

Confronting Law Affectively: Encounters of a Patpong Sex Tourist

Victoria Brooks

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Abstract When considering spaces of sex-work such as Patpong in Bangkok, Thailand, the inclination is to be drawn into habitual debates concerning the legitimacy of sex-work and the clear objectification of sex-workers. While these concerns are valid and real, there are significant absences in terms of the theoretical mapping of the space, such as the affect of the presence of law, bodies, space and the sexual encounter itself. Law emerges as the most significant presence, since it both forms the transactional surface of Patpong and produces the confusion and revilement that results from the confluence of cold legal exchange with the tactile intimacy of the sexual encounter. This text explores the ethnographic space of Patpong in order to understand ways in which law's transactional, effective surface is both embodied through subjectivication and spatially emplaced, yet also disrupted through the affective agency of the bodies and spaces it enfolds in order to produce this surface. This exploration will point to the limitations of law's effective surface and suggest ways in which law might be located within a regime of affect, which returns the law to the body it subjectivises.

Keywords Affect · Bangkok · Deleuze · Materiality · Sexuality · Sex-work · Space

Writings concerning sex tourism in Patpong tend to be confined to debates regarding the legitimacy of sex-work and whether the practice can be justified. Patpong is a site of sexual tourism, of general tourism, as well as exploitation, of pain as well as pleasure and of liberation as well as entrapment. The space is justifiably seen as a site in which women are exploited due to their economic circumstance by Western

V. Brooks (✉)
Law School, University of Westminster, London, UK
e-mail: victoria.brooks@my.westminster.ac.uk

sex tourists and these concerns are valid and real (Wilson 2004; Doezema 2010).¹ However, it seems that in the theorisation of this space, there are three significant actants that are rendered invisible and almost mysterious. First, space tends to be conceived as merely the arena in which encounters take place, and is not generally considered to be a participant in the exchange, or something that is capable of influencing the dynamics of the encounter. Second, the material sexual encounter itself is absent in that the focus of these studies is not ‘the sexual services these women provide’ (Wilson 2004, p. 85). It is clear that the economic, racial and geographic dynamics tend to be intensely debated and theorised, yet complex and potent material aspects of the encounter such as desire, pleasure and orgasm, are glaringly absent from this theorisation (Wilson 2004; Doezema 2010; Neeley and Samura 2011).² This absence is problematic since all of these are aspects of the encounter that are produced between the bodies engaged in the actual *experience* of the encounter. The third notable absence is law. Law is conceived of as a passive agent, which tends to respond by allowing these encounters in this particular terrain. My objective here is to theorise Patpong in a way that responds to these theoretical absences. Through examination of the ethnographic terrain of Patpong I will demonstrate that these absences can only be conceived as theoretically present.

Having dismissed previous discussions regarding sexual tourism in Patpong, it is impossible to avoid their impact. Further, these texts have made rich and valuable contributions to the study of sex work in Thailand and contributed to the textual landscape of the site itself. As I have already said, I do not consider it necessary (nor am I able) to add to this already rich discourse. I will therefore be taking an alternative and perhaps slightly precarious position in order to explore the theoretical absences identified. This text will implicitly encounter and develop its narrative from the position of the sex-tourist. Adopting this position carries certain hazards, since in order to adopt it, certain subjectivities also must be assumed. In so doing, the space is encountered as a subject, with a particular subject position; that is, the space is encountered *through* a certain subjective lens. The sex tourist is a reviled figure, but also an enigmatic one. Enigmatic, that is, in the sense that the sex-tourist’s subjective position is traditionally characterised as male, racialised as Western and white, and as holding a certain economic strength; while the true characteristics of the individual sex-tourist remain under-explored. Even if it were to be accepted that these characteristics maintain a prelevance in the subjective make-up of the sex-tourist, it seems that the actual *experience* of being a sex-tourist is absent in a number of ways. Importantly, it is absent from the discourse which

¹ Wilson provides an overview of the complex economic, cultural and racial dynamics in relation to sex-work in Thailand and see also Doezema for an engaging exploration of the history and development of the practice, as well as the political and racial dimensions of global sex trafficking. Doezema’s work also considers the production and political context of sex-work discourse.

² There is a substantial body of work that considers the racial dynamics of sex-work, as well as the connection between race, space and tourism, for example Neeley and Samura’s text. The current text is concerned with the material dynamics of space and bodies and material encounters. Although race is arguably a significant aspect to the relations between bodies and spaces, my concern here is to assess the confrontations that the basic presence of the material body and space can represent in a system of transactional laws of effect.

builds the perception of the sex-industry,³ and from the kind of text which essentialises the sex industry and examines only its ‘spectacular qualities’ (Wilson 2004, p. 73).⁴ It is not through ignorance or dismissal of the inequalities and difficulties of the sex-tourist/sex-worker relationship that I adopt the position of the sex-tourist here. Rather, I attempt to grasp at the potentialities and openness that come as part of this subjectivity, the qualities of which exist despite the subject’s reviled and morally precarious position. Simply put, in attempting to encounter Patpong as a sex-tourist, it is possible to capture some of the limitations in the syntheses that create this subject-position, as well as its receptiveness to the affects of space and bodies.

Encountering Patpong in this way is an essential device which points to the key theoretical concerns I attempt to address, particularly in terms of locating law. As will be seen in the following discussion regarding Patpong, law is present in the lens (or subject) through which we encounter, yet its presence is not static. The subject appears closed, yet is open to the affects, which are produced by other bodies and by the space in which we encounter, and which are enfolded to produce different, transient modes of subjectivity. In this sense, the theoretical absences identified above can be demonstrated as ethnographically present. In the following discussion I will suggest that, in light of my examination of the ethnographic space of Patpong, law must be conceived as not only determinative of transcendent subjectivities such as ‘the sex tourist’, or ‘heterosexual’ but also as receptive and reflexive to material affects produced by bodies and spaces.

Patpong

Bangkok is a very hot space, where heat shines on the bodies of those who tread its streets, where the air is heavy and thick with sweat and each step is a footfall in another’s heat-soaked trail. Prostitution is prolific throughout much of Thailand, but Bangkok is the hub, with the notorious red light district of Patpong being the commercial red-light centre, and the best known red-light district. Although Patpong is the hub of sex-work in Bangkok, it is also a place where tourists go just to experience the atmosphere of the space, as well as partake in intimate purchases and visit the vibrant night markets and restaurants.⁵

As well as the space of Patpong, another central theme of this text is sex-work. This is a subject with obvious economic and sexual dimensions, both of which are explored in a particularly effective way by Ara Wilson. She uses Bangkok and Patpong as a site to observe various unusual interactions which together construct

³ Texts such as Wilson’s and Doezema’s conduct valuable investigations into the sex-industry, but do not evaluate nor investigate spaces of sex-work from the perspective of the sex-tourist. While it is beyond the scope of this text to attempt to develop the literature in this way, I will hope to demonstrate that there is potential to encounter bodies and spaces in a productive way from this subjective position.

⁴ These qualities are created by texts that critique and explore, but they also create and fuel a kind of ‘hyper-reality’ in relation to the international sex-trade.

