
Guest editorial

Governing intimacy

Intimacy is personal. It is also, therefore, political. This commonplace insight has received renewed attention over the past decade in a growing strand of anglophone scholarship on liberalism and subjectivity (eg Berlant, 1998; Briggs, 2002; Eng, 2001; Povinelli, 2006; Shah, 2001; Stoler, 2002; 2006). Typically working at the intersection of feminist, queer, and postcolonial studies, these scholars take it as given that the intimate is a coproduction with the public, and collectively they further undo the primordial status of intimacy in two characteristic ways. The first is by unfixing its scale. Whether by emphasizing intimacy's national, media-based performance (eg Berlant, 1997) or outlining its global, diasporic determinations (eg Povinelli, 2006)—to mention just two approaches—they show how intimate relations cannot be considered synonymous with the body or the household, locations which then simply mirror larger social relations through their capacity to oppress or liberate at closer physical proximity. Instead, the closeness and belonging that intimacy affords (even when unwelcome) may operate at any distance, while isolation and estrangement may be very near.

Second, this unfixing of scale has helped unfix identity in favor of a more nuanced sense of mutual production. In this literature, relations such as gender to the home, race to chattel property, or sexuality to the closet are implicated in fields of power large and small (Feder, 2007). Through these, plural intimacies are produced along with multiple differentiations of bodies and spaces, as in the case of Ann Stoler's (1995) exemplary complication of colonial domesticity. Intimacy becomes a matter of degree rather than kind, insofar as the bodies and spaces it marks, and is marked by, are processes rather than essences. Yet if intimacy has neither fixed geographies nor identities in this literature, it still has its object, a sense of self in close connection to others—other selves or other things—that inhabits that elusive space somewhere between a purely solipsistic 'me' and a wholly subsuming 'us'. Rather than straightforward liberation or oppression, then, what intimacy offers these scholars is subjectification. It is the sphere in which we become who we are, the space in which the self emerges.

In this literature the intimate is still very much the personal, the close, that which refers to "one's most inmost self", in accordance with conventional usage and the *OED*. But it also underscores that the intimate self is a distinctly modern self, for 'intimacy' only appeared in the English language in the 17th century. Such intimacy requires a topology of self that is, in Charles Taylor's words, "radically reflexive" (1989, page 176). The Delphic inscription "Know thyself" may have proposed a self as an object of knowledge, but it presumed no symmetrical self as the source of that knowledge—such a "disengaged" (Taylor, 1989, page 176) or objectified interiority would be the legacy of Descartes. The intimate self not only knows itself in its fullness and authenticity; it also governs itself accordingly. Its association of this self-knowledge and self-control with bodily signs such as maleness and whiteness is well known (the female and nonwhite have been conflated with the intimate without the disengaged self), and so too has been the critique of these political effects since at least the 18th century, as figures such as Mary Wollstonecraft and Olaudah Equiano sought inclusion within the unquestioned categories of the rational and the civilized.

Although the modern, intimate self is one that relates to itself in a rational, self-governing fashion, it also entails a threshold for an other who may or may not enter

into an intimate relation with the self. The Latin root of intimacy refers to “close in friendship” in the sense of “inmost, deepest, profound” (*OED*). This is an ancient supplement that has been reasserting itself as citizenship has become increasingly privatized under the sign of neoliberalism. Lauren Berlant (1997) has articulated this recent historical shift in the United States as the emergence of an “infantile citizenship” that requires political subjects to relinquish public virtue in favor of private care. Elizabeth Povinelli (2006) extends her geographical reach to liberal settler societies more generally by identifying a hypostasization of an “intimate event” that locates personal authenticity—a necessity for a life worth living—and thus political claims to life itself, in the monogamous, romantic relationship. What both accounts point to is how proper intimacy in liberal societies is performed through a particular set of knowledges and practices as a productive, relational conduct of self to self, *and* of self to other.

In short, intimacy is a dispositive.⁽¹⁾ A dispositive, for Michel Foucault, is “a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions—in short, the said as much as the unsaid” (1980, page 194).

