CHAPTER 1

Genealogies of Queer Theory

Kadji Amin

To perform a genealogy of queer theory need not require going in search of origins that legitimate and stabilize the field. "The search for descent is not the erecting of foundations," Foucault writes, "on the contrary, it disturbs what was previously considered immobile; it fragments what was thought unified; it shows the heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself."[1] Genealogy reveals the element of chance that allowed certain theoretical schools to become central to the field; it exposes the incommensurable fractures between different theories within the field and, at times, within the work of a single theorist. Perhaps most excitingly, genealogy allows for the formation of new roots to the side of those canonized for "founding" a field. This chapter begins with a section on "Inception" that assesses the influence of three major figures through which the field was conceived – Judith Butler, Eve Sedgwick, and Michel Foucault – as well as psychoanalytic theory. Butler, Sedgwick, and Foucault demonstrate the element of chance in genealogy: They all wrote their most canonical queer theoretical texts before the inception of a field called "queer theory" and were retrospectively claimed (almost instantaneously in the case of Butler and Sedgwick) as founders. The first section asks what theoretical orientations each of these figures brought to the field of queer theory and how those orientations influenced later queer theorists. I understand "influence" in various ways – as self-conscious citation and intellectual debt, as largely uncited methods and habits of thought, and as critical divergence, in which the critique of a theorist generates a new body of work. The second section, "Alternate Genealogies," focuses on queer theorists who self-consciously sought alternative intellectual roots for the field and claimed new founding figures, largely in a bid to center racialized populations and/or geopolitical locations outside Europe and North America. This chapter leaves out many names and intellectual schools; in this short space, it cannot possibly give an exhaustive account of every "turn" in the history of queer inquiry or every important queer theorist.

Its ambition, instead, is to simultaneously account for the generativity of particular theorists and theories – sometimes for critics whose political stakes and objects of study could not be more different – while leaving the field open to the claiming of new genealogies.

But first, a word about the intrinsic difficulty in defining queer theory or the field of Queer Studies to which it gave rise. It is worth remembering that queer theory emerged in the US academy during the 1990s as a theoretically oriented disruption of "normal business in the academy"[2]; it was never intended to found a field of study. Despite its anti-institutional ethos, queer theory was crucially informed by three aspects of the institutional context of the US academy during the 1990s. First, the "identity knowledges" of Women's Studies, Black Studies, Latino Studies, etc.[3] – all of which emerged from social movements of the 1960s – had recently been institutionalized within the academy. This institutionalization sparked a series of critiques of the constitutive limitations of institutionalized, identity-based fields of study. Emerging at a moment when these critiques were hotly debated, queer theory did not seek to become an identity knowledge among others, nor did it demand institutionalization. To the contrary, it articulated a critique of settled identities and assumed a posture of resistance to institutionalization and academic disciplinarity. Queer theory's most original move was to describe itself as a form of "subjectless critique" that, unlike the identity knowledges, could not be defined by its object of study.[4] However, queer theory's star-studded and intellectually dazzling debut quickly eclipsed and partially absorbed the still-emergent field of Gay and Lesbian Studies. The result was that queer theory became at once a sophisticated critique of identitarian knowledges emphatically *not* defined by the study of gays and lesbians, *and* it became one of the major sites for the study of (homo)sexuality and gender transgression in the US academy. This paradoxically identitarian anti-identitarianism remains a central tension within contemporary queer theory and Queer Studies. The second major way in which the state of the US academy shaped queer theory was the fact that the 1990s were the heyday of "high" theory in the humanities. Queer theory immediately and promiscuously pillaged the various forms of theory in ascent at that moment and put them into transformative contact with dissident sexualities. Finally, queer theory was initially housed primarily within English departments. When Queer Studies later solidified, it inherited from queer theory the following set of tensions: an antidisciplinary orientation emerging primarily from the disciplinary location of the humanities; an anti-identitarian ethos uneasily paired with an overall focus on dissident sexualities and LGBT

identities; and an institutionalization of humanities theories over objects, areas, periods, or methods that, paradoxically, had the effect of marginalizing certain objects, areas, periods, and methods. For these reasons, queer theory and Queer Studies remain hotly contested sites of inquiry. Given the fact that they were largely institutionalized through *theory*, rather than objects, a genealogy of the theories that inform queer theory seems like a good place to start.

