

THINKING SEXUALITY TRANSNATIONALLY

An Introduction

Elizabeth A. Povinelli and George Chauncey

Recently, there has been a small but discernible “transnational turn” in lesbian and gay studies and queer theory. Queer study groups on globalization have appeared at numerous universities and colleges, and a handful of national and international conferences have been held, including “Queer Globalization,” organized by the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies at the City University of New York in April 1998. This issue of *GLQ* is the outgrowth of one such initiative, a yearlong seminar on sexual identities and identity politics in transnational perspective that was organized in 1997–98, under the auspices of the Chicago Humanities Institute, by the Lesbian and Gay Studies Project of the Center for Gender Studies at the University of Chicago.¹ University of Chicago faculty had applied to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation in 1993 for a grant to organize the seminar and three small related conferences, which proposed to examine the effect of the increasingly transnational mobility of people, media, commodities, discourses, and capital on local, regional, and national modes of sexual desire, embodiment, and subjectivity.

The impetus for the yearlong seminar was a growing sense that transnational sexual diasporas were transforming the sexual politics and cultures of many nation-states. Postcolonial nations were witnessing the emergence of sex-based social movements whose political rhetoric and tactics seemed to mimic or reproduce Euro-American forms of sexual identity, subjectivity, and citizenship and, at the same time, to challenge fundamental Western notions of the erotic, the individual, and the universal rights attached to this fictive “subject.” New forms of “gay/lesbian” or “queer” identity, of sexuality, of intimacy, erotics, and community were emerging in these hybrid cultural fields and calling into question dominant

models of sex, governance, and nationalism, but they were doing so in ways little understood by lesbian, gay, and queer historians, ethnographers, literary critics, and theorists, whose focus remained on the nation, the local, or the disembodied and decontextualized subject of rights. During the year we learned that the recent emergence of globalization studies complicated, if it nevertheless necessitated, a sustained assessment of the analytic power that the contested concepts of globalization, transnationalism, translocality, and other related ideas provided queer studies.² We wish here to outline the difference that global and transnational perspectives make to the study of sexuality and corporeality, intimacy and proximity, and how theories of sexuality complicate the task of globalization studies.

Globalization refers less to the fact of a set of global economic, political, and social connections—a phenomenon that has existed at least since the fifteenth century—than to their scale, intensity, and density in post-Fordist capitalism and to their effect on the social practices, identities, and imaginaries of people throughout the world.³ In this spirit Saskia Sassen argues that while there have always been “economic actors and practices that were transnational . . . over the last fifteen years we can see a profoundly different phase, one where national economies are less and less a unitary category in the face of the new forms of globalization.”⁴ The best work in the interdisciplinary field of globalization studies is careful not to mistake the emergence of a consciousness of a global ecumene for the emergence of the phenomenon itself.⁵ Analyzing lesbian and gay social formations and consciousness in the industrial cities of North and South America during the last century suggests the long history of transnational and diasporic sexualities and their impact on national sexualities (see Larvie in this issue).⁶ The striking (and often explosive) diversity of sexual identities and practices in early-twentieth-century New York, for instance, resulted in no small part from the arrival of southern and eastern European Catholics and Jews, who brought with them sexual conventions and modes of embodiment significantly different from those of the earlier (and then-dominant) Protestant migrants from northern Europe. In the 1950s the massive migration of Puerto Ricans transformed New York’s sexual culture again. It is impossible to understand the sexual history of New York, Rio de Janeiro, San Juan, and other cities in the Americas without coming to terms with the implications of such transnational movements and the tremendous translocal mobility of every city’s residents (see Negrón-Muntaner in this issue). These movements clearly affected the sexual practices, subjectivities, and politics of the immigrants’ homelands and host nations.

