Queer Studies in the House of Anthropology

Tom Boellstorff

Department of Anthropology, University of California, Irvine, California 92697;
email: tboellst@uci.edu

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2007. 36:17–35

First published online as a Review in Advance on April 4, 2007

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:
10.1146/annurev.anthro.36.081406.094421

0084-6570/07/1021-0017$20.00

Key Words

gay, lesbian, homosexuality, sexuality, gender

Abstract

This review examines anthropological research on sexuality published in English since 1993, focusing on work addressing lesbian women, gay men, and transgendered persons, as well as on the use of history, linguistics, and geography in such research. Reviewing the emergence of regional literatures, it investigates how questions of globalization and the nation have moved to the forefront of anthropological research on questions of sexuality. The essay asks how questions of intersectionality, inclusion, and difference have shaped the emergence of a queer anthropology or critical anthropology of sexuality, with special reference to the relationship between sexuality and gender.

ON THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF A NAME

In 1993, the *Annual Review of Anthropology* published a groundbreaking article by Kath Weston entitled "Lesbian/Gay Studies in the House of Anthropology." Weston noted that the essay's inclusion represented "an institutionalizing move" for an "emergent domain of inquiry" with a long but largely hidden history and its share of debate (Weston 1993, p. 340). Appearing 14 years after Weston's article, this review could be taken to signify the further consolidation of a once-emergent field. Yet Weston's concerns remain pertinent. Once at the center of anthropological theorizing (Lyons & Lyons 2004), sexuality deserves a less marginal place than it occupies today with regard to topics of anthropological interest ranging from postcoloniality to globalization, from embodiment to technology.

There is no more symptomatic, productive, and vexing starting point for this discussion than the impossibility of naming the very subject of study this review addresses. This impossibility constitutes not a problem to be solved but a kind of syntax error or event horizon reflecting the complexity of the subject under consideration. This is a question of disciplinarity as much as subject matter: For instance, when talking about so-called non-Western sexualities, we are often talking about the politics of recognition in the American university at the same time. Work on the anthropology of sexuality is now often enrolled into forms of queer politics in a manner reminiscent of how the anthropology of women began to be used in forms of feminist politics a generation ago. The phrase "lesbian and gay," employed by Weston in 1993, remains in circulation (for instance, the American Anthropological Association's Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists), but many within and beyond the academy now feel the phrase omits important categories of identity. This concern originates in key questions about intersectionality, inclusion, and difference discussed at the end of this article, questions deferred rather than resolved by additional identity categories and "the affective appeal of acronyms" (Kulick 2000, p. 244). To add "B" for "bisexual" only highlights the need to add "T" for "transgender," but the temporary stability of "LGBT" is soon compromised by "I" for "intersexed," and so forth.

In titling this review "Queer Studies in the House of Anthropology," I have chosen a parsimonious terminological handle that situates the essay in relation to Weston while indexing the impact of the growing body of work known as "queer studies," some of it produced by anthropologists. Many anthropologists and others do not like the term queer "because it reminds them so strongly of homophobia and oppression" (Graham 1998, p. 106). However, even those who reject it must acknowledge the influence of queer studies on "lesbian and gay anthropology," even if they disagree with that influence. Another workable title might be "The Critical Anthropology of Sexuality," but I fear such a title casts its referential net too broadly, implying an deeper engagement with feminist anthropology than the scope of this article allows.

An additional concern with my chosen title could be that it lumps together women and men, thereby passing over the experiences of women. It is true that ostensibly ungendered uses of "man"—more specifically, "gay"—have overgeneralized in the past, and overgeneralization can and does occur with some uses of "queer." However, for two reasons I find this concern unconvincing as a general principle. First, although I do not have the space to discuss them here—focused as it is on anthropology—a range of queer feminisms and queer-of-color critiques insist on the relevance of "queer" beyond the situated knowledge practices of gay white men (e.g., Ferguson 2003, Johnson & Henderson 2005, Rodríguez 2003). A second reason, one that strikes at the heart of the theoretical conundrum at hand, is that some rejections of "queer" originate in an implicit disavowal of overarching categories in social analysis. According to what I term a logic of enumeration,

political and theoretical efficacy can exist only through naming each category of selfhood or experience: women, men, transgendered persons; gender, race, class, sexuality, disability; etc. The failure to enumerate becomes a de facto sin of omission. I suggest that this logic of enumeration (parodied in the title of Weston 1996) is part of the conceptual framework that makes it impossible to name this review's subject of study. The question is not just the degree to which a particular piece of research is inclusive, but how assuming a unilinear scale of inclusion structures theoretical agendas.

This logic of enumeration thus points toward a frontier for further research analogous to the project of transcending ethnocartography—"looking for evidence of same-sex sexuality and gendered ambiguity in 'other societies'" (Weston 1993, p. 341)—more than a decade ago. Weston felt "ethnocartography," which she saw as a kind of sexual cartography, was limiting because it originated in a documentary impulse where "the researcher's theoretical perspectives remain embedded in apparently straightforward reports from the field. In effect, the absence of theory becomes the submersion of theory" (p. 344). The problem with a logic of enumeration is that, like ethnocartography, it works through deferring theorization. It presumes that concepts name preexisting entities and relations, rather than asking how the social is produced and sustained through acts of representation, including scholarly and activist representation. In place of ethnocartography, one can see encouraging signs of a "critical empiricism," by which I mean an approach that although not fetishizing "data" nevertheless demands that theorizations be accountable to their subjects of study. To those in the academy who wish to speak about the actual lives of persons embodied in specific historical, cultural, and material contexts, this critical empiricism asks after the relations of adequation between any theorization and the discursive realities it claims to interpret. Could a critical empiricism help move us beyond not just ethnocartography, but also the logic of enumeration?

Concerns about the validity and inclusiveness of "queer" reflect not just conflicts over how to interpret this or that piece of ethnographic data, but generational approaches to academic disciplinarity and the politics of recognition in the American academy and the wider world. This recalls Robyn Wiegman's interest in "the agonized conversations about feminism's generational transmission" (Wiegman 2004, p. 164), particularly because the anthropology of gender laid many of the conditions of possibility for an anthropology of sexuality. It did so not just analytically (through feminist theory, for instance), but also by creating institutional conditions of possibility where anthropologists of sexuality and/or anthropologists who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, or queer could imagine a future for themselves in the university (Newton 2000). That these conversations are about institutional contexts as much as the fieldsite explains why naming the subject of study is so difficult: It includes "us," the anthropologists, as knowledge producers as well as embodied individuals.

