

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Queer Studies Under Ethnography's Sign

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/19h763sn>

Journal

GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 12(4)

ISSN

1064-2684 1527-9375

Author

Boellstorff, Tom

Publication Date

2006

DOI

10.1215/10642684-2006-004

Peer reviewed

QUEER STUDIES UNDER ETHNOGRAPHY'S SIGN

Tom Boellstorff

*Symptoms of Modernity: Jews and Queers in
Late-Twentieth-Century Vienna*

Matti Bunzl

Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004. xii + 292 pp.

Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora

Martin F. Manalansan IV

Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003. xvi + 221 pp.

*Toms and Dees: Transgender Identity and Female Same-Sex
Relationships in Thailand*

Megan J. Sinnott

Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004. x + 261 pp.

In this essay, I use the occasion of three excellent queer ethnographies to reflect on the continuing marginalization of anthropology in queer studies. I wish to advance the argument that anthropology can offer queer studies much more than empirical data. The three works discussed illustrate how anthropology's largely unrealized contribution to queer studies is to provide truly situated knowledges that destabilize still-unacknowledged parochialisms of queer theory itself.¹ This is of particular use in addressing questions of transnationalism and postcoloniality, since the three greatest barriers to an informed theory of queer globalization remain: (1) equating globalization with activists, tourists, and jet-setting elites, when in fact such persons may not be indicative of broader processes; (2) equating culture with locality; and (3) producing discordances by projecting Euro-American theoretical frameworks—including frameworks of ethnicity/race and gender/sexuality—onto other contexts.

In the current moment no one, it seems, thinks interdisciplinarity is bad, a discursive seamlessness that makes me wonder what is really at stake in a relation of abjection toward disciplines. My impression is that valorizing interdisciplinarity is far more prevalent in the humanities than elsewhere: in that universe interdisciplinarity or transdisciplinarity typically implies a discordance between training and object of study, most often someone trained in literature discussing nontextual or popular-culture artifacts: cartoons, performances, video, and so on.² The citation networks and the methodologies remain largely unchanged, the metaphorical construal of objects of study as “texts” sufficing as theoretical mandate.

In asking after the place of anthropology in queer studies, I have in mind the contribution of anthropological ethnography as a mutually constituting triad of method, data, and theory. This includes long-term participant observation, interviewing, focus groups, archival research, and other methods oriented around a historically and spatially specific field site (though this “specificity” may include multiple locales, translocal spatial formations like the nation-state, or nonspatial locales like cyberspace). The situated data produced through ethnography blurs the distinction between data and theory: anthropologists make their own archives.³ Obviously, anthropology does not have all the answers or even all the questions: all methods (like all theories and all bodies of data) are perspectival, partial insights into the human project. Perspectivalism and partiality are, however, the effect of certain modes of knowledge production that always hold out the agglutinative possibility of more angles on the topic or more perspectives on a problem: “‘Partial’ captures the nature of the interlocution well, for not only is there no totality, each part also defines a partisan position. Ethnographic truths are similarly partial in being at once incomplete and committed.”⁴ One of the most productive crises in contemporary anthropology has been the exhaustion of a mode of knowledge that sees partiality as a failure to be redressed through more context; as a result, I do not want to argue that ethnography offers still more “perspectives.” Rather, I hold out the possibility that disciplinarity can further the goals of queer studies toward a different effect, which one might call an effect of accountability: as Marilyn Strathern notes, there is a “need to conserve the division of labor between disciplines, if only because the value of a discipline is precisely in its ability to account for its conditions of existence and thus as to how it arrives at its knowledge practices.”⁵

The three books under review are all easily recognizable to anthropologists as ethnographies in the classic sense. Given the Euro-American character of queer studies, it is likely readers from that tradition will be familiar with—at best—Manalansan’s book, since it is set in the United States.⁶ Yet all three works

provide important interventions in queer studies as a theoretical apparatus and a corpus of knowledge concerning relationships between nonnormative sexualities and genders, on the one hand, and, on the other, articulations of various cultural, political, and economic domains, including globalization, nation, kinship, and belonging. Taken as a whole, they make a powerful case for a truly interdisciplinary queer studies not predicated on the humanities. They also challenge anthropology—sometimes counted as one of the humanities and sometimes as a social science—to recall the pivotal place of sexuality in its own history and to strive to match the important contributions humanities scholars have made in formulating the very notion of queer studies as well as building up impressive theoretical and substantive contributions to it. At the most general level, these books speak to possibilities for coalitional projects that cross interdisciplinary and disciplinary spaces, forging new relevancies for queer studies in the academy and beyond.

