



blackwell readers in anthropology

same-sex cultures and sexualities
an anthropological reader

edited by
iifer robertson

 **Blackwell**
Publishing

Same-Sex Cultures and Sexualities

An Anthropological Reader

Edited by

Jennifer Robertson

Editorial material and organization © 2005 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA

108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK

550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

The right of Jennifer Robertson to be identified as the Author of the Editorial Material in this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

First published 2005 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Same-sex cultures and sexualities : an anthropological reader / edited by Jennifer Ellen Robertson.

p. cm. — (Blackwell readers in anthropology ; 6)

ISBN 0-631-23299-0 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 0-631-23300-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Homosexuality. 2. Lesbianism. 3. Gay and lesbian studies. 4. Gay men. 5. Lesbians. I. Robertson, Jennifer. II. Series.

GN484.35.S36 2005

306.76'6—dc22

2003026674

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on

Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:

<http://www.blackwellpublishing.com>

Same-Sex Cultures and Sexualities

Blackwell Readers in Anthropology

1. *Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*
Edited by Jonathan Xavier Inda and Renato Rosaldo
2. *The Anthropology of Media: A Reader*
Edited by Kelly Askew and Richard R. Wilk
3. *Genocide: An Anthropological Reader*
Edited by Alexander Laban Hinton
4. *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*
Edited by Setha Low and Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga
5. *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*
Edited by Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Philippe Bourgois
6. *Same-Sex Cultures and Sexualities: An Anthropological Reader*
Edited by Jennifer Robertson

As anthropology moves beyond the limits of so-called area studies, there is an increasing need for texts that attempt to do the work of both synthesizing the literature and of challenging more traditional or subdisciplinary approaches to anthropology. This is the object of the exciting new series, *Blackwell Readers in Anthropology*.

Each volume in the series offers what have emerged as seminal readings on a chosen theme, and provides the finest, most thought-provoking recent works in the given thematic area. A number of these volumes bring together for the first time a body of literature on a certain topic. Inasmuch, these books are intended to become more than definitive collections; they demonstrate the very ways in which anthropological inquiry has evolved and is evolving.

Acknowledgments

I was very pleased when Jane Huber, Blackwell's energetic and enterprising anthropology editor, invited me to edit a reader on same-sex sexualities, and it is to her that I owe the first of many grateful thanks. I also owe thanks to Annie Lenth, an assistant editor at Blackwell, from whose cheerful efficiency I greatly benefited, and to Juanita Bullough, whose attentive and expert copy-editing was greatly appreciated. Celeste Brusati made room in her own busy publication schedule to read over the introduction and I am, as always, grateful for her valuable suggestions. I owe hearty thanks to the fifteen contributors whose rigorous and scrutinizing scholarship made this *Reader* possible in the first place. Thanks also to the journals and presses who granted copyright permission, and to Mary Hancock, Evelyn Blackwood, and the other (anonymous) reviewers of the initial proposal and my introductory essay whose comments helped to further shape this volume.

The editor and publishers wish to thank the following for permission to use copyright material:

1. Carole S. Vance, "Anthropology rediscovers sexuality: A theoretical comment." *Social Science and Medicine* 33(8): 875–84, 1991. Reprinted by permission of Elsevier Science.
2. Bonnie Spanier, "Biological determinism and homosexuality." *NWSA Journal* 7: 54–71, 1995. Reprinted by permission of Indiana University Press.
3. Barbara L. Voss, "Feminisms, queer theories, and the archaeological study of past sexualities." *World Archaeology* 32(2): 180–92, 2000. Reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd. <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals>
4. Don Kulick, "No." *Language and Communication* 23(2): 139–51, 2003. Reprinted by permission of Elsevier.
5. Alisa Klinger, "Resources for lesbian ethnographic research in the lavender archives." *Journal of Homosexuality* 34(3–4): 205–24, 1998. Reprinted by permission of The Haworth Press.