Writing this review is a great honor but also a bit of a thankless job: I cannot please all possible audiences, nor can I claim any closure or comprehensiveness. This fact is not only because of my own limitations and the protean character of the subject under discussion, but because the current *Annual Review of Anthropology* format places strict limits on word count and references. This forces a helpful concision but imposes painful choices on which works to cite. To make these choices as systematic as possible, I employ the following rubric, with only minor exceptions. The most difficult decision has been to include only works published in English. I would, for instance, dearly like to cite many scholars writing in Indonesian, but there is no way to do so with any pretense of fairness on a global scale. The danger this poses is that it can easily be taken to locate theoretical and methodological innovation in the Anglo-American world,

save for those "non-Western" scholars who can publish in English (and often from centers of academic production located in the United States). Other difficult decisions include not citing any work already referenced in Weston's (1993) review or Morris's (1995) review essay, "All Made Up: Performance Theory and the New Anthropology of Sex and Gender." I cite almost exclusively works published since 1993, referring readers interested in pre-1993 references to the review essays by Weston and Morris (and also Davis & Whitten 1987, Fitzgerald 1977, Gutmann 1997, Visweswaran 1997). Although I cite a number of nonanthropologists, I emphasize ethnographically informed works by anthropologists. When possible I cite only one work by any author and do not name all the important contributions within a particular edited volume. My research touches on many issues examined in this review, but with two exceptions I will not cite my own work, encouraging readers to refer to my two monographs on sexuality in Indonesia (Boellstorff 2005, 2007). Even with these conditions, creating a list of roughly 150 references has been a frustrating and humbling experience. My goal is to spur debate and encourage readers to engage the growing body of literature from which I draw the subset discussed in this review article.[1]

ANTHROPOLOGIES OF FEMALE DESIRE, TRANSGENDERISM, AND NORMATIVITY

What I very heuristically term queer anthropology remains dominated by work on homosexuality and transgenderism. In turn, this work remains dominated by research on men, particularly men identifying as "gay" in some fashion, although in the universe of anthropological research the total amount of such work remains small (Bereket & Adam 2006; Besnier 2002; Bunzl 2004; Campbell 2004; Carrier 1995; Carrington 2002; Carrillo 2002, Donham 1998; Essig 1999; Girman 2004; Hawkeswood 1997; Kaplan 2003; Levine 1998; Lumsden 1996; Manalansan 2003; McLelland 2000, 2005; Murray 2002; Parker 1999; Rofel 1999; Rofes 1996; Shokeid 1995). Since 1993, however, anthropological work has increased on female nonnormative sexualities (including work on women identifying as "lesbian" in some fashion), forms of transgenderism, and the critical study of normative sexualities (including work on women and men identifying as "heterosexual" in some fashion). Not all authors of this work frame their research in feminist terms, but many link their research explicitly to feminism. The rise of feminist networks since 1993 (for instance, those enabled by the important but contentious United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in 1995) has facilitated the growth of this research, just as the global response to the HIV/AIDS epidemic aided in the growth of research on men (and only later turned significant attention to women).

The publication of *Inventing Lesbian Cultures in America* (Lewin 1996) and *Female Desires* (Blackwood & Wieringa 1999) marked a new phase in the anthropology of female nonnormative sexualities. Such work has contributed enormously to understandings of how sexualities are shaped by cultural conceptions of female embodiment, and also how notions of female agency, desire, and community take form under various contexts of domination (and not simply the domination of men), ranging from ideologies of marriage and motherhood to patterns of violence. However, beyond contributions to these two volumes and a number of articles scattered across a range of journals and edited volumes (e.g., Kantsa 2002, Marin 1996), few ethnographic monographs on female nonnormative sexualities have appeared (e.g., Chalmers 2002, Green 1997, Kirtsoglou 2004, Sinnott 2004). Because such monographs are a mainstay of anthropological prestige (and rightly

[1] Owing to these limitations, I will not discuss archaeology here. A forthcoming *ARA* review by Barbara L. Voss will address this topic.

so, given that they render most visible the insights offered by sustained ethnographic engagement), their lack is a cause for concern. Weston's (1993) observation that "particularly lacking are data on homosexuality and homoeroticism among women outside the United States" (p. 345) remains accurate.

It is not sufficient to attribute this lack of ethnographic monographs to "lesbian invisibility" because there remains a relative lack of such work even on gay men. It is true that worldwide, women face barriers in accessing public and private space away from male control, making research on female nonnormative sexualities difficult. However, it is important not to discount institutional contexts. Most research on female nonnormative sexualities continues to be conducted by women. As graduate students these women face pressure not to study female nonnormative sexualities, despite the cache queer studies enjoys in some quarters of the academy. On the job market their work may be classified as "narrow," they face difficulties gaining tenure, and once tenured they may face heavy service burdens owing to administrative drives for gender parity in the context of the relative paucity of women at senior levels. Although further exploration of these issues is beyond the scope of this review, it bears emphasizing that questions of disciplinary politics are not external to the programmatic questions this article addresses.

Given these institutional realities it is interesting that since 1993 there has been a notable increase in ethnographic work on forms of transgenderism, although very little of it by transgender-identified ethnographers (for an exception, see Wilchins 1997). This research has provided important insights into how the hopelessly broad category "transgender" is lived in particular historical and cultural contexts, and how it articulates with a range of domains—from political economy to the nation, from religion to gender itself (Besnier 2002, Blackwood 1998, Cohen 1995, Elliston 1999, Graham 2003, Johnson 1997, Kulick 1998, Prieur 1998, Reddy 2005, Schifter 1999, Sinnott 2004, Teh 2002, Young 2000). This theoretically informed ethnographic work has begun to engage with research in anthropology and beyond that asks how notions of transgenderism and intersexuality trouble the female/male binarism that remains dominant at ontological, epistemological, and political levels throughout much of the world, despite its instability, variability, and surprisingly poor link to any supposed biological "foundation" (Bagemihl 1999, Chase 1998, Halberstam 1998, Kessler 1998, Roughgarden 2004, Towle & Morgan 2002, Valentine 2003a).

In addition to these growing literatures on female nonnormative sexualities and transgenderisms, a specifically critical anthropological work on normative heterosexualities has appeared, much of it drawing from, inspired by, or in collaboration with feminist anthropological work. Although addressing this research in any detail is impossible in this brief review, it has helped destabilize and localize dominant understandings of sexuality. Such research has addressed topics ranging from romantic love (Ahern 2001, Collier 1997, Kelsky 2001), masculinity (Gutmann 1996, Ortner 1997, Peletz 1996, Tuzin 1997), and sexualized female-male relations at work and home (Allison 1994, Carrillo 2002, Frank 2002, Wilson 2004), to articulations with nationalism (Borneman 1992, Dwyer 2000). This research is joined by work that strives to examine gay men and lesbians (and often, heterosexually identified persons as well) within a single ethnographic lens (Bunzl 2004, Carillo 2002, Faiman-Silva 2004, Weismantel 2001).