Toms and Dees

The significance of Megan Sinnott's *Toms and Dees*—winner of the 2004 Ruth Benedict Prize of the Society of Gay and Lesbian Anthropologists—is immediately obvious, since it is one of the first book-length ethnographies on what we can provisionally term *female homosexuality* outside Euro-America. Worldwide, a common pattern is that women have less unfettered access to public spaces than men. A consequence of this is that what we can provisionally term *lesbian* social spaces are often built in the margins of domestic environments—when one's husband is away at work, for instance. Because of this, and other factors (including the ongoing difficulty female scholars and particularly nonheteronormative female scholars have in securing academic employment), there are far fewer ethnographies of lesbians or female-to-male transgenders than there are of gay men and male-to-female transgenders (and even these are remarkably few in number).

However, to argue for the relevance of *Toms and Dees* in terms of providing voice to a silenced minority—in other words, adding a new perspective or making our accounts less partial—does not begin to address its contributions. As is usual for an ethnographic project, Sinnott gained fluency in the language used by her interlocutors (Thai) and spent many years in Thailand, bracketed by ongoing archival and other work in the United States. The result is a rich text that can be drawn on by, for instance, those with interests in Southeast Asia or those with interests in modernity.

Sinnott's goal from the outset is “to place *tom* and *dee* identities within their cultural context, including the transnational linkages that form the basis

for these categories of selfhood” (17). Her choice of words is consequential: while this is a study of Thailand, conducted primarily in the Thai language, she takes the cultural context for the *tom* and *dee* subject positions to include transnational linkages as a “basis,” not a second-order modification of something fundamentally local. Sinnott’s historical work demonstrates that the *tom* and *dee* subject positions came into being approximately in the early 1970s (a chronology largely shared by similar subject positions throughout Southeast Asia), and she works to show both the novelty of these subject positions and their continuities with preexisting discourses of gender, sexuality, and subjectivity.

The term *tom*, which in my own theoretical parlance I would say “dubs” the Euro-American term *tomboy*, is taken up in contemporary Thailand by persons seen to be born as women (and remaining as women) but who act in what is seen to be a masculine manner. This includes dress and style (having a short haircut like a man, for example, or using masculine pronouns), but *toms* do not typically see themselves as men or wish to become men. *Tom* subjectivity is self-consciously novel in the sense that most *toms* (like Thais in general) see the idea of *tom* identification as something quite new, something linked to the massive social and economic changes in Thailand in the last thirty years, though evincing continuities with largely unlexicalized masculine female subjectivities that existed in earlier times (and are recalled by some of Sinnott’s older interlocutors).

The term *dee*, derived from the second syllable of the English word *lady*, is in some ways the more fascinating of the two subject positions. *Dees* are women who have romantic relationships with *toms*, but their subjectivities are fundamentally relational: “*Dees* are only *dees* in their relation to a *tom*. . . . *Dees* are consequently not understood by most Thais as ‘homosexual’ in the same way that *toms* or gays are. In this way *dees* are similar to gender-normative men who have relations with [male-to-female transgenders]” (30). It is significant that “sexual desire is rarely mentioned by mainstream society as a reason for *dee* identity, that is, being in a relationship with a *tom*” (30). Instead, mainstream Thais, like *toms* and *dees* themselves, see *dees* as being attracted to *toms* because *toms* are known for the care and affection they show toward *dees*. The irony here is that these qualities of attentiveness and protectiveness associated with *tom* subjectivity are qualities more commonly associated with women in Thailand. Thus inhabiting the *tom* subject position does not mean attempting to replicate normative Thai masculinity: both *toms* and *dees* agree that it is the combination of traits deemed masculine (embodiment, demeanor) and traits deemed feminine (attentiveness with regard to sex but even more with regard to everyday socialization) that makes *toms* attractive to *dees* in the first place.