⁵ See again Wilson’s text for a rich and engaging description of the visual aspects of the space of Patpong.

Bangkok's vibrant economy (Wilson 2004). Wilson identifies and encounters an ambiguity to sex-work, which arises as a result of her investigations into the economy of the Go-Go bar, and the strange dynamics of the sex-work transaction. There is one particular incident that Wilson recounts where she and her colleague engage the company (for research purposes) of 'Mot', a bartender at a Go-Go bar and they pay the requisite fee for her time and ask her to join them at a Patpong disco (Wilson 2004, pp. 69–70). This transaction results in confusion and discomfort for Wilson, since it appears she is unsure whether to approach the exchange (which she understood as neither a commercial, nor a sexual transaction) as a customer; that is, should she have paid for her time or not? Or rather, was it a sexual transaction or commercial transaction, and if so, what was the appropriate interpretation of the codes of the trade in that situation? (Wilson 2004, p. 71). It is clear from Wilson's account that there is a certain set of laws that shape the experience of both the sex-tourist and sex-worker. Wilson's experience and analysis is therefore particularly important, since she recognises the capacity of the space to shape the bodily articulation of those engaged in the transaction. The terrain is where the sex-worker will learn something of his/her sexuality, gender, as well as the libidinal economy, and it is clear from reading Wilson's work that such lessons are inextricable from the space in which they are taught (Wilson 2004, p. 73). Wilson also upsets the irresistible assumption that there is a complete subordination of the sex-worker. Her work is therefore vital as it assists in fortifying the basis of the alternative perspective adopted here, that is, the perspective of the sex-tourist. It is clear throughout her text that the sex-workers' lives are far from easy, but it also suggests that their lives take on an economic independence and sometimes a sexual advantage.⁶ This hints at departure from subordination and objectification of the sex-worker as the incontrovertible nature of the sex industry in Bangkok. This dynamic also arises in Boone's *Vacation Cruises* on a textual level, in which the occidental Mr David becomes objectified by the beautiful Mohammed (Boone 1995, p. 102). These studies also create a space for exploring the presence of the material sexual encounter that is present within transactions in sex work, which occurs despite the prevalence of narratives that construct and produce the revilement of the sex-tourist.

Encounters between the bodies in Patpong are not only economic, they are sexual. Yet it is also the case, as noted by Wilson, that these superficially economic encounters have additional dimensions; that is, they not only represent an economic exchange, but the bodies engaged in them create affects. One way in which these affects emerge is through the body's presence in the transaction itself; not only as the initiator, but as the subject of the exchange. These exchanges produce an excess of affect. In his study of male-male sex behaviours, Storer alludes to a tantalising fluid sexuality that is produced via sex-work in Bangkok (Storer 1999, p. 46). This kind of sexuality would seem to flow with its innate character, as suggested by Grosz. She writes that the 'true' and innate character of sexuality is to transgress

⁶ Wilson describes encounters between sex-workers and clients where there are elements of manipulation in efforts to enhance their financial gain, as well as clients becoming long-term partners. Wilson also mentions that sex-workers tend to keep the details of their sexual encounters with clients private, as opposed to sharing financial tactics and other such tools of the trade with their colleagues.

thresholds of (legal) identity, meaning that more restrictive corporeal identifications can be dislocated via recognition of its materiality (Grosz 1994, pp. 7–24 and pp. 187–210).⁷ This potential fluidity is produced by bodies of the sex-workers, and the sex-tourists engaged in sexual transactions in Patpong.

It is the excess of affect of bodies engaged in sexual transactions which produce the affect of sexual fluidity and, as will later be suggested, the disturbance to fixed subjectivity. The *space* of Patpong also produces affects and reveals itself as an unexpectedly embodied space in line with the material nature of the body. This emerges through spatial (and sexual) crossings, for which Patpong is a fruitful site. Binnie suggests that there is an ephemeral and ‘soft’ quality to queer spaces (Bell et al. 2001, p. 107), which represents a transgression of the very omnipresent and fixed heterosexual space. I will therefore explore this potential spatial-sexual fluidity within Patpong, which is demonstrated in spatial and sexual crossings. These crossings can also be conceived as producing a spatial and affective presence within subjectivities. Space in this text is not space ‘for’ a purpose (in this case, sex-work), but material space which is generative of affects. The interaction and connection of living bodies and spaces has been explored elsewhere in texts such as Massey’s (1994). Massey’s text enriches this connection by developing an embodied perspective of space, albeit in a context not of legal, but general normative rules. My perspective is similar, in that I attempt an embodied theorisation of Patpong as a space, but I also suggest this perspective can be developed in two ways: first, by transferring this perspective to Patpong as a site of sexual enactment; and second, by situating law in the multitude of affects produced by bodies and the space. In doing so, I seek to mobilise discussions of the disjuncture between the law and embodied sexuality by approaching the site of Patpong from a perspective of openness, as opposed to revulsion (Bell et al. 2001; Berkowitz 2012).⁸

The challenge that then arises is how law can be situated within these affective relations between bodies in their interactions as a part of Patpong. If law is to be understood as producing solid subjectivities, or effects, then how can it also be conceived as receptive and open to affects? Where can law be placed? Does it adopt a position of reflexive mediation between the subject and affects? To understand the production of affects and to situate law, I will be using a Deleuzian conceptual underpinning which will be applied to the transactional and affective dynamics of Patpong.

Law and Its Effects

Effect tends to be surface. I have already mentioned that I will point to a different aspect to encounters in Patpong since it is apparent that there is an alternative space

⁷ Grosz writes that sexuality escapes its pre-designated regions and outside of its biological and sociologically represented places, as well as outside of legally imparted and ‘validated representations of desire’.

⁸ See Bell and Berkowitz for a historical problematisation of the continuous disembodiment of laws concerning sexuality through a perpetual struggle to govern and impart perspective to human sexual desire.

to be explored. The most readily examined perspective is that of the sex-worker and the associated economic and racial dimensions of their transactions with sex-tourists. This aspect tends to emerge as representative of the habitual debate concerning spaces of sex-work such as Patpong, and is an example of an encounter with the space through the subjective lens I have mentioned. But how is this image produced? This perception does not represent the entirety of the surface of effect. Rather, the surface is a surface of depth; it is multifaceted and built of a multitude of effects, where law privileges the 'value' of encounters. This value is calculated through a formulaic method which comprises an assessment of the legality of sexual encounters based on gender, age, sexuality and consent. This way of judging the value of encounters is quantitative and is not an adjudication based on the material qualities of bodies. Deleuze suggests that this judgment is produced by bodies, but is simultaneously disconnected from them: 'These are no longer states of affairs—mixtures deep inside bodies—but incorporeal events at the surface which are the results of these mixtures' (Deleuze 2004b, p. 8). These 'incorporeal events', or judgments, are effects. They are values attributed to the encounter by law, rather than an assessment of the aggregate of *affects*. There is an element of inseparability between the body and effect and the terms are not entirely distinct, yet bodily affectivity is never on the surface of the law; the law is incorporeal and can be nothing other than effect (Deleuze 2004b, p. 10). In his work on Spinoza, Deleuze speaks of the way encounters with other bodies are understood. Through law, we experience only the effects of encounters, whether it is a harmonious encounter or an encounter of decomposition (Deleuze 1988, p. 19). The law thereby emerges as a system of effect, or rather the surface of these mutual encounters with bodies. Regulation is founded on predetermined directions based on an assessment of the results of these encounters. The directions are not vectors of development, as the encounter is already provided with its permitted outcome through its presumed aggregate of effects. The law is thereby *effective* as opposed to affective; *representative* as opposed to experimental.