More specifically, it is a “system of relations” between these elements, relations which “respond to an urgent need” at a given moment, but also shift accordingly as needs change (page 195). “The apparatus [dispositive] thus has a dominant strategic function” (page 195). A dispositive *acts* rather than *is* (Agamben, 2009, page 10); it has effect but no essence. Sexuality is Foucault’s most famous dispositive, but he complained that readers of the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* seemed to skip the last chapter on power in which he briefly discussed another dispositive important to modern subjectification—that of race (1980, page 222; see also 1978, pages 149–150; 2003). Here he discussed what was at stake with the emergence of sexuality and race as means and objects of regulation in the 19th century: the “urgent need” to regulate the species-life of the population, especially its reproductive and productive forces, not only by disciplining bodies, but by way of accessing the truth of the self through its desires and its conduct.

Why do we propose to add intimacy to the list of biopolitical dispositives, when its frequent equivalence with sexuality would seem to make it redundant? The nonsexual aspects of intimacy predate sexuality as the truth of the modern self, and they persist into the present. The heterogeneous elements that proper intimacy and sexuality currently comprise are certainly overlapping sets—the body, the self, ideally the home, to name just three—but they are not coterminous. Also, as commentators such as Berlant and Povinelli seem to suggest, as the range of acceptable disciplined sexualities increases (even if their degrees of legitimation differ; eg civil partnerships versus marriage) intimacy per se is coming to the fore as a regulatory construct.

One of the most forceful articulations has come from none other than the United States Supreme Court in its 2003 decision striking down state sodomy laws:

“The intimate, adult consensual conduct at issue here was part of the liberty protected by the substantive component of the Fourteenth Amendment’s due process protections” (*Lawrence v Texas* 539 US 558).

To be sure, in liberal terms the decision was a victory for GLBT and disabled people claiming a right to privacy, as it was for interracial couples who were often the object

⁽¹⁾ The French term ‘dispositif’ has most often been translated as ‘apparatus’ in English. But ‘dispositive’ still exists in English as an adjective having a sense akin to Foucault’s use of the term. The noun form is obsolete, but we see no reason not to bring it out of retirement as a theoretical term.

of the laws' actual enforcement (Shah, 2005). But the phrase "intimate adult consensual conduct" is not merely a euphemism for sex,⁽²⁾ and as many critics have pointed out, this is not so much sexual liberation as it is legal recuperation (eg Franke, 2004). In the US the sexuality of 'good gays' is now in the running for the conditioning of intimacy peculiar to marriage, a discipline that dates back to the Reformation (Jakobsen, 2005), and whose telos has already been fulfilled in several other jurisdictions, beginning with the Netherlands in 2001.

Stoler makes another important point about intimacy as an effect of power:

"To study the intimate is not to turn away from structures of dominance but to relocate their conditions of possibility and relations and forces of production. Foucault's 'biopolitics'—the notion that power relations are played out in how bodies are aggregated and individuated, healed, buried, made indistinguishable, and marked—provides not an abstract model but one analytic tool for asking grounded questions about whose bodies and selves were made vulnerable, when, why, and how—and whose were not" (2006, pages 13–14; italics original).

Intimacy thus serves as a primary domain of the microphysics of power in modern societies precisely because it is a bridge to so-called larger relations of power. Kinship, procreation, cohabitation, family, sexual relations, love—indeed all forms of close affective encounter—are as much matters of state as they are matters of the heart.

None of the six essays in this theme issue explicitly characterizes intimacy as a dispositive. But they all build upon this emphasis on intimacy as a regulatory project, even as they render it a most heterogeneous ensemble. Collectively they suggest that, as a primary nexus of biopolitics and sovereignty, 'the intimate' is not only the sphere of individual subjectification, but also a site for ordering populations. In this it shares much with sexuality and race in Foucault's work (1978, page 145; 2003, pages 251–252; see also McWhorter, 2009; but see Feder, 2007). Unsurprisingly volume 1 of *The History of Sexuality* is frequently present in these essays, and so too are the governmentality lectures (Foucault, 2003; 2007), with their emphasis on regulatory divisions within populations. Collective categories such as sexuality, race, nationality, class, and even species are mutually constituted through intimate discourses, practices, and relations. This is the common theoretical starting point for the essays in this issue, even if only implicitly, but from there they proceed in very different directions, both geographically and historically. They offer no consensus on how they articulate what the intimate is, who might experience it, what its geographies may look like and what effects it may have. They cite different 'heterogeneous elements' and different 'urgent needs' by situating intimacy in different times and places in order to interrogate the limits of a singularly protean concept.

