

The "P" Word: Trans Men, Stone Butches and the Politics of Penetration

Bobby Noble, York University, is the author of *Sons of the Movement: FTMs Risking Incoherence in a Post-Queer Cultural Landscape*; the also recently published monograph *Masculinities Without Men?*, listed as a Choice Outstanding Title, 2004; and co-editor of *The Drag King Anthology*, a 2004 Lambda Literary Finalist.

Abstract

The practice of sexual penetration has long been a site of contestation in butch-femme, queer and, more recently, female to male transsexual public cultures. Tracking representations of penetration in several documentaries about female and transsexual masculinities, this paper suggests that not only does penetration mark ambivalent spaces of sexual and gender incoherence, it also signals a resistance to the heteronormative potencies of shame.

Résumé

La pratique de la pénétration sexuelle depuis longtemps fût un sujet de contestation dans les cultures lesbiennes, gays et plus récemment dans les cultures publiques de transsexuels de femme à homme. En retraçant les représentations de la pénétration dans plusieurs documentaires sur les masculinités des femmes et des transsexuelles. Cet article suggère que non seulement la pénétration marque des espaces ambivalents de l'incohérence sexuelle et des genres, elle signale une résistance aux forces de la honte hétérosexuelle normative.

With notable exceptions American Loren Cameron and British Del LaGrace Volcano, explicit depictions of female to male trans bodies and genitals are few and far between. Even more obscure, at least in a representational sense, are those same bodies as sexual bodies. If, as I've argued recently, ftm trans men are one site of political and corporeal incoherence, then this paper is interested in tracking the sexual practices of gender incoherence (Noble 2006). While it most certainly could be countered that many sexual practices are, at the very least, a site of ambivalence and excess, I want to explore constructions of sexual incoherence as they function in excess of heteronormative sex categories and gender identifications through gendered sex play for butches and ftm trans men (Butler 1991). One notable transman embodies and earns his living precisely through the kind of public sexual incoherence that this paper documents. Hailed as the first ftm pornstar, Buck Angel (a.k.a. "Mangina Man"), is the first and, to date, only ftm transman porn star. Buck is becoming somewhat legendary in the online porn industry. His incoherent body - muscled, buffed and chiseled chest, complete with what could be called "female genitals" - is put quite unabashedly on display on his website and in his porn videos. Buck is both queer in his trans sex and public porn but also post-queer. Redeploying the language of sensationalized she-male (that is to say, mtf transsexual women) genres of mainstream pornography, Buck's porn-site shows him bald-headed, smoking a large cigar and sporting a wide ranging of tattoos, fucking female partners with a variety of objects but also being similarly penetrated with the same objects by both men and women. "You've never seen porn like this," the site reads, "You've seen chicks with dicks. Now see a dude with a pussy. Buck just loves to get fucked in both holes." As the site of contradiction, Buck defiantly hyperbolizes and visualizes what I want to track in this project through two documentaries about female masculinity, transgendered and transsexual masculinity and sex: a contradictory relation, for ftm transsexual masculinity and female masculinity, between gendered embodiment

and sexual penetration.

Certainly it would be unwise to presuppose lines of continuity between butch and ftm embodiment and sexual practice. Butch masculinity occupies a very different space of embodiment and engendering than ftm masculinity. While these might hold non-teleological echoes of each other in the same biography, they are different materializations or approximations of gender norms. But if one could presuppose a line at all, that line might well, at the very least, be a space of ambivalence about sexual embodiment and, more precisely, about sexual penetration. Even while feminist and queer theories of sexuality have certainly heeded Gayle Rubin's (1984) separation of the analytic frameworks of sexuality and gender, the persistent connotations around penetration, where being on the receptive end resonates for masculinity in many contexts as somehow feminine, indicate an equally persistent relation between them instead. That is, the space of, and meanings associated with, sexual penetration continue to do the work of gender normativity. As I will show below in my discussion of two documentaries, Debra A. Wilson's *The Butch Mystique* (2003) and Luke Woodward's *Enough Man* (2004), many butches characterize penetration as a decidedly invasive and very gendered sexual practice. And moreover, not only are the choreographies of the event of penetration persistently gendered, they might also mark spaces of trauma, shame, and ambivalence for ftm transmen about the gendered (i.e., "female") terms of embodiment. These are not natural meanings or normative connections at all; they are deeply social and are doing the work of gender and of power at exactly the same time. To be sure, these spaces of bodies as trauma are not pathological and are conditioned by heteronormative, compulsory engendering practices. They are the traumas of heteronormative and essentialist cultures of regulated and enforced embodiment. But one of the results of such corporeal traumas is the way that the transed body in its overdetermination, either as "female" for butches or "incomplete with a penis" for ftm transmen, becomes coterminous with shame and impossibility. These are two further lines between butch and ftm masculinity that might well be presupposed in a non-teleological analytics of their relation: first, each converts the traumas of being differently gendered into a form of political resistance, of varying degrees. And second, those resistances to essentializing engenderings