Having forged an understanding of effect, it is necessary to understand what this mysterious 'affect' is that is produced through encounters between bodies, and yet remains somehow absent from the incorporeal surface. Affect is experimental and developmental and these attributes are useful, but they are also impossible for law to translate, which means that affect is incorporated into law's surface as an encounter of effect. The affect is the experience of the encounter, but this is dissolved into the value of the encounter, or permitted outcome. Permitted outcomes are the details which form the intricacies of law's regulatory surface because they demonstrate to bodies when, for instance, their encounter will result in punishment. The result of this view of encounters is that effects are separated from their cause (Deleuze 1988, p. 19). The mechanism by which encounters are regulated and permitted or punished is separated from the action; the action is separated from the body that enacts. The law comprises a collection of symbols founded in a momentary state (the effect of the encounter) and not the (affective) encounter itself. These symbols are merely 'indicative' of our bodily state and our presence (Deleuze 1988, p. 105).

The law governs relations between bodies, yet it is somewhat disconnected from the body which is the cause and the beginning of the encounter. Despite this

apparent disjuncture, the affectivity of bodies is returned to the surface. The deficiency in the surface is not that it is separate and ignorant of the materiality of bodies, but that it is necessarily incorporeal. Its disembodiment is necessary because the attributes of effect are ‘logical and dialectical’ (Deleuze 2004b, p. 7). It is a summative system of values that flows from the affective state of bodies; it is not beings, facts or things of vitality, but the effect of their encounters (Deleuze 2004b, p. 7). The question at this point becomes: where precisely can law be located? It seems as though there is a continuum from affect to effect: they are connected, but at the same time disconnected. The difference between the affect and effect is subtle—*everything happens at the border* (Deleuze 2004b, p. 12). This is the place where affect becomes effect; this is the moment of evaporation and transformation of the corporeal into the incorporeal mist, as Deleuze writes: *It is by following the border, by skirting the surface, that one passes from bodies to the incorporeal* (Deleuze 2004b, p. 12). This is the space where the relation between law and affect can be observed, confronted and disrupted.

But the effective surface of the law is not without detail and has physiognomies of its own. The law proceeds via difference, but only through already *differentiated* difference.⁹ I have said that law sits on the effective edge of bodily encounters. The incorporeal mist emanates from bodily collisions, yet these are unconnected potential determinations of the collision. The mist is at the edge of effect/affect and is, as Deleuze writes: ‘the once more calm surface upon which float unconnected determinations like scattered members: a head without a neck, and arm without a shoulder, eyes without brows’ (Deleuze 2004a, p. 36). The constituents of the body are visible at the edge of the surface, yet they are not formed into an organism which can be mobilised and connected to another: ‘difference is the point of determination’ (Deleuze 2004a, p. 36). Difference is a mode that the law uses as a way of distinguishing bodily entities, which deprives a body of distinguishing (or differentiating) *itself*. This manner of distinguishing is not merely abstract. On the effective surface, distinguishing can proceed in overt manifestations of political and legal paradigms, such as Oedipalisation, which is a form of social repression that reduces the directions of sexual desire and its connections to those which sustain the state in its current form (Parr 2010, p. 195). Such connections are bodily identifications, spatial representations and aggregates of desire that manage to permeate all senses: the ears are subjected to music that throbs from the speakers in the Go–Go bars; the music videos, the neon lights and the exposed flesh are a feast for the eyes; the smell of Thai food, damp streets and perfumed and sweaty bodies. The body navigates the organisation of the furniture within the bar and finds its way through the bar stools and the dancing platforms. It is all an oedipal construction that constitutes a controlling space: everything cries out to be touched. This kind of environment is an arena that makes ‘the sex of individuals completely “readable”’ (Mussawir 2011, p. 46). In other words, it is an area that requires negotiation of

⁹ For Deleuze, all life is immanently undifferentiated. Life is a differential *process* which produces the individual. The individual is infinitely and in every case, different, see Deleuze (2004a). In this text it is argued that a transcendent law reigns, which maintains a stable and essentialised subjectivity. This act deprives life of its self-differentiating properties.

points and involvement in only legal encounters, which ensures a body's coherence before law.

It is clear that law tends to denature affectivity through its translation into effective terms, but is it possible for law to return to affect? Simply put, could there be a model of law that is formulated of affects? Patricia MacCormack writes of legally organised bodily states, such as life/death, as legal paradigms of effect. These paradigms are constituted through events which are encounters between law, medicine and ethics (Braidotti et al. 2009, pp. 73–96). We live and we die through legal events, where life/death are the most fundamentally 'effective' legal categories of encounter. The actual *states* of life and death are silenced into semantics, which do not have their own voice, or their own affect outside of the legal term. Through the Body without Organs,¹⁰ MacCormack proposes a law that although organised, is still 'ethically adaptive, mediative and diverse in reference to significations of body, property, domination, autonomy and the demarcation between bodies' (Braidotti et al. 2009, p. 77). This is potentially a model, or rather an anti-model, for an *affective* law. It could allow space for *genuine* encounter through dissolution of effective boundaries and excess beyond the semiotics of state and encounter. I will be using a conception of the law as a mechanism of translation of affect to effect, yet I will trouble this understanding through the apparent inseparability and productive tension between affect and effect.

This understanding of effect/affect can also be spatially emplaced. Geography and legal mapping are spatial effects. This spatial surface is easy to read and to navigate, but it also translates spatial affects into representation. Spatial affects are concealed by fixed forms of cartography; or rather, the materiality of the space is not apparent on the surface. The law displays spatial stasis and maintains an austere exterior, as Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos writes, 'it fixes space, turns it into points, tight measurements of distance and propinquity, normative geometries, lines of connection that do not allow any excess to surface' (Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos 2010, p. 7). This 'excess' can also be understood as affect. Law tends to favour an act of surfacing, or translation of spatial affects into effect, yet it can be situated at varying points on the affect/effect continuum. Legal spatial practises tend to produce and surface an excess of affect, but it also 'stabilises and specifies' (Kraftl and Peter 2008, p. 215) its desired affects. Simply put, it can be seen to produce and also limit the affectiveness of space. Having said this, law's lexicon and materiality cannot competently handle affect, which means it tends to be located at a point where limit is favoured over productivity; Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos goes on to write: 'Law reduces space into law's saturable, controlled context while refusing to (admit that they) operate together in a folded becoming' (Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos 2010, p. 7). This act of reduction and attempt to map the excess of affect causes confusion. The reason for this is that in attempting to concede the excess of the transaction, there is also an act of separation from this excess. This separation produces distance between the body of law and the bodies (including spaces) that it is trying to regulate. Space in this piece takes on a universal meaning;

¹⁰ The Body without Organs is explored later as a potential way of escaping an overly signified body through encountering an immanent bodily strata closer to bodily materiality.

it is material in that it is the environment within which bodies move, it is textual, it is political and economic. It is also a space of properties. It is not a void that is merely filled with bodies, but also a body in itself.