6. Deborah A. Elliston, "Erotic anthropology: 'Ritualized homosexuality' in Melanesia and beyond." *American Ethnologist* 22(4): 848–67, 1995. Reprinted by permission of the American Anthropological Association and the author. Not for sale or further reproduction.
7. Corinne P. Hayden, "Gender, genetics, and generation: Reformulating biology in lesbian kinship." *Cultural Anthropology* 10: 41–63, 1995. Reprinted by permission of the American Anthropological Association and the author. Not for sale or further reproduction.
8. Judith Shapiro, "Transsexualism: Reflections on the persistence of gender and the mutability of sex." In *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity*, Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub, eds. Pp. 248–79. New York and London: Routledge, 1991. Reproduced by permission of Routledge, Inc., part of The Taylor & Francis Group.
9. Estelle B. Freedman and John D'Emilio, "Problems encountered in writing the history of sexuality: Sources, theory and interpretation." *Journal of Sex Research* 27(4): 481–95, 1990. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.
10. Edward Stein, "Choosing the sexual orientation of children." *Bioethics* 12(1): 1–24, 1998. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.
11. Jennifer Robertson, "Yoshiya Nobuko: Out and outspoken in practice and prose." In *The Human Tradition in Modern Japan*, Anne Walthall, ed. Pp. 155–74. Copyright 1996 by Scholarly Resources Inc. Reprinted by permission of Scholarly Resources Inc.
12. Matti Bunzl, "Outing as performance/outing as resistance: A queer reading of Austrian (homo)sexualities." *Cultural Anthropology* 12: 129–51, 1997. Reprinted by permission of the American Anthropological Association and the author. Not for sale or further reproduction.
13. Evelyn Blackwood, "Tombois in West Sumatra: Constructing masculinity and erotic desire." *Cultural Anthropology* 13(4): 491–521, 1998. Reprinted by permission of the American Anthropological Association and the author. Not for sale or further reproduction.
14. Donald L. Donham, "Freeing South Africa: The 'modernization' of male-male sexuality in Soweto." *Cultural Anthropology* 13(1): 3–21, 1998. Reprinted by permission of the American Anthropological Association and the author. Not for sale or further reproduction.
15. Timothy Wright, "Gay organizations, NGOs, and the globalization of sexual identity: The case of Bolivia." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 5(2): 89–111, 2000. Reprinted by permission of the American Anthropological Association and the author. Not for sale or further reproduction.

Every effort has been made to trace copyright holders and to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. The authors and publishers will gladly receive any information enabling them to rectify any error or omission in subsequent editions.

Contents

Acknowledgments	viii
Introduction: Sexualizing Anthropology's Fields <i>Jennifer Robertson</i>	1
Part I Anthropology's Sexual Fields	13
1 Anthropology Rediscovered Sexuality: A Theoretical Comment <i>Carole S. Vance</i>	15
Vance explores the strengths of social constructionist approaches to the study of sexuality, separating them from earlier nature-nurture debates. She observes that the concern with AIDS has created new possibilities and new problems alike for research on sexualities.	
2 Biological Determinism and Homosexuality <i>Bonnie Spanier</i>	33
Spanier exposes the flawed methodology of so-called scientific claims about the biological bases for differences in sex and sexualities. Her broader aim is to make feminist sense of received notions of "reason" and "scientific evidence."	
3 Feminisms, Queer Theories, and the Archaeological Study of Past Sexualities <i>Barbara L. Voss</i>	48
Voss employs an analysis of citational practices to consider how feminist and queer theories articulate with, and are useful in, archaeological investigations of sexuality.	