Whether globalization is posited as a rupture in older forms of global circulation or as a progressive, uneven development of the world system, there are

several dominant trends in contemporary research. Some scholars seek to understand how the density and speed of global linkages and movements affect local, regional, national, public, and state practices, embodiments, identities, and imaginaries.⁷ Perhaps most influential to this work has been the model of “space-time compression” proposed by David Harvey to describe the spatiotemporal effects of post-Fordist patterns of flexible accumulation.⁸ Harvey’s own work focuses on the shrinkage of the time horizons of both private and public interaction and decision making; on the wider, more variegated space created by the geography of capitalism; and on the form, tactics, and techniques of social power emerging in and across these spaces. Other scholars examine either the structure and form of emergent transnational corporations, their economic and legal instruments, and their modes of production and accumulation, or the structure and form of emergent political organizations that are neither state- nor nation-based.⁹ Still other scholars attempt to develop new models for the emergent forms and dimensions of these global spaces and temporalities in the context of the persisting, if weakened, nation-state. Arjun Appadurai, for instance, proposes that globalized space be conceptualized as a series of provisional, interlocking, deterritorialized “scapes” rather than as a set of sovereign, territorial-based nation-states.¹⁰

Homogenization, diversification, hybridization; the local, the global, and the glocal; locality, localization, and translocality; globalization and transnationalism; flows, linkages, scapes, and circuits: we are witness to a proliferation of conceptual conjunctions and neologisms that describe, or more simply that demarcate, the dense, variegated traffic in cultural representations, people, and capital that increasingly characterizes the social life of people around the world. This much we are fairly sure of: the dissemination of variously mediated forms of culture, embodiment, and desire happens at ever higher speeds and across long, striated distances in the context of reconfigurations and reconsolidations of economic, state, and national power. Information technologies allow quick communication across vast distances to those who have access to computer terminals and telephones. Web sites and cable networks enable diasporic and immigrant populations to maintain intimate connections with their real or imagined national homelands, state or stateless, or to create new transnational, originless communities. But these communicative arrays are not completely severed from older nation-based state and economic forms; for instance, the Cable News Network and the British Broadcasting Corporation provide an Anglo-American digest of and perspective on the news to viewers in much of the world.

That is, as scholars track the new forms of territoriality and identity emerging in the context of globalized political and economic institutions and media, they

are increasingly aware of the unevenness of these global circulations. The range and speed of an object's (or a subject's) circulation depend on a variety of institutionally mediated power relations. In many places the introduction of mobile phones and faxes has preceded that of television or even indoor plumbing. Wealthy cosmopolitan elite in one nation-state may have more in common with the wealthy elite in other nation-states than with the impoverished men and women in their own. Web sites provide gay pornography to browsers where there are *hijra*, *travesti*, and *kathoeys* but no gay men. And the material and conceptual objects that Web sites circulate are insinuated into local, regional, and national spaces and times, still regulated by state-based law, citizenship, and markets and by local notions and practices of embodiment and sociality. How local persons imagine the commonsense location of the local may be defined by a globally disseminated U.S. television show: characters on *Sesame Street* translate the question "Who are the people in your neighborhood?" into local genres, footings, and framings conceptually *nearest to a neighborhood*. The question that scholars of globalization face is how to conceptualize these delicate and dramatic figurations and refigurations of local embodiments, identities, and imaginaries.

Although many studies of globalization purport to be interested in the full range of local embodiments, identities, and imaginaries, most of them focus on the shifting centrality of a particular identity and imaginary, that is, on a shift from national to transnational (a term often used interchangeably with *diasporic*) identities and imaginaries and on the impact of this shift on forms and practices of citizenship in the context of economic globalization.¹¹ From the sociology of Mike Featherstone to the cultural criticism of Fredric Jameson, "the question revolves around the sociocultural processes and forms of life which are emerging as the global begins to replace the nation-state as the decisive framework for social life."¹² In a world defined by transnational movements, the rights that people moving and staying put can legitimately and practically demand of nation-based governments and publics are being rethought.