One plausible Euro-American response to this state of affairs would be to say “this sounds like butch-femme relationships in the West.” Yet while acknowledging the similarities between *tom-dee* subjectivities and butch-femme dynamics, Sinnott is careful to underscore how *tom* and *dee* are not simply imitations of Western subject positions. One key way she does this is by emphasizing that “for Thais in general and for *toms* and *dees* in particular, an activity that is recognized as sexual must by definition include gender opposites, that is, masculine and feminine” (86). This is shaped by

a local meanings system in which sexual behavior in itself is not normatively a basis for the categorization of people. Thus gender-normative *dees* and masculine gay men are not accommodated in Thai discourses of “homosexuality.” . . . *Toms, dees*, and Thais in general rarely classify *toms* and *dees* together as products of the same phenomenon and usually distinguish *toms*, as “misgendered,” from *dees*, as “ordinary women.” (205)

In other words, there is a powerful sense in which in the case at hand, transgenderism reinforces rather than problematizes heteronormativity by coding relationships between *toms* and *dees* as heterogendered and thus, in a fundamental sense, heterosexual.⁷ Thus the relationships between *toms* and *dees* are seen by *toms*, *dees*, and Thais in general as less transgressive than relationships between two masculine men or two feminine women (or, indeed, two *toms*); additionally, most *toms* and *dees* reject the term *lesbian* and the very idea of “homosexuality”: “*Toms* and *dees* do not hold a radically nonconforming position. They acknowledge that their identities and sexuality are not acceptable for society . . . [they] did not challenge the assumptions that heterosexuality, or ‘correct’ gendering, was natural and that they were in some ways abnormal” (141–42).

It is striking that while Sinnott discusses the role of activist organizations and transnational feminist networks, most *toms* and *dees* do not belong to such organizations or networks. They do not speak English and usually have never traveled outside Thailand. Despite the importance of tourism to the Thai economy, they may have had little contact with Euro-American lesbians or gay men. The context within which the *tom* and *dee* subject positions have come into being as stable subject positions is as much (if not more) a national context than a transnational one, shaped by “local” discourses of gender but particularly by modern discourses of gender articulated by the nation-state. As a monarchy, family and nation are explicitly linked in Thailand, and this linkage takes on historically specific forms in the modern era. Tracking how contemporary discourses of gender

have come into being in contemporary Thailand, Sinnott shows that the *tom* and *dee* subject positions are not harbingers of a monolithic transnational lesbianism; instead, they illustrate how globalization works through the contingent yet power-imblicated transformation of ostensibly “global” discourses in local and translocal contexts, above all in the shadow of the nation-state that remains the dominant geopolitical formation of the age.

Symptoms of Modernity

At first glance, Matti Bunzl’s *Symptoms of Modernity* appears to be a very different text from *Toms and Dees*, and not only because of the difference in field site (Austria versus Thailand). Where Sinnott emphasizes that “any generalization about the Thai ‘gay-lesbian’ scene would need to account for . . . important differences between being male and being female in Thai society” (70), Bunzl not only groups together gay men and lesbians but interweaves a discussion of Jews: “It is a central argument of this book that the historical trajectories of Jews and queers have been linked by a joint logic of social articulation” (12). This is not because Bunzl conflates gay and lesbian (or Jewish) experience, but because his analysis is written in a different register. Ethnography is never just reporting “what is there”: there is always enough going on “there” to fill a hundred monographs, should we take the time to look and listen. While some early functionalist work in anthropology did at times aspire to produce totalizing compendia of cultures,⁸ ethnography more typically emerges out of a situated and open-ended line of investigation that delimits the kinds of questions asked, the kinds of persons addressed, and, ultimately, the kinds of realities perceived and critiqued.

In *Toms and Dees*, Sinnott’s primary questions concern how novel “female homosexual” subject positions form at the intersection of national and transnational discourses in a Southeast Asian context far from where contemporary queer subjectivities seem to originate. Bunzl, writing on the German-speaking world where the term *homosexual* was first coined nearly 150 years ago, takes up a very different historicity. Bunzl is fundamentally concerned with the place of homosexuality as symptomatic of modernity, and it is this that compels him to pair Jews and queers in his analysis, as explained in a remarkable opening passage:

I focus on these two groups as the foundational bearers of negative identification in the constitution of the modern nation-state. In its Central European (that is, German) variant, the nation-state was invented in the late nineteenth century as an ethnically homogenous and intrinsically mascu-

linist entity, a narrative whose cultural coherence depended on the systematic abjection of Jews and homosexuals. Through the modern twin discourses of antisemitism and homophobia, these groups were mobilized and fortified as the constitutive outsides of respectable Germanness, thereby allowing the retrospective fixing of the nation-state as a fantasized public space of ethnic and sexual purity. (ix)