-
- | | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| 4 | No
<i>Don Kulick</i> | 60 |
| | Kulick examines how the enunciation (or not) of "no" in particular social situations works to produce those situations as sexual. In distinguishing between performance and performativity, he aims to understand the way that language and sexuality intertwine. | |
| 5 | Resources for Lesbian Ethnographic Research in the Lavender Archives
<i>Alisa Klinger</i> | 73 |
| | Klinger discusses the pragmatic issues of creating and maintaining the accessible research venues necessary to develop the study of multiracial and multiethnic lesbian lives. | |
| Part II Problems and Propositions | | 89 |
| 6 | Erotic Anthropology: "Ritualized Homosexuality" in Melanesia and Beyond
<i>Deborah A. Elliston</i> | 91 |
| | Elliston critiques anthropological uses of the concept of "ritualized homosexuality" in Melanesia and explores related theoretical problems in the cross-cultural study of same-sex sexuality and erotics. | |
| 7 | Gender, Genetics, and Generation: Reformulating Biology in Lesbian Kinship
<i>Corinne P. Hayden</i> | 116 |
| | Hayden explores the ways in which many lesbian mothers employ notions of biology to articulate their own sense of a uniquely lesbian kinship. Rather than show how lesbian kinship constitutes a radical critique of American kinship, she draws out the ways in which lesbians rework and recontextualize "blood ties." | |
| 8 | Transsexualism: Reflections on the Persistence of Gender and the Mutability of Sex
<i>Judith Shapiro</i> | 138 |
| | Shapiro takes transsexualism as a point of departure for examining the paradoxical relationship between sex and gender. She notes that the comparative study of gender differences both reveals how few differences are predicted by sex in any sense of the term and demonstrates the great flexibility of gender systems. | |
| 9 | Problems Encountered in Writing the History of Sexuality: Sources, Theory and Interpretation
<i>Estelle B. Freedman and John D'Emilio</i> | 162 |
| | Freedman and D'Emilio explore the array of interpretive problems and theoretical approaches to two historical subjects: changing definitions of sexual identity in the nineteenth century and working-class sexuality in the twentieth century. | |

Part III Ethics, Erotics, and Exercises	175
10 Choosing the Sexual Orientation of Children <i>Edward Stein</i>	177
Stein argues that the availability of procedures to select the sexual orientation of children would contribute to discrimination and prejudice against lesbians, gays, and bisexuals, and would undermine the maintenance of a just society.	
11 Yoshiya Nobuko: Out and Outspoken in Practice and Prose <i>Jennifer Robertson</i>	196
Robertson contextualizes the life and times of a Japanese female novelist who challenged social and familial conventions by both choosing a female life partner and creating a new genre of "girls' fiction."	
12 Outing as Performance/Outing as Resistance: A Queer Reading of Austrian (Homo)sexualities <i>Matti Bunzl</i>	212
Bunzl analyzes the contradictory and ambivalent politics of outing, focusing on an "outing-action" in Austria in 1995. He argues that lesbians and gays should be wary of locating themselves in a reified reality of "lesbian and gay" experience, and should examine the constitution of their political experiential tropes.	
13 <i>Tombois</i> in West Sumatra: Constructing Masculinity and Erotic Desire <i>Evelyn Blackwood</i>	232
Blackwood explores how <i>tombois</i> , Indonesian females acting in the manner of men, both shape their identities from and resist local, national, and transnational narratives of gender and sexuality.	
14 Freeing South Africa: The "Modernization" of Male-Male Sexuality in Soweto <i>Donald L. Donham</i>	261
Donham traces the life, work, and death from AIDS of a gay black African activist in Soweto. He argues for a revitalized attention to ethnography in order to impart a fuller understanding of sexuality in South Africa and elsewhere.	
15 Gay Organizations, NGOs, and the Globalization of Sexual Identity: The Case of Bolivia <i>Timothy Wright</i>	279
Wright combines an ethnography of sexual activities, personal identities, and social relations of males-who-have-sex-with-males in Bolivia with an analysis of attempts by government and international development agencies to create a demographically identifiable population of "gay" Bolivians.	
Index	295