The debates about the reconfiguration of nation-based government and citizenship have forced lesbian, gay, and queer studies to reconsider the self-evident nature of the national, the local, and the intimate in ways that have profound implications for the histories, ethnographies, and literary-critical theories of sexuality we write.¹³ As Prasenjit Duara and others argue, almost all historical analysis is at the service of the nation and reifies the nation by taking it as its proper and necessary field or background of study; and while anthropology avoided or ignored, for the most part, the national and state context of local sexual practices prior to the postwar era, it relied on a bounded territorialized concept of cultural

production and reproduction that quietly led to a national perspective in the postwar period.¹⁴ The concept of culture as territorially rather than circulatorially based has been put under significant pressure (see Rofel and Boellstorff in this issue).¹⁵ Nevertheless, most historians, including most gay historians, and most literary critics still frame their subjects in a national field and rely on the internal dynamics of national histories to analyze and explain them.¹⁶ For instance, American historians typically explain the cold war antigay politics and discourse of the 1950s with reference to the domestic consequences of the Second World War, the rise of anticommunism, and other features of the internal logic of American postwar culture and politics. No matter how nuanced these Americanist explanations are, they suddenly seem less satisfactory once the transnationality of postwar antigay discourse and politics is recognized. Purges of homosexuals from state bureaucracies, crackdowns on gay meeting places, and depictions of the homosexual threat posed to the nation's security and children developed at the same time in many European countries, whether ruled by left-wing Social Democratic regimes or by right-wing Christian Democratic regimes, as well as in Australia and New Zealand and elsewhere. The transnationality of these discourses cannot be explained by reference to postwar republican politics or purely domestic security concerns; it forces us to think more broadly about the imperatives of social reconstruction in the postwar, post-Depression world and about the transnational circulation of ideas, political ideologies, and fears.

Whatever its current focus, globalization assaults more than the self-evident nature of the local and national. It queries the commonsense referent of the proximate and the intimate, the subject and her space and time of being, and thus her forms and practices of desire.¹⁷ Globalization studies ask a fundamental question: where are the intimate and proximate spaces in which persons become subjects of embodied practices and times of desire? The landscape of the bedroom, archetype of Enlightenment intimacy and publicness, is produced in part by the publicly accessible, although often state-regulated, interspace of privately encoded global e-mail correspondence; the landscape of ritual corporeality—clit- oridectomy, suttee—is a matter for national and international congresses and parliaments; gay and lesbian freedom parades in Asia and Europe are organized in part by men and women who have vacationed in the United States and stayed in transnationally advertised gay and lesbian bed-and-breakfasts. In other words, where one looks to find what is proximate, where the proximate is, and what it results from depend on the translocal technologies of localization and the desires and embodiments they give rise to. The reconfiguration of the intimate and proximate poses a set of interesting problems to theories of sexuality.

Theories and histories of sexuality have been key to the development of a notion of the subject as the nontransparent effect of a temporal enfolding of external social forms that constitute and are mediated by psychic and corporeal economies. There are well-rehearsed critical differences between psychoanalytic and historicist descriptions of the corporeal and discursive forms and effects of these folds. For instance, Joan Copjec strongly differentiates psychoanalytic from historicist accounts of sexuality. Copjec quarrels with what she understands as the historicist mistake of conceptualizing the cause of sexuality “as immanent with the field of its effects.”¹⁸ David M. Halperin equally forcefully and eloquently makes the opposing case: the very notion of a foundational sexual subject is an effect of a history of power rather than of desire.¹⁹ These differences are not trivial, especially for critical sexual projects seeking to understand the potential fissions and fissures of utopian and dystopic political projects.²⁰