GLOBALIZATION AND NATION

While forms of ethnocartography persist, often linked to forms of identity politics, anthropological work on sexual subjectivities has been further refined theoretically. This work traces its origins to Freudian thought and addresses issues of pleasure, desire, and love, including the instability of the identity/behavior binarism (Blackwood 1998,

Cameron & Kulick 2003, Cohen 1995, Elliston 1995, Herdt 1999, Johnson 1997, Kulick 1998, Povinelli 2006). In association with this focus on self-identity and intersubjective meaning-making, anthropologists have moved toward investigating the role of political and economic forces in the construction of sexuality. In this regard, one of the most significant developments since 1993 has been the growth in ethnographies of persons outside the West who see themselves as "lesbian" or "gay" in some transformed sense of these terms (Bereket & Adam 2006, Blackwood 1998, Carrier 1995, Carrillo 2002, Cruz-Malavé & Manalansan 2002, Donham 1998, Elliston 1999, Essig 1999, Girman 2004, Herdt 1999, Johnson 1997, Knauft 2003, Lumsden 1996, Manalansan 2003, McLelland 2000, Morris 1997, Murray 2002, Parker 1999, Rofel 1999, Sinnott 2004, Sullivan & Jackson 1999, Tan 1995, Wilson 2004, Wright 2004).

This body of scholarship takes up anthropology's traditional focus on non-Western cultures but challenges the epistemology of difference that traditional focus implied: It does not necessarily frame its subject of study in terms of the Other, nor does it necessarily place the subject of study into a static past time. This research has little patience for nostalgic approaches that dismiss lesbian women and gay men outside the West as contaminated by the foreign, to seek instead ritualized forms of transgender or homosexual practices that supposedly reveal regimes of idyllic precolonial tolerance. This newer research takes non-Western gay and lesbian subjectivities as legitimate forms of selfhood and addresses the role of mass media, consumerism, ethnicity, religion, class, and a range of other factors (Donham 1998, Yue Martin & Berry 2003). This literature links up with research on sex work and trafficking, including the political economy of sexual relations that may not be seen as prostitution (Chapkis 1997, Flowers 1998, Frank 2002, Kempadoo 2004, Kulick 1998, Lindquist 2004, O'Connell Davidson 1997, Renaud 1997, Wekker 2006). Such research on prostitution and trafficking represents a significant area of growth since 1993, connecting to broader questions of human rights that are also an important area of innovative research (Engelke 1999, Miller & Vance 2004, Teunis & Herdt 2006).

Also of consequence has been the ethnographic analysis of how the nation-state shapes dynamics of globalization (Babb 2003, Chalmers 2002, McLelland 2000, Manalansan 2003, Sinnott 2004). Such work demonstrates how globalization does not lead to the withering away of the nation-state form; instead, national imaginaries constitute a key spatial scale through which apparently delocalized conceptions of sexuality become reworked in specific cultural contexts. That these contexts are often national in character serves as a corrective to the focus on locality which remains a stubbornly persistent methodological, theoretical, and political presupposition for anthropological inquiry. It also adds to our understanding of how most nation-states make underwriting normative heterosexuality central to their practices of governance and ideologies of belonging (Bunzl 2004, Wekker 2006) and how in the process they inadvertently help people conjure "alternative" sexualities and desires.

The growth of ethnographic work on HIV/AIDS that critically addresses questions of sexuality has provided new ways to engage these questions of governance and belonging (Dowsett 1996, Junge 2002, Levine 1998, Lyttleton 2000, Manalansan 2003, Renaud 1997, Rofes 1996, ten Brummelhuis & Herdt 1995, Wilson 1995; see Parker 2001 for further discussion). However, given the epidemic's horrific worldwide impact since 1993 and the comparatively large (although still woefully insufficient) level of funding for social scientific research on HIV prevention and AIDS treatment, continuing research is clearly needed in this area. By transcending the limits of the dichotomy between applied and theoretical work, such research can lead to more appropriate prevention and treatment protocols; a better understanding of cultural

conceptions of risk, self-efficacy, and community; and also a set of incisive theoretical tools with which to interrogate contemporary dynamics of embodied neoliberalism.

Comparing the growing corpus of ethnographic research on how articulations of globalization and nation shape sexual subjectivities with some recent scholarship on gay/lesbian transnational activism and tourism (Massad 2002, Puar 2002) demonstrates the importance of a critical empiricism. This scholarship has provided important insights into the unequal power relations that, however reconfigured, are still fundamental to the dynamics of globalizing processes. However, in comparison with more ethnographically informed research, such work often presumes that persons outside the West terming themselves lesbian or gay are inauthentic: wealthy, connected to nongovernmental organizations, mobile, and ultimately estranged from their own cultures. These assumptions ignore tenets of postcolonial and queer theory concerning how nonnormative subjectivities entangle with dominant discourses. They thereby leave us unable to understand the contingent processes by which inequality is challenged through forms of reverse discourse that may not appear in travel brochures, organizational bylaws, or company web sites, but in the kinds of everyday reconfigurations of common sense to which ethnographic inquiry addresses itself. Efforts to segregate ethnography from the moment of critical inquiry are obviated by a continuing trend toward work insisting on the interdisciplinary cosituation of substantive and theoretical knowledge.

LANGUAGE, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY

From its beginnings, queer anthropological work has drawn from a range of disciplines in the social sciences, humanities, and arts, as well as activism. This interdisciplinarity originates in both the history of anthropology more generally and the longstanding exclusion of lesbian and gay anthropology from the academy, a state of affairs that continues in various forms into the present. Since 1993 this interdisciplinarity has broadened in various ways, ranging from science studies (Lancaster 2003) to cybersociality (Campbell 2004). Although tracking all these linkages lies beyond the scope of this review, I here briefly discuss intersections with history, linguistics, and geography.

Questions of history have long been central to anthropologies of sexuality, particularly given the influence of the work of Michel Foucault. Since 1993, historical work that looks critically at questions of sexuality with a specifically ethnographic eye has grown substantially, linking sexuality with topics ranging from urbanity and modernity to the colonial encounter (Beemyn 1997, Bleys 1995, Chauncey 1994, Epprecht 2004, Garcia 1996, Green 1999, Jackson 1999, McClintock 1995, Proschan 2002, Stoler 2002, Terry 1999). This has included work reflecting on the centrality of sexuality to the history and present practice of anthropology itself (Kulick & Willson 1995; Lewin & Leap 1996, 2002; Lyons & Lyons 2004; Markowitz & Ashkenazi 1999; Robertson 2004; Roscoe 1995; Rubin 2002; Seizer 1995). A slate of ethnographic works has also woven historical research into their analyses (Blackwood 2005, Bunzl 2004, Levine 1998, McLelland 2005, Parker 1999, Reddy 2005, Sinnott 2004, Tan 1995; see also Lancaster & di Leonardo 1997). This diachronic sensibility has proven to be of particular importance given the relative novelty of subjectivities using transformed notions of "lesbian" or "gay" in many parts of the world: A historical understanding has helped clarify how such apparently unprecedented categories of selfhood are in fact shaped by specific historical contexts.

