In the past twenty years, what is (in)discriminately called the “Arab world” has witnessed a surge of various foreign investigations pertaining to the domain of human rights. After seemingly unending research on the issue of the woman and the veil in the Arab world, a new hot topic emerged with the birth of various LGBTQ and feminist organizations in the MENA region. The former marks the beginning of a neo-orientalist race to the region; the latter, however, indicates the well-documented shift from saving women to saving gays, which destabilizes the triangular relationship of savior to saved from mean bearded Arab men. Because of its flourishing community and its reputation as the “safest” gateway in “that part of the world,” Beirut has been the particular target of the race for case studies on queer natives. Helem, Meem, and Nasawiya, three organizations that center their work on queer and feminist issues respectively, constantly receive e-mails and visits from (in the case of this paper) American academics, journalists, and artists wanting to interview the “gays” or the “feminists” of the Middle-East for a newspapers article, a thesis, or a documentary. It is undeniable that the local queer and feminist movements are not impervious to the influence of Western knowledge production, which allows them in turn to produce the researchers as white Americans endowed with inexhaustible savior mentality. On the other hand, the interest that queer bodies in the MENA region provoke is instigated by the oxymoron it presents to some and the desire to lend an indulgent voice to the “oppressed.” This paper seeks to explore the different articulations of queerness in transnational encounters between researchers and queer/feminist bodies in 2004-2013 Beirut. By analyzing Western research conducted on gay and feminist communities in Lebanon in opposition to local texts, it will think of the contrapuntal reading entailed by the haptic space created and will offer a critique of Said’s contrapuntalism that, in that case, remains trapped in a novel binary of a queer “East” versus “West.” Although both parties produce divergent narratives of the same events, it will be proposed that they also produce each other alternately and continuously, thus normativizing the queer subject by entanglement in a complex web of privileges. The pretense to a discourse of purity or one-dimensional truth can be dismantled by thinking of Kristeva’s intertextuality in the process of knowledge and meaning production.