Inception

Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (1990) was written before the inception of queer theory as an antifoundationalist feminist approach to "sex."[5] Specifically, it contributed to debates within feminist scholarship about how to conduct feminist inquiry while thoroughly critiquing all essentialisms, including those that ground the category "woman." *Gender Trouble*'s import for queer theory was solidified by Butler's famous use, toward the end, of the drag queen as the key figure that subversively reveals the performativity of all gender – that is, the fact that gender's apparent solidity and binary structure are illusions derived from compelled and reiterated performances of gender ideals. *Gender Trouble* was hugely influential throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, giving rise to a wave of scholarship analyzing the performativity of various forms of social identity and assessing the subversive potential of particular performative iterations.

Gender Trouble may still be the queer theoretical text most likely to be read by those situated outside the field; it is certainly the most-read work of queer theory in translation. Despite its continuing status as the exemplification of "queer theory," it is no longer at the origin of current trends within the field. Butler's influence has gone more underground. Her signature remains present within queer theory's antifoundationalist and anti-identitarian bent: its deep suspicion of settled social and sexual identities. We might locate Butler's legacy in the queer method, borrowed from poststructuralism, of unsettling and subverting binaries, and in the tendency to put more political weight on moments of slippage, fluidity, and subversion that call entire ontological systems into question than in the goal-oriented, intentional, and effective mobilization more conventionally understood as "politics." Nevertheless, in queer theory today, Butler's profound antifoundationalism is as apt to pose a problem as to be seen as a resource. Butler may currently have the most citational life in those movements of thought directly opposed to the anti-essentialism of

which she is one of the most sophisticated exemplars: affect theory, new materialism, and transgender studies. The move, on a number of fronts, to take bodies, biology, materiality, and affect seriously, not as limitations, but as more vital and even more "queer" than the critique of essentialism could admit, is indebted to Butler in its very departure from the forms of suspicion she exemplifies.

Like Butler, Sedgwick published her landmark queer theoretical text, *Epistemology of the Closet*, in 1990, before the inception of the queer theory that the text was immediately taken up as exemplifying.[6] *Epistemology* was written specifically as a work of "antihomophobic inquiry" within gay literary studies.[7] Its "Introduction: Axiomatic" asserts that homosexuality is crucial to a contradictory series of epistemological binaries foundational to Western modernity. This strong argument for the epistemological significance of homosexuality within something so grand as "Western modernity" was, undoubtedly, what catapulted Sedgwick to prominence within queer theory. However, *Epistemology* is also an exuberant look at just how *incoherent* modern constructions of homosexuality actually are. This is one example of the unsystematizability of Sedgwick's thought: it cannot be distilled into singular analytic or argument without doing violence to the textures and surprises of her writing as well as of her objects of study. For many queer scholars today, *Epistemology*'s objects of study are a negative reminder of the white and cisgender gay male, as well as canonical and literary origins of queer theory. Despite this, Sedgwick's orientation toward unsystematizable complexity continues to prove a source of renewal to contemporary queer critics. This orientation has been carried forward by Sedgwick's student, José Esteban Muñoz, and an entire cadre of queer and queer of color critics interested in the generativity of literature, performance, and art practices as sites of queer (of color) world-making, reparation, and alternatives. Sedgwick appeals to the desire to bypass or supplement strong theories with vast diagnostic power in favor of a multitude of "weak theories," including affect theory, that stay close to the textures of the everyday.[8]

Foucault, on the other hand, exemplifies the "paranoid criticism" that Sedgwick critiques as dominant within politicized humanistic scholarship. He is the theorist of what have become three key terms within queer theory: sexuality, normativity, and biopolitics. His *History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (1976) identifies sexuality as a key switchpoint of modern biopower – a means of simultaneously disciplining the individual body and controlling populations on the biological level of birth,