In the opening essay of the collection, Stephen Legg (2010) constructs an anti-nostalgic portrait of Meliscent Shephard, a representative of the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene (AMSH) in India between 1928 and 1947. He skillfully integrates biography and geography to explore "An intimate and imperial feminism". Locating Shephard in a colonial social formation in which the sexual exploitation of women had been racialized in multiple ways, Legg traces the transnational, national, and urban friendship and professional networks that were produced as she sought to deploy claims of unmediated knowledge in her fight to abolish prostitution in India. As a white imperial feminist, she had decidedly ambivalent relationships with white imperialist men, Indian nationalist women, and seemingly everyone else in between. Her reformist discourses and practices in the pursuit of the abolition of tolerated

⁽²⁾ The decision is clear on this point: "When sexuality finds overt expression in intimate conduct with another person, the conduct can be but one element in a personal bond that is more enduring" (*Lawrence v Texas* 539 US 558).

brothels brought her into conflict with imperialists and nationalists alike as she was simultaneously ashamed by the role her country played in producing the problems she sought to address and persuaded by the notion that “one has to try to be one’s best English self” (page 75). Despite her commitment to local, first-hand work in India, her persistent Eurocentrism resulted in a failure to achieve the intimate relationships she craved within Indian civil society, especially as independence neared. Her most intimate friendships would turn out to be conducted by post with like-minded AMSH campaigners residing in London.

Legg’s consideration of intimacy as scalar resonates with the well-established feminist geographical insight that “relations of power at different scales (global, national, urban) are linked” and that “global processes, whether economic, political, or socio-cultural, are experienced in localized, everyday, embodied ways” (Hyndman, 2001, page 212; see also Marston, 2002). Specifically echoing Geraldine Pratt and Victoria Rosner’s (2006) thoughts on “the global and the intimate”, he argues that “[a] focus on the intimate helps to disable any sense of an ontological realm of the ‘global’ and forces attention back to the specific, quotidian effects of processes which are global in scope” (page 69). But the facts of Shephard’s life lead Legg to expose a rather different feminist politics of intimacy than that which has come to be commonly championed in the literature. Where many offer a feminist optic that highlights intimate connections for its progressive political possibilities, for its potential to disrupt hierarchies and enable resistant countertopographies (see Katz, 2001; Wright, 2009), Legg points out that Shephard was an “individual at the forefront of the invasive governmentalities which sought to extend the realm of the political into that of the intimate” (page 70). Her familiarity with India, its people, its cities, and, most importantly, its red light districts led her to perpetuate rather than dismantle colonial divisions. The intimate strategy she adopted in the name of colonial social reform fostered a variety of connections, as Legg carefully details, but by no means overcame distance and differentiation.

Deirdre Conlon, in her essay “Ties that bind” (2010), offers another examination of the scalar politics of intimacy. Her subject is a 2004 referendum in Ireland that amended the nation-state’s constitution such that citizenship is now determined on the basis of the *jus sanguinis* (familial descent) principle rather than the *jus soli* (birth-right) principle. In particular, she considers debates that cast women asylum seekers as inimical to Irish citizenship. Coming on the heels of a decade of unprecedented Irish in-migration, including unprecedented numbers of asylum seekers, the referendum was called to deal with a perceived “population problem”. Conlon argues,

“When asylum seekers sought to muddy the distance between themselves and the rest of the population by claiming ties to the nation and state in association with their roles as parents as well as the provisions laid out in the Irish Constitution, a substantive rejigging of the relations between state, territory, and population was deployed” (page 102).

The assertion that refugee and asylum seekers were “breeding like rabbits” (cited on page 104) saturated popular discourse. On this basis, the seemingly private act of mothering was rendered a public concern, family ties were devalued as irresponsible procreative acts and—in a state which constitutionally defines the family as the fundamental unit of society—the children of asylum seekers were denied the intimate relationship to the nation that citizenship confers.

