar de ter varias questoes, problemas com qualquer coisa mais eu acho que esses sao os cais seguro que as pessoas podem encontrar tambem respostas ou tentar encontrar respostas para seus questionamentos e tem um amparo legal e eu acho que isso e importante’.

Tony: Então você diria que os homens gays que demonstram mais a sua sexualidade sofrem mais preconceitos neh?
Caio: Sim, muito preconceito, é dentro do ônibus, no trabalho e então pra evitar esses tipos de preconceitos eu me privo mais, fico mais fechado, quando eu estou no meio de pessoas GLS eu já me solto mais, brinco mais...

Tony: Como na ABIA?

Caio: Sim, porque ali onde eu estou é um público voltado para gays mais se estou em algum lugar como aqui onde nós estamos por exemplo, mesmo que eles percebam mais algumas pessoas podem ter duvidas sobre mim “Será que ele é gay mesmo?, mais ele é tão educado, falo normal” mais eles vão sempre ter essa duvida ate porque eu vou ser mais discreto, ainda existe esse preconceito e é grande.

Davi
‘Me sinto mais a vontade com eles naquela parte gay da praia de Ipanema porque é destinado ao meu público, então lá eu me sinto a vontade...você pode beijar o seu parceiro, abraçar-lo, brinca do jeito que você quiser então eu me sinto mais a vontade’.

Tolerance and Intolerance in Ambivalent LGBT sites

The Gay Beaches
Ryan
‘Não sei se no seu país vocês utilizam esse termo “macho e fêmea, passivo e ativo” na maioria das vezes principalmente lá na praia, essas pessoas ou esses gays que tem esses corpos sarados, sem pelo são os considerados machões, os ativos. Então há uma certa reação adversa com o gay feminino que são as mulheres’.

The Pride Parade
Mauro
‘As pessoas aproveitam muito e começam a se expor demais, quando você ver coisas acontecendo, as pessoas se vulgarizando. Elas pensam que se gay é ser livre demais e acabam se ridicularizando então gosta da parte política com mais limites’.

Enzo
‘Todas as paradas gays do mundo, você vai quer se são aberrações, pessoas que estão agredindo ate mesmo o poder dos gays, agridem as palavras dos gays com tipos estranhos de roupas. Quem vai querer sair na rua com seus filhos entre pessoas desse tipo que assustam mais do que filmes de terror? Não tem como aceitar isso, eu nunca votaria a favor’.

André
O carro das travestis a maioria com os peitos de fora, mostrando o porque justamente quebra essa questão do gênero de masculino e feminino e sempre e o carro mais esperado e mais visto pelas senhoras de Copacabana elas todas querem ver os carros das travestis elas sentam na calcada com suas cadeiras de praia para ver os carros das travestis’.

Cauê
‘É um local que agente esta para reivindicar os nosso direitos e é uma pena que muitas pessoas que frequentam a parada ainda não tem essa noção... So querem dar pinta. Eu acho que eles não param muito para presta a atenção no significado da parada gay, que não é somente uma festa por trás da festa tem direitos’.

Wanderson
‘É assim: Tem alguém lutando pelo meu direito. Então eu não vou lutar, vou beber e deixar que lutem pelo meu direito. As pessoas só vão lá pra dar pinta, não participam’.

Teodoro
‘Eu não tenho nada contra mais eu acho que tem alguns que exageram na parada, mais tem gays que se fantasiam demais, e eles acabam se diferenciando do mundo hetero’.

Lorenzo
‘A primeira vez que eu fui numa parada gay a única coisa que eu vi, foram pessoas que iam para festejar e não tinha nenhum motivo específico para estar ali, porque muitos vão para festejar e muitos vão para poder levantar a bandeira e ficar de pegação. Então, eu falei “é só isso, dizem que essa parada gay é para dar visibilidade aos gays, lésbicas etc... e dizem também que ela é para lutar pelos direitos. Mas, se eu for ficar debaixo de uma bandeira me agarrando com qualquer um que eu vejo e ficar fazendo pegação, eu vou estar lutando por qual direito?... ou seja na hora da festa nos chamam mais na hora de lutar pelos seus deveres não precisa, eu sei que eu fiz a minha parte mas não da pra contar é muito pouco e a maioria só querem saber da festa, só que saber da famosa pegação’.