fertility, and death.[9] Queer theory needed Foucault's theoretical cachet to establish sexuality, not as some giggly, private joke, but as a consequential technology invested with the gravitas of modern biopower itself. Along with sexuality, Foucault influentially identified norms, normativity, and normation – based on the development of the nineteenth-century science of statistics and invention of the "population" as a statistical entity – as crucial modalities of modern power. Recently, Robyn Wiegman and Elizabeth Wilson have argued that "normativity" rather than sexuality occupies the definitional center of queer theory.[10] As a form of "subjectless critique," "queer" refers not to LGBT, but to whatever subverts, resists, or creates alternatives to various forms of normativity. They argue, however, that this shorthand definition of queer as antinormative is actually anti-Foucauldian, since, as a statistical average, the norm already contains and modulates all variations. Norms, in this statistical sense, cannot be opposed or resisted. Statistical norms, however, may be distinct from the forms of *normalizing power* that queer theorists seek to analyze and oppose.[11] Regardless, critical reflection on the proliferation of binaries, within queer scholarship, that oppose a queer term to a normative one does seem warranted within the field, as does further work parsing and multiplying kinds of relations to normativity beyond opposition and resistance. "Biopolitics," along with "necropolitics," Achille Mbembe's term critically reorienting biopolitics toward the power to kill, is increasingly being centered by queer work on race, homonormativity, and geopolitics.[12] For such scholarship, biopolitics and necropolitics name racialized technologies of control over life and death *within which* sexuality is a key node. By foregrounding biopolitics and necropolitics, this body of scholarship reframes sexuality as a technology of race rather than as, in and of itself, a point of potential resistance to normativity.

Foucault famously premised his analysis of power on a critique of psychoanalysis and the "repressive hypothesis." Nevertheless, in one of many interesting contradictions, Foucault's position as one of queer theory's major progenitors is matched by the prominence of psychoanalysis as a major strand of queer theory. This is partly because, along with poststructuralism, psychoanalysis was a major form under which "high theory" circulated in the US academy during the emergence of queer theory in the 1990s. It is also because psychoanalysis offers one of the most compelling modern accounts of sexuality and subjectivity. Queer theoretical engagements with psychoanalysis have been diverse, from Judith Butler's theorization of how prohibited same-sex love is melancholically

incorporated as the gendered ego to Muñoz's formulation of "disidentification" as a queer of color tactic for creatively reworking exclusionary dominant ideals.[13] Queer theorists tend to read psychoanalysis against the grain – particularly given psychoanalysis's colonialist inheritance, focus on bourgeois nuclear families in Europe, and emphasis on "normal" trajectories of gendered and sexual development. Perhaps most strikingly, queer theorists have used psychoanalytic accounts of *jouissance* and the death drive as resources to theorize the ways in which sex shatters subjecthood, identity, relationality, and linear temporality. For Leo Bersani and Lee Edelman, queers bear the symbolic burden for the ways in which jouissance and the death drive, respectively, threaten subjectivity in general.[14] Both theorists have been critiqued for installing a presumptively white gay male subject at the heart of their theorizations of queer sexuality. This critique has itself generated queer of color scholarship that inhabits black sexual abjection and explores the ethical potential of the stereotype of the Asian American man as a bottom.[15] A critically reworked version of psychoanalysis, in sum, has offered queer and queer of color critics a means of thinking through the possibilities of sex as a form of negativity and a means of shattering, debasing, and abjecting the self.

Alternate Genealogies

Queer theory's antidisciplinary stance has sometimes made it difficult to address the fact that the field has developed its own normativities and produced its own marginalizations. It is glaring, for instance, that the theorists, theories, areas, and objects of study taken up as "queer theory" during the field's inception were white and Euro-North American. It can be less obvious, to those of us whose disciplinary training is in the humanities, that much of what is recognized as queer theory has predominantly emerged from humanities departments and prizes humanistic methods, theories, and habits of thought. As queer theory develops into Queer Studies – a more genuinely interdisciplinary field – it must reckon with the exclusions inherent in what have been claimed as its founding theoretical genealogies. Increasingly, scholars have been responding to these exclusions by seeking new theoretical precursors for their work, as well as rediscovering early queer theorists who have not always received credit as "founders" of the field.

Heather Love argues that midcentury deviance studies contributed to the inception of queer theory but was incorporated and largely forgotten, rather than being hailed as a founding genealogy.[16] Social