Here, Conlon challenges an ontological sense of the nation as a scale. But unlike other feminist geographers who scale up to connect the ‘finer’ scale of the intimate to those ‘above’ it, she reads the national as corresponding to the intimate. Suggesting that citizenship is an intimate relation to the nation, she draws explicit connections between social reproduction and the envisioning of state futures. This analysis resonates with

Catherine Nash's (2005) call to attend to the "geographies of relatedness" and her recognition that social life within a state hinges upon legitimate kinship. Family is the biopolitical, is the geopolitical.

In her contribution "The queer intimacy of global vision", Meredith Raimondo (2010) examines *Pandemic* and *A Closer Walk*, two recent US-produced documentaries on the politics of HIV/AIDS. She describes both films as offering "a travelogue of diverse sites affected by HIV/AIDS in order to remake the spatial relations that undergird a disinterested status quo" (page 113). Each provides close-ups of HIV/AIDS-affected persons in sites around the globe that are framed by what Raimondo identifies as a "queer optic" (page 113)—an attempt to configure a mediated intimacy between the viewer and the subjects of the videos. She argues, however, that there are limits to this queering, as the films "struggle to create intimacy without resorting to forms of narrative and visual colonialism" (page 116). They presuppose an ideal viewer that is Western, heteronormative, and seronegative and thus the attempt to engage the viewer in an intimate encounter with people living with the virus reinforces the agency of the privileged.

"By remaking distance—and its affective domains of disinterest and disengagement—*Pandemic* and *A Closer Walk* risk the camera's potential to objectify in order to subjectify the viewer" (page 116). This process of subjectivation winds up individualizing agency to the point that the structural relations behind the experience of HIV/AIDS are occluded, hierarchies of people and places are naturalized, and the only 'intimate' relations given room are sympathy and regret. As in Legg's spatial genealogy of Meliscent Shephard's intimacies, Raimondo finds an intimate strategy that is consonant with a colonizing logic and that therefore perpetuates rather than overcomes distance. Highlighting the politics of "the freedom to look globally" (page 117), she identifies the workings of privilege in the visual strategy of moving from the body to the globe.

Notably, Raimondo's is the first of several essays in the collection to take a queer approach, which owes so much to Foucault's genealogy of sexuality. The prevalence here of this theoretical inspiration is fitting since the queer geographies literature has arguably advanced disciplinary interest in the regulation of the intimate sphere most purposefully given its focus on the heterosexualization of space and on challenging practices that exclude gays and lesbians (Bell, 1995; Hubbard, 2000; Valentine, 1996). But as do all the queer analytics in this collection, Raimondo's goes beyond a narrow sexual referent. She employs queer as a "critical modality focused on the politics of normativity" (page 114) and thus does not limit herself to analysis of the representation of gender and sexuality in the films. Approaching the term 'queer' broadly enables her to examine the ways in which heteronormativity, racism, and colonialism come together to limit a global vision of HIV/AIDS.

Extending the theme of colonization and queering, Natalie Oswin's "Sexual tensions in modernizing Singapore" (2010) takes current efforts to overturn Singapore's sodomy law as its point of departure in proposing a postcolonial queer approach to the politics of intimacy. Although Section 377A of the city-state's penal code is undeniably homophobic, it is far from being simply a colonial hangover and therefore a symptom of Singapore's lack of modernity, as is argued by some gay rights campaigners. Rather, Oswin shows how the law was passed during the late colonial period as the colonial government began to actively mold its multiracial and multicultural entrepôt population into a distinctly Singaporean nationality. It did so by bringing its intimate practices into line with those of other modern nation-states, and it did so equally by the initiative of the Straits Chinese elite and that of the colony's European rulers. 377A, then, was an inherent part of Singapore's modernization, even though explicit

references to homosexuality are rare and perfunctory in the colonial archive. For in Oswin's genealogy, the law was part of a broader effort to modernize intimacy through several interrelated efforts in the decades straddling independence, ranging from registering Chinese marriages, to balancing the colony's sex ratio, to reforming housing to spatially enforce the heterosexual nuclear family.

Gay and lesbians, then, were not the only people queered by the regulation of intimacy. So too were "the single, the uneducated, the unskilled migrant worker, and many others who have been deemed incapable of creating and sustaining a 'quality' population" (page 139). It is clear for Oswin that heteronormativity is by no means just a gay issue. Nor is it just a sex thing. Rather, it is an integral part of nation-building processes and the imagining of a postcolonial future. By panning out from an apparent contest between homosexuality and heterosexuality, Oswin interrogates the definition of a proper intimate sphere. She takes the focus off the lives of 'queers' and puts it onto those who are 'queered' in a way that renders family, home, and kinship strange.