The following sections will connect this theoretical base to the dynamics of affect that take place within Patpong, and seek to identify points where law materialises affect on its effective surface. This conceptual frame will also serve as a means of encountering, and experiencing the bodies and the space of Patpong or, rather, as a means of distinguishing the levels of encountering. Simply put, this theoretical frame will assist in establishing at which points the sex-tourist is effected and affected by law, and/or by the bodies and the space. The following section will attempt an understanding of the various transactions that take place in Patpong and how these transactions and the laws governing them are interrupted, confronted and fragmented by the material presence of bodies and space.

Affective Transactions

Most sex-work transactions in Patpong take place in Go-Go bars. The music is loud and visitors are provided with a site of both visual and sexual consumption; there are neon lights, music playing and large television screens that play music videos (Wilson 2004, 2010). Sex-workers are usually either outside of the establishment, drawing in clientele, or they are inside entertaining them. The women inside will be usually nearly naked, dancing around poles and there will also be women at the bar mingling with customers before they swap places with those dancing when it is their turn. Patpong has two main streets (Patpong 1 and Patpong 2), which are like two rungs of a ladder, between Surawong Street and Silom Road. These are the main streets that house a number of Go-Go bars, as well as what are termed 'beer-bars'. 'Beer-bars' are smaller, less commercial open-air bars, where there are no dancing poles, but one can sit and chat to the women and also take them 'off' for a fee, if desired.¹¹ There is a difference between one of these bars and a massage parlour. In a massage parlour, the sexual encounter will take place on the premises, instead of the woman being taken 'off' as they would be from a Go-Go or beer bar. There are constellations of these bars and in between there is a smattering of pharmacies, fast food restaurants and supermarkets and, at night, the entire place springs to life in a neon flash.

All of this forms a spectacle that draws in customers; the entire place in all its neon-lit splendour invites the customer into this sensory explosion to experience the space. Within the bars, the tourists can see the women dancing on the stage, yet the women cannot meet the gaze of every customer (Wilson 2004, p. 79). The women are somewhat vulnerable, in the centre of the room, often on a platform. This arrangement could be seen to allow the occidental tourist to deduce all that is on offer, without permitting the sex-worker an equal power of selection. This could be

¹¹ Taking a sex-worker 'off' means paying their bar fee (this is paid to the owners of the bar in which the sex-worker is based) and then negotiating a fee with the sex-worker to cover the subsequent sexual encounter that will take place away from the premises of the bar. The encounter will usually take place at the hotel room of the tourist. See Wilson (2004, pp. 61–101) for a detailed account.

suggestive of a spatial arrangement that facilitates capitalism; a maximisation of consumer choice and opportunity of service deployment. The spatiality is also indicative of the bar's attempt to control their employees; to ensure they further the economic gain of the establishment and that they do not have an equal power to select consumers.¹² Through this arrangement, law presents an effective surface which invites the consumer to partake in a transaction as part of the capitalist experience, to enjoy the commodification of sex and indulge their sexual appetites for the women who are on display.

Yet the space is more complex than this, since it is a space of effect and *affect*. A simple assessment of the arrangement of the bar as only the facilitator of the contractual exchange does not account for the material properties of the space. A transaction is a contract, or series of contracts, which lawyers would recognise as agreements which gives rise to obligations that are recognised by law (Peel 2007, p. 1). In this case, in its most basic form, the transaction comprises a promise of sexual services and intimacy in return for money. The space in which this transaction occurs is more than just a facilitator for this contractual exchange, it is also a participant. It emerges as a space of legal effect, in that it is a space of a quintessentially legal event: the contractual exchange. This is an encounter of effect, as it is a meeting between bodies in a particular space for an exchange, which is attributed a value: a valid or invalid contract. The contract is the *effect* of the encounter and the space. But we know that Patpong is a space of affectivity, as well as effect, which means its effectivity can be disturbed through the presence of bodies and space. Deleuze and Guattari's smooth/striated paradigm enables the spatially enplaced situation of law within the affect/effect continuum.

Smooth and striated are distinct forms of space, yet they exist together: 'smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space; striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space' (Deleuze and Guattari 2004b, p. 524). Yet there is a distinction between the two, as Deleuze and Guattari go on to write: 'in striated space, lines or trajectories are subordinated to points: one goes from one point to another. In the smooth, it is the opposite: the points are subordinated to the trajectory' (Deleuze and Guattari 2004b, p. 528). Within Bangkok there are certain forms of movement that are within the striated space, with such movements being literal, for example, movement along the map that shows the tourist which way to go. It is also movement in terms of the macro-economics¹³ of the bar and the legalities of the contractual 'exchange' that takes place between the customer and the sex-worker. Spatial praxes in Patpong seem to facilitate this kind of exchange, since the space is arranged and constructed in order to draw in customers and offer them unrestricted choices. It is a space ripe for the legal transaction; the exchange of money for sexual services. The economic aims of the

¹² See Wilson (2004, pp. 78–88) for an account of the economic structure of the Go-Go bar. It is structured in a way that ensures the bar is provided with its fee. The gaining of this fee is dependent on the productivity of the sex-worker, yet she will not earn tips or an 'off' fee without the customer paying the bar fee first.

¹³ See Wilson (2004, pp. 68–101) concerning the economic microcosm formed by the Go-Go Bar which is comprised of many different clusters of exchange, ranging from sale of specific 'ladies drinks' to 'bar' and 'off' fees, which all hold within them an element of intimate exchange.

transaction are apparent from these spatial arrangements, yet there is an excess of affect produced by this striation. This excess of affect is produced through the seemingly capitalist arrangement of the space, yet affects are also produced by the materiality of the space itself and the bodies within it, which is then also reduced and returned to striation through the endless cycle of space.

But what is this 'excess' of affect that is surfaced through the medium of the transaction? This is not a normal transaction which is taking place in Patpong, since the object of the transaction is for the tourist and sex-worker to engage in a mutually acceptable and beneficial sexual encounter. The site of Patpong is ripe for these interactions, since the space 'lays down needs' (Bell et al. 2001, p. 89). Yet Patpong is a space which sells two seemingly conflicting commodities: the transaction and sexual intimacy. The question then becomes as to where this 'smooth' element of the space of Patpong can be found, and how law can be situated in relation to it. Patpong is optically very inviting, since it is a space of neon flashes, colourfully decorated bars and naked flesh. This almost hyper-real aspect of the space is the extensive and legal space of Patpong, or the *striated*. The intensive (and *smooth*) elements of the space are excesses of affect within the space, which are haptically rather than optically perceived (Deleuze and Guattari 2004b, p. 528). The moment where the transaction is experienced haptically, where the 'matter' of the transaction is felt, is the rupture across the striated surface. This cycle of surface/rupture/surface can be demonstrated through the typical sex-work transaction, which is complexified further by the subjective lens through which it is experienced.