are curiously coded as sexual. How those codings function as visual grammars is where their respective contributions to public sexual cultures become very fascinating. In other words, my question could be reformulated as this: within such economies where embodiment is a site of profound ambivalence and political shaming for butches and/or ftms, how then might social and discursive power be negotiated through complex sexualities and incoherent gender and identifications? What kind of work is being accomplished through these complex desires to put the "man pussy" on display as self-constructed visual spectacle vis-à-vis representation? Is that work, for ftms, similar to the gender work accomplished through the repeated, and hence, ambivalent public disavowals of penetration for some butches? Can both moments of - the moments of self-constitution through representation as well as through disavowal - be read as a redeployment of cultural and political shame animating that same body?

The subjects interviewed in the successful and award-winning documentary, *The Butch Mystique* (2003), bear witness to both the potencies but also potentialities of these correlations. Produced and directed by Debra A. Wilson, *The Butch Mystique* tracks the mystique surrounding female masculinity - butch and transgendered masculinity - in the lives of a group of African-American butch-studs and, in a couple of cases, (ftm) trans identified, folks. The group is diverse, representing individuals from across socio-economic, age, and other markers of identity including firefighters, musicians, teachers, businesswomen, mothers, activists, and artists. The documentary has a remarkable depth and honesty to it due in part to the diversity of the folks interviewed. Matu is an older butch who talks about butch in the 1940s and 50s while Sable is a young butch still attending high school. The film represents a rich and diverse range of artists (Pippa is an visual artist; trans-identified Johnny is a performance artist; and Kymberly is a musician), skilled labourers (Matu is a carpenter and Elyse is a firefighter) and professional workers (Carol is a teacher/writer and Skyler an engineer). Each locates themselves along a continuum of masculinity occupying positions everywhere on that line from "daddy," "masculine female" and "butch woman" to trans-person (Johnny identifies as a "big nelly fag") to soft butch or "butch of centre." Ranging over topics as vast as femme partners, definitions of butchness as well as its historicities, family

life, relationship challenges, bathroom choices, racism, relationships with fathers and other men and so on, the documentary presents a complex, intersectional picture of the lived experiences female and trans masculinities.

But what's even more interesting are the ways that *Butch Mystique* raises conversations about different sexualities that accompany gender identities and, to write it differently, about gender identification as sexual identity. The documentary pays particular attention to the way that sexual activity - and penetration more specifically - while not the measure of trauma in and of itself, certainly marks the magnetic field of trauma and, I would argue, incoherent ambivalence as a result. Penetration itself functions, in almost every case, as a problem facing the masculinity of each subject, a problem that has to be solved with resiliency, resourcefulness, and the creative rearticulation of gender codes. Some refuse penetration completely. Chris, for instance, who self-identifies as butch, is very clear: "nobody's sticking nothing into this puppy," she says emphatically. Matu provides a complex point of view on penetration suggesting that "some butches like it, some don't, thinking that it takes away from the mystique." Others negotiate the language of penetration, fully aware of the camera's presence. Pippa, for example, argues that "I have no problem being penetrated...I am flexible woman," she says. Then again, others offer a curious kind of ambivalent body language when citing the embrace of penetration. As Pippa talks about being flexible and having little trouble, the entire time she is shaking her head back and forth as if to say no. There remains a kind of curious tension between the body language of that moment and the embrace of the activity.