A similar pattern can be seen with regard to language and geography. An interest in language dates back to the earliest research in gay and lesbian anthropology, and important new work in this area continues to appear (Campbell-Kibler et al. 2002; Gaudio 1994; Leap 1996a,b; Leap & Boellstorff 2004; Livia

& Hall 1997; see Kulick 1999 and 2000 for overviews). Another development has been the rise of work attending to how linguistic forms, in some cases not prima facie distinguishable from "normal" linguistic forms, become emically deployed in cultural logics of nonnormative desire. As a result, some of the most compelling work on language is integrated into broader ethnographic analyses (Besnier 2002, Elliston 1999, Johnson 1997, Kulick 1998, Manalansan 2003, Valentine 2003b). Similarly, a growing critical geography of sexuality (Altman 2001, Bell & Valentine 1995, Binnie 2004, Boone et al. 2000, Ingram Bouthillette & Retter 1997) is now reflected in a geographically sensitive literature within anthropology (Faiman-Silva 2004, Johnson 1997, Kuntsman 2003, Leap 1999, Manalansan 2003, Shokeid 1995, Wilson 2004). This work has focused ethnographic attention on how place-making shapes cultural conceptions of desire, community, and belonging. It shows, for instance, how globalization resignifies the meaning of place rather than making place irrelevant.

REGIONAL STUDIES

In her 1993 review article, Weston noted that "when only one or two investigators have studied homosexuality or transgendering in a particular region, it creates a situation in which the lone anthropologist becomes responsible for describing 'his/her people'" (p. 345). Although this state of affairs remains unchanged in some parts of the world, we have seen the beginnings of regional literatures. This could be seen to represent the retrenchment of an ethnocartographic "area studies" framework that seeks essential traits within supposed cultural areas, but there exist encouraging signs of an emergent critical regionality that "provides a vantage point from which to problematize naive and uncritical writing on globalization . . . and . . . enables us to think about [how] gender and sexuality are made and experienced in particular locales" (Johnson Jackson & Herdt 2000, p. 361; see also Boellstorff 2007, Ch. 7; Wilson 2006). As noted at the outset, such work destabilizes the current hierarchy of academic production, which valorizes Anglo-American scholarship, and could forge a more diverse, decentered, and robust place for queer studies in anthropology. That potential is limited here by the fact I am citing only work published in English. The field has a great need for more works in the review article genre that address research in a range of languages (Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, French, even Indonesian, Portuguese, Russian, etc.). In this regard, regional conferences such as the 2005 AsiaPacifiQueer conference, held in Thailand, may prove more effective than "global" conferences and organizations that always seem to end up anchored in the United States or Europe.

With regard to emerging regional literatures, the two areas that have generated the broadest body of scholarship are Southeast Asia (Blackwood 1998, Butt 2005, Dwyer 2000, Graham 2003, Jackson & Cook 1999, Johnson 1997, Marin 1996, Morris 1997, Peletz 1996, Sears 1996, Sinnott 2004, Sullivan & Jackson 1999, Tan 1995, Teh 2002, Wieringa 2002, Wilson 2004) and Latin America/the Caribbean (Alexander 2006, Babb 2003, Carrier 1995, Carrillo 2002, Girman 2004, Kempadoo 2004, Kulick 1998, Lumsden 1996, Murray 2002, Parker 1999, Prieur 1998, Schifter 1999, Weismantel 2001, Wekker 2006, Wilson 1995, Wright 2004). Although the range of topics addressed in each of these regional literatures is expansive, one can detect variations in emphasis. For instance, questions of the state and female sexuality have been characteristic for the literature on Southeast Asia, whereas the Latin American literature evinces interest in questions of male-to-female transgenderism and class. Expanding literatures can also be found for Europe (Borneman 1992, Bunzl 2004, Collier 1997, Essig 1999, Kantsa 2002, Kirtsoglou 2004, Kulick 2003, Young 2000), East Asia (Allison 1994, 1996; Chalmers 2002;

McLelland 2000, 2005; Robertson 1998; Rofel 1999), South Asia (Ahearn 2001, Cohen 1995, Reddy 2005, Vanita 2002), the Pacific (Besnier 2002, Elliston 1999, Herdt 1999, Jolly & Manderson 1997, Knauft 2003, Tuzin 1997, Wardlow 2006), and the Middle East and Africa (Aarmo 1999; Donham 1998; Kaplan 2003; Kuntsman 2003; Morgan & Wieringa 2005; Murray & Roscoe 1997, 1998; Renaud 1997; Whitaker 2006).

Given American anthropology's traditional focus on non-U.S. cultures save those of Native Americans, as well as the historical importance of work in the United States for lesbian and gay anthropology, the continued growth of work in the United States has been heartening, addressing issues such as community formation, kinship, parenting, youth, religion, migration, and race (Carrington 2002, Faiman-Silva 2004, Gray 1999, Hawkeswood 1997, Jacobs Thomas & Lang 1997, Levine 1998, Lewin 1998, Luibheid & Cantu 2005, Manalansan 2003, Newton 2000, Povinelli 2006, Rofes 1996, Shokeid 1995, Stein 2001, Sullivan 2004, Weston 1996). Allied to this work is a growing body of research produced by nonanthropologists but with an ethnographic sensibility, often focused on the United States, which continues to provide crucial insights into sexuality (Constantine-Simms 2000, Eng & Hom 1998, Gopinath 2005, Halberstam 1998, Johnson & Henderson 2005, Muñoz 1999). Much of this work focuses on minoritized ethnic and racial formations in the United States, struggling productively to unpack the idea that "America" is a monolithic entity, while also acknowledging their imbrication with United States privilege. This work represents another area where queer studies can contribute to anthropology.

INTERSECTIONALITY, INCLUSION, AND DIFFERENCE

Although I have moved through a dizzying range of topics and omitted authors and subjects I would have dearly liked to discuss, I hope this review has helped highlight contributions since 1993 to what I could provisionally term a queer anthropology or critical anthropology of sexuality. I still have no simple solution to the impossibility of a more definitive name. My suspicion is that such a solution will emerge gradually from theoretically engaged ethnographic work rather than from a detached spark of philosophical brilliance. In this concluding section, I return to the question of the impossibility of naming this review's subject. In light of the literature discussed, I suggest that if a pathway out of the impasse signaled by the impossibility of a name exists, it is probably through, not around, questions of intersectionality, inclusion, and difference. Have we reached a point of paradigmatic exhaustion with intersectionality, inclusion, and difference as our analytical goals and ethnocartography and the logic of enumeration as our means toward those goals?

These questions are amenable to ethnographic investigation because they are lived out in everyday practices of subjectivity and social relation, but such everyday practices are also matters of concept formation and articulation. The question of the relationship between "sexuality" and "gender" is the pivotal issue. At the beginning of this review, I noted how the objection that "queer" unacceptably lumps together women and men is unsustainable because if all attempts to create overarching terms create hierarchies that drown out the voices of the less powerful, then the only alternative seems to be a logic of enumeration whose endpoint would be the individual naming of each person discussed, a fitting logic for an age of atomistic individualism. This tension over the logic of enumeration is institutionalized in, for instance, the naming practices of departments of "Women's and Gender Studies," where what is taken to be a particular and a general category are juxtaposed, without deciding in favor of either. That one rarely finds, say, departments of Christian and Religious Studies, or Latino and Ethnic Studies, points to something special about how

anthropologists and others approach sexuality and gender.