Alexandre
‘Eu gosto muito de me divertir com meus amigos, mais eu acho importante mais as vezes a parada gay perde um pouco o foco... e a parada esta ali para você levantar a bandeira e defender sua causa e muitos ali não esta nem ai pela causa, estão ali para se divertir mais uma vez e fazer pegação, porque quero defender uma causa, uma igualdade, uma respeito maior mais também quero me divertir e curtir. Pessoas perdem o foco e acabam fazendo coisas e acham que tudo e liberal naquele dia e acabam passando dos limites do que seria julgado como comportamento normal’.
Tony: O que você acha sobre a pegação, que você falou que faz mal para comunidade gay., que acontece na prada gay.

Alexandre: Vou te dar a opinião da minha amiga. Foi totalmente assustada pelo jeito que pessoas estavam se comportando. Como falei, pessoas passam dos limites. É feio ver isso, para encontrar esse tipo de comportamento em volta de você, acontecendo num jeito agressivo. Isso é o que ela falou pra mim. Aquelas que vão por causa da curiosidade ficam chocados e, mesmo, formam opiniões mas, dependente do que eles vivem e experiencaram naquele momento.

Gay Bars and Clubs
Marcos
'Aquela pessoa que não chama atenção... que não tem voz de afeminado, que não rebola aquela pessoa não freqüenta esse tipo de lugar, aquela pessoa quando esta afim de sair com alguém ela vai para uma boite ela não chama atenção em geral ela vai encontrar aquelas pessoas com jeitos afeminados e é por isso que tem preconceito muito grande com relação a essas pessoa em geral'.

Antônio: Sim, as pessoas que demonstram a sua homossexualidade, as pessoas afeminadas, os travestis também são muito descriminados, eu acho que esses dois grupos, ou até mesmo através da voz, da roupa, para alguns que são afeminados há muita descriminação, muitos comentários, tipo “olha lá o viadinho passando, olha a menininha. Acho que esses grupos sofrem preconceitos nas boates e bares gays. Tem discriminação contras gays que são mais efeminados.

Tony: Então, diria que na comindade gay tem preconceitos?
Antônio: Sim, acho que algumas pessoas diriam que não tem, mais na minha opinião existe muitos preconceitos contra os gays efeminados.

Tony: Tem lugares que são menos tolerantes pras travestis?
Mirella: Ate mesmo em ambientes gays existe essa questão. Eu trabalho no grupo transrevolução sobre essa questão, eu acho que o preconceito devemos quebrar desde a nossa casa, então não existe lugares onde as travestis são mais ou menos aceitas, porque ate nos próprios lugares gays freqüentados por gays e travestis eles demonstram preconceitos com as travestis assim também como os travestis tem preconceitos com os gays então ainda há essas questões.Tem gays que não gostam de sair com travestis.

Claudinha Boca Doce
‘Tem esse divisão entre ativos e passivos. Então, as bichas efeminadas sentem fora...fora desse milieu e a boa parte das bichas efeminadas não assumem a passividade deles, apesar dos gestos efeminados deles. ‘Ahh meu namorado e meu homem, ele é completamente ativo mais ele so me come. Então, acho que esses homens efeminados com aquele ar não tem a menor chance com os gays modernos’

Egor
‘Até os próprios gays fazem isso “olha a pintosa, olha a passiva”, então o maior preconceito que existe são contra os afeminados. Toda bicha que é pintosa tem um rótulo de ser passiva, as pessoas já chama de passiva’.

Virtual Spaces
Fabio
‘Eu acho que hoje em dia tem uma certa valorização dentro do universo gay de uma certa masculinidade do homossexual que é mais aprovado por exemplo eu posso notar isso muita na internet “Você é efeminado? Não curto efeminados”. “Eu não estou procurando efeminados”. E quando não pergunta esta escrito no texto deles. Então as vezes você se encontra com o cara e pra mim ele é efeminado mais ele diz que não é então também isso é uma questão muito subjetiva neh, mas assim o que eu vejo disso é que existe uma reprovação ao comportamento mais efeminado. O machão sobrepondo e a própria coisa dos homens mais definidos com musculatura puxando mais o masculino mesmo, mesmos os magrinhos, tirando alguma situações, os estilos mesmo que é possível você ser magro sem sofrer esse tipo de coisa’.