Yet globalization suggests that, for all their differences, both of these schools of sexuality must fundamentally rethink the relationship between the subject and its intimate productions. Both approaches to theories, histories, and ethnographies of sexuality require us to understand the processes by which these external social forms produce bodies, languages, and desires. Some of the best research in gender and sexuality has demonstrated how normative discourses interpellate individuals into hegemonic gendered social orders that produce the subjects of gender and the trajectory of their desire. These studies show how socially mediated discursive technologies inlay into psyche and corporeal hexis the delicate structures of local corporeal texts, such as proper and improper gender classification, reference, embodiment, and identity and the fine phonological features of a social register that lays out social space in the act of speaking. The specters of countless microdiscursive and corporeal encounters, part subjects, trace memories, nonlinguistic hopes, aspirations, disappointments, and corporeal surfaces and contours are laminated into phonological features, lexical choices, syntactic patterns, bodily hexis, genres, scenes, and senses of entitlement. These inflections compose the intimate grammar that every subject has, and this grammar, unperceived, migrates, so to speak, with persons as they enter and transgress public and intimate spheres, orienting their expectations and demands.

But who and where are the intimates who mediate the laminations of the social into a person's body and psyche? What, where, and when is the proximate exteriority? Who and what discipline pleasure, produce dispositions of desire, embrace the body? How is this embrace produced and mediated? If the theoretical drama of psychoanalysis was the self-evident immediacy of the family drama mediated through face-to-face communication, then this self-evidence must now

be queried. The sensorium that surrounds and provides the trace memories extended into subsequent scenes is not necessarily composed from the drama of the local, from its family form, or from national anthems, nor is it mediated simply by face-to-face speech events. If the exponents of psychoanalytic models of subjectivity must rethink the relationship between the intimate and the proximate and between social normativities and the discursive technologies that mediate them, so too must historicists rethink accounts that rely on a regional relationship between the proximate, the subject, and his or her desire. What should it matter to social accounts of sexuality that intimate spaces are created by multiple textual forms—speech, cyberspace, film, television, telephonic media—produced vast distances from the site of their consumption? How can we take seriously the sensuality of audio and audiovisual technologies, the strange conjunctions of chat rooms and bedrooms?

If sex can learn from globalization and transnationalism, these schools have much to gain from critical studies of sex. A troubling aspect of the literature on globalization is its tendency to read social life off external social forms—flows, circuits, circulations of people, capital, and culture—without any model of subjective mediation. In other words, globalization studies often proceed as if tracking and mapping the facticity of economic, population, and population flows, circuits, and linkages were sufficient to account for current cultural forms and subjective interiorities, or as if an accurate map of the space and time of post-Fordist accumulation could provide an accurate map of the subject and her embodiment and desires. In many ways, reading meaning off practice, or practices off meaning, or meaning off texts, without regard to the subject mediating these meanings, texts, and practices, is no better or worse than the historicist accounts of sexuality discussed above. The dynamism of the subject is related in one-to-one fashion with the dynamism of discourse and practice. We will not solve or even discuss our often differing views on these debates here. Suffice it to say that the debates are important, and it remains unclear how we should relate the orders of discourse to the subject of discourse to the subject's practices. In "Is Ontology Fundamental?" Emmanuel Levinas suggests the extraordinary complexity of the noncorrespondence of discursive, psychic, and practical orders—how we produce our undoing as we attempt to follow our desires. In doing what we will to do, we do "a thousand and one things" we "hadn't willed to do"; "the act [is] not pure"; we leave traces, and in "wiping away these traces," we leave others. "It is like an animal fleeing in a straight line across the snow before the sound of the hunters, thus leaving the very traces that will lead to its death."²¹ It is this travail of the subject, fashioned far afield from herself, that globalization has yet to track.