So, while the ambivalence around penetration is not caused by trauma, potential scenes of penetration certainly seem to articulate the event or occasion of trauma by staging the impossibilities of gender and sexual taxonomies. That space is one overdetermined by the imperatives of both coherent gender identities and gendered sexual activity within a heteronormative but also anti-feminist binary model of sex. Matu gestured to this earlier saying that penetration takes some away from the mystique or "something" that is butchness or, in this case, female masculinity. To frame this differently, what produces the ambivalence is not just limited choice of gender categories but also the way that heteronormative imperatives around sexuality have

overdetermined receptivity as female, as a sign of submissive femininity to a dominant masculinity. The genderedness of penetration as event creates trauma but also holds the potential of rearticulating those traumas, at least for some. This rearticulation depends upon the conditions and arrangements of the sexual scene. They must be worked incoherently enough to enable more complicated gender identifications. For instance, while firefighter Elyse, a mom to an adult son, talks about not enjoying penetration as a much younger butch, she also pauses, and then talks about the necessity of "learning to free yourself from limitations." But in a scene in the extra clips, Elyse looks into camera, and asks much more decidedly, "do I like penetration? No," and then pauses, looks back into the camera and adds, "Not vaginally." This is a curious moment. On the one hand, the allusion to other forms of penetration is especially interesting for Elyse, the one person who is both a "mom" but also a self-defined Daddy. When asked how she would describe herself, and as the camera closes in on her face, Elyse answers: "I am a lesbian, butch, daddy top" but then adds, "and you can throw faggot into that too because, you know, that's what I am." It's no surprise, given the complexity of each of these identities mapped together, that Elyse also talks about the impossibilities of her gender identity being visible: "Society has a hard time seeing me as a woman, a butch woman. They see me as just a guy even when I'm looking busty." So, given the connotations of Daddy combined with butch and top, it seems clear that the linguistic spaces of penetration within this arrangement can only be signaled by faggotry. But on the other hand, the post-queer sexual genders signaled here by Elyse seem closer to those articulated by Buck Angel. When asked to what demographic his sex work appeals, he answers, "Gay men enjoy [my] masculinity, they aren't attracted to women but some of them are definitely into pussy" (*SX News* Feb. 2006). The contradiction named by both Elyse and Buck - that a pussy does not always equal a woman or woman with a vagina - suggests that sexual genders articulate bodies despite sex not because of it. So, what the work of these post-queer, incoherent sexual scenes seems to accomplish is a rupture of the way that bodies, genders and sexual identifications are arranged, and also reciprocally witnessed and given meaning by sexual partners in very precise contexts.

This arrangement of genders and sexual

identifications - often signaled by the grammars of "trust" - is instead much more a condition of entrustment. The difference is significant. Trust is often taken up as a noun denoting a space of belief, or a capacity of confidence. More often than not, trust is constructed as a naturalized process, and increasingly within a public therapeutic culture, one kind of affect which, when "damaged," is simply in need of remedy or restoration to enable intimacy and functionality. Entrustment, on the other hand, is a transitive verb, denoting a process of giving over. Such a transitive activity, in a sexual context, can function as a kind of contract governed by the agreed upon terms of sex play. Robyn Wiegman teases out the analogous stakes of the grammar lesson: "Transitivity...is the property of a verb that must take a direct object; in this, it is the mechanism for mediating the relation between the sentence's subject and the action it takes toward an object...transitive verbs therefore are routinely disparaged as dependent...dependence, it became clear, was the real condition of the subject, and that dependence was not a matter of linguistic structure alone" (Wiegman 2006, 95). Wiegman maps the relation between grammars of language and coherent grammars of transitive genders and desires. "Words meant in context...hence we might say...that no gendered subject is possible without an object on which its ability to act as a subject depends...the grammar lesson serves to pen a space...to consider the possibility that gender is constitutively, inherently, transitive" (2006, 95). This transitivity - not in terms of cross-gendering but within the grammars of relation - functions akin to the process of sexual negotiation and agreement that takes place regularly between BDSM¹ partners; but in the context of butch and ftm identities and sexualities it functions to materialize genders without essentialized genitals instead. It is a verb, yes, but importantly, it is a transitive verb, which means it cannot function without a logic or grammar of relation and interdependence. Dictionary definitions suggest that entrustment means "to give responsibility for (a thing, a person, its safety) to the person in whom one has confidence or with whom one has a shared set of agreements" (Oxford English Dictionary). I want to qualify this as a set of agreements about how those bodies, identifications and sexual genders are to be made sense of. This is not to suggest at all that the sexual partner has primary or exclusive responsibility for