What Bunzl offers queer studies is a way to sustain ethnographically a Foucauldian argument about the productivity of power relations and the centrality of what first appear to be “deviant” and marginal subjectivities to modern governmentalities. Like Sinnott, Bunzl’s ethnography reveals fluency in the language and culture of the persons who are the focus of this study. Bunzl details shifts in the political and cultural position of Jews and queers in Vienna throughout the twentieth century, with a particular focus on the decades following the end of the Second World War. Alternating chapters address in turn Jews and queers, focusing on the similar trajectories of these minoritized subjectivities in the context of Austrian modernity. Because Bunzl’s ethnography has a strong historical sensibility, he is able to draw striking conclusions about the contemporary state of affairs in Austria, in which Jews and queers have attained a good measure of social recognition:

I suggest that the emergence of Jews and queers into Vienna’s public sphere should be read as a signpost of postmodernity. This is meant literally, in that the unprecedented prominence of these groups within the city’s urban landscape signals a genuine departure from the modern logic of Jews’ and homosexuals’ foundational abjection. In a globalizing world, the principal Others of the modern nation-state no longer figure as constitutive outsides. On the contrary, they have been incorporated as fundamental elements of a diversified public sphere. (x)

Rather than read contemporary legal and social conditions of recognition toward Austrian Jews and queers as a ruse—a veneer over an essentialized intolerance—Bunzl’s linkage of the twentieth-century abjection of Jews and queers to the project of modernity provides him with a historically sensitive theoretical apparatus that opens up lines of inquiry for future projects worldwide. In Bunzl’s interpretation, symptomatic of postmodernity in its German variant is a “constitutive pluralism” (216) that substitutes for a logic of abjection one of incorporation. Where this form of modernity self-defines through exteriorization, its

associated form of postmodernity self-defines through incorporation. How this interface between modernity and postmodernity plays out in differing national contexts worldwide is only one of many important questions raised by *Symptoms of Modernity*.

Global Divas

Winner of the 2003 Ruth Benedict Prize, *Global Divas*, like *Toms and Dees* and *Symptoms of Modernity*, is an ethnography of queer subjects in a particular place and time, but it also raises broad questions about queer studies. As noted earlier, Manalansan's book is probably more familiar to nonanthropological audiences than the other two, both because it is largely set in the United States and because its citational field includes many works in cultural studies, ethnic studies, and other disciplines identified with the humanities. *Global Divas* is, among other things, an important example of a growing literature that blurs the boundaries between Asian studies and Asian American studies. As the book's title suggests, this blurring results from the need for theoretical frameworks that transcend the specific histories of geographic imaginaries like "Asia" and "America." It also is due to the fact that the subjects of study, Filipino gay men in the diaspora, move across national boundaries themselves—in terms of immigration as well as in terms of mass media consumed, money transferred, and kinship networks sustained and transformed.

While clearly well-grounded in area studies and ethnic studies literatures, Manalansan more than Sinnott or Bunzl sites his text squarely in what he terms a "new queer studies" (6) that is centrally concerned with questions of globalization and inequality. Manalansan notes that

the useful step that these new queer scholars are making is not in denigrating gay and lesbian identity categories and cultures but rather expanding and troubling their seemingly stable borders by illuminating the different ways in which various queer subjects located in and moving in between specific national locations establish and negotiate complex relationships to each other and to the state. (8)

Manalansan wishes to highlight the role of the nation-state in queer subjectivities and socialities, but where Sinnott and Bunzl both focus on two subject positions in a single nation, Manalansan asks how movement between two nations with a long history of inequality (the Philippines and the United States) shapes a form of gay subjectivity: "Carrying the baggage of colonial and postcolonial cul-

tures, the Filipino gay immigrant arrives in the United States not to begin a process of Americanization but rather to continue and transform the ongoing engagement with America" (13). Sharing with Sinnott and Bunzl a concern with the place of modernity in the articulation of queer subjectivities, Manalansan notes how "Filipinos' modernity is established not through a rejection of 'tradition' but rather through complex amalgamations of cultural and historical elements" (13). The emphasis is on how the processes by which Filipino men reconfigure the ostensibly Euro-American term *gay* are shaped by a long history of cultural syncretism in the Philippines itself.