Cesar
‘Os gays veem os anuncios em internet, de pessoas que não querem afeminados então os homens gays ficam procurando se afastar dessa impressao e o preconceito vai caindo cada vez mais sobre alguém que tem a aparencia ou o jeito femenino de ser e eu acho que e o homem femino que sofre mais preconceito’.

André
‘Eu acho que hoje os grandes espaços e a internet, os grandes espaços onde você encontra parceiros com muita facilidade onde voce ja virou produto antes de consumir’ ‘não e um comportamento so dos gays talvez os gays tem maior possibilidade dentro desses espaços virtuais principalmente pela falta de espaço fisico, convivencia e os heteros sexualis eles podem pegar, ficar em qualquer espaço e os homossexuais não.’
Chapter 6

‘My sexuality isn’t going to interfere with my love for God’: Religion and Performing Queer Identities

Evangelical Pastor

‘Não temos uma postura preconceituosa, portanto a igreja não é a favor do ato do homossexualismo, porque na bíblia fala que esse ato é pecaminoso, então não podemos aceitar algo em nossa igreja que pode ser pecaminoso e não levar a salvação, mais tentamos levar essa pessoa a se harmonizar com Deus e deixar essa vida de homossexual até porque este escrito na bíblia que é algo pecaminoso, então a igreja não tem essa atitude preconceituosa mas também tenta ajudar essas pessoas tentando tirar essa ideologia de homossexual, porque se você perguntar pra sociedade quem quer ter um filho homossexual ninguém vai dizer que “sim”.

Douglas

‘Acho que não até porque a religião já é mais católica e para eles o homossexualismo é uma coisa errada e que o homem tem que ficar com mulher etc... e por isso não é um local para você freqüentar e mostrar que você é gay, esses locais não são locais para gays freqüentarem’.

André

‘Pessoa precisa ter um pouco do limite, porque senão as pessoas perdem seus limites, elas elouquecem. Precisa ter medo de alguma coisa, saber qual é o seu limite acho que a religiosidade trabalha um pouco com isso. Mais tem que ter um cuidado, porque muitas vezes a religiosidade ela vai além da questão do medo e ela trabalha com a questão da culpa, e ai ao invés de criar pessoas que se possibilitem em escizofrenias, você cria pessoas estressadas e com medo de tudo, com vergonha de si mesmo’.

Nilton

‘A igreja Católica seria aberta, apesar de eles serem contra o homossexualismo, é uma coisa mais velada, mais por exemplo como a igreja universal eles praticamente te amarram, vão querer fazer uma corrente, te exorcizar, dizer que você está com o demônio no corpo, dizer que você é uma pessoa com uma energia negativa. Como um cristão, que esta indo lá para rezar e conversar com Deus, mais já uma igreja como a Universal eles vão querer saber da onde você veio e o que você faz e vai querer te marginalizar, pra você entrar nesses tipos de igreja você tem que se adequar... se eles me vêem ou veem qualquer outro tipo de gay na rua falam que esta com o demônio no corpo, que você vai para o inferno, que você é uma pessoa maligna’.
Pai-de-santo

'Nós entendemos que a homossexualidade é uma opção de um ser humano, então nós não temos nenhum tipo de preconceito e restrição, desde que a pessoa procure proceder aqui dentro de forma correta, porque se a pessoa não procede de forma correta, não vai depender em absolutamente nada em ela ser homossexual ou heterossexual, ela vai precisar pautar os procedimentos dela aqui dentro da nossa casa de maneira independente da opção sexual dela. A Umbanda que é a religião que nós professamos, ela é uma religião livre de preconceitos, preconceito de raça, cor, sexual, religioso. A umbanda é universalista, ela abraca todas as tendências, todas as pessoas independentemente de suas opções, então nós entendemos que os homossexuais são irmãos nossos, assim como os heterossexuais são nossos irmãos'.

