Published as Hegarty, P. (2011). Becoming curious: An introduction to the special issue on Queer Theory and Psychology. *Psychology and Sexuality*, 2, 1-3.

I have already drafted and thrown away two introductions to this special issue. In the first, I attempted to write a mini-history of the lack of engagement between psychology and queer theory. I anchored it in Minton's (1997) call for psychologists to look to queer theory for new lessons about emancipation, identity politics, ethics and participatory research. I was going to talk about the few essays that took up that call and applied it to issues such as methodology (Warner, 2004), prejudice (Hegarty & Massey, 2006), counselling (Moon, 2008) and who interrogated that work for race privilege (Riggs, 2007). I could not make myself happy with that introduction, and the unhappiness was not of a useful sort. No matter what I wrote, the introduction kept suggesting that a burden was placed on psychologists to create a 'queer psychology'. Mindful that I had written essays along those lines before (Hegarty, 2001, 2007, 2009), I thought that the essays in this collection deserved something better than the repetition of an earlier argument that had inspired much disinterest. I was not content to let things rest there.

My second attempt had a bit more bite to it. It was inspired by reading the introduction to Halperin and Traub's (2008) edited collection *Gay Shame*, which the authors had generously mailed me some time ago. After finally finding the time to dip into it, I was struck by the theme of 'shame', a psychological category if ever there was one – and by the reference on the first page of the first essay by Eve Sedgwick to Silvan Tomkins, a psychologist if ever there was one. I was going to use these shards to initiate a different mini-history about the limits of queer theory's engagement with psychology. I had great ambition to use Hook's (2001) excellent work on the uses and misuses of Foucault by psychologists and to revisit Butler's (1990) critique of the 'heterosexual matrix' in psychoanalytic discourse and its influence on my own thinking about claims about the 'gay brain' (Hegarty, 1997). I was going to hold up Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's essay *How to bring your kids up gay* as a sign that a queer psychology was always imminent within queer theory, even if it was never quite named as such. In my weaker moments, I honed some fine bars for humanities scholars, arguing that *they* needed psychology as a site of engagement to retain the criticality of queer theory. I was beginning to feel quite smug, and not in the least bit shamed. And so, I was not content to let things rest there either.

Then, as luck would have it, I was undone by an unplanned and unrelated conversation with someone who reminded me about the pleasures of curiosity. The gift of her conversation moved me on from attempts to privilege one area (whether 'queer' or 'psychology') over the other and from my own anxious desires to narrate a history of their past relationship in which to position the current special issue. I threw away both introductions. I decided instead to foreground the value of psychology and queer theory and the value of [page 2] their having been curious about each other in the past and of remaining curious to each other now.

The articles in this special issue take the time to notice the ways that queer theory and psychology can be made more intimate, but they do not lose the sense of unfamiliarity between queer theory and psychology in the process. All of them have engaged my curiosity about both areas, and I am hopeful that they will have similar effects on other readers, who might be invested in one of those fields, in both or in neither. By now, statements about the tensions between queer theory's rejection of identity and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT)-affirmative projects – such as LGBT psychology – are commonplace. They could even be described as 'paradigmatic' in Kuhnian terms (Kuhn, 1970) as they have now appeared in the first textbook of LGBT psychology (Clarke, Ellis, Peel, & Riggs, 2010). The authors who wrote for this special issue wrote from positions as different as those grounded in clinical and counselling work (e.g. Balick, Hodges, Riggs and

Semp, this volume) to those of 'two arts and humanities scholars with an expertise in queer theory' (Downing & Gillett, this volume) to those of us who jumped in without making our stakes perfectly clear (e.g. Hegarty, Roen, this volume).

Lisa Downing and Robert Gillett revisit and complicate Minton's (1997) historical narrative of the overlapping histories of queer theory and psychology, concluding with the challenges of the recent anti-social turn in queer theory for psychology's ethics. The two articles that engage with psychoanalytic practice reach very different conclusions. Ian Hodges argues that queer theory 'provides the tools . . . to prize open the workings of psychoanalysis both as theory and analytic technique'. Aaron Balick sees queer theory's critique of psychoanalysis as more limited and holds out hope for a response in psychoanalysis that ontologises a more relational subject. Two further articles engage with clinical practice. Damien Riggs offers several examples of how queer theory informs the positioning of a therapist at work, and David Semp examines what queer theory can say about the norm to 'match' clients and therapists by sexual identity. Katrina Roen explains how puberty-suppressing hormonal therapies for children who do not fit 'cisgenderist' norms (Ansara, in press) continue to mitigate bringing your kids up gay, and I argue that there has always been a queer anxiety inherent in the norm to bring your kids up gifted. The special issue ends with two book reviews by Rusi Jaspal and Nicole Vitellone on recent books by Damien Riggs and David Halperin.