Manalansan pays attention to how notions of "drama" and "biyuti" (beauty) take on culturally specific meanings for Filipino gay men and examines the resonances, dissonances, and contradictions between uses of *gay* versus *bakla*, a Filipino term that (very roughly in the manner of Thai *kathoey* or Indonesian *waria*) signifies a kind of effeminate male, male transvestite, or male transgendered subjectivity. Interrupting the tendency to place such terms in a teleological relationship to "gay" subjectivities, Manalansan emphasizes that "*bakla* is not a premodern antecedent to *gay* but rather, in diasporic spaces, *bakla* is recuperated and becomes an alternative form of modernity" (21). The relationship between *bakla* and *gay*—which in the ethnographic locations Manalansan examines sometimes functions as a binarism—cannot be directly mapped onto binarisms of Philippines/United States or traditional/modern. Rather, it acts as a resource for articulating a range of relationships to ethnicity (including associations of gayness with whiteness), class, and belonging.

Like *Symptoms of Modernity*, *Toms and Dees*, or any good ethnographic work for that matter, *Global Divas* turns its anthropological gaze on Euro-American assumptions that form the (often unacknowledged) normative default for understandings of culture and selfhood. For instance, Manalansan notes early on in *Global Divas* that "the American cultural landscape, premised on . . . cultural, physical, and emotional distancing from the family, is the same one in which gay identity is founded" (22). Since most Filipinos (like many persons elsewhere outside Euro-America) live in circumstances where it is not expected or economically feasible for children to leave the home on reaching adulthood, the narrative structure of normative gay (and lesbian) selfhood is from the outset at odds with notions of the proper life course. Given a context where family relations are seen as intimate throughout one's life, notions of visibility and "coming out" take on a different valence, so that many of Manalansan's interlocutors saw

public display of identity to be inappropriate, reminiscent of the kind of carnivalesque vulgarity of a particular type of lower-class *bakla*. . . . Pub-

lic visibility, canonized in the mainstream gay community, is questioned and held at bay by these men. In my conversations with many Filipino gay men, coming out, or more properly the public avowal of identity, is not necessary for their own self-fashioning. (33)

These culturally specific understandings of Filipino gay subjectivity extend to notions of cross-dressing:

Far from being just a remnant or a vestige of homosexual traditions from the homeland, cross-dressing has become a space for articulating and marking difference and a particular kind of modernity. For many of my informants, cross-dressing was an attempt to mimic real women. In contrast, they saw another kind of cross-dressing popular among Caucasians that revolved around parody. (138)

Like Bunzl and Sinnott, Manalansan's alternation between specific ethnographic materials—from the discussion of the layout of a single gay Filipino's apartment to the details of *swardspeak*, or gay Filipino slang—allows him to address general questions of globalization and sexuality missed by approaches based on intentionally produced cultural artifacts and contexts (art, literature, film, activism, tourism, and so on):

Most ideas about queer community and identity formations are based on organized public enactments of gayness and lesbianness. In contrast, the focus on the everyday not only exposes the inadequacy of conventional narratives where self and community progressively unfold, it also points to the complexities of various intersections and borderlands of race, gender, class, and sexuality in diasporic and immigrant groups. (90)

Queering Interdisciplinarity

It could perhaps be argued that this essay represents a partisan attempt to claim a privileged place for anthropology in queer studies, given that much of my own work also falls in the category of “queer anthropology,” however provisionally defined.⁹ However, my goal here is to argue for the value of a truly interdisciplinary queer studies that views the perspectival character of knowledge production as a virtue. The value of disciplines lies in their limitations. Whereas many notions of interdisciplinarity valorize the dream of holism, disciplinary formations can productively reflect on the complicities and inadequacies of their own approaches to knowledge.

One contribution ethnography makes to queer studies, as can be seen from the work of Sinnott, Bunzl, and Manalansan, is self-limited analyses of specific queer subject positions—*toms* in 1990s Thailand, queers in 1960s Austria, Filipino gay men in contemporary New York, and so on. This militates against a transcendental queer subject serving as foil for a too-facile queer studies that would see documenting difference as the end point of analysis. Rather than congratulate ourselves for having established that there is no universal queer, or for the general insight that queerness is inflected by nation, generation, gender, class, ethnicity, religion, and so on, ethnographic methods provide a way to explore how these intersectionalities play out in actual communities of subjectivity and practice. My use of the term *actual* here is meant not to index an empiricist Real over and above regimes of representation but to underscore the situated character of all representations, all embodiments, all collectivities.