scientists influenced by midcentury deviance studies, such as Esther Newton (1972) and Gayle Rubin (1984), conducted groundbreaking scholarship on sexual subcultures before the inception of queer theory and under institutionally difficult conditions.[17] Although some of their insights were absorbed by subsequent queer theorists, the genealogy of their thought in deviance studies and the social sciences more broadly was largely cast aside. Love's centering of deviance studies as a social scientific genealogy of queer theory reveals the field's occluded grounding in the critical humanities. Queer humanities scholarship is more likely to be classified as Queer Studies and as theory, whereas queer social science and historical scholarship is more likely to be classified as Sexuality or LGBT Studies and seen as contributing examples rather than theories. This disciplinary divide tends to reinforce the existing marginalization of work on the Asias, Latin America, and Africa in Queer Studies, given that much scholarship on sexuality in these areas is conducted within the social sciences, especially cultural anthropology. As a result, the existing sense that area studies scholarship, as well as scholarship conducted in non-European (and even non-English) languages is "specialized" and generative of examples rather than theories or epistemologies is compounded by the tendency to dismiss empirical methods as disciplinary, naïve, and uncritical.[18] Could centering midcentury deviance studies indirectly spur a methodological opening of queer theory to scholarship on other geographical areas?

Queer of color critique was a theoretically diverse enterprise from the start. Among other intellectual traditions, Muñoz drew from utopian Marxism and Sedgwickian reparative reading, Roderick Ferguson from Marxism and the critique of sociology, and Chandan Reddy from legal studies and the critique of liberalism.[19] Despite its intellectual heterogeneity, queer of color critique was drawn together at its inception by its explicit claiming of women of color feminism as its theoretical genealogy. Women of color feminism was the inspiration for two of queer of color critique's lasting interventions: intersectionality and, relatedly, the expansion of "queer" to include heterosexual but nonheteronormative racial formations. "Intersectionality," first theorized by legal scholar Kimberle Crenshaw, but present in prior US women of color thought, is an analytic that parses concatenated vectors of social power – including race, class, and gender – by centering figures, such as black women, who tend to fall through the cracks when a single mode of power is under analysis.[20] Queer of color analysis contributes to this project by proposing, as Ferguson writes of Reddy's work, "that racist practice articulates itself

generally as gender and sexual regulation, and that gender and sexual differences variegate racial formations" and by centering racial formations for queer theorization.[21] Hence, queer of color critique, along with work on queer diasporas, also necessarily articulates a critique of the unmarked white (and often, gay cisgender male) basis of certain queer theorizations. This critique has been deepened by queer native and disability scholarship, which reveals and seeks alternatives to the unacknowledged role of settler colonial and ableist logics, respectively, within queer theory. Queer of color critique's second major intervention is the move to include heterosexual, but nonheteronormative racial formations within the purview of queer theorization. Queer of color critics argue that, because racialized cultures have been constituted as sexually aberrant and materially excluded from the achievements that define heteronormativity – including property ownership, citizenship, and/or self-sufficient nuclear family formations – racial formations are nonheteronormative and should occupy the center of intersectional queer theorizing.

Queer of color critique's claiming of women of color feminism as its genealogy has lastingly transformed queer theorization. However, women of color feminism is not a unified or unproblematic genealogy for queer theory. As Sharon Holland has noted, the internal complexity and dissonance of black feminism – for instance, Audre Lorde's suspicion of BDSM and critique of pornography – was not engaged by early queer of color critique, though new work by scholars like Ariane Cruz is beginning to change this.[22] Although the tensions between a version of feminism that prioritizes the issue of sexual violence against women and a version of queer theory that champions marginalized sexual practices and subjectivities have been well-explored, potential sites of discord between women of color feminism and its (largely celebratory) queer of color uptake have not received the same attention. One underexplored dissonance, for instance, is the fact that some versions of women of color feminism rely on a standpoint epistemology that prioritizes the marginalized knowledges of women of color, whereas the anti-identitarian, psychoanalytic, Foucauldian, and poststructuralist genealogies of queer theory all tend to cast doubt on the foundation of epistemic authority on identity.[23]

Queer of color critique is an entry point into an important question: What would vocabularies, epistemologies, and genealogies of queer theory look like that emerged from racialized cultures or marginalized geographic locations? E. Patrick Johnson's use of the African American vernacular "quare," Kale Fajardo's Filipinization of "kweer," and the Queer/Cuir/Cuyr