In his essay "Disreputable life", Eric Olund (2010) also looks to the regulation of marriage, along with prostitution, as a governmental project centered on race and sexuality, but his focus turns to the early-20th-century US. He argues this was a moment of crisis for whiteness as a marker of self-governing subjectivity. This was due in no small part to changing practices of intimacy and their relationship to the public sphere, such as the removal of courtship from domestic parental supervision to the new commercialized spaces of dance halls and movie theaters. Because of this visible and material change in intimacy, its constitutive role for liberal subjectivity—and its marking by whiteness—became glaringly apparent. This resulted in the production of whiteness coming explicitly to the fore of the white social reform agenda of the Progressive era. Marriage was articulated as the site of the white liberal subject's production, while prostitution was construed as the site of failed whiteness.

Despite the hypervisibility of blackness in US society, African Americans were written out of both marriage and prostitution by the white Progressive reform movement, for these were both regulatory constructs of the emerging category of sexuality, an individual characteristic whose status as property rendered 'black sexuality' an oxymoron. Only whites *had* property; in the lingering cultural legacy of slavery, blacks *were* property (Spillers, 1987). Olund's analysis responds to critiques of liberal capitalist modernity by feminist, queer, critical race, and postcolonial scholars. While this work rightly points out the enfolding of race and sexuality in the establishment of the liberal individualist subject, it errs, Olund argues, in universalizing the assumption "that part of the operation of white privilege and heteronormativity is their failure to interrogate themselves" (page 143). The details of Progressive era reformers' very self-conscious accounting of and for white sexual privilege suggest that the liberal idea that intimacy "allows space for an a priori, self-grounding, authentic *sexual* subject to be itself—is in fact rather new" (page 148). Heterosexual whiteness is thus productively framed as a self-recognized fragile achievement.

Finally, Michael Brown and Claire Rasmussen (2010) explore a 2005 sex panic that spectacularly troubled the boundary between the human and nonhuman in "Bestiality and the queering of the human animal". The case of a Washington State man who died after sex with a horse led to the realization in the state's capital that the 'protection' of bestiality laws was lacking. Brown and Rasmussen examine the assumptions that underlay the declaration that there *had* to be a law, and they show how proponents of new legal sanctions sought to justify the proposition that it was permissible to own, eat, and indeed breed an animal but not to have sex *with* it. In their words, "Nonreproductive sexual activities (such as human–animal contact) are sexual while reproductive activities (involving human–animal contact) are scientific or practical" (page 168).

The policing of bestiality, they argue, relied upon a series of arguments that opposed intimacy, property, vulnerability, and moral autonomy in varying ways, situated in an imaginative geography in which a metropolitan sexuality threatened rural innocence. The authors take the antihumanist critique of sexuality in a logical if rarely embraced direction by focusing on the material practices of interspecies intimacy in order to prompt a queering of the sovereign human self and, ultimately, question the boundaries of the political community.

Brown and Rasmussen offer this reading as a ‘queerer queer geography’. They explicitly respond to calls for geographical considerations of a wider range of bodies and pleasures as queer. They also usefully point out the frequent distinction between “just sex”, on the one hand, and intimacy, on the other, that is, “sex that furthers a greater social interest” (page 167). Bestiality is perceived as an act, not an identity. It fails to produce long-term relationships that might be socially beneficial. While queer scholars have pointed out that a similar comparison distinguishes the aforementioned ‘good gay’ (ie moneyed, monogamous, assimilated) from the ‘bad queer’ (ie fringe, promiscuous, radical) and that this dichotomy is relied upon by gay marriage campaigns, Brown and Rasmussen provocatively expand our understanding of intimacy and acceptability. They show how the ‘urgent need’ met by the dispositive of intimacy may be the very humanity of the modern self.