the safety of their partners. For example, Ann Cvetkovich explores the way that butch-femme relationships are already a materialization of emotional processes, which, at times, can include an unequal and gendered distribution of emotional labour (2003, 62). Femmes already perform a significant amount of emotional labour and I do not intend to add more through the concept of entrustment. Instead, it is important to detail the way that many femmes, lesbian or otherwise, have the ability to actively produce ftm and butch masculinities in bodies conventionally marked otherwise. And what we see in *Butch Mystique*, and as I will argue below, in *Enough Man*, is the shared labour of rearranging gender identities and the meanings of sexual activities outside of limited heteronormative and misogynist overdeterminations. Skyler, one of the most physically sculpted butches in the documentary, performs the difference: "for the butch who does it, she's giving up a lot of trust to that woman." The concept of entrustment is an active, always negotiated relation. It is likened to something being given up and given over, something exchanged in the sexual scene. It functions like a shared sets of agreements and arrangements about how those bodies and desires are materializing in excess or beyond the limits of the conventionally sexed or sexualized body. Such entrustments are visualized and indeed, rendered performative in the most recent documentary to which I will turn my attention, *Enough Man*.

Enough Man details the lives and sex lives of mostly white trans men from the United States. Produced in 2004 by Luke Woodward, *Enough Man*, with its mystifying and performative title, remains one of the most explicit monuments to trans sexual practices and bodies. The documentary is also remarkable for the way that the trans and queer folks interviewed move through boastfulness and gregariousness at the start of the interviews to very thoughtful, intimate and piercingly honest accounts of the pleasures and paradoxes of their transformed bodies. Moreover, many of the couples also perform sex scenes in front of the camera. Seeming to pose its own title as a question - that is, when is enough physical or corporeal matter present to qualify a body as male - *Enough Man* answers: when the body in question says so. The body itself, as many trans, feminist and queer theorists have argued, is a metaphor for both psychic and social processes (Cvetkovich 2003, 65). As such, it can be

rewritten to mark resistance to those processes at the same time. The message of the documentary echoes that made by James Green in *You Don't Know Dick* when he suggests that North American culture authorizes particular performances of gender as "real" and "natural," if we can see evidence of these genders on and through bodies. If that is the case, Green argues, then we are governed by essentialist hegemonic grammars which suggest that gender is conditioned by what we can see not just on the body but as the body; if we cannot see it, it cannot exist.

But *Enough Man* takes those agreements at least one step further when it converts them into a strategy of disruption or what Stuart Hall calls misunderstandings. Such ruptures or disagreements arise "from the contradictions and disjunctions between hegemonic-dominant encodings" and oppositional codings (Hall 2001, 175). These are not in any way just simple differences of opinion but instead are moments which "arise precisely from the lack of equivalence between the two sides in the communicative exchange" (2001, 169). In other words, the closer to hegemony on both levels of cultural production and reception, the fewer misunderstandings and contradictions over what counts as "reality." Like Buck Angel, at least three of the "couples" represented in *Enough Man* code so aggressively for incoherence at the level of production and through their sexual genders, that the documentary itself bends under the weight of its own contradictions.

As a lived and embodied lesson in the politics of incoherence, almost all of the trans men in the documentary identify with the "enough" qualifier in their presentations so as to approximate - not reproduce - masculinity. Moreover, these same three couples illustrate the degree to which ftm penetration aggressively defies shaming but also reading practices - popular and academic alike - that need to conflate pussy and penetration and femaleness. Casey and Natalie; Wendell and Randall; as well as Raven and Joshua all talk in very complex ways, before having sex in front of the camera, about bodies, desires and genders. All are female to male transed, except for Natalie, who identifies as femme, bio-female, and a sex worker (as she puts it, a self-identified "whore"). With the exception of Randall and Wendell, all of the trans men have had some surgical interventions (mostly top surgeries); neither Randall nor Wendell have had top surgery and neither appears to be taking testosterone at the time of filming. All of the couples practise safe sex and consensual BDSM sex to varying degrees in

front of the camera. What's even more interesting is that, like Buck, none of the men who appear without clothes on screen have had bottom surgeries; nor do they allow the reductive politics of gender essentialism to fold pussy into female.