It is generally accepted through debates concerning the sex industry that the sex-worker tends to be the weaker party, and the one who is subordinated to the greater economic strength of the (usually Western) sex-tourist, yet there is economic and sexual strength gained by the sex-workers of Patpong. The female sex-worker usually originates from an economically poor region of Thailand, typically the North East (Wilson 2004, pp. 68–101). By moving to Bangkok and becoming a sex-worker, she will earn a comparatively large sum of money, she will also sometimes maintain a longer relationship with a Western customer, where continued relations are sustained between the sex-worker and the customer in exchange for continuous financial support, which is often passed on to the families of the sex-worker (Wilson 2004). Within these exchanges there is a reversal that destabilises the assumption of the sex-worker as subject of the transaction. On the contrary, there is almost subordination of the Western tourist, where they become the object of their own story (Boone 1995, p. 102). This subordination moves against narratives that use the tourist as the centre of movement and the one who predominantly benefits from the transaction. Wilson's text also produces a reversal of this narrative, both in that she gives the subject a voice through the textual body of the book, and also when she reports of occasions where the system is manipulated by the women that are apparently subordinated by it, since they use their sexuality and intimate capital to enhance their gains from their encounters with tourists (Wilson 2004, pp. 68–101). There is almost a suggestion that these women derive some pleasure from their encounters and almost certainly romantic (and economic) satisfaction from their

long-term relationships formed with clients.¹⁴ The sex-tourists are well-aware, especially those who form long-term relationships with sex-workers, that they need to provide adequately for the well-being of her and her family. In fact, there is a pragmatic acceptance that to maintain exclusive relations with a woman, they need to ensure that the sex-worker and the family are not going without; otherwise she is likely to engage the economic support of other men (Wilson 2004, p. 96).

The space of smoothness in the transaction emerges as not necessarily the reversal of the presumed narrative of subordination, but as the space of the *encounter* itself. In terms of effect, the expected sexual act tends to produce an element of confusion, which renders the women's bodies as bodies of contractual confusion. While the exchange that takes place provides the women with economic gain, there is also an exchange that is *formed* of, as well as based on sexual acts. This confusion flows from a moment where economic and sexual bodies collide; neither body knows whether their surface is being touched intimately or economically.

The sexual encounter itself therefore becomes a disturbing presence to the effective and striated space of the transaction. The sexual part of the exchange occurs off-site in the case of the Go-Go bar,¹⁵ despite the space being built in order to facilitate the purchase of this commodity. This shift in location for performance of the sexual act is indicative of how difficult it is to subsume material bodies that are generative of multi-directional affects into the coldness of the transaction. It seems that the striated space of the transaction cannot assimilate sensing, sexual bodies and compels bodies out of the transactional space. This apparent confrontation between affect/effect and smooth/striated produces alternative legalities; that is, micro-legalities and micro-economies emerge within the transactional space, which produce Patpong's 'economies of intimacy' (Wilson 2004, pp. 68–101), which I will now explore further.

There is a special fee that must be paid to move from a conversational encounter with a sex-worker, to a sexual one which occurs off-site (Wilson 2004). Consequently, it is only the *access* to women that is sold by the Go-Go Bar, as opposed to the sexual encounter itself (Wilson 2004, p. 85), with the main income for the bar being through the sale of drinks and the 'off' fees generated by the sex-workers employed by the bar (Wilson 2004, p. 79). It is at the point where the client expresses a desire to take the sex-worker 'off' that the sex-worker will negotiate how much she will be paid for the sexual encounter that follows. The *traditional*, legal, contractual exchange occurs on-site, in the space where the goods are viewed. Yet due to the presence of sexual, material bodies, it seems that the traditional exchange and law's effective surface becomes fragmented or, rather, it submits to the corporeal. While it is clear in this context that law is a mechanism of effect, which builds spaces of striation and *effect*, law can also be tentatively located *affectively*. Sexual encounters are more suited to the hapticity of smooth space, since sex is an encounter of tactile engagement, arousal and the exchange of bodily

¹⁴ The relationships which result from these transactions are economic and complex. My point is simply that the (economic and romantic) benefit through the transaction is not only attained by the sex-tourist.

¹⁵ See above at footnote 12.

fluids and affects. Whereas the optical (and effective) encounter that takes place with the visible flesh of the sex-worker, the neon brightness of the bar and the loudness of the music, occurs within the bar itself. The material encounter therefore creates a disturbance which fragments the law and asserts its presence through these micro-transactions that occur within this particular space. Law remains present within these transactions, since they are still transactions, but the important point to note is that it seems it is possible for law to materialise bodily presences within these transactions through a fragmented surface.

But what is to be gained from this apparent fragmentation of law? Law seems to be able to accommodate the sexual encounter within this space, yet it is perpetually caught in a transactional cycle. It is always necessary to return affects to its effective surface, which means the coldness of the transaction is *always present*. This becomes a problem when it is the single thing that is represented across the space and represents the perception of the space, since representation does not encourage change or review, 'it mediates everything but mobilizes and moves nothing' (Buchanan and Lambers 2005, p. 176). But if a representative space is our concern here, surely space can be moulded and formed by bodies which are capable of shaping effects, as Grosz suggests: 'I think that women, or gays, or other minorities, aren't "imprisoned" in or by space, because space is never fixed or contained... because space is open to how people live it' (Grosz 2001, p. 9). While the effective surface of law appears to be an obstinate presence, it is also clear from the economies of intimacy that have developed in Patpong that the surface *can* be disrupted, that is, to the extent that it can be fragmented in line with the substance of exchanges. The following section examines in greater depth how law materialises the sexual affects of the streets of Patpong, and whether the legal, effective map can be affectively located in a similar way to the transactional space.

Affective Streets

What is it that drives the sex-tourist to engage in these transactions? And if it is desire, how can this desire be connected to sexuality; that is, are the terms 'desire'/'sexuality' interchangeable, and how can either term be situated spatially and in terms of law and affect/effect?

For Deleuze, desire is not necessarily sexual, rather it is the bare force of life and flows from the idea of life as 'literally a machine' (Colebrook 2002, p. 22). Sexuality is present (although not always explicitly so) in a significant part of Deleuze's work, but the connection between desire and sexuality is most explicitly made in *Anti-Oedipus* where, with Guattari, he critiques the political colonisation of sexuality by the Freudian model of sexuality (Beckman 2011, p. 12). Yet connecting desire with sexuality is problematic since if desire is to be conceived of as a force in pursuit of something it wants, as opposed to simply moving, then we impart a false teleology to desire, we provide it with an 'end' that locates and orientates the subject (Beckman 2011, p. 12). The point at which desire is sated becomes the point that is used by the sexual subject in order to locate herself in-relation-to a range of sexualities (Beckman 2011, p. 12). Law uses sexual desire in this way by identifying

bodies and determining whether these bodies are engaged in sexual encounters that can be quantified as holding a value (or effect) that can be assessed as legally permitted; whereas corporeal sexual materiality is inclined towards a volatile state of flux (Grosz 1994). The range of sexual encounters that are permitted in law are provided through law's inclination towards easily readable categories and identities. In order to relocate sexuality as fluid, and in line with Deleuzian desire, it must be disconnected from the search for pleasure and the search for readable encounters. In Patpong, it is possible to observe legal, effective, desire, which is used to locate and orientate the subjectivity of the sex-tourist, yet it is also possible to reconnect sexuality with desire through the affects generated by the smoothness of the streets of Patpong.