Anthropologists have long been at the forefront of showing the cultural constructedness of taken-for-granted concepts that become tools for theoretical analysis—from kinship to race, from religion to nationalism. Although concerns often arise that an individual piece of research (or an entire body of literature) discusses gay men but fails to mention lesbians, or discusses lesbians but fails to mention transgendered persons, or discusses race but fails to mention class, less common are parallel concerns about failures to include butterflies, or mitosis, or gravity (despite the rise of the ethnography of science and technology as an anthropological subdiscipline). Are the human and the social, then, the implicit limits for intersectionality, inclusion, and difference?

Scholars broadly accept that gender and race are coconstituting. Yet there is also a broad understanding that given the impossibility of discussing everything at once, it is acceptable to examine race in some cases without bringing up gender, or gender without bringing up race. Religion and nationalism fundamentally interpenetrate in secular societies as much as in cases where an official religion or religions exist. Yet there is also a broad understanding that given the impossibility of discussing everything at once, it is acceptable to examine religion in some cases without bringing up the nation, or the nation without bringing up religion. Rarely does one encounter calls for departments of gender and race studies, or nation and religion studies, despite the wide recognition that these cultural domains (indeed, all cultural domains) intersect. What appears instead are quasi-disciplinary formations such as critical race studies or transnational feminist studies, each with their own albeit "intersecting" canons, where the modifier "critical" or "transnational" does the work of an excluded category (for these two cases, most often gender and race, respectively). The emergence of these quasi-disciplinary formations underscores how debates over the scope of disciplinary interest are also debates over the politics of inclusion and recognition in the university.

The inability to definitively fuse or separate sexuality and gender seems to be a special case. What might be the consequences of this for understanding cultural logics of embodiment, desire, and intersubjectivity? To the degree this juxtaposition-without-resolution has been institutionalized in the humanities in the form of a division between feminism and queer theory, anthropology could play an important role in ethnographically unasking—rather than theoretically solving—the question of the relationship between sexuality and gender, by showing their coconstitution in historically and culturally specific life worlds.

This role for anthropology might be possible because the special relationship between sexuality and gender is not just an artifact of academic discourse. It shows up in a startling spectrum of cultural contexts worldwide—shaped by various histories of colonialism, migration, and trade, and remade in unpredictable and complex ways. For instance, around much of the globe the prefixes "homo" and "hetero" are now taken to mean "same" and "different" in relation to the terms "homosexuality" and "heterosexuality." Yet these terms of sexual orientation need not presume gender. One could imagine a cultural context in which "homosexuality" referred to the desire of a Hindu for a Hindu, regardless of whether the persons involved were two women, two men, or a woman and a man. In such a context "heterosexual" might refer to the desire of a Hindu for a Christian or Buddhist or some other religion, once again without regard to the genders of the persons involved. One could imagine analogous contexts in which "homosexual" and "heterosexual" referred to sexuality involving persons of the same or different ethnicities, age cohorts, and so on.

That such contexts seem almost never to arise in any sustained fashion tells us something important, and not just about any

supposed shortcomings in the scholarly literature on sexuality and gender. Rather, it points to an ongoing and widespread linkage between sexuality and gender and, at the same time, the simultaneous presence of a distinctiveness that keeps them from fusing. It is almost as if they are in a metaphorical state of intercourse. Perhaps only the relationship between race and ethnicity presents a significant analogue to this state of affairs (Stolcke 1993). It is difficult to find a scholar of sexuality and gender—anthropologist or otherwise—who would not hasten to emphasize the centrality of race, class, nation, and a host of other categories for the study of sexuality and gender. Such categories are often enumerated in ever-growing clauses appended to key sentences of an analysis, recalling the logic of enumeration that leads from "lesbian and gay" to LGB, LGBT, LGBTQI, and so on. Yet as my example of "homosexuality" and "heterosexuality" demonstrates, the logic that links sexuality and gender does not appear to lie within this logic of enumeration. It appears to be of a different order, troubling the logic of enumeration itself: in particular, its "merographic" assumption that we "make sense of things by describing them as part of something else," so that "ever more contexts could be combined to garner knowledge and thus increase insight" (Schlecker & Hirsch 2001, pp. 71, 76).

What, then, accomplishes this cultural work? This is the question at the heart of the impasse. Theorizing and ethnographically investigating the coconstitutive imbrication of sexuality and gender remains a foundational challenge for anthropological inquiry. It represents a methodological pressure point where a "new queer studies" (Manalansan 2003, p. 6) might offer important insights for anthropology. One possible answer is that a theorization based on overarching categories is simply unsustainable for sexuality. Where this is so, a logic of enumeration need not stand as the only alternative. For instance, perhaps the notion of a prosthetic relationship that Strathern derives from Haraway's (1991) notion of cyborg embodiment might speak not just to relationships between anthropology and feminism, but also to relationships between sexuality and gender:

> The cyborg supposes what it could be like to make connections without assumptions of comparability. Thus might one suppose a relation between anthropology and feminism: were each a realization or extension of the capacity of the other, the relation would be of neither equality nor encompassment. It would be prosthetic, as between a person and a tool. (Strathern 1991, p. 38)

Such a "prosthetic" relationship would be one founded not in semantics, but in pragmatics. It would be less concerned with what the relationship between sexuality and gender means and more interested in what it does: how through their imbrication as lived categories and analytic approaches, each helps constitute the other, even while remaining distinct.

Through this review I have worked to extend a conversation on queer studies in the house of anthropology. Beyond "fostering a preoccupation with issues of visibility" (Weston 1993, p. 360) by seeking political and theoretical efficacy through enumeration, this work has provided insights on the place of sexuality in the human journey, a journey fundamentally structured by relations of inequality for which sexuality is operative, not subsidiary. Ten or 15 years hence, some of the impasses identified here may be resolved to the point that they seem uninteresting; others will persist as arenas for research and debate, joined by new questions currently unavailable. We can rest assured that ethnographic work in this area can play a pivotal role in how new anthropologies will shape our understanding of human selfhood and sociality in the context of continuing technological transformation and socioeconomic inequality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Susan Greenhalgh, Don Kulick, William Leap, Ellen Lewin, Martin Manalansan, Bill Maurer, and Kath Weston provided extremely helpful comments on drafts of this review essay. Thanks are also due to Alexandre Beliaev, Evelyn Blackwood, Gracia Clark, Alvaro Jarrin, and Horacio Sívori.