Gender and sexuality converge, then, on these incoherent bodies in very complex and anti-essentialist ways. Gender is produced not only through surgical and chemical interventions on the body but it also emerges in excess of those technologies as well. Both Casey and Wendell identify their forms of masculinity as what I've described earlier as "faggotry"; each identifies their approximations of manhood as "flaming faggots." For Casey, though, given that his partners are primary femmes, this strikes a bit of an unusual cord. Like Elyse in *Butch Mystique*, "faggotry" here marks an anti-normative space of gender rather than object choice. Casey's appearance in the documentary supports this; he is wearing gold shorts, a cowboy hat and his body language resonates in ways less conventionally masculine even though his object choice - femmes - marks his sexuality as heterogendered. Wendell, on the other hand, has not had top surgery yet his entire gender presentation is much more conventionally masculine. With a crew cut, dressed in army colours, and less flamboyant in appearance, Wendell's space of faggotry does signal object choice far more than Casey's. Wendell's on camera sex partner is Randall, another young pre-transition ftm who identifies not only as "atypically male" but also as Wendell's sexual bottom.

However, what continues to be queerly incoherent in *Enough Man* is the way that these sexual identifications fold over and articulate through gender in an anti-essentializing way. These are, to borrow a conceptualization from Wiegman, neither understandings of sexuality irreducible to gender identities, nor the sexualities of gender identifications without reiterating either gender or sexuality according to heteronormativity (2006, 91). These are instead something else; complex, triangulated sexual and gendered identifications where each circumvents and interrupts the essentialisms of the other. But these genders also remain incommensurate with queer sexual performativities and heteronormative genders. For instance, Wendell is a sexual top, being gender queer and running the sexual scene allows him to access what he identifies as his actual body underneath his breasts. Randall, on the other hand, as

Wendell's boy, bottoms as a decidedly feminist gender expression. "Bottoming," he says, "is like a gender expression. I like being a boy who gets put in his place." Both share Wendell's analysis of entrustment, that is, a negotiation around the incoherence of gender identity, bodies and sexual practice: "Biology and gender are separate. Even if someone has their fingers up my vagina, as long as they perceive me as male it doesn't matter." Raven and Joshua, on the other hand, are both ftms who exist as part of an intergenerational alternative kinship system/family made up of their relationship plus a male-to-female trans-femme. The three of them have what Raven calls a "fluid bond"; they do have unprotected sex with each other but have protected sex with folks outside of their family. Raven is a top and Joshua is his boy-bottom. They exist in a consensual ownership BDSM relationship where Raven is contractual owner of Joshua's sexuality; dominance/submission is the scenario they perform in front of the camera. Again, this relationship between two ftm transsexual men who have not had bottom surgery transcends essentialism. Raven identifies their kinship, not necessarily their object choices, as "trans perverted," suggesting that their relations of kinship are equally as significant in terms of identity as are their gender and sexual identifications. And, it seems, each plays out on the site of the other. Raven is both Daddy-top to Joshua and butch to his wife's femme. Sexuality is articulated through gendered bodies produced as the effect of sex play, even though neither are an index or cause of the other. At the same time, BDSM, which includes penetration through bottoming/topping, becomes an expression of gender identities. Although some of the folks in *Enough Man* are queer, some are gay, and some are what we might even call "straight with a twist," that is, queerly heterosexual (Thomas 2000).

To put this differently: the gender identifications and sexualities of the folks represented in the documentary are beyond even a simple queering of heteronormative subjectivities. But equally true is the premise that their relative social positionings condition their sexual and gender configurations. As Cvetkovich puts it: "the body [is] a ground for negotiating social relations...these experiences are not necessarily traumatic in the more conventional sense of the term but are traumatic in the specific sense of a breach of bodily boundaries. [This is] what keeps sexuality queer, to

keep a place for shame and perversion within public discourses of sexuality rather than purging them of their messiness in order to make them acceptable" (1995, 62-63). These incoherent bodies - incoherent because they refuse to make sense within political grammars governing the social and sexual relationships between bodies, desires and genders - use these everyday moments of shame and trauma for trans folks as sexual props, inverting their ability to regulate by making public that which is supposed to be kept as private.

