



PROJECT MUSE®

Transecting the Academy

Dean Spade, Sel Wahng

GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 10, Number 2, 2004, pp.
240-253 (Article)

Published by Duke University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/54596>

3. For a more nuanced discussion of the perils of such disciplinary erasures see Miranda Joseph, "Analogy and Complicity: Women's Studies, Lesbian/Gay Studies, and Capitalism," in *Women's Studies on Its Own: A Next Wave Reader in Institutional Change*, ed. Robyn Wiegman (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 267–92.
4. For instance, see the excellent collection *Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism*, ed. Arnaldo Cruz-Malavé and Martin F. Manalansan IV (New York: New York University Press, 2002).
5. Joan Wallach Scott, "Feminist Reverberations," *differences* 13, no. 3 (2002): 11.
6. Elizabeth A. Povinelli and George Chauncey, eds., "Thinking Sexuality Transnationally," special issue, *GLQ* 5, no. 4 (1999).

Transecting the Academy

Dean Spade and Sel Wahng

The identity politics that underwrite many gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender discourses have proved limiting in regard to potential political alliances and social change. We address this concern by looking at the questions under consideration in this forum through a particular lens: how bodies and identities interact and intersect with modern formations of power. Through this mode of inquiry we seek to relate supposedly disparate elements for the purpose of making new social, political, and scholarly connections and transformations.

Modern Formations of Power

Dean: For me, any answer to questions about the interrelation or separation of the study of sex, sexuality, gender, and gender identity has to start with my purpose for engaging in careful analysis about these topics to begin with. That purpose is to enable an understanding of the operation of coercive and violent systems that determine and prescribe sex, sexual practices, and gender identities and expressions for everyone. My motivation for understanding the relation between sexuality and gender, then, is to destroy that coercion, end that violence, and enable all people to determine their own sex, sexual practices, and gender identity and expression. I do not envision self-determination as the ability to express a natural, essential, preexisting or inherent sex, sexual desire, or gender identity or expression. Rather, self-determination is a means of making room for all people to navigate the complex and overlapping constructions of sexual identity, gender identity, sexual behavior, and gender expression with which we all must contend in whatever ways make the most sense to us. It is a way to end the mechanisms of coercion that

incentivize binary gender, cohesive single-gender identification and presentation, heterosexuality, monogamy, and misogyny, whether those mechanisms are intersex genital mutilation, gender-based dress codes, sex designations on birth certificates, rape, marriage promotion policies in the welfare system, gender segregation of prisons, bathroom harassment, or something else.

In combating this coercion, one inevitably stumbles across the fact that it operates in part to consolidate gender identity and expression, sexual orientation, gender, and sex all as one thing. The coercive system sets out for each of us a path that includes a sex designation at birth, matching gendered behavior and characteristics, matching heterosexual desires and behaviors, and a matching, lifelong, unchanging gender identity identical to the sex designated at birth. In this system, if I am labeled “female” at birth, I will understand myself as a woman, buy products marketed to women, walk like a woman, talk like a woman, use women’s bathrooms, and desire and have sex with men. For those of us working to combat the conditions that enforce this sex-sexuality-gender prescription, separating out sex, sexuality, gender, and gender identity is an essential part of articulating the principle that one’s birth-assigned sex should not be a predictor or indicator of one’s sexual desire, behavior, gender identity, or expression. Whether I fight for a trans person to be placed in a homeless shelter according to hir gender identity rather than hir birth gender, advocate for an intersex person who has been sexually assaulted in prison because of a setup by guards, or appeal a name-change rejection because a judge does not think that Bill should be able to change hir name to Mary until s/he has genitals that the judge identifies as “female,” a central element of my strategy is to wrestle apart these ideas of a predetermined relationship between birth sex, sexual behavior and desire, and gender identity or expression. This process of cutting the ties between birth-sex designation and expectations for all other aspects of each of our lives is, I think, the same thing we do when we fight for women to be included in a formerly all-male profession, or when we argue against the testing of low-income mothers of color for drugs in public hospitals, or when we try to decriminalize sex work or queer sex.

It is impossible to imagine studying these categories truly separately, just as it is difficult or impossible for people to examine their own gender, sex, sexual desire or practice, or gender identity and not see them as having mutually constitutive, overlapping, and connecting relations with each other. It is essential, however, that the distinction we draw between these aspects of identity and expression be clear enough for us to create a politics in which these characteristics do not rigidly determine one another as part of a coercive binary gender system.

Sel: Yes, gender is different from sexuality, although they are inextricably connected. The fields that study them need to distinguish them more and more precisely in order for us to think about the intersection of gender and sexuality in more complex ways. If the distinction between gender and sexuality is not developed, the intersections between them also cannot be developed.