In different ways, each author prompts my curiosity about those transformative moments when psychology is looked at through the lenses of queer theory. I say 'transformative' because it seems that psychology is not quite the same – in theory or in practice – when viewed from this vantage point. 'Queering psychology' has seemed to some of the authors here – as it did to Minton (1997) – to be a project that deserved our curiosity because of the possibility of transforming business-as-usual in psychology. The essays contained herein give equal cause for curiosity about a shift in the 'proper objects' of critical studies of sexuality (Butler, 1994). Halperin (2009, p. 17) describes three moves by which queer theory calcified its objects. First, 'theory' became the dominant term and not 'queer' so that the impulse was confined to literary and cultural studies. Second, there was a de-specifying of the LGBT content of 'queer' such that queer theory became – as Kitzinger and Wilkinson (1994) feared it would – a trendy nonnormative version of liberal. Third, queer remained a theory and not a discipline, presenting no challenge to the traditional map of the disciplines.

To the extent that Halperin is right, a queering of psychology would break apart the disciplinary formation of queer theory in quite useful ways. Indeed, the project of this special issue suggests that he may have described with some accuracy the ways that queer [page 3] theory is curtailing its range. Meg Barker, Darren Langdridge and I initially conceived this project as an edited book, but our proposal was rejected by one publisher, in part, on the grounds that the essays roamed too far beyond critical psychology and psychoanalysis, the zones with which queer theorists could be expected to be most familiar. We continued on in the hopes that the potential for curiosity about psychology among queer theorists had been underestimated. Psychology and queer theory have made very different objects out of gender, sexuality, race, health, embodiment, normality and – more recently – temporality, disability, the child and shame. All three of us hope the special issue engenders curiosity about how this might have happened, and how things might happen otherwise from diverse readers.

Peter Hegarty
University of Surrey

References

- Ansara, Y.G. (in press). Beyond cisgenderism; counselling people with affirmed gender identities. In L.T. Moon (Ed.), *Counselling ideologies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1994). Against proper objects. *Differences*, 6(2–3), 1–26.
- Clarke, V., Ellis, S.J., Peel, E., & Riggs, D.W. (2010). *Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, & queer psychology: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Halperin, D.M., & Traub, V. (2008). Why gay shame now? In D.M. Halperin & V. Traub (Eds.), *Gay shame* (pp. 3–41). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hegarty, P. (2007). What comes after discourse analysis for LGBTQ psychology? In E.A. Peel and V.C. Clarke (Eds.) *Out in psychology: LGBTQ Perspectives* (pp. 41–57). Chichester: Wiley and Sons.
- Hegarty, P. (2009). Queering lesbian and gay psychology's coming of age: Was history just kid stuff? In M O'Rourke and N. Giffney (Eds.) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Queer Theory* (514–544). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Hegarty, P. & Massey, S. (2006). Anti-homosexual prejudice...as opposed to what?: Queer theory and the social psychology of anti-homosexual prejudice. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 52, 47–71.
- Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis. *Theory & Psychology*, 11, 521–547. 110
- Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (1994). Virgins and queers: Rehabilitative heterosexuality. *Gender & Society*, 8, 444–463.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Minton, H. (1997). Queer theory: Historical roots and implications for psychology. *Theory and Psychology*, 7, 337–353.
- Moon, L.T. (2008). *Feeling queer or queer feelings: Radical approaches to counselling sex, sexualities and genders*. London: Routledge.
- Riggs, D.W. (2007). Queer theory and its future in psychology; exploring issues of race privilege. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 39–52.
- Sedgwick, E.K (2008). Shame, theatricality and queer performativity: Henry James's *The Art of the Novel*. In D.M. Halperin & V. Traub (Eds.), *Gay shame* (pp. 49–62). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Warner, D.N. (2004). Towards a queer research methodology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1, 321–337.