Ryan

'Vamos dizer que a religião Protestante e a Católica no Brasil elas proíbem sim o exercício dessa sexualidade que é diferente das deles, no candomblé e na Umbanda que são religiões aptas. Há um certa liberdade em você exercer sua sexualidade. Eles são mais receptivos com gays femininos ou masculinos, eles não tem preconceitos em si, eles são receptivos com qualquer prática social, não sei se há preconceito mais eles aceitam de qualquer forma a prática da sua sexualidade'.

Rethinking Tolerant and Intolerant Religious Spaces
Intolerance and tolerance in the Terreiro

Pai-de-Santo: Sim, ele e tolerante não so para os homossexuais como para todos, só que essa tolerância tem os seus limites porque existe uma disciplina, existe um comando, a casa tem um comando espiritual e material. E desde que haja essa disciplina e claro que a tolerância ela é ampla.

Tony: Então e desde que a pessoa se comporte com respeito, correto neh...?

Pai de Santo: Como eu te falei no início, as pessoas se comportando dentro de uma normalidade, dentro de um procedimento correto, dentro de um procedimento correto, dentro da forma que a parte espiritual desejá, a opção sexual dele e a última coisa que vai importar rsrsrs não tem importância.

Felipe: Pode ser algo do tipo: ele e hetero e não precisa ficar assistindo duas pessoas se beijando, sabe?

Tony: O pai de santo mesmo, ou todo mundo?

Felipe: Pode ser tudo mundo... Acho que seria considerado inapropriado dois homens agindo como amantes num ambiente como este, mesmo que a religião
tolere que eles se comportem da maneira que se comportam devido a justificativa de que eles estejam 'possuídos' com um espírito mais feminino. Ou que seja, mais femininos devido a influência de tais espíritos....

Tony: Mais, você acha que se eles dão pinta demais pode criar problemas também?
Felipe: Não acho que esse seja o problema, acho que o problema seria eles agirem como amantes.

Queer Behaviours in the Church
Cauê
‘Existem lugares onde é pregado e falado muito contra os gays sendo que no meio dessas pessoas que estão pregando contra os gays também existem gays fazendo pegação’.

Tony: Diria que a boa parte dos homossexuais tem religião no Brasil?
Teodoro: Sim, a maioria dos homens gays são parte da Igreja Evangelica, porque eles tentam acolher um pouco mais
Tony: Que as outras religiões?
Teodoro: Sim, antes de saber que você é gay. Porque os homossexuais estão procurando isso, algum lugar que acolhe.

Artur: Minha vida antes era completamente desarregada, completamente perdida, sem religião e hoje em dia me sinto bem mais feliz...
Tony: Desde você começou frequentar a igreja?
Artur: Isso, me sinto mais centrado, mais pé no chão, mais consciente com tudo, com meus deveres, comigo mesmo e com os outros.

Nilton
‘Todas as igrejas tem um clima, você entra, reza, você sente uma paz. Você pode estar super nervoso e triste e ficar dentro da igreja apenas por 30 minutos ou uma hora e já sai de lá super leve e limpo’.

Bruno: Porque sinto muito melhor quando sair. Eu realmente gosto de ir pra igreja Católica. Tenho amigos gays que vão e eles também gostam muito.
Tony: Conversou com outras pessoas lá na igreja sobre sua sexualidade, ou você fica na sua?
Bruno: Não, nunca falei nada. Sempre fica na minha.
Tony: Você já viu cara paqueando uma vez na igreja?
Bruno: Nunca vi na igreja Católica, mas tem muitos caras na Igreja que gostam de ficar com outros caras, fora da Igreja.
Tony: Caras que eles encontraram na igreja?
Bruno: Hmm, não. Bem, alguns deles, pode ser.

**LGBT Religious Spaces**

Caio 'Fica aqui no centro e é uma igreja voltada para o público gay, até o pastor é gay e é muito bonito isso, eu gosto muito. Eu adoro ir a igreja, ler a bíblia e os hinos (musicas da igreja) nos deixa emocionado...ela é muito boa e legal.'

Tony: Quais são os objetivos da sua igreja?
Pastor da Igreja Betel: Em primeiro lugar, incluir pessoas LGBT na comunidade de fé cristã. Ser um espaço seguro e saudável, limpo da homofobia religiosa cristã, para que LGBTs cristãos e cristãs vivam em paz sua espiritualidade sem a auto-condenação de suas sexualidades.