Americas Working Group's hemispheric exchanges all work to provincialize "queer" and to reground queer epistemologies in marginalized locations.[24] Such a project is inspired by another intellectual genealogy – one which focuses on the hierarchies of power and scale that inform translation within the academy, provincializes particulars that accede to the status of universals ("queer" itself might be one such universal), and analyzes translocalizations of "global" vocabularies. This multisited intellectual genealogy has roots in postcolonial and area studies, comparative literature, and transnational and diasporic modes of analysis. Another approach is to mine "queer" itself for the racial and geopolitical histories it conceals. Gloria Anzaldúa's "La Prieta" (1986) contains the first printed use of "queer" as a theoretical term evoking a sense of racialized/sexual Latina borderlands abjection.[25] Nevertheless, Anzaldúa is not regularly recognized as a founder of queer theory. Finally, as with queer of color critique's claiming of women of color feminism, another strategy is to hail, as queer theorists, authors who were not intentionally writing as part of a queer theoretical tradition. As we have seen, Foucault, Butler, and Sedgwick all wrote their major queer theoretical texts before the inception of queer theory. These works were intended to contribute to other scholarly debates rather than to found a field, and their interventions were not, moreover, anchored by the term "queer." Genealogy is always disparate; it indexes the work of chance as well as relations of power. What makes something a foundational queer text is the fact that it is taken up as such and used to found bodies of queer scholarship. Such a promiscuous understanding of genealogy might serve as an impetus to scholars seeking queer epistemologies in authors and geopolitical locations that have not, thus far, been central to queer theorization.

One stunningly successful example of a rerooting of queer theory in an alternate genealogy is recent queer and trans scholarship under the sign of what could be termed black antihumanism.[26] This emergent body of scholarship is more likely to take up Frantz Fanon, Hortense Spillers, or Sylvia Wynter as its foundational theorists than Sedgwick, Butler, or Foucault.[27] Moreover, it begins from a different ontological premise than queer of color critique. Black antihumanists center their queer and trans readings less on intersectional analysis than on the fungibility, dehumanization, and ungendering of the black body under chattel slavery and, more broadly, within the Western metaphysical and medico-scientific tradition. Without a doubt, this body of work has successfully animated an alternative genealogy and a new theoretical lexicon for black queer and trans studies. In a striking departure from

most queer theorization to date, for instance, "normative" and "nonnormative" are not necessarily anchoring concepts. For black antihumanists, the position of the slave is not that of a human bearing a nonnormative racialized sexuality or living in nonheteronormative social formations. Instead, the position of the slave is that of the nonhuman thing, the exchangeable commodity, and the border between the human and its animal others. As a result, the slave cannot be disciplined by normalizing power or counted among the statistical gradations of normative and nonnormative. Here, too, however, there are important disagreements – between Afro-pessimists who seek no horizon of future becoming and scholars who forecast the elaboration of new genres of the human; between thinkers who map the relation between blackness and other modes of racial formation and those for whom blackness is a unique and incomparable ontology of race; and between theorists who root a new genealogy of queer and trans becoming in blackness and those for whom blackness is incommensurate with queer and transgender as versions, however nonnormative, of the human. These important debates are just beginning to get underway.

Conclusion

A genealogical approach demonstrates that queer theory has always been a promiscuous borrowing, reworking, and interested claiming of disparate theoretical traditions. As such, scholars might rework queer theory by rerooting it in its own forgotten genealogies as well as in alternate theoretical traditions. To say this is not, however, to claim that queer theory is infinitely mobile and open to redefinition. I have argued elsewhere that queer theory bears the trace of its discursive travels and of the intellectual genealogies that have most repetitively defined it.[28] These genealogies cannot simply be cast off, for they have come to shape some of the key sensibilities, methodological moves, and scholarly orientations of queer theory. If Queer Studies is to become a genuinely interdisciplinary field, it is critical to multiply its theoretical genealogies. However, this process of multiplication will inevitably give rise to both dissonances and resonances with the habits of thought and feeling that had previously shaped the field. Investigating the source of these dissonances and amplifying the resonances should be part of the work of claiming alternate theoretical genealogies for queer scholarship.