Within these framings this issue of *GLQ* interrogates histories, cultures, and theories of sexuality from a transnational perspective and, to a lesser extent, critiques recent theories of globalization from a queer perspective. It pays particular attention to the tension between increasingly powerful global discourses and institutions of homosexuality and heterosexuality and between local sexual ideologies and subjectivities organized in different, often resistant terms. It makes the case for why scholars in lesbian, gay, and queer studies need to think sexuality globally and transnationally. All the essays, in one way or another, map the movements of people, capital, and images across national boundaries; follow the desires, aspirations, and desperations that prompted these movements; and chronicle the effects of these movements on sexual subjectivities, identifications, and intimate practices. Some of the essays focus on regionalism and transnationalism (Boellstorff, Hoad, Rofel), emphasizing legal and other state instruments of coercion and consensus making (Hoad, Larvie) and public or popular mediations of subject formations (Silvio, Negrón-Muntaner). Some of them examine the content and contours of localized transnational forms (Silvio, Rofel, Kulick, Boellstorff) or the conditions of their emergence (Larvie, Hoad, Negrón-Muntaner). The dispersal and concentration of the essays' geographic referents—Brazil, Indonesia, China, Latin America, the Caribbean, southern Africa—reflect in part the exigencies of putting together a special issue on translocality and sexuality at this point in time and in part the effects of funding on scholarly production. We consider this introduction and the essays that follow it opening rather than definitive statements on the ethnographic, historical, and theoretical accounts of contemporary global sexualities.

Notes

1. The Lesbian and Gay Studies Project provides research grants and dissertation-year fellowships to graduate students; coordinates courses; sponsors a biweekly lesbian and gay studies workshop at which graduate students, faculty, and visiting scholars present works in progress; and organizes research projects and conferences.
2. A full review of recent global studies publications in the social sciences and humanities is beyond the purview of this essay. In the social sciences see Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson, eds., *Global Modernities* (London: Sage, 1995); Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992); Ulf Hannerz, *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places* (London: Routledge, 1996); Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson, *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance* (Cambridge: Polity, 1996);

- Alan Scott, ed., *The Limits of Globalization: Cases and Arguments* (London: Routledge, 1997); and James H. Mittelman, ed., *Globalization: Critical Reflections* (Boulder, Colo.: Rienner, 1996). In the humanities see Caren Kaplan, *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996); Martin F. Manalansan IV, "In the Shadows of Stonewall: Examining Gay Transnational Politics and the Diasporic Dilemma," in *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*, ed. Lisa Lowe and David Lloyd (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 485–505; and Fredric Jameson and Masao Miyoshi, eds., *The Cultures of Globalization* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).
3. Hannerz, *Transnational Connections*, esp. 17–19.
 4. Saskia Sassen, *Globalization and Its Discontents* (New York: New, 1998), xix.
 5. See Rolph Michel-Trouillot, introduction to *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World*, ed. M. R. Trouillot (New York: Routledge, forthcoming).
 6. See also Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996); and Roger Rouse, "Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernity," *Diaspora* 2, no. 2 (1991): 8–23.
 7. For diverse perspectives on how questions of transnational and global capital problematize concepts of space, territoriality, and identity see Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991); Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989); Joseph A. Camilleri and Jim Falk, *End of Sovereignty? The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmenting World* (London: Polity, 1995); John Agnew, "The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory," *Review of International Political Economy* 1 (1994): 58–80; Neil Brenner, "Global Cities, Glocal States: Global City Formation and State Territorial Restructuring in Contemporary Europe," *Review of International Political Economy* 5 (1998): 1–37; David Harvey, "The Geopolitics of Capitalism," in *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, ed. Derek Gregory and John Urry (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1985), 128–63; and Roger Rouse, "Thinking through Transnationalism: Notes on the Cultural Politics of Class Relations in the Contemporary United States," *Public Culture* 7 (1995): 353–402. For recent work on geographic and spatial aspects of sexuality see Rudi C. Bleys, *The Geography of Perversion: Male-to-Male Sexual Behaviour outside the West and the Ethnographic Imagination, 1750–1918* (London: Cassell, 1996); and Beatriz Colomina, ed., *Sexuality and Space* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992).
 8. David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989).
 9. See Saskia Sassen, *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, eds., *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*