Patpong can also be thought of as a body that is subject to the force of desire. Deleuze writes in his work on Spinoza that a body can: 'be anything; it can be an animal, a body of sounds, a mind or an idea; it can be a linguistic corpus, a social body, a collectivity' (Deleuze 1988, p. 127). This body is capable of being subject to the violent flux of desire, but we must remember that this body is carefully constructed by law in order to facilitate the effective encounter that is the transaction. The streets of Patpong 1 and 2 are constructed to appeal to predominantly heterosexual men, since there are bars that are easily accessed, which are filled with easily available women; there are different women at different bars; they are lined up caressing poles; and all of them are visible to the client entering the bar (Wilson 2010). As mentioned in the previous section, this is a space constructed by law to facilitate a transaction, which also provides the 'end' or orientating point for desire, by sexualising the space in a particularly heteronormative way. However, we know that sexuality is material and volatile, which means that the sexuality of the spatial body *cannot* be stabilised; the space cannot remain a heterosexual space since it desires, and desire, even sexual desire, is not only heterosexual. So what affect does this produce on the bodies that encounter this volatile spatial body?

Desire is inhabited by a 'Non-Human sex', or 'a microscopic transsexuality, resulting in the woman containing as many men as the man, and the man as many women, all capable of entering...into relations of production of desire that overturn the statistical order of the sexes' (Deleuze and Guattari 2004a, p. 325). Desire is comprised of independent particles which are transient and can run counter (although not necessarily) to heteronormative sexuality. This conception of desire reveals a fluid sexuality that flows outside of predetermined zones, or legally categorised identities and sexualities (Grosz 1994). Legally aggregated sexualities become mere intersections across a potentially infinite range of sexes and sexualities—*desiring-machines or the nonhuman sex: not one or even two sexes, but n sexes* (Deleuze and Guattari 2004a, p. 325). This scale opens up a terrain of potential sexual combinations; it is simply a case of acknowledging and remembering and exploring the potential in forgetting the legally established order of sexualities. Once Patpong's desire is conceived of as embodied in this way, it becomes necessary to accept that it will produce sexually diverse affects and movements in the bodies that encounter it, which are observed by Wilson in her study of the space.

Wilson observes occasions where a heterosexual couple or lesbian purchases the services of a female sex-worker,¹⁶ as well as occasions where a male or transsexual/transgender sex-worker is purchased by a heterosexual or homosexual single customer or couple. All these customers are different to the traditionally structured transactional encounter of heterosexual male and female sex-worker. It is also the case that it is easy to wander from one area of Patpong to another; that is, while intending to remain in a part of the space that is constructed for one particular appetite, it is easy to wander accidentally into a space that caters for another. This could be attributed to accident, or to an inclination to explore different terrain. This wandering and variance in types of transaction are actualised through movement which is produced by Patpong's capacity to draw out other ways of moving through its desiring self-causality. Law creates a single trajectory of sexual effect through the heteronormativity of the space, which is also indicative of the law's attempt to fortify the connection between sexual desire and its end, thereby depriving it of its inherent vitality. Yet in being subject to the flux of desire, the space emanates a pan-sexual affect which induces new connections and crossings from within itself, which do not necessarily accord with the directions assigned by law's transactional striation of the space. Although orientating sexual transactions still take place, the *range* of transactions and the range of crossings and movement is increased through the presence of desiring affect produced by the seemingly overly striated and effective streets of Patpong. The following section examines more closely the affect that Patpong's sexual body has on the desiring bodies that walk its streets.

Affective Bodies

Through effect, law constructs a range of sexualities which must be performed by bodies. I have said that sexuality tends to transgress legally imposed sexual and spatial boundaries, but what is the material nature of the body that makes it inclined to do so? When thinking about sexuality from the point of view of legally constructed identity, the sexual body is static and is compartmentalised into readable representations of heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual and so on. There is no room for shades of sexuality, or for experimentation without law reconstituting the outcome as deviance. Yet the body is inclined to experiment with sexuality, with sexual experiences producing a transient sexual identity, as Storer suggests: 'the self is not static, but is continuously re-defined in one's experiences in interactions with others' (Storer 1999, p. 144). In other words, the sexual self is always open to be affected by the experience of other bodies.

For Deleuze and Guattari, each material body is able to redefine itself continuously through the immanence of its Body without Organs, which is a bodily strata that allows us to erase sexual representation and to drift into

¹⁶ See Wilson (2004, p. 71), although Wilson states that the women sex-workers say it is usually the male part of the couple that initiates these kind of encounters, which could be due to the man taking the lead in the encounter or even pressuring his partner into the scenario, it is also the case that these encounters can have a bisexual dynamic, both in terms of a female-male couple seeking the company of a female sex-worker, or a female-male couple seeking a transsexual/transgender or male sex-worker.

polysexuality, or any sexuality or no sexuality, allowing the destination (if there is one) to be attained via interaction and encounter—it *produces nothing other than itself* (Deleuze and Guattari 2004b, p. 262). The potential within the Body without Organs is virtual, but can be actualised by the body through collisions and encounters with other bodies via becomings across the sliding scale of the n sexes of the Non-Human sex, while always being receptive and reactive to the affect of other bodies. It is important to note at this point that the Body without Organs is not a separate body; rather, it is the body of affect that is immanent in legal representations of the body, and also has the power to confront these representations, as Williams suggests: ‘[affect] is also a kind of force or power that courses through and beyond subjects’ (Blackman 2012, p. 16). It is a body that is within the legal body, resting at indeterminate points across the affect/effect continuum, pushing at law’s surficial, effective and incorporeal boundary.

There are particular bodies that are present within Patpong which demonstrate the kind of wandering and drifting polysexual potential of this body of affect. Storer presents a confrontation to traditional male/female representations of identity via the ‘Kathoei’, or transsexual/transgender identity in Thailand (Storer 1999). It can be argued that this confrontation can be seen as further reinforcement of the disembodied legal origin of the human sexes by reconfiguring gender into further, albeit more developed categories. However, these bodies represent a destabilising force to law’s identifying categories (Moran et al. 1998, p. 27) by pushing against the boundaries of law’s disembodied enactments of identification. The Kathoei identity is indicative of fluidity between the genders in Thai culture and encourages recognition of the responsiveness of bodies to affect. The first step in rendering the body receptive to this power of affect is to recognise that disembodied legal dichotomies such as gender can be destabilised and established as precarious—*Let’s go further still... we haven’t sufficiently dismantled our self* (Deleuze and Guattari 2004b, p. 167). The Kathoei as an identity could be argued to represent one that captures the wandering nature of the body, but how can this seemingly transient subjectivity be thought of as enfolding, or as being affected by, the space of Patpong?