Introduction: Sexualizing Anthropology's Fields

Jennifer Robertson

Over the past quarter-century, sexuality¹ has moved from the periphery to the center of anthropological research and lesbian and gay studies has followed in its wake. Queer, transgendered, bisexual, transsexual, and intersexed are now familiar (non-slang) terms that, with lesbian and gay, have more or less replaced “homosexual,” a wooden, if overdetermined, term coined in the nineteenth century that does not capture the plasticity and malleability of human sexual practices and identities. In the meantime, “heterosexual” is becoming a less self-evident orientation or ideology through its interrogation by scholars and laypersons alike, although it remains the dominant default mode of sexuality in most societies. This is not to claim, however, that these now familiar terms are free from ideological content, or that as categories they are automatically more accommodating and expansive than “homosexual.”

The essays comprising this anthropological reader all question and challenge, in different yet related ways, the a priori assumption among many people of a connection between same-sex sexual *desires, practices, and identifications*, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, queer, etc. *identities*. Viewed retrospectively, one might argue that human sexual desires and practices per se have not multiplied, but rather, that since the 1980s, multiple academic, legal, and medical ways have been coined and created in an effort to categorize and contain them. Consequently, multiple “ready-made” identities and their attendant politics have formed around and on the basis of human sexual practices (cf. Robertson 2002). If not themselves understood as relational and their relevance part of a continuous process of sociocultural change, these new categories and identities will become as reified and rendered as inadequate as the terms – like “homosexual” – they initially helped to complicate.

This *Reader* aspires to channel the comparative anthropological and historical study of same-sex cultures and sexualities into a full-spectrum anthropological mainstream. It also aims to demonstrate the centrality of the complicated relationship of sex, gender, and sexuality to the development and refinement of

anthropological theories in general. As the constituent essays make absolutely clear, studies of sexuality, in this case same-sex sexualities, are not limited to, and are much more than, studies *by and for* self-identified lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, or transsexual scholars. Similarly, by titling this volume *Same-Sex Cultures and Sexualities* I am not referring to reified things. Rather, I am advocating a kind of “cultural physics” in which sexuality operates as a vector that occasions multiple interactions among groups of humans, and that transmits through manifold media different kinds of energy among humans. Kinship, for example, is one of the variety of effects and outcomes generated.

That the time is right both for mainstreaming sexuality within anthropology and for publishing this *Reader* is evidenced in part by the appearance of, in the 1993 and 2000 editions of the *Annual Review of Anthropology*, essays surveying a range of anthropological scholarship on same-sex sexualities.² Another indicator, based on my own experience, of the timeliness of this *Reader* is the increasingly vocal demand on the part of anthropology students, both graduate and undergraduate, for theoretical and comparative work on the sexualities of actual (as opposed to fictional) human beings, past and present.

A concerted effort is made in this volume to consider the relationship of sex, gender, and sexuality through the lenses of the sociocultural, biological, linguistic, and archaeological sub-fields of anthropology along with historical and applied anthropology. It is surprising that the place of biology and archaeology in the anthropology curriculum continues to be debated by anthropologists. The general public, it seems, holds a different view. Even a quick perusal of a recent year's worth of the Science section of the *New York Times* is telling: the vast majority of articles with anthropological content and implications deal with the human genome and genetics or with skeletal remains and human evolution. It seems to me that anthropologists cannot afford to ignore the enormous popular authority of biology and archaeology. It is imperative that we understand the basis for the allure of science, and to learn how to respond effectively to misappropriations of biology and archaeology, such as the “gay” gene and the “nuclear family” of *Australopithecus africanus*.