But even beyond simply queering them, Casey and Natalie, in particular, defy and fuck those grammars. As a sexual top, Natalie's desires transitively depend upon the instabilities of Casey's body. Sex play between them is intensely edgy including water sports (girls, it seems can pee standing up) and genital needle play. Such needle play in the film is evidence of the political uses of sexual incoherence - conditioned by gender and social relations - as the needles themselves are recognizable (to those subject to them) as the means of testosterone ingestion: the 21 gauge, 1.5 inch needle.² This needle becomes the prop that Natalie uses to quite literally penetrate Casey's man-pussy. Natalie's use of the medicalized mechanisms of sexual reassignment - testosterone needles - marks these sexual bodies and desires as political ones, where the perverse pleasure of the sexual scene is conditioned by the political struggle to access still heavily regulated sex reassignment technologies in the first place. As a politicized and perverse resignification of the trans-man's supposedly corporeal "failure" as a man (that his body is not "man enough" to produce its own testosterone), this scene in particular sutures sex play and penetration to the social world but also calibrates them both through a queering of differently gendered shame. To return to Wiegman's previous grammar lesson on transitive verbs: As a man, Casey becomes Natalie's object to her subject and her pleasure circumvents his. But judging by the object of penetration (i.e., the needle), neither is he completely irrelevant. As a femme top, Natalie takes her pleasure in finding a trans-object for her quite active desire; these sexualized objects (trans-boys) cannot exist without a subject (femme top) through which their own ability to act as a subject depends. The scene of BDSM between them becomes a feminist sexual grammar necessitated by their gender incoherence but equally fuelled by a political deployment of perversion.

Moreover, where previous documentaries about ftm cultures circumvent the incoherence and incompleteness of the ftm body (for instance, *Annie and Les*; *The Opposite Sex*; even *You Don't Know Dick*), *Enough Man*, like the public porn work of Buck Angel, puts that body unblushingly on display. Living in an ftm transsexual body is, of course, living in, with, and through corporeal incoherence. Very few ftms can afford successful lower surgery as most phalloplasties remain simply cost prohibitive. *Enough Man*, and Casey in particular, both take those private masculine anxieties about living with indeterminate bodies (that is, bodies which might pass as male in public but could not pass visual inspection) and refuse the social shaming by allowing the camera to film the physical site that is quietly and euphemistically identified among ftm men as "the tranny bonus hole." In his interviews with ftm tranny-bois as well as with intersexed folks, Colin Thomas teases out the way that transfolks rearticulate gender possibilities based on a decoding of the binary gender system even as that system attempts to limit its subjects. "Hanging out with gender-variant people," Thomas writes, "can quickly dislodge one's concepts of what it means to be male or female, gay or straight" (2005, 3). In fact, one of his interview subjects notes how these limits of language mirror the limits of bodies when "he" says: "If there was a tranny pronoun, I'd use it...I'm male, but I'm not suddenly this bio-dude either [...] I do plan on keeping my tranny bonus hole [though]. That's staying" (2005, 1). This is not the same site of physicality that defines heteronormative femininity (the vagina-as-sheath-for-penis) and by implication lesbianism (the for-women-only vagina); this is the paradoxical space that defies existing gender and sexual taxonomies but which uses their imperatives as foreplay. As a way to pay homage to the early sex radicals of the sex wars, and to Annie Sprinkle in particular, Casey does a performance piece in the film that he calls his "Andy Sprinkle." With partner Natalie holding a flashlight, Casey puts his feet into stirrups and invites the viewer, assisted by Natalie and via the camera's gaze, to quite literally look at his genitals and into his vagina or what he calls his boy hole. "Andy's" piece, narrated through a voiceover by Natalie, puts that space of nothingness on display, situating his body within a public archive but challenging its essentialisms at the same time. There's something vertiginously incoherent about "Andy's" body literally in motion

between sexes, irreducible to either, bearing traces of both, and owned, and narrated, in circuits of desire, by his femme top. Gendered discourses of shame might compel the composition of the sexual scene but their work is rendered mute.