- (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); Robert Boyer and Daniel Drache, eds., *States against Markets: The Limits of Globalization* (London: Routledge, 1996); David Gordon, "The Global Economy: New Edifice or Crumbling Foundations?" *New Left Review*, no. 168 (1988): 24–65; Lisa Maalki, "National Geographies: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees," *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1992): 24–44; and Martin Heisler, "Transnational Migration as a Small Window on the Diminished Autonomy of the Modern Democratic State," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, no. 485 (1986): 153–66.
10. Arjun Appadurai, "Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology," in *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 48–65.
 11. See Masao Miyoshi, "A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State," *Critical Inquiry* 19 (1993): 726–51; Aihwa Ong, *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999); You-tien Hsing, "Building *Guanxi* across the Straits: Taiwanese Capital and Chinese Bureaucrats," in *Ungrounded Empires: The Cultural Politics of Modern Chinese Transnationalism*, ed. Aihwa Ong and Donald M. Nonini (New York: Routledge, 1997), 143–66; and Vicente L. Rafael, "'Your Grief Is Our Gossip': Overseas Filipinos and Other Spectral Presences," *Public Culture* 9 (1997): 267–91.
 12. Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash, "Globalization, Modernity, and the Spatialization of Social Theory: Introduction," in Featherstone, Lash, and Robertson, *Global Modernities*, 2–3.
 13. We may ask what reconceptualization might be possible by reading against each other such sociological and queer-theoretical works on cities as Brenner, "Global Cities, Glocal States," and Elizabeth Grosz, "Bodies-Cities," in Colomina, *Sexuality and Space*, 241–53. Similarly, how might the disciplinary location and technologies of public sex be rethought? See, e.g., Dangerous Bedfellows, ed., *Policing Public Sex: Queer Politics and the Future of AIDS Activism* (Boston: South End, 1996).
 14. See, e.g., Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982); Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, "Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference," *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1992): 6–23; and Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).
 15. See also Lawrence Cohen, "Holi in Banaras and the *Mahaland* of Modernity," *GLQ* 2 (1995): 399–424; Rosalind C. Morris, "Educating Desire: Thailand, Transnationalism, and Transgression," *Social Text*, nos. 52–53 (1997): 53–79; Dennis Altman, "Global Gaze/Global Gays," *GLQ* 3 (1997): 417–36; and Elizabeth A. Povinelli, "Sexual Savages, Sexual Sovereignty: Australian Colonial Texts and the Post-Colonial Politics of Nationalism," *Diacritics* 24 (1994): 122–50.

16. See, e.g., Michael Warner, "Thoreau's Bottom," *Raritan* 11, no. 3 (1992): 53–79; Lauren Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997); and George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940* (New York: Basic, 1994). For general discussions of nationalism and sexuality see George L. Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); and Andrew Parker et al., introduction to *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, ed. Andrew Parker et al. (New York: Routledge, 1991), 1–18.
17. A critical intervention on sexuality and intimacy is outlined in Lauren Berlant, "Intimacy: A Special Issue," *Critical Inquiry* 24 (1998): 281–88.
18. Joan Copjec, "Introduction: Structures Don't March in the Streets," in *Read My Desire: Lacan against the Historicists* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1994), 6; see also Leo Bersani, "The Gay Daddy," in *Homos* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 77–112.
19. David M. Halperin, *Saint Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). See also Biddy Martin, "Feminism, Criticism, and Foucault," *New German Critique*, no. 27 (1982): 3–30; and Michael Warner, introduction to *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, ed. Michael Warner (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), vii–xxxi.
20. Nor is it clear to some of us whether underlying (post)structural paradigms should be relied on any longer either in psychoanalytic or in discursive approaches to sexuality.
21. Emmanuel Levinas, "Is Ontology Fundamental?" in *Entre Nous: On Thinking-of-the-Other*, trans. Michael B. Smith and Barbara Harshav (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 3.