I have selected essays that treat (same-sex) sexuality not as an isolable thing, but as a nexus comprised of myriad intersecting fields and forces, sites, and situations. This *Reader* does not pretend to be a comprehensive history of anthropological research on sexualities, much less same-sex sexualities, although several articles provide a historical overview of such. Though it is impossible to do justice to the amazing variety of sexual practices and desires across cultural areas, I did attempt to include essays based on ethnography in specific cultural areas at specific points in history. Collectively, these essays represent epistemological and research topoi that have emerged as especially salient over the past decade to the development of an anthropology of same-sex sexuality. These include biotechnology and bioethics, sexual categories and boundaries, language and terminology, ethnicity and identity politics, kinship and family, citizenship and politics, and policy-making. I have made every effort to avoid redundancies and duplications with other anthologies on same-sex sexualities that either focus on anthropology or include the work of anthropologists.³

Given the centrality of sex in the lives of humans individually and collectively, one would think that anthropologists, whose intellectual and pedagogical mission is to

explore and represent the colorful and complex varieties of human cultures and experiences, were at the forefront of the investigation of human sexualities. On the contrary, as Carole Vance has argued (in this volume), they have been "far from courageous or even adequate," especially in regard to same-sex practices.⁴ A point I made in *Takarazuka: Sexual Politics and Popular Culture in Modern Japan* [(Robertson 2001 [1998])] pertains equally to the discipline of anthropology and its practitioners. Contrary to the opinion of majority of my colleagues in Japanese Studies, I realized that the all-female Takarazuka Revue was an ideal site for an exploration of the contested discourse of sexuality in modern Japan.⁵ That such a connection had either been overlooked or dismissed was one manifestation of the relative lack of serious attention that scholars of Japan had paid to ideas about gender and sexuality beyond the completely normative. Some shortsightedly eschewed the subject itself as unscholarly and/or motivated by a radical (i.e., feminist or lesbian) agenda; others apparently were afraid of being stigmatized and ostracized for undertaking research on the subject of sex and gender – and, in particular, on the subject of same-sex sexualities. Apparently the threat encoded in the insidious expression "It takes one to know one" overpowered the fear of incomplete or even bad scholarship. Unfortunately, it still is too often the case that indifference, ignorance, and prejudice prevent researchers from considering the historical and cultural significance of gender attribution and sexual practices even when these have been and remain part of a very *public* discourse. Imagine scholars fifty or one hundred years from now writing about marriage in the late twentieth-century United States without mentioning the enormous amount of attention, popular and legal alike, paid to the issue of same-sex marriage (Robertson 2001 [1998]: 45).

It is thus no wonder, as Vance keenly observed over a decade ago, that "the recent development of a more cultural and non-essentialist discourse about sexuality has sprung not from the centre of anthropology but from its periphery, from other disciplines (especially history), and from theorizing done by marginal groups." The role of historians has been especially important in laying a foundation for the rigorous study of sexuality, beginning with the crucial point that the "very term 'sexuality' is a modern construct which originated in the nineteenth century," as Freedman and D'Emilio point out (in this volume).⁶ Historian Robert Padgug usefully distinguishes between sexuality as ideology and sexuality as praxis; that is, sexuality as an essence or group of essences, and sexuality as an ensemble of active social relations (Padgug 1989: 22). He notes that "the most commonly held twentieth-century assumptions about sexuality imply that it is a separate category of existence (like "the economy," or "the state," other supposedly independent spheres of reality), almost identical with the sphere of private life" (ibid.: 18–19).

Predicated on a classic division of individual and society, these assumptions fuel various psychological and biological determinisms about sexuality (ibid.: 19), determinisms that some researchers – and some ideologues – seek to attribute to brain morphology as well as to genetics. Invoking the axiom, "good politics, like good intentions, are not sufficient to produce valid science," Bonnie Spanier (in this volume) analyzes and deconstructs scientific claims about biological bases for differences in sexuality. She focuses on the widely publicized research of Simon LeVay, a self-identified gay neurobiologist who "found," in the structure of the

hypothalamus, a difference between ostensibly heterosexual and homosexual males. For LeVay, a biological determinant of homosexuality served as evidence against the belief that it was a mental illness, or criminal, or immoral. Edward Stein (in this volume) confronts the ethical implications of such scientific studies of sexual orientation in conjunction with the popular belief – despite serious flaws in those studies – that a person's sexuality is genetically determined. Will prospective parents advocate for and apply biotechnologies to select the sexual orientation of their children and/or to prevent the birth of children who will not be heterosexual? In answering this troubling question, Stein attempts to reconcile the tension between, on the one hand, the application of biotechnologies in the name of reproductive liberty and, on the other hand, the legal protection of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals through the regulation of certain reproductive technologies.