Part of what Buck Angel, *The Butch Mystique* and *Enough Man* offer is the opportunity to reconsider gender work both accomplished and deconstructed through sexual identifications. As much as the grammars of gender essentialism and heteronormativity both regulate identification through a politics of shame, each is resisted by that which the other cannot fully constrain or contain. Like Buck as he bottoms for gay men attracted to man-pussy - something Buck calls "mangina" - Elyse's, Wendell's and Casey's gendered sexual space of faggotry is available to transmen as a productive trope of gendered sexual receptivity staged and triangulated through those same shaming logics. In this case, however, identification and desire are not conditioned or enabled by the foundational and sexed body; that is, viewing or desiring as a woman or a man as limited by essentialist bodies. Instead, these texts depict self-unmade transed bodies which sexual incoherence animates instead of defeats. In fact, that image of a man with a pussy being penetrated is indicative of what Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake (1997) call the lived and defiant messiness of gender as productive contradiction not as failure. Within this gendered sexual culture, the vagina becomes tranny bonus hole becoming "pussy," which becomes gender without genitals. Penetration signifies a compelling incoherence where top-bottom, active-passive, male-female, gay-straight dichotomies become sexually deconstructed imperatives. Annie Sprinkle may have been parodic when she suggested that "you can never demystify a cervix" (2001, 1). But what Casey, Buck and the rest of these trans-perverts demystify, at the very least, and stage as spectacle, are the intransigent needs to compulsively consume trans sexed bodies in the first place.

Endnote

1. Sex practices and cultures organized around Bondage Submission Sadism and Masochism.
2. The specifications refer to the length of the needle itself which needs to be long enough so that it can inject testosterone deep into the centre of the muscle.

References

- Butler, Judith. "Imitation and Gender Insubordination," *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories*. Diana Fuss, ed. New York: Routledge, 1991, pp. 1-31.
- Cameron, Loren. *Body Alchemy: Transsexual Portraits*. Pittsburgh: Cleis Press, 1996.
- Cvetkovich, Ann. "Recasting Receptivity: Femme Sexualities," *Lesbian Erotics*, Karla Jay, ed. New York and London: New York University Press, 1995, pp. 125-46.
- _____. *An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality and Lesbian Public Cultures*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Hall, Stuart. "Encoding, Decoding," *Media and Cultural Studies*. Keyworks. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas M. Kellner, eds. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001, pp. 166-76.
- Heywood, Leslie and Jennifer Drake, eds. *Third Wave Agenda: Being Feminist, Doing Feminism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Johnson, Merri Lisa, ed. *Jane Sexes it Up: True Confessions of Feminist Desire*. New York/London: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2002.
- Nestle, Joan. *A Restricted Country*. Ithaca, New York: Firebrand Books, 1987.
- Noble, Jean Bobby. *Masculinities Without Men?* Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004.
- _____. *Sons of the Movement: FTMs Risking Incoherence in a Post-Queer Cultural Landscape*. Toronto: Women's Press, 2006.
- Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Rubin, Gayle. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Carole Vance, ed. Boston: Routledge, 1984, pp. 267-319.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- Sprinkle, Annie. *Hardcore from the Heart: The Pleasures, Profits and Politics of Sex in Performance*. London and New York: Continuum, 2001.
- Thomas, Calvin, ed. *Straight with a Twist: Queer Theory and the Subject of Heterosexuality*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000, pp. 11-44.
- Thomas, Colin. "Beyond the Binary: Adventures in Gender." <http://www.straight.com> accessed 31 July 2005.
- Vance, Carole S. "Pleasure and Danger: Toward a Politics of Sexuality," *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston: Routledge, 1984, pp. xvi-xxxix.
- Volcano, Del LaGrace. *Sublime Mutations*. Tübingen: Konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke, 2000.
- Wiegman, Robyn. "Heteronormativity and the Desire for Gender," *Feminist Theory* 7.1. (2006): 89-103.

Films

- The Butch Mystique*. Dir. Debra A. Wilson. 2003 USA.
- Enough Man*. Dir. Luke Woodward. 2004 USA.
- The Opposite Sex: Rene's Story*. Dir Josh Aronson. 2003 USA.
- You Don't Know Dick: Courageous Hearts of Transsexual Men*. Dir. Schermerhorn, Candace and Bestor Cram. 1997 USA.
- Linda/Les and Annie: The First Female-to-Male Transsexual Love Story*. Dir. Annie Sprinkle. 1992 USA.

Web Media

- SX News*. February 2006. <http://buckangel.com/>. Accessed 11 November 2006.