Acknowledgements. This theme issue arose out of two events held at the San Francisco meeting of the Association of American Geographers in 2007: two paper sessions on “Race, Intimacy and the Governance of Culture” organized by the guest editors; and a one-day preconference on “Sexuality and Space”. We are grateful to Richard Phillips and Mary Thomas for acting as discussants for the former and to Michael Brown, Lawrence Knopp, and Damon Scott for coorganizing (with Natalie Oswin) the latter. Thanks are also due to the Sexuality and Space Speciality Group of the AAG and Sonoma State University Department of Geography for funds provided for the preconference. Finally, we would like to thank Eduardo Mendieta for his very helpful comments on this introduction.

Natalie Oswin, Department of Geography, McGill University
Eric Olund, Department of Geography, University of Sheffield

References

- Agamben G, 2009 *What Is an Apparatus? And Other Essays* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA)
- Bell D, 1995, “Pleasure and danger: the paradoxical spaces of sexual citizenship” *Political Geography* **14** 139–153
- Berlant L, 1997 *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)
- Berlant L (Ed.), 1998, “Intimacy: a special issue” *Critical Inquiry* **24** 281–288
- Briggs L, 2002 *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science and US Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)
- Brown M, Rasmussen C, 2010, “Bestiality and the queering of the human animal” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **28** 158–177
- Butler J, 2002, “Is kinship always already heterosexual?” *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* **13** 14–44
- Conlon D, 2010, “Ties that bind: governmentality, the state, and asylum in contemporary Ireland” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **28** 95–111
- Eng D, 2001 *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)
- Feder E, 2007 *Family Bonds: Genealogies of Race and Gender* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)
- Foucault M, 1978 *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (Vintage, New York)
- Foucault M, 1980 *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* Ed. C Gordon (Pantheon, New York)
- Foucault M, 2003, “*Society Must Be Defended*”: *Lectures at the Collège de France 1975–1976* (Picador, New York)

- Foucault M, 2007 *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978* (Palgrave, New York)
- Franke K, 2004, “The domesticated liberty of Lawrence v Texas” *Columbia Law Review* **104** 1399–1426
- Hubbard P, 2000, “Desire/disgust: mapping the moral contours of heterosexuality” *Progress in Human Geography* **24** 191–217
- Hyndman J, 2001, “Towards a feminist geopolitics” *The Canadian Geographer* **45** 210–222
- Jakobsen J, 2005, “Sex+freedom = regulation: why?” *Social Text* **23** 285–308
- Katz C, 2001, “On the grounds of globalization: a topography for feminist political engagement” *Signs* **26** 1213–1234
- Legg S, 2010, “An intimate and imperial feminism: Meliscent Shephard and the regulation of prostitution in colonial India” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **28** 68–94
- McWhorter L, 2009 *Racism and Sexual Oppression in Anglo-America: A Genealogy* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN)
- Marston S, 2002, “The social construction of scale” *Progress in Human Geography* **24** 219–242
- Nash C, 2005, “Geographies of relatedness” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* **30** 449–462
- Olund E, 2010, “‘Disreputable life’: race, sex, and intimacy” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **28** 142–157
- Oswin N, 2010, “Sexual tensions in modernizing Singapore: the postcolonial and the intimate” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **28** 128–141
- Povinelli E, 2006 *The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)
- Pratt G, Rosner V, 2006, “Introduction: the global and the intimate” *WSQ: Women’s Studies Quarterly* **34** 13–24
- Raimondo M, 2010, “The queer intimacy of global vision: documentary practice and the AIDS pandemic” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **28** 112–127
- Shah N, 2005, “Policing privacy, migrants, and the limits of freedom” *Social Text* **84–85** 275–284
- Shah S, 2001 *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco’s Chinatown* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)
- Spillers H, 1987, “Mama’s baby, Papa’s maybe: an American grammar book” *Diacriticis* **17**(2) 64–81
- Stoler A, 1995 *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)
- Stoler A, 2002 *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (University of California Press, Berkeley)
- Stoler A (Ed.), 2006 *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)
- Taylor C, 1989 *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA)
- Valentine G, 1996, “(Re)negotiating the ‘heterosexual street’: lesbian productions of space”, in *BodySpace: Destablising Geographies of Gender and Sexuality* Ed. N Duncan (Routledge, New York) pp 146–155
- Wright M, 2009, “Gender and geography: knowledge and activism across the intimately global” *Progress in Human Geography* **33** 379–386