Recent developments in reproductive technologies – alternative (artificial) insemination (AI), in vitro fertilization (IVF), zygote intrafallopian transfer (ZIFT), surrogacy, etc. – have exacerbated (rather than caused) a “crisis of kinship.” However, human beings across cultures and over centuries have been far more resilient and innovative about “the structures that connect society to the natural world and generations to each other” (Laqueur 2000: 80) than those (and not just in the United States) who currently advocate so-called traditional marriages and family values. Female–female marriages in parts of Africa are a case in point. Kath Weston, in *Families We Choose* (1991), explicitly challenged the dominant model of American kinship and its foundation in procreation and biological ties, and Corinne Hayden (in this volume) demonstrates that whereas “chosen families may *decentralize* biology, lesbian families’ explicit mobilization of biological ties challenges the notion of biology as a *singular* category through which kin ties are reckoned.” How the so-called core symbols of American kinship are reworked and recontextualized by both lesbian mothers and the new reproductive and genetic biotechnologies is the main focus of Hayden’s essay.

In addition to procreation and biological ties, the dominant model of American kinship is understood to be premised on a strict, naturalized alignment of sex, gender, and sexuality: males are bodies with penises, are masculine men, and are heterosexual; females are bodies with vaginas, are feminine women, and are heterosexual. The phenomenon of transsexualism, writes Judith Shapiro (in this volume), paradoxically both “raises questions about what it means to consider external genitals as the ‘basis’ for systems of gender difference,” and reinforces the dominant, conservative assumption that there are only two sexes and two genders, that genitals are essential signs of gender, and that one’s gender is “invariant and permanent.” Sex-change surgery, she argues, is in the domain of “heroic medicine.” A biotechnological tour de force, the transsexed body⁷ calls attention both to competing ideologies of essential (“natural”) and socially constructed gender, and to the naturalization of “nature” by biomedical specialists. Similarly, in *Lessons from the Intersexed* (1990), Suzanne Kessler explores how infants born having physical gender markers (genitals, gonads, or chromosomes) that are neither clearly “female” nor “male” compel a rethinking of the relationship of sex (*qua* genitals), gender, and sexuality.

Shapiro also draws from others’ ethnographic research in order to compare Euro-American transsexualism with forms of what she calls “institutionalized gender

crossing" in cultures where dominant Euro-American notions about sexuality have little or no cachet: the Native American *berdache*, the Omani *xanith*, and female-female marriage in Africa. In this volume, articles by Deborah Elliston, Evelyn Blackwood, Donald Donham, Timothy Wright, and myself deal with same-sex practices, desires, and erotics in Melanesia, West Sumatra, South Africa, Bolivia, and Japan, respectively.

Elliston critiques the concept of "institutionalized" or "ritualized" homosexuality, arguing that although it helped to destigmatize anthropological research on same-sex sexualities, the concept is fundamentally problematic in that it promotes a certain "erotic ethnocentrism" which may exist only in the mind's eye of the beholding ethnographer. Focusing on semen practices in Melanesian societies, she makes the case that erotics and sexuality (as understood in a Euro-American context) are neither central nor relevant to the local meanings of these practices. Rather, age and gender hierarchies, and local models of (male/masculine) identity development – in other words, the stuff of everyday life – provide a more accurate theoretical framework for understanding boys' initiation into manhood.