Tony: O que você acha sobre igrejas e.g. igreja universal, que são supostamente inteiramente contra direitos LGBT?
Pastor da Igreja Betel: Acho um horror! rs rs rs rs! Todo e qualquer fundamentalismo, seja cristão, judaico, islâmico ou budista tem e deve ser combatido. Nada de bom existe no fundamentalismo religioso senão a disseminação do ódio, da intolerância, da desigualdade diante da lei.

Renato: A maioria dos frequentadores foram criados no cristianismo, mas por serem gays passaram preconceitos. Eles continuam cristãos, continuam acreditando, mas preferem a igreja gay, por não haver uma discriminação.

Tony: Passaram preconceitos onde, nas igrejas originais deles?
Renato: Sim, nas igrejas de cristianismo hétero

Tony: Mas isso seria o q, evangélicos, ou católicos ou os dois?
Renato: Os dois

**Religion in ‘Profane’ Spaces**

Tony: Com relação ao seu dia a dia, você acha que a religião é importante fora dos espaços religiosos?
Miella: Sim, é super importante você crer, acreditar, seja ate com a natureza não deixa de ser uma religião você ter fé na natureza, jogar uma oferenda no mar para a lemanjá, saudar uma lua cheia, saudar o céu estrelado eu acho que a religião seja ela qual for é muito importante para o ser humano.
Religion, the Family Home and Coming Out

Caio

‘Eu era da igreja, então eles criticam muito e por causa dessas atitudes eu tive que me esconder e mostrar um pessoa que não era eu criei um personagem para minha família, para sociedade e o pastor da igreja. Fiquei noivo de uma mulher e até iria me casar com ela, mais depois eu pensei “meu Deus, que rumo que estou dando a minha vida, eu estava dentro de um igreja e vou me casar com uma mulher e esse não sou eu, estou vivendo um personagem que não sou eu”.

Artur

‘Por que quando era criança, meus pais deixaram um livro perto de mim falando sobre homossexualidade e Deus e eu li esse livro. Era um livro ligado a religião, no livro tinha conselhos para evitar o homossexualismo, ai no livro dizia que era para o homem não usar roupas muito folgadas e tomar cuidado porque isso era pecado etc... na verdade, eu li esse livro mais nunca segui esse livro’.

Davi

‘Eu já tentei contar, na verdade eu até contei mais ela pensa que foi uma fase da minha idade, mais a minha família é protestante Luterana, então pelo fato da religião deles ficaria muito difícil dele aceitarem. Minha mãe falou que eu não posso aceitar isso, que eu tenho que lutar contra isso, que as coisas não estão certas, que é pecado e eu vou para o inferno e que Deus não aceitaria isso mais a verdade é que essa questão acontece muito aqui no Brasil e eles dizem que os gays em geral são seres que vão para o inferno, que isso é contra a vontade de Deus, e eu penso que se Deus não existisse os gays não seriam criaturas de Deus’.

Tony: como foi a reação da sua família?
Damon: Meus pais são pastores de igreja.
Tony: De qual igreja?
Damon: Metodista Ortodoxia, meu pai minha mãe e meu irmão então é uma família evangélica e foi meio complicado na hora porque eles disseram que era prostituição da carne, que isso não era legal, que era coisa do mal e que eu devia me consertar porque eu fui crescido dentro da igreja e que eu conheço muito bem a palavra de Deus. das artes então eu disse pra eles que talvez poderia ser uma fase e que eu queria viver esse momento e que eu estava feliz assim e um obviamente eu disse pra eles isso, meu pai e minha ator choraram muito e hoje eles não comentam sobre o assunto.

Luís
‘Porque é completamente conservadora, homofóbica, as pessoas lá não gostam de gays, os gays lá não são livres, precisam sempre estar em guetos, sempre escondido porque é muito Católica’.