LITERATURE CITED

Aarmo M. 1997. How homosexuality became "un-African": the case of Zimbabwe. In *Female Desires: Same-Sex Relations and Transgender Practices Across Cultures*, ed. E Blackwood, SE Wieringa, pp. 255–80. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Ahearn LM. 2001. *Invitations to Love: Literacy, Love Letters, and Social Change in Nepal*. Ann Arbor: Univ Mich. Press

Alexander MJ. 2006. *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Allison A. 1994. *Nightwork: Sexuality, Pleasure and Corporate Masculinity in a Tokyo Hostess Club*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Allison A. 1996. *Permitted and Prohibited Desires: Mothers, Comics, and Censorship in Japan*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Altman D. 2001. *Global Sex*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Babb F. 2003. Out in Nicaragua: local and transnational desires after the revolution. *Cult. Anthropol.* 18(3):304–28

Bagemihl B. 1999. *Biological Exuberance: Animal Homosexuality and Natural Diversity*. New York: St. Martin's

Beemyn B, ed. 1997. *Creating a Place for Ourselves: Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Community Histories*. New York: Routledge

Bell D, Valentine G, eds. 1995. *Mapping Desire: Geographies of Sexualities*. New York: Routledge

Bereket TD, Adam BD. 2006. The emergence of gay identities in contemporary Turkey. *Sexualities* 9(2):131–51

Besnier N. 2002. Transgenderism, locality, and the Miss Galaxy beauty pageant in Tonga. *Am. Ethnol.* 29:534–66

Binnie J. 2004. *The Globalization of Sexuality*. London: Sage

Blackwood E. 1998. *Tombois* in West Sumatra: constructing masculinity and erotic desire. *Cult. Anthropol.* 13(4):491–21

Blackwood E. 2005. Gender transgression in colonial and postcolonial Indonesia. *J. Asian Stud.* 64(4):849–80

Blackwood E, Wieringa SE, eds. 1999. *Female Desires: Same-Sex Relations and Transgender Practices Across Cultures*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Bleys R. 1995. *The Geography of Perversion: Male-to-Male Sexual Behavior Outside the West and the Ethnographic Imagination*, 1750–1918. New York: NY Univ. Press

Boellstorff T. 2005. *The Gay Archipelago: Sexuality and Nation in Indonesia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press

Boellstorff T. 2007. *A Coincidence of Desires: Anthropology, Queer Studies, Indonesia*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Boone JA, Dupuis M, Meeker M, Quimby K, Sarver C, et al. eds. 2000. *Queer Frontiers: Millennial Geographies, Genders, and Generations*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press

Borneman J. 1992. *Belonging in the Two Berlins: Kin, State, Nation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Bunzl M. 2004. *Symptoms of Modernity: Jews and Queers in Late-Twentieth-Century Vienna*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Butt L. 2005. "Lipstick girls" and "fallen women": AIDS and conspiratorial thinking in Papua, Indonesia. *Cult. Anthropol.* 20(3):412–42
Cameron D, Kulick D, eds. 2003. *Language and Sexuality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Campbell JE. 2004. *Getting It On Online: Cyberspace, Gay Male Sexuality, and Embodied Identity*. New York: Harrington Park
Campbell-Kibler K, Podesva RJ, Roberts SJ, Wong A, ed. 2002. *Language and Sexuality: Contesting Meaning in Theory and Practice*. Stanford, CA: CSLI
Carrier J. 1995. *De Los Otros: Intimacy and Homosexuality Among Mexican Men*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Carrington C. 2002. *No Place Like Home: Relationships and Family Life Among Lesbians and Gay Men*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Carrillo H. 2002. *The Night is Young: Sexuality in Mexico in the Time of AIDS*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Chalmers S. 2002. *Emerging Lesbian Voices from Japan*. London: RoutledgeCurzon
Chapkis W. 1997. *Live Sex Acts: Women Performing Erotic Labor*. New York: Routledge
Chase C. 1998. Hermaphrodites with attitude: mapping the emergence of intersex political activism. *GLQ* 4(2):189–211
Chauncey G. 1994. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940*. New York: BasicBooks
Cohen L. 1995. The pleasures of castration: the postoperative status of hijras, jankhas, and academics. In *Sexual Nature/Sexual Culture*, ed. PR Abramson, SD Pinkerton, pp. 276–304. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Collier JF. 1997. *From Duty to Desire: Remaking Families in a Spanish Village*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
Constantine-Simms D, ed. 2000. *The Greatest Taboo: Homosexuality in Black Communities*. Los Angeles: Alyson Books
Cruz-Malavé A, Manalansan MF, ed. 2002. *Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism*. New York: NYU Press
Davis DL, Whitten RG. 1987. The cross-cultural study of human sexuality. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 16:69–98
Donham DL. 1998. Freeing South Africa: the "modernization" of male-male sexuality in Soweto. *Cult. Anthropol.* 13(1):3–21
Dowsett GW. 1996. *Practicing Desire: Homosexual Sex in the Era of AIDS*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
Dwyer LK. 2000. Spectacular sexuality: nationalism, development and the politics of family planning in Indonesia. In *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation*, ed. T. Mayer, pp. 25–62. London: Routledge
Elliston DA. 1995. Erotic anthropology: "ritualized homosexuality" in Melanesia and beyond. *Am. Ethnol.* 22(4):848–67
Elliston DA. 1999. Negotiating transnational sexual economics: female mahu and same-sex sexuality in "Tahiti and Her Islands." In *Female Desires: Same-Sex Relations and Transgender Practices Across Cultures*, ed. E Blackwood, SE Wieringa, pp. 230–52. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Eng DL, Hom AY. 1998. *Q & A: Queer in Asian America*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
Engelke M. 1999. "We wondered what human rights he was talking about": human rights, homosexuality and the Zimbabwe International Book Fair. *Crit. Anthropol.* 19(3):289–314

Epprecht M. 2004. *Hungochani: The History of a Dissident Sexuality in Southern Africa*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press

Essig L. 1999. *Queer in Russia: A Story of Sex, Self, and the Other*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Faiman-Silva SL. 2004. *The Courage to Connect: Sexuality, Citizenship, and Community in Provincetown*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press

Ferguson RA. 2003. *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Fitzgerald TK. 1977. A critique of anthropological research on homosexuality. *J. Homosex.* 2(4):385–97

Flowers A. 1998. *The Fantasy Factory: An Insider's View of the Phone Sex Industry*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

Frank K. 2002. *G-Strings and Sympathy: Strip Club Regulars and Male Desire*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Garcia JNC. 1996. *Philippine Gay Culture, The Last 30 Years: Binabai to Bakla, Silahis to MSM*. Diliman, Quezon City: Univ. Philipp. Press

Gaudio RP. 1994. Sounding gay: pitch properties in the speech of gay and straight men. *Am. Speech* 69(1):30–57

Girman C. 2004. *Mucho Macho: Seduction, Desire, and the Homoerotic Lives of Latin Men*. New York: Harrington Park

Gopinath G. 2005. *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Graham M. 1998. Follow the yellow brick road: an anthropological outing in queer space. *Ethnos* 63(1):102–32

Graham S. 2003. While diving, drink water: bisexual and transgender intersections in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *J. Bisexuality* 3(3/4):233–47

Gray ML. 1999. *In Your Face: Stories from the Lives of Queer Youth*. New York: Haworth

Green JN. 1999. *Beyond Carnival: Male Homosexuality in Twentieth-Century Brazil*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Green S. 1997. *Urban Amazons: Lesbian Feminism and Beyond in the Gender, Sexuality and Identity Battles of London*. London: MacMillian

Gutmann MC. 1996. *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Gutmann MC. 1997. Trafficking in Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 26:385–409