Most anthropologists tend to pay close attention to how people make sense of their world, seeking out local "voices," and engaging in transparent interactions over the course of their fieldwork. But those of us working on sexualities often encounter silences and opaque references and transactions. Alisa Klinger (in this volume) discusses how lesbian lives have been "disappeared" from the historical record, and elaborates on the ways in which those lives can be retrieved from seemingly insignificant ephemera. She urges scholars to complement text-based scholarship with fieldwork and archival research in order to resist and counter the "historic tendency to silence lesbians" as well as to forge a strong(er) relationship between the academy and local communities.⁸

Timothy Wright's essay on Bolivia (in this volume) reminds us that silence is an equally "valuable and malleable resource," and that just because (male) homosexuality and silence have been inseparable partners, this does not mean that homosexuality is never mentioned. Wright explains that male homosexuality is a "safe" topic provided references to it are made in "tones of indignation, repulsion, anger, or pity" or in the form of degrading jokes and tabloid articles about immorality and crime. However, the more personal the connection to homosexuality, the more often the subject is shrouded in silence.

Wright's work as a regional gay men's outreach coordinator for HIV/AIDS prevention provided him with direct insights into contradictions between local understandings of same-sex practices and the "gay" identity fostered by, in this case, USAID-funded public health programs. He, and the other contributors to this volume who work in Indonesia, Japan, and South Africa, found that transnational encounters introduced changes in local cultural attitudes toward, definitions of, and identifications with various sexualities, just as local sexual practices confound theories of sexuality premised on reified norms, whatever their provenance.

Blackwood writes about the Minangkabau *tomboi*, understood as "a female acting in the manner of men," and the "normative" (that is, unmarked) womanly females who choose a *tomboi* partner. She argues that two forms of gender transgression among females are collectively produced by the "hegemonic heterosexuality" of the Indonesian state, the Minangkabau kinship system, and the

opportunities for self-sufficiency provided by the capitalist economy. These forms are the *tomboi* and the womanly female who participates in “compulsory heterosexuality” by marrying and bearing children, who then, her obligations fulfilled, pursues erotic relationships with *tombois*.

This situation is very similar to the predominant ideology in Japan regarding marriage, which is recognized less as a product of romantic love – which is not to imply that Japanese married couples do not love each other – and more as a means to achieve social adulthood and normality, to ensure genealogical continuity, and to secure economic security, etc. Consequently, as I have written elsewhere, as long as an individual’s sexual practices do not interfere with or challenge the legitimacy of the twinned institutions of marriage and household, Japanese society accommodates – and in the case of males, even indulges – a diversity of sexual behaviors. One of the most tenacious of mistaken assumptions that anthropologists need to dismantle if any progress is to be made in understanding sexuality and its theories is the easy equation of marriage with sexuality, and heterosexuality in particular (Robertson 2001 [1998]: 145). I explore a case in point (in this volume) in contextualizing the life and (female) loves of Yoshiya Nobuko (1896–1973), one of Japan’s most popular novelists and, most unusually in the early twentieth century, an economically self-sufficient woman thanks to her literary successes. When she realized that, like its predecessor, the post-World War II constitution would not recognize same-sex marriage, Yoshiya made radical use of the flexible Japanese kinship system by adopting her life partner, Monma Chiyo, in 1957, thus ensuring that Monma would be legally recognized as her successor.

For Yoshiya and other Japanese women writers of modern Japan, traveling throughout Europe and the United States was considered *de rigueur*, and their experiences abroad directly informed their literary efforts. Yoshiya, who claimed to be “impressed by the liberated women of America,” vowed “never again to write about female characters who cried a lot and simply endured their miserable lot in life.” Similarly, the worldwide transmission of a lesbian and gay discourse, circulated through “rainbow” NGOs and their media, the internet, and AIDS-related outreach programs, has influenced the formation of a supra-local lesbian and gay identity politics in countries and regions across the globe. In this connection, it is crucial to realize that transcultural encounters, while not strictly dialectical, and however uneven or unequal in power or degree, are “shifting processes”: they do not constitute unidirectional teleologies. All parties involved in the encounter are affected and modified by it, albeit with different consequences (Taylor 1991: 63; Robertson 2001 [1998]: 219, n. 23).