**Religion in the Workplace**

**Teodoro**

‘Então eu trabalho na emissora de televisão que se chama Record e é uma emissora de televisão evangélica, o nosso patrão não tem nada contra a homossexualidade e trata a gente super bem, mais como ele é dono de uma igreja chamado “Universal” que é o bispo Macedo que é o meu patrão então os fieis da igreja dele não poderiam gostar da ideia e ele pede para que nos funcionários não falemos sobre as nossas sexualidades’.

**Valéria**

‘Você escuta essas gracinhas mais não é nada que chega a ser uma coisa absurda e que você pode relevar e graças a Deus que nunca sofri também uma agressão física, nunca ninguém me bateu e nem fez violência nenhuma, e peço sempre a Deus que nunca possa passar por uma situação assim antes de começar o trabalho’.

**Nilton**

‘Eu sou muito devoto a Santo Antônio, então tem aquela igreja de Santo Antonio lá na cidade, no arco da carioca, quando estou de férias eu gosto de ir lá, eu tenho medalhinhas que eu gosto de carregar comigo quando estou trabalhando. Deus que é meu poder espiritual, que é minha força, porque eu preciso rezar, pedir, orar, agradecer, saber agradecer’.

**Religion in LGBT Spaces**

**Cauê**

‘Essa igreja é totalmente aberta, não me lembro o nome mais o padre estava na parada gay com roupa de padre e subiu em cima do Trio e disse “Deus ama os gays, Deus não condena os gays. Viva qualquer tipo de forma de expressão de amor e de amor porque Deus não é contra os gays”. E o padre também orou e fez um pedido a Deus para que tudo corresse bem e que a parada gay saísse com o apoio de Deus e foi um sucesso. Então eu no meu ponto de vista não vejo que Deus é contra os gays e odiasse, o que eu vejo é falta de informações das pessoas que estão nesses patamar por trás de uma religião que falam tentando denegrir e sujar a imagem dos gays mais eu acredito que Deus não seja contra os gays’.
Interview Material

Interview Guide
Below I have included interview interview questions grouped by theme. It should be read as an example of the general topics and questions asked in interviews and not as a rigid or prescriptive set of questions used in all interviews due to their semi-structured nature (see methodology section). The actual questions asked depended on the photographs chosen and responses given and those below give a rough overview of those that were commonly asked. The interview questions are in Portuguese with approximate translation in English.

INTRODUCTION

Antes de começar a nossa entrevista gostaria que voce escolhece algumas das fotos que tenho aqui comigo que representem alguns dos lugares importantes em sua vida como homem gay.
Before we start I’d like you to choose four or five photos here which represents important places for you as a gay man.

Quantos anos você tem? Em qual parte do rio você mora?
How old are you? Where do you live in Rio?

Como você definiria sua sexualidade?
How would you define your sexuality?

Você acha que o Rio é um lugar tolerante para alguém que não seja hetero?
Por que?
Do you think Rio is a tolerant place for someone who isn't straight? Why?

Você diria que existem alguns lugares aqui no Rio onde são mais livres para homens gays e bissexuais do que outros? Quais e porque?
Would you say that there are some parts of Rio that are more liberal for gay and bisexual men than others? Which and why?

Você diria que é seguro?
Would you say it’s safe there?

Mais porque você diria que muitos gays gostam de freqüentar esses tipos de lugares (mesmo sabendo que são perigosos)?
Why would you say that lots of gays like going to these places (even knowing they are dangerous [if applicable])?

Quais lugares você diria são mais importante pros gays no rio? Porque?
Which places are most important for gays in Rio? Why?
PHOTOGRAPH DISCUSSION

*Pode explicar por que você escoheu estas fotos?*
Can you explain why you chose these photos?

*O que você (não) gosta nessa foto?*
What do you like about this photo?

*Qual é o significado dessa foto para você?*
What is the meaning of this photo for you?

*NORMALMENTE VOCÊ FREQÜENTA O [LUGAR NA FOTO] E COM QUEM?*
Normally who do you go to [place in photo] with?

*PORQUE VOCÊ GOSTA DE IR A ESTE LUGAR?*
Why do you like to go to this place?

*VOCÊ SENTE SEGURO NESTE LUGAR? PORQUE(NÃO)?*
Do you feel safe in this place? Why (not)?

*VOCÊ SE SENTE A VONTADE NESTE LUGAR?*
Do you feel at ease in this place?