Notes

[1] Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 82.
[2] Michael Warner, Introduction to *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), xxvi.
[3] Robyn Wiegman, *Object Lessons* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012), 1n.
[4] David L. Eng, J. [Jack] Halberstam, and José Esteban Muñoz, "Introduction: What's Queer about Queer Studies Now?" *Social Text* 23, nos. 3–4 (2005): 10.
[5] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990).
[6] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).
[7] Sedgwick, *Epistemology*, 14.
[8] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), 136.
[9] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, vol. 1, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990).
[10] Robyn Wiegman and Elizabeth A. Wilson, "Introduction: Antinormativity's Queer Conventions," *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 26, no. 1 (2015): 1–25.
[11] Samuel A. Chambers, "On Norms and Opposition," *No Foundations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Law and Justice* 14 (2017): 1–26.
[12] Achille Mbembe, "Necropolitics," trans. Libby Meintjes, *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11–40; Jin Haritaworn, Adi Kuntsman, and Silvia Posocco, eds., *Queer Necropolitics* (New York: Routledge, 2014); Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).
[13] Judith Butler, "Melancholy Gender/Refused Identification," in *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 132–50; José Esteban Muñoz, *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).
[14] Leo Bersani, "Is the Rectum a Grave?" *October* 43 (1987): 197–222; Lee Edelman, *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).
[15] See Darieck Scott, *Extravagant Abjection: Blackness, Power, and Sexuality in the African American Literary Imagination* (New York: New York University Press, 2010) and Nguyen Tan Hoang, *A View from the Bottom: Asian American Masculinity and Sexual Representation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), respectively.
[16] Heather Love, "Doing Being Deviant: Deviance Studies, Description, and the Queer Ordinary," *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 26, no. 1 (2015): 74–95.

[17] Esther Newton, *Mother Camp: Female Impersonators in America* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1979); Gayle S. Rubin, "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," in *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 137–81.

[18] Anjali Arondekar and Geeta Patel, "Area Impossible: Notes toward an Introduction," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 22, no. 2 (2016): 151–71.

[19] José Esteban Muñoz, *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity* (New York: New York University Press, 2009); Roderick A. Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004); and Chandan Reddy, *Freedom with Violence: Race, Sexuality, and the U.S. State* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

[20] Kimberle Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6 (1991): 1241–99.

[21] Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black*, 3.

[22] Sharon Patricia Holland, *The Erotic Life of Racism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012), 65–93; Ariane Cruz, *The Color of Kink: Black Women, BDSM, and Pornography* (New York: New York University Press, 2016).

[23] Lynne Huffer, *Are the Lips a Grave?: A Queer Feminist on the Ethics of Sex* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013).

[24] E. Patrick Johnson, "'Quare' Studies, or (Almost) Everything I Know about Queer Studies I Learned from My Grandmother," in *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology*, ed. E. Patrick Johnson and Mae G. Henderson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 124–57; Kale Fajardo, "Kweer Filipino Seamen Rocking the Boat: Racialized and Classed Homoerotics in Paul Santa Ana and Allen Dizon's film 'Marino' (2009)" lecture, The Pratt Institute, New York City, February 27, 2018; María Amelia Viteri, "*Intensiones*: Tensions in Queer Agency and Activism in Latino América," *Feminist Studies* 43, no. 2 (2017): 405–17.

[25] Gloria Anzaldúa, "La Prieta," in *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, ed. Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, 4th ed. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015), 198–209.

[26] See Treva Ellison et al., eds. "The Issue of Blackness," special issue, *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (2017): 159–321, and Amber Jamilla Musser, *Sensual Excess: Queer Femininity and Brown Jouissance* (New York: New York University Press, 2018).

[27] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2008); Hortense J. Spillers, "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book," *Diacritics* 17, no. 2 (1987): 64–81; Sylvia Wynter, "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, after Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument," *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3, no. 3 (2003): 257–337.

[28] Kadji Amin, "Haunted by the 1990s: Queer Theory's Affective Histories," *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly* 44, nos. 3–4 (2016): 173–89.

Further Reading

Cohen, Cathy J. "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?" *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 3, no. 4 (1997): 437–65.

Epps, Brad. "Retos y riesgos, pautas y promesas de la teoría queer." *Debate Feminista* 18, no. 36 (2007): 219–72.

Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*. Edited by François Ewald, Alessandro Fontana, and Michel Senellart. Translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Jagose, Annamarie. "The Trouble with Antinormativity." *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 26, no. 1 (2015): 26–47.

Manalansan, Martin F., IV. *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.

Rubin, Gayle. "Geologies of Queer Studies: It's Déjà Vu All Over Again." In *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader*, 347–56. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.

Salamon, Gayle. *Assuming a Body: Transgender and Rhetorics of Materiality*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Snorton, C. Riley. *Black on Both Sides: A Racial History of Trans Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.

Warren, Calvin. "Calling into Being: Tranifestation, Black Trans, and the Problem of Ontology." *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (2017): 266–74.