In Indonesia, for example, *tomboi* identity has been incorporated into the formation of a national lesbian and gay “community” and movement. And in Soweto, South Africa, as Donald Donham (in this volume) writes, the end of apartheid occasioned the creation, for some black men, of an identity based on sexuality, that is, a *gay* identity. In apartheid-era urban black culture, gender apparently overrode biological sex. Males who cross-dressed or who expressed a sexual interest in other males were identified, and identified themselves, as “women.” However, Donham elaborates, this new way of looking at the sexual world was not taken up consistently, evenly, or completely. He reiterates emphatically the crucial importance of ethnography both in challenging theories, however useful, now taken as self-

evident and universally relevant, and in analyzing the interreferential relationship between the local and the global.

The clarion call of the anthropologists represented in this volume is for more ethnography—empirical and historical information—about *actual* human sexual desires and practices, and less abstract and “presentist” philosophy. Problems of accurate interpretation and representation arise when local, everyday sexual practices are diluted and distorted by an ethnographer’s fealties to a particular theory or theoretical matrix. In anthropology, at least, theories are congealed from the living flux, or the animated archive, of quotidian, patterned experience. If theories are not to become frozen as formulaic explanation, and consequently rendered atheoretical, they must be challenged, modified, and refined by empirical, everyday “stuff.” Thus, for example, although Michel Foucault’s work on sexuality has been foundational to the anthropology of sexuality, Donham points out that it also presents serious limitations. He explains that Foucault overstressed a unidirectional narrative of supersession, when, in fact, cultural change tends to be more various, more fractured, more incomplete. A second limitation of Foucault’s work on sexuality, Donham notes, stems from his over-reliance on the texts of medical specialists to infer the categories and commitments of ordinary people.

Matti Bunzl (in this volume) makes an analogous argument in his critical analysis of the politics of outing in Austria. His essay also effectively makes problematic any notion of “Europe” or “the West” as an internally coherent culture in its own right. Taking as his subject the 1995 *Outing-Aktion* of a leading activist in Austria’s oldest lesbian and gay organization, Homosexuellen-Initiative, Bunzl aims to show the perilous contingencies of lesbian/gay political work. The targets of the outing were Catholic bishops and their “clandestine homosexuality,” and the objective was to draw attention to the ongoing legal discrimination that continues to denigrate lesbians and gay men in Austria. Through a close, analytical reading of the various texts generated in preparation for and by this event, Bunzl determines that while outing closeted homophobes exposes their hypocrisy, it also turns these closeted persons into “Others,” thereby, ironically, reinforcing the normativity and dominance of heterosexuality.

Whereas anthropologists studying sexuality need to work at generating new theoretical insights from inter- and intra-cultural encounters, archaeologists need to do just the opposite. Working with “broken pots, faunal remains, collapsed structures, burials, soil residues, and other evidentiary sources,” archaeologists need to, in Barbara Voss’s words (in this volume), stretch “theories of sexuality in new chronological and cultural directions.” This is more easily said than done. Feminist archaeology was formally – and *finally* – introduced in the United States in the early 1980s by pioneers like Margaret Conkey, Joan Gero, and Janet Spector, among others. Judging from citational practices, there exists a “degree of theoretical conservatism in feminist archaeology with regard to conceptions of sexuality and its relationship to gender.” Voss further elaborates that it is difficult for those feminist archaeologists who are occupied with legitimizing and developing gender studies simultaneously to embrace queer theories that deconstruct gender and sexuality. Deconstructions of sex and gender destabilize precisely those categories (e.g., male, female, woman, man) that are necessarily invoked to model engendered social worlds of the past. In other words, Voss argues, the fear of compromising “gender”