*VOCÊ ACHA QUE ESSE TÍPO DE LUGAR E TOLERANTE PROS HOMENS GAYS NO RIO? POR QuE?*
Do you think this type of place is tolerant for gay men in Rio? Why?

*VOCÊ ACHA QUE O [LUGAR NA FOTO] É IMPORTANTE PROS HOMENS GAYS AQUI NO RIO? PORQUE?*
Do you think [place in the photo] is important for gay men here in Rio? Why?

HOMOPHOBIA

*VOCÊ ACHA QUE EXISTEM ALGUNS HOMENS AQUI NO RIO QUE TEM MAIS LIBERDADE PARA ELES SE COMPORTAREM COMO ELES QUISEREM DO QUE OUTROS? QUAI S?*
Do you think that some men have more freedom to behave how they want to compared with others in Rio? Which groups?

*DENTRO DA COMUNIDADE GAY E BISEXUAL, VOCÊ DIRIA QUE ALGUNS HOMENS GAYS OU BISEXUAIS SOFREM MAIS PRECONCEITOS QUE OUTROS OU NÃO? QUAI S?*
Within the gay and bisexual community would you say there are some gay and bisexual men who suffer more prejudice than others? Which groups?

*PORQUE VOCÊ DIRIA QUE ALGUNS [GRUPO] SOFRERAM MAIS PRECONCEITOS DO QUE OUTROS?*
Why would you say that [group] suffer more prejudice than others?
Você acha que alguns comportamentos de homens gays e bissexuais são mais aceitos do que outros? Quais? Porque?
Do you think that certain behaviours of gay and bisexual men are more accepted than others? Which? Why do you think this is?

Você já foi vítima de alguma agressão homofóbica física ou verbal? O que aconteceu? Foi onde?
Have you already been a victim of physical or verbal homophobia? What happened? Where did it happen?

O que você faria se acontecesse?
What would you do if it happened?

Você conhece alguém que já foi vitima de qualquer tipo de preconceito homofóbico?
Have you heard of other people who have been victims of homophobia?

Existem preconceitos dentro da propria comunidade gay?
Are there prejudices within the gay community?

Você se sente a vontade trocando carinhos com o seu parceiro em publico? Onde?
Do you feel comfortable being intimate in public? Where?

COMING OUT

Você já saiu do armário? Como foi?
Have you already come out? How was it?

Com relação a sua família, eles sabem sobre a sua sexualidade?
In relation to your family, do they know about you/your sexuality?

Você tem alguns amigos que sabem de você?
Do you have friends that know about you/your sexuality?

E qual foi a reação deles diante da noticia em saber que você era gay/bissexual?
What was their reaction when they found out you were gay/bisexual?

FAMILY HOME/HOME

Você mora com quem?
Who do you live with?

Você se sente a vontade na sua casa?
Do you feel comfortable at home?

Você se sente seguro convidando seu parceiro ou amigos gays para sua casa?
Do you feel comfortable inviting guys back to your house?

Vocês se sente confortável falando sobre assuntos de sexualidade na sua casa?
Do you feel comfortable talking about your sexuality at home?

WORK

Onde você trabalha?
Where do you work?

Você sente confortável sendo um homem gay em seu local de trabalho?
Do you feel comfortable as a gay man in work?

Os seus colegas sabem de você no trabalho? Como eles te tratam?
Do your workmates know you are gay at work? How do they treat you?

CARNIVAL

(Asked when participants chose photographs of the carnival only)

Você acha que o carnaval é uma época importante para você ou não?
Would you say carnival is an important time for you particularly or not?

O que você costuma fazer durante o carnaval?
What do you normally do during carnival?

Você já participou de algum bloco de carnaval?
Have you taken part in a carnival bloco before?

Você diria que a época do carnaval é uma época importante para os homens gays e bissexuais?
Would you say that carnival is an important time for gay and bisexual men?

LGBT Spaces

Vocês gosta de freqüentar lugares ou eventos gays no rio como bares, botes, parada gay, ou organizações gays? Porque sim/não?
Do you like to go to gay places in Rio like bars, clubs, the pride parade or gay groups? Why/why not?
Como você se sente nestes lugares?
How do you feel in these places?