Halberstam J. 1998. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Haraway D. 1991. A cyborg manifesto: science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century. In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, pp. 149–81. New York: Routledge

Hawkeswood WG. 1997. *One of the Children: Gay Black Men in Harlem*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Herdt G. 1999. *Sambia Sexual Culture: Essays from the Field*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Ingram GB, Bouthillette A, Retter Y, eds. 1997. *Queers in Space: Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance*. Seattle, WA: Bay Press

Jackson PA. 1999. An American death in Bangkok: the murder of Darrell Berrigan and the hybrid origins of gay identity in 1960s Thailand. *GLQ* 5(3):361–11

Jackson PA, Cook NM, eds. 1999. *Genders and Sexualities in Modern Thailand*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books

Jacobs S, Thomas W, Lang S, eds. 1997. *Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
Johnson EP, Henderson MG, eds. 2005. *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Johnson M. 1997. *Beauty and Power: Transgendering and Cultural Transformation in the Southern Philippines*. Oxford: Berg
Johnson M, Jackson PA, Herdt G. 2000. Critical regionalities and the study of gender and sexual diversity in South East and East Asia. *Cult. Health Sex.* 2(4):361–75
Jolly M, Manderson L. 1997. Introduction: sites of desire/economies of pleasure in Asia and the Pacific. In *Sites of Desire, Economies of Pleasure: Sexualities in Asia and the Pacific*, ed. L Manderson, M Jolly, pp. 1–26. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Junge B. 2002. Bareback sex, risk, and eroticism: anthropological themes (re) surfacing in the post-AIDS era. In *Out in Theory: The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*, ed. WL Leap, E Lewin, pp. 186–221. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
Kantsa V. 2002. "Certain places have different energy": spatial transformations in Eresos, Lesvos. *GLQ* 8(1/2):35–55
Kaplan D. 2003. *Brothers and Others in Arms: The Making of Love and War in Israeli Combat Units*. New York: Harrington Park
Kelsky K. 2001. *Women on the Verge: Japanese Women, Western Dreams*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Kempadoo K. 2004. *Sexing the Caribbean: Gender, Race, and Sexual Labor*. New York: Routledge
Kessler SJ. 1998. *Lessons from the Intersexed*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
Kirtsoglou E. 2004. *For the Love of Women: Gender, Identity and Same-Sex Relations in a Greek Provincial Town*. London: Routledge
Knauft BM. 2003. What ever happened to ritualized homosexuality? Modern sexual subjects in Melanesia and elsewhere. *Annu. Rev. Sex Res.* 14:137–59
Kulick D. 1998. *Travesti: Sex, Gender, and Culture Among Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Kulick D. 1999. Transgender and language: a review of the literature and suggestions for the future. *GLQ* 5(4):605–22
Kulick D. 2000. Gay and lesbian language. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 29:243–85
Kulick D. 2003. Four hundred thousand Swedish perverts. *GLQ* 11(2):205–35
Kulick D, Willson M, eds. 1995. *Taboo: Sex, Identity, and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. London: Routledge
Kuntsman A. 2003. Double homecoming: sexuality, ethnicity, and place in immigration stories of Russian lesbians in Israel. *Women's Stud. Int. Forum* 26(4):299–311
Lancaster RN. 2003. *The Trouble with Nature: Sex in Science and Popular Culture*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Lancaster RN, di Leonardo M, eds. 1997. *The Gender/Sexuality Reader: Culture, History, Political Economy*. New York: Routledge
Leap WL, ed. 1996a. *Beyond the Lavender Lexicon: Authenticity, Imagination, and Appropriation in Lesbian and Gay Languages*. Amsterdam: Gordon & Breach
Leap WL. 1996b. *Word's Out: Gay Men's English*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
Leap WL, ed. 1999. *Public Sex, Gay Space*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Leap WL, Boellstorff T, eds. 2004. *Speaking in Queer Tongues: Globalization and Gay Language*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
Levine MP. 1998. *Gay Macho: The Life and Death of the Homosexual Clone*. New York: NYU Press

Lewin E, ed. 1996. *Inventing Lesbian Cultures in America*. Boston: Beacon Press
Lewin E. 1998. *Recognizing Ourselves: Ceremonies of Lesbian and Gay Commitment*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Lewin E, Leap WL, eds. 1996. *Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
Lewin E, Leap WL, eds. 2002. *Out in Theory: The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
Lindquist J. 2004. Veils and ecstasy: negotiating shame in the Indonesian borderlands. *Ethnos* 69(4):487–508
Livia A, Hall K, eds. 1997. *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
Luibheid E, Cantu L, eds. 2005. *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, U.S. Citizenship, and Border Crossings*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
Lumsden I. 1996. *Machos, Maricones, and Gays: Cuba and Homosexuality*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
Lyons A, Lyons HD. 2004. *Irregular Connections: A History of Anthropology and Sexuality*. Lincoln: Univ. Neb. Press
Lyttleton C. 2000. *Endangered Relations: Negotiating Sex and AIDS in Thailand*. Amsterdam: Harwood Acad.
Manalansan MF. 2003. *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Marin M. 1996. Stolen strands: the in and out lives of lesbians in the Philippines. In *From Amazon to Zami: Towards a Global Lesbian Feminism*, ed. M Reinfelder, pp. 30–55. London: Cassell
Markowitz F, Ashkenazi M, eds. 1999. *Sex, Sexuality, and the Anthropologist*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
Massad J. 2002. Re-orienting desire: the gay international and the Arab world. *Public Cult.* 14(2):361–85
McLelland MJ. 2000. *Male Homosexuality in Modern Japan: Cultural Myths and Social Realities*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon
McLelland MJ. 2005. *Queer Japan from the Pacific War to the Internet Age*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield
McClintock A. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge
Miller AM, Vance CS, eds. 2004. Sexuality, human rights, and health. *Health Hum. Rights* Vol. 7, Spec. Issue 2
Morgan R, Wieringa S. 2005. *Tommy Boys, Lesbian Men, and Ancestral Wives: Female Same-Sex Practices in Africa*. Johannesburg: Jacana Media
Morris RC. 1995. All made up: performance theory and the new anthropology of sex and gender. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:567–92
Morris RC. 1997. Educating desire: Thailand, transnationalism, and transgression. *Soc. Text* 15(3/4):53–79
Muñoz JE. 1999. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
Murray DAB. 2002. *Opacity: Gender, Sexuality, Race, and the "Problem" of Identity in Martinique*. New York: Peter Lang
Murray SO, Roscoe W, eds. 1997. *Islamic Homosexualities: Culture, History, and Literature*. New York: NYU Press