Near Patpong 1 and 2, there is a street known as ‘Soi Kathoei’, or sometimes it is known as Patpong 3. It is predominantly a site where bisexual or homosexual men participate in sexual transactions. Again, the sexuality of the streets of Patpong is apparently demarcated, yet there are nascent appearances of fluidity between the areas, since it is easy to wander from one area to another without realising and to find yourself between the streets or repeatedly crossing spatial boundaries. As a Body without Organs, Patpong becomes its smooth space, or space of affect. This spatial pool of potentials is the domain of trajectory as opposed to points of departure and arrival, as Deleuze and Guattari write: ‘one “distributes” oneself in an open space, according to the frequencies and in the course of one’s crossings’ (Deleuze and Guattari 2004b, p. 167). This space leads bodies to move *in accordance* with moments of affect; one does not decide to move, say, from point A to point B. Rather, one just *moves* and is constantly realigned by encounters with the space and other bodies.

Patpong is predominantly known as a space of heterosexual sex-work transactions and it is a space that the sex-tourist is easily able to recognise as heterosexual space; it is a space of overwhelming heterosexuality, as Binnie writes: ‘heterosexual space and heterosexual desire are all-pervasive-just *there*. Heterosexual identity is ubiquitous and thereby *placeless*’ (Bell et al. 2001, p. 107). Yet Patpong also creates a different kind of space which is constituted through the affects brought about by its desires and its Body without Organs. Binnie’s construction of homosexual pleasure grounds as ephemeral can be adapted to fit the burgeoning fluidity of Patpong’s sexual space. Binnie describes this kind of space as a ‘soft’ space (being the domain of the gay imagination), and a departure from placeless heterosexual space (Bell et al. 2001, p. 108). The advantage of these soft spaces is that they are constructed by desire, and they move with desire and are unexpectedly constituted through the movements of the desiring bodies of Patpong itself, as well as sex-tourists and sex-workers (Bell et al. 2001, p. 108).

The force of desire and the fluidity of the body produce affects and the body of Patpong produces affects; the result of which is the emergence of spaces constituted by desire, such as crossings (spaces between) and the spaces of the ‘Kathoe’y’. These spaces are spaces of affect, yet their constitution results from crossing the thresholds set by the *effectivity* of law. These thresholds are imposed as instruments of legal orientation and subjectivation, yet they can also be considered reflexive and are productively confronted through the presence of affect. At this point it becomes necessary to examine further the potential for law as a presence within subjectivity to be confronted by affectivity; that is, can legal subjectivity in Patpong be thought of as affectively located?

Affective Sexuality

Law must ensure that gender and sexual identity are static, lest subjects escape and become disruptive to the intransigence of law’s surface. Disruptive presences such as the ‘Kathoe’y’ seem to cause a breakdown in legal reasoning (Moran et al. 1998, p. 33) and law is affectively confronted through the presence of the ‘Kathoe’y’ and through the presence of spaces of affect. The ‘Kathoe’y’ identity could be seen as the embodiment of a productive terrain of sexual experience and experiment, since the destabilising force that the identity creates becomes a space in which another starting point can be established; that is, an alternative point from which law tells us to begin. But is there something which is hidden by law; is there a material truth that is enfolded? Mussawir writes, ‘There may, in fact, be no such underlying truth, but the search itself which makes up the narrative, introduces the reader to the possibility of surveying another secret...level of sexual relations’ (Mussawir 2011, p. 46). The search for this secret level of relations is without narrative; rather it is an experience of openness of one’s body, to other bodies, to the affects of other bodies: ‘knowing how to love does not mean remaining a man or a woman; it means extracting from one’s sex the particles, the speeds, the slownesses, the flows, the *n sexes*’ (Beckman 2011, p. 87). In other words, the way to experience embodied sexuality is to give oneself over to experience. The ‘Kathoe’y’ body appears to be

such an open body, a body that is affected and effectively changed, yet the question remains as to whether it is productive or even desirable to leave one's body open in this way, to the transformative power of affect.

One way of opening the sexual subject to the transformative power of affect could be through a sexual encounter with multiple bodies. This is a tantalising sexual manifestation to explore in this context, since on the surface it appears to remove the demarcating legal affect of the streets of Patpong; it brings all the bodies into one space. There are no spatial crossings required, while it simultaneously takes the affect of spatial crossings to their limit in a mutual becoming of bodies in one place. It also provides an effective way in which to consider the law de-actualising potential of the sexual act itself. The encounter produces fluidity; bodies merge seamlessly, organs connect all over the place, *people (be)come everywhere*; it is a scenario rich with sexual experience capable of actualising bodily potential. The openness brought about by this encounter allows bodies to affect each other in richly sensual ways. There might be heterosexual becomings, homosexual becomings and variations thereof: there is a mutual becoming of each individual. The openness and ease that these kind of becomings occur embraces the wandering and morphing that is inherent within sexual desire and the Body without Organs. However, what the encounter does not do is remove the subjectivised boundaries since once again we are presented with an affirmation of law's subject orientation, 'the sexes... [remain] statistical, aggregate or "molar" on this level' (Mussawir 2011, p. 46). It must therefore be questioned as to whether the binary position can ever be overturned. It seems it cannot, even in such a ménage; rather, the sexual actuality can 'be(come) more or less rhizomatic, molecular, minoritarian, smooth...' (Nunes 2010, p. 117).

Instead, it is a matter of rearranging in an encounter with multiple bodies; it is not an act of concocting endless combinations and ways of combining but, rather, sexuality's radical potential is reached through the *action* of rearranging. The bodies of the Kathoey are bodies of rearrangement, and despite the movement of their identity being in recognition of legal points (male/female), their bodies are one possible actualised combination of the act of rearranging potential of the body, where their sex can be understood as 'dyadic', where 'neither is desirable' (Nunes 2010, p. 112). The Kathoey is the very embodiment of the encounter between (*or as*) multiple bodies, where the potential within the Body without Organs to connect with either sex is actualised, in any combination, through the act of 'rearranging' our subjectivities and forgetting the orientating points attributed to desire by law.

Affective Confrontations

At the beginning, I said that I would attempt to situate law within the complex dynamics of affective bodies in Patpong. This is no easy task, since affects emanate from material bodies, material spatial bodies, and encounters between them. All of these affects are forces of incoherence against a system of law that is inclined to reduce these affects to effect, which denatures the material character of the body or event. In trying to locate law precisely in this complex mist of affectivity, it is impossible to avoid an act of reduction. That is, the affectivity of this textual space

must be reduced in order to make sense of it. It is clear throughout this text's encounter with Patpong that law is an *effective* device; that is, it must reduce bodies and encounters to those which can be recognised within a system of effect. In this way, the effectivity of law is diffuse; bodies are provided with a surface through which to encounter each other, which in turn, builds an encounter that affirms legal subjectivation. Law provides bodies with a surface through which to encounter one another, albeit these surfaces are reflexive and open to disturbances brought about by the volatile material affect of the body, and of the spaces which become part of it. Situated in this space of disturbance there are four ways in which law is confronted by the bodies and spaces of Patpong.