Porque são importantes para você?
Why are they important for you?

OUTSIDE RIO DE JANEIRO

Você gosta de visitar outras partes do estado do Rio que são mais rurais?
Do you like to visit other parts of Rio sate that are more rural? Why?

Porque?

Você diria que a vida dos homens gays e bissexuais de lá e uma vida diferente dos homens gays e bissexuais da capital do Rio? Porque?
Would you say that the lives of gay and bisexual men there are different than the lives of gay and bisexual men in the capital? Why?

Você diria que a vida dos homens gays e bissexuais é muito diferente fora do Rio?
Would you say that the lives of gay and bisexual men is different outside Rio?

CLOSING

De todos os lugares que nos falamos, qual seria o lugar onde você se sentiria mais a vontade em respeito a sua sexualidade? Por que?
Of all the spaces we’ve talked about, where would you say you feel most comfortable in terms of your sexuality? Why?

Qual seria o lugar onde você se sentiria bem/mal tratado com relação a sua sexualidade aqui no Rio? Porque?
Which would be the part of the city where you feel well/badly treated in relation to your sexuality? Why?

De todos os lugares que nos falamos, qual seria o lugar que tem mais importância para você no Rio? Por que?
Of all the places we’ve talked about, which place is most important for you? Why?

Existem outros lugares que são importantes para você e que nos ainda não falamos hoje?
Are there important places for you that we haven’t talked about today?
Você tem algumas perguntas para mim, sobre minha tese, minha pesquisa?
Do you have questions for me about my thesis or my research?

**Interview Photographs**
The photographs below were given to participants at the beginning of interviews. They were asked to select several that were meaningful for them and these were discussed in the interview.

1) Le Boy – LGBT club
2) Metô train

3) Man in drag – Rio Pride
4) Police station number 13

5) Leaflets promoting LGBT rights
6) Zona Sul residential street
7) Rio Carinval – Sambôdromo

8) Volleyball court – Zona Sul beach
9) *Trioeletrico* (float) at Rio Pride Parade

10) Street carnival parade
11) Gym

12) Ipanema beach promenade
13) Ipanema Beach (LGBT Section)

14) Car
15) Supermarket

16) Carnival in the city centre
17) Pride Parade Volunteers, Copacabana

18) Taxi
19) Small shopping centre

20) Bus
21) Political float at the International Day Against Homophobia

22) Street carnival car
23) Men at a boteco (small bar)
24) Snack bar

25) Bob’s - Fast food restaurant
26) Pride Parade – Copacabana

27) Carnival fancy dress
28) Pride parade - Copacabana

29) Rocinha Favela
30) Dona Marta Favela Houses
Afro-Brazilian Queer Slang used by Participants
The following terms were used by some participants in interviews, at LGBT organisations or in day-to-day conversations:

**Aqüé** = Money
**Alibã** = Police officer
**Amapô/Amapoa** = Vagina, used pejoratively for women.
**Angêlica** = Taxi
**Aqüendar** = To grab or snatch
**Arrasou** = Expression of admiration for something done well.
**Bafo/Babado** = (i) A fight/argument (ii) Important occurrence/gossip
**Cheque** = Shit
**Chuça** = Anal douching
**Coió** = Beaten up, e.g. leva um coió.
**Dar a Elza** = To rob
**Erê** = Misbehaved, ‘crazy’ – louca - child, from slang meaning child spirit in Candomblé.
**Ebô** = Magic/spell.
**Edí** = Bottom or Anus.
**Equê** = Liar
**Gongar** = To make jokes about, laugh at, to degrade someone.
**Gongada** = Ugly, e.g. travesti gongada.
**Ilê** = Home
**Mona** = Effeminate Homosexual.
**Ocó** = Man
**Ocâne** = Penis
**Padê** = Cocaine. Literally means food offering for Candomblé deity.
**Picumã** = Hair
**Pomba-gira or Maria Padilha** = Pejorative term for a sexual female or effeminate gay man. Often used as synonym for piranha (slut).
**Racha** = Vagina, used pejoratively to refer to women
**Uô** = Something terrible
**Uzê** = Something terrible, synonym for uó
**Xanã** = Cigarette
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