Murray SO, Roscoe W, eds. 1998. *Boy-Wives and Female Husbands: Studies in African Homosexualities*. New York: St. Martin's Press
Newton E. 2000. *Margaret Mead Made Me Gay: Personal Essays, Public Ideas*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
O'Connell Davidson J. 1997. *Prostitution, Power and Freedom*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
Ortner SB. 1997. *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press
Parker R. 1999. *Beneath the Equator: Cultures of Desire, Male Homosexuality, and Emerging Gay Communities in Brazil*. New York: Routledge
Parker R. 2001. Sexuality, culture, and power in HIV/AIDS research. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 30:163–79
Peletz MG. 1996. *Reason and Passion: Representations of Gender in a Malay Society*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Povinelli EA. 2006. *The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Prieur A. 1998. *Mema's House, Mexico City: On Transvestites, Queens, and Machos*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Proschan F. 2002. Eunuch mandarins, *soldats mamzelles*, effeminate boys, and graceless women: French colonial constructions of Vietnamese genders. *GLQ* 8(4):435–67
Puar JK. 2002. Circuits of queer mobility: tourism, travel, and globalization. *GLQ* 8(1/2):101–37
Reddy G. 2005. *With Respect to Sex: Negotiating Hijra Identity in South India*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Renaud M. 1997. *Women at the Crossroads: A Prostitute Community's Response to AIDS in Urban Senegal*. Amsterdam: Gordon & Breach
Robertson J. 1998. *Takarazuka: Sexual Politics and Popular Culture in Modern Japan*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Robertson J, eds. 2004. *Same-Sex Cultures and Sexualities: An Anthropological Reader*. London: Blackwell
Rodríguez JM. 2003. *Queer Latinidad: Identity Practices, Discursive Spaces*. New York: NYU Press
Rofel L. 1999. Qualities of desire: imagining gay identities in China. *GLQ* 5(4):451–74
Rofes E. 1996. *Reviving the Tribe: Regenerating Gay Men's Sexuality and Culture in the Ongoing Epidemic*. New York: Harrington Park
Roscoe W. 1995. Strange craft, strange history, strange folks: cultural amnesia and the case for lesbian and gay studies. *Am. Anthropol.* 97(3):448–53
Roughgarden J. 2004. *Evolution's Rainbow: Diversity, Gender, and Sexuality in Nature and People*. Berkeley:Univ. Calif. Press
Rubin G. 2002. Studying sexual subcultures: excavating the ethnography of gay communities in urban North America. In *Out in Theory: The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*, ed. E Lewin, WL Leap, pp. 17–68. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
Schifter J. 1999. *From Toads to Queens: Transvestism in a Latin American Setting*. New York: Haworth
Schlecker M, Hirsch E. 2001. Incomplete knowledge: ethnography and the crisis of context in studies of media, science and technology. *Hist. Hum. Sci.* 14(1):69–87
Sears LJ, ed. 1996. *Fantasizing the Feminine in Indonesia*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Seizer S. 1995. Paradoxes of visibility in the field: rites of queer passage in anthropology. *Public Cult.* 8(1):73–100
Shokeid M. 1995. *A Gay Synagogue in New York*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Sinnott MJ. 2004. *Toms and Dees: Transgender Identity and Female Same-Sex Relationships in Thailand*. Honolulu: Univ. Hawai'i Press

Stein A. 2001. *The Stranger Next Door: The Story of a Small Community's Battle over Sex, Faith, and Civil Rights*. Boston: Beacon
Stolcke V. 1993. Is sex to gender as race is to ethnicity? In *Gendered Anthropology*, ed. T del Valle, pp. 17–37. London: Routledge
Stoler AL. 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Strathern M. 1991. *Partial Connections*. Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield
Sullivan G, Jackson PA, ed. 1999. *Lady Boys, Tom Boys, Rent Boys: Male and Female Homosexualities in Contemporary Thailand*. New York: Harrington Park
Sullivan M. 2004. *The Family of Woman: Lesbian Mothers, Their Children, and the Undoing of Gender*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Tan ML. 1995. From Bakla to gay: shifting gender identities and sexual behaviors in the Southern Philippines. In *Conceiving Sexuality: Approaches to Sex Research in a Postmodern World*, ed. RG Parker, JH Gagnon, pp. 85–96. London: Routledge
Teh YK. 2002. *The Mak Nyahs: Malaysian Male to Female Transsexuals*. Singapore: Eastern Univ. Press
ten Brummelhuis H, Herdt G, ed. 1995. *Culture and Sexual Risk: Anthropology and AIDS*. Amsterdam: Gordon & Breach
Terry J. 1999. *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine, and Homosexuality in Modern Society*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Teunis N, Herdt GH, ed. 2006. *Sexual Inequalities and Social Justice*. Berkeley: Univ Calif. Press
Towle EB, Morgan LM. 2002. Romancing the transgender native: rethinking the use of the "third gender" concept. *GLQ* 8(4):469–97
Tuzin D. 1997. *The Cassowary's Revenge: The Life and Death of Masculinity in a New Guinea Society*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Valentine D. 2003a. "The calculus of pain": violence, anthropological ethics, and the category transgender. *Ethnos* 68(1):27–48
Valentine D. 2003b. "I went to bed with my own kind once": the erasure of desire in the name of identity. *Lang. Commun.* 23:123–38
Vanita R, ed. 2002. *Queering India: Same-Sex Love and Eroticism in Indian Culture and Society*. New York: Routledge
Visweswaran K. 1997. Histories of feminist ethnography. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol*. 26:591–21
Wardlow H. 2006. *Wayward Women: Sexuality and Agency in a New Guinea Society*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Weismantel M. 2001. *Cholas and Pishtacos: Stories of Race and Sex in the Andes*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Wekker G. 2006. *The Politics of Passion: Women's Sexual Culture in the Afro-Surinamese Diaspora*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Weston K. 1993. Lesbian/gay studies in the house of anthropology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol*. 22:339–67
Weston K. 1996. *Render Me, Gender Me: Lesbians Talk Sex, Class, Color, Nation, Studmuffins*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
Whitaker B. 2006. *Unspeakable Love: Gay and Lesbian Life in the Middle East*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Wiegman R. 2004. On being in time with feminism. *Mod. Lang. Q.* 65(1):161–77
Wieringa SE. 2002. *Sexual Politics in Indonesia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
Wilchins RA. 1997. *Read My Lips: Sexual Subversion and the End of Gender*. Ithaca, NY: Firebrand Books

Wilson A. 2004. *The Intimate Economies of Bangkok: Tomboys, Tycoons, and Avon Ladies in the Global City*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Wilson A. 2006. Queering Asia. *Intersections* Issue 14 (Nov) **http://www.sshe.murdoch.edu.au/intersections/issue14/wilson.html**

Wilson C. 1995. *Hidden in the Blood: A Personal Investigation of AIDS in the Yucatan*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press

Wright T. 2004. Gay organizations, NGOs, and the globalization of sexual identity: the case of Bolivia. In *Same-Sex Cultures and Sexualities: An Anthropological Reader*, ed. J Robertson, pp. 279–94. London: Blackwell

Young A. 2000. *Women Who Become Men: Albanian Sworn Virgins*. Oxford: Berg

Yue A, Martin F, Berry C, ed. 2003. *Mobile Cultures: Mass Media and Queer Asia*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Annual Review of Anthropology
Volume 36, 2007

Contents

Sociocultural Anthropology

Indexes

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Anthropology* articles may be found at http://anthro.annualreviews.org/errata.shtml