First, the transaction that facilitates the exchange of sex for money in Patpong is characteristic of law's effective surface. This is an example of an encounter of effect, as it reduces relations between bodies to a legal encounter (as opposed to a material encounter). This encounter is produced through the arrangement of the space, which is constituted of striated and smooth elements. When the space is literally *viewed* by virtue of its striated qualities, one encounters a space constructed by and for the transaction. This space is highly optical and draws in the tourist through exchange and consumption. The moment of confrontation emerges in the domain of smooth space, which is the space of *affect*, as opposed to effect, it is *haptic* as opposed to optical. The distinction between the two kinds of space is vital in terms of characterising this first confrontation. This confrontation occurs by virtue of the subject of the transaction; the sexual encounter. The encounter is more suited to the smooth space of affect, which is due to its tactile and physically corporeal qualities. The encounter itself exposes the productivity of spaces of affect, as well as becoming a disruptive presence. Law can be situated both as part of the transactional surface and at the point where smooth must always be returned to striated, or where affect becomes effect. Yet the presence of the sexual encounter also produces micro-transactions, which appear to align themselves in the space of the encounter itself. *These micro-transactions represent the power of the encounter and the space to disrupt the surface, but law is still able to subsume these affects into effect, yet the surface is always exposed to the fragmenting affect of affect.*

Second, desire is a self-driving perpetual force which is devoid of perspective. It can be aligned with sexuality, but such a sexuality must be non-human in order to accord with the nature of desire. Patpong is a spatial body and its sexuality is determined by law through the specific transactional effective encounters which constitute the character of the effective (and striated) surface of the spatial body. Yet this spatial body is subject to the flux of its desire, which produces an affect which transgresses the transactional boundaries imposed by law. The spatial body of Patpong demonstrates its fluid sexual desire through affects that it generates that are manifest in sexual crossings produced and drawn out of other bodies. Yet these crossings will never be far from the functional specificity of the space; the sexual desire of the space and the affects (and encounters) it creates are always subsumed within the space of legal effect. *Patpong's desiring body produces affects which force re-orientation in terms of the sexuality of the space and produces a spatial law receptive to affect.*

Third, in the same way as sexual desire, the material body brings about disturbances to law's bodily surface. Heteronormative sexual identity is imposed on both the spatial body of Patpong, as well as the bodies that move within it. This sexual identity is an act of legal effect in itself, and is enacted through the spatial construction of transactional encounters. This identity and prescribed movement can be recognised as aspects of the law's 'organism' or organised body. Despite this apparent act of violence, the organism and any bodily configuration holds immanent potential to rearrange itself through its Body without Organs. The Body without Organs can be conceived of as the body's inherent receptive openness to affect, that is, affect produced by other bodies and Patpong's spatial body. *These affects produce a moment of confrontation to law's effectivity since they are able to draw the body out of, and past, its legally attributed surface through the power of encounter.*

Finally, the bodies of the Kathoey emerge as perhaps the most violent confrontation to legal effect. These bodies create affects within the space of Patpong, but they also embody the destabilising affect of the sexual encounter. This encounter is a destabilising force in terms of the transaction, as highlighted in the first confrontation. The Kathoey are productive bodies in that they demonstrate *why* the encounter is such a destabilising force of affect. Despite the fact that law tends to view sex as productive only where it results in pleasure with a particular kind of body, the materiality of the encounter is such that it is more inclined to wandering instability. The bodies of the Kathoey are also unstable bodies, to the point where they become a force of incoherence in relation to legal categorisation. The materiality of the sexual encounter is inclined towards wandering openness, yet it tends always to be performed in recognition of disembodied points. The Kathoey body is a body of rearrangement, which both recognises and disturbs sexual identity. *The Kathoey body represents an embodied and unstable form of sexual subjectivity, which enfolds the affects and instability of other material and spatial bodies.*

Acknowledgments I would like to thank Andreas Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos for his comments on drafts of this article, and for his patience and thoughtful engagement with my work.

References

- Beckman, Frida (ed.). 2011. *Deleuze and sex*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bell, David, et al. 2001. *Pleasure zones*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Berkowitz, Eric. 2012. *Sex and punishment: Four thousand years of judging desire*. London: The Westbourne Press.
- Blackman, Lisa. 2012. *Immaterial bodies*. London: Sage.
- Boone, Joseph. 1995. Vacation cruises: Or, the homoerotics of orientalism. *Modern Language Association* 110: 89–107.
- Braidotti, Rosi, et al. (eds.). 2009. *Deleuze and law: Forensic futures*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buchanan, Ian, and Gregg Lambers (eds.). 2005. *Deleuze and space*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Colebrook, Claire. 2002. *Understanding Deleuze*. Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1988. *Spinoza: Practical philosophy* (trans. Hurley, R.) San Francisco: City Light Books.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 2004a. *Difference and repetition* (trans. Patton, P.). London: Continuum.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 2004b. *The logic of sense* (trans. M. Lester with C. Stivale). London: Continuum.

- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. 2004a. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (trans. Hurley, R. et al.). London: Continuum.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. 2004b. *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*, (trans. Massumi, B.). London: Continuum.
- Doezema, Jo. 2010. *Sex slaves and discourse masters*. London: Zed Books.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. 1994. *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. 2001. *Architecture from the outside: Essays on virtual and real space*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Krafft, Peter, and Peter Adey. 2008. Architecture/affect/inhabitation: Geographies of being in buildings. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98(1): 213–231.
- Massey, Doreen. 1994. *Space, place and gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Moran, Leslie, et al. (eds.). 1998. *Legal queries*. London: Cassell.
- Mussawir, Edward. 2011. *Jurisdiction in Deleuze: The expression and representation of law*. London: Routledge.
- Neeley, Brooke, and Michelle Samura. 2011. Social geographies of race: Connecting race and space. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(11): 1933–1952.
- Nunes, Rodrigo. 2010. Politics in the middle: For a political interpretation of the dualisms in Deleuze and Guattari. *Deleuze Studies* 4: 104–126.
- Parr, Adrian (ed.). 2010. *The Deleuze dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Peel, Edwin. 2007. *The law of contract*. London: Sweet and Maxwell.
- Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, Andreas. 2010. Spatial justice: Law and the geography of withdrawal. *International Journal of Law in Context* 6(3): 201–216.
- Storer, Graeme. 1999. Rehearsing gender and sexuality in modern Thailand. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services* 9(2–3): 141–159.
- Wilson, Ara. 2004. *The intimate economies of Bangkok: Tomboys, tycoons and Avon ladies in the global city*. California: University of California Press.
- Wilson, Ara. 2010. Post-Fordist desires: The commodity aesthetics of Bangkok sex shows. *Feminist Legal Studies* 18: 53–67.