Another important contribution ethnography can make to queer studies is a better calibration of descriptive versus prescriptive modes of inquiry. Too much of queer studies trafficks in the obvious. We know ahead of time that persons will “negotiate” their identities, that those suffering inequality will “resist” that inequality, that coalitions will be formed and counterdiscourses articulated. Often I am left wondering if queer people can do anything wrong. I suspect that this presumptive valorization of the queer subject originates in a conflation of analysis and activism. Saba Mahmood’s insightful diagnosis of this problem with respect to feminism is quite applicable to queer studies as well:

Agency, in this form of analysis, is understood as the capacity to realize one’s own interests against the weight of custom, tradition, transcendental will, or other obstacles (whether individual or collective). . . . What is seldom problematized in such an analysis is the universality of the desire—central for liberal and progressive thought, and presupposed by the concept of resistance it authorizes—to be free from relations of subordination and, for women, from structures of male domination. This positing of women’s agency as consubstantial with resistance to relations of domination, and its concomitant naturalization of freedom as a social ideal, I would argue is a product of feminism’s dual character as both an *analytical* and a *politically prescriptive* project.¹⁰

Ethnographic analysis is concerned with understanding cultural logics in their own (emic) terms, but usually has its own (etic) analytic agendas as well. This does not mean ethnographers never engage in activist work. It does mean, however, that when Sinnott discusses *tom* and *dee* subjectivities, she does not pass

judgment on these subjectivities, claiming they are either outdated or vanguardist. Bunzl remains agnostic on the desirability of queers' entrance into a public sphere that may promise new normativities as well as new freedoms. And Manalansan does not conclude that it would be better for his Filipino interlocutors in New York to identify as "bakla," "gay," or both.

Instead, the goal of analysis in these three works, and more broadly in what I see as the best ethnographic work, is the careful portrayal of specific modes of human sociality—not a claim to present the total way of life of a people or a deep structure completely unknown to one's interlocutors themselves. It is certainly possible to critique queer anthropology, just as it is possible to critique queer cultural studies, queer film scholarship, and so on. In place of what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick might term paranoid readings of queer anthropology, my own prescriptive moment is to urge a modality of critical engagement, a hermeneutic of generosity that can provide not just new answers but new kinds of questions for a decentered, indeed "queered," queer studies.¹¹

Notes

1. See Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism as a Site of Discourse on the Privilege of Partial Perspective," *Feminist Studies* 14 (1988): 575–99.
2. See Robyn Wiegman, "Difference and Disciplinarity," in *Aesthetics in a Multicultural Age*, ed. Emory Elliott, Louis Freitas Caton, and Jeffrey Rhyne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 135–56.
3. With reference to the anthropologist Esther Newton, Judith Halberstam notes that "she literally makes her own archives." See Judith Halberstam, "Foreword: The Butch Anthropologist Out in the Field," in *Margaret Mead Made Me Gay: Personal Essays, Public Ideas*, by Esther Newton (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), xiii.
4. Marilyn Strathern, *Partial Connections* (Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1991), 39.
5. Marilyn Strathern, *Commons and Borderlands: Working Papers on Interdisciplinarity, Accountability, and the Flow of Knowledge* (Wantage, UK: Sean Kingston, 2004), 5. I discuss many of the issues in more detail in *Coincidence: Anthropology, Queer Studies, Critique* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).
6. As of 2005, Martin Manalansan has become the social science editor for *GLQ*; this review essay was commissioned and written before he assumed that position.
7. Similar dynamics can be found in many cases of transgendered subject positions worldwide. See, for example, Don Kulick, *Travesti: Sex, Gender, and Culture among Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

8. I am thinking here of works like Raymond Firth's *We, the Tikopia: A Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1936) and Bronislaw Malinowski's oeuvre on the Trobriand Islands, particularly *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (New York: Dutton, 1922) and *Coral Gardens and Their Magic* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1935).
9. See my books *The Gay Archipelago: Sexuality and Nation in Indonesia* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005) and *Coincidence*.
10. Saba Mahmood, "Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some Reflections on the Egyptian Islamic Revival," *Cultural Anthropology* 16 (2001): 202–36.
11. See Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading, or, You're So Paranoid, You Probably Think This Essay Is about You," in *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), 123–53. The phrase *hermeneutic of generosity* comes from Paul Farmer, *AIDS and Accusation: Haiti and the Geography of Blame* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 235.