Transgender/transsexual (tg/tx) identities may be different from gay/lesbian/bisexual (g/l/b) identities because of the particular ways that tg/tx people interact with institutions and modern formations of power.¹ In “Identity and Cultural Studies” Lawrence Grossberg writes that the discourse of identity needs to be relocated and rearticulated within the context of modern formations of power that move beyond reactionary models to oppression. Both the “colonial model” of oppressor and oppressed and the “transgression model” of oppression and resistance operate under a modernist logic. These models are not only inappropriate to contemporary relations of power but unable to create alliances and interpellate various fractions of a population in different relations of power for the purpose of effecting social and political change.²

This does not mean that tg/tx identities have more intensive or privileged engagements to modern formations of power than g/l/b identities; it means that the relations of tg/tx identities to specific modern formations of power, such as medical and legal institutions, may be different. For instance, in the academy “drag performance” has often been collapsed with “transgender” identities; the performance of drag has sometimes been viewed as “the transgender identity” par excellence. However, it is useful to consider how various identities intersect and interact with modern formations of power. Drag performers may have a larger investment in zoning ordinances and licensing of nightclubs in which to perform, while tg/tx people may be more invested in legal and medical reform concerning name and birth-sex changes, hormone replacement therapy, or surgery.

Furthermore, gay and lesbian discourse has often fallen into the colonial model and/or the transgression model in addressing the “oppression” of heterosexuality, even invoking such terms as *queer nationalism*. This usage has never been acceptable to me because of the modernist logics of binary opposition within an arborescent schema that inform such “nationalist” approaches within the European/American ideological plane of transcendence.³ In my own work I have often racialized gay and lesbian discourses. The addition of race has often complicated the oppositional logic that undergirds so many aspects of gay and lesbian discourses and their approaches to sexuality.

Scholarship

Dean: We all face the consequences of living in a capitalist, binary gender-enforcing context, where impossible standards of masculinity, femininity, and wealth keep us consistently punished and punishing for gender variation, consistently exploited, greedy, and vilifying the poor. As I see every day at work and know from my own experiences, however, those of us who transgress gender norms more noticeably, who exist farther from permitted expressions and behaviors, face more dire consequences. Trans people have a murder rate seven to ten times higher than others, and our murders go uninvestigated. We are disproportionately homeless, poor, and incarcerated. I am interested in seeing academic work and radical gender and sexuality analyses relevant to those living at the injurious extremes of the capitalist/binary gender systems. Feminist economic analysis has exposed the misogynist underpinnings of welfare policy, employment practices, and advertising, and I am ready for an extension of this critique to the gender segregation of the institutions and practices that control poor people (shelters, group homes, foster care, mandatory drug treatment, jails, prisons). I am ready for deep interrogation of the utter failure of HIV policy to address the skyrocketing rates of HIV in trans communities and the horrendous lack of treatment for these communities.⁴ I am ready for feminist and antiprison scholars to develop real analysis of the widespread use of false arrest against trans people and the use of trans people themselves, in prisons and institutions of juvenile justice, as targets for violence and as examples to other inmates of the consequences of transgressing gender norms. In my day-to-day work and in my life, I crave information about why and how low-income people and people who transgress gender norms continually fall to the lowest levels of our economy, medical care systems, systems of “rehabilitation,” educational systems, and so on. But we are likely to see less and less of that analysis the more our educational systems are privatized, affirmative action programs are dismantled, and financial aid is restricted (particularly for people with drug convictions), and the more prison expansion takes young people out of educational processes.

Sel: I want to discuss how scholarship has often reified staid definitions of “women” and “sexuality” and how these definitions have resulted in the erasure or collapse of unique cultural specificities, including racial performativities. According to Chandra T. Mohanty, “women” are constructed through specific social relations. Mohanty also critiques the assumption and imposition of the category of “women” *before* the examination of actual social sites and lived relations.⁵ If women are indeed constructed through specific social relations, then it would follow that other

types of gendered identities can also emerge through the examination of actual social sites and lived relations—what George Chauncey Jr. would term the “richly textured evidence” provided through ethnographic research, archival data, personal narratives, and other types of information gathering.⁶

In my own work on Korean sex slaves for the Japanese military during World War II, I have noticed how superficial scholarly analysis often renders them as examples of “colonized women” and victims of “wartime rape.”⁷ Closer study, however, reveals that they actually inhabited gendered territory beyond the culturally specific definitions of “women.” Although born female, they were configured as subhuman entities with superhuman strength—as Amazons and “sanitary toilets”—in the Japanese nationalist imaginary.⁸ They were also subject to a process of militarized “bastardization” that entailed physical, verbal, and emotional abuse and medical interventions that rendered their bodies barren. In fact, the rape of Korean female bodies was construed as a sexually nonreproductive act, and since most sex slaves were raped from thirty to sixty times a day, every day, often for years, physical strength and endurance became associated with sexual penetrability. A detailed examination of testimonies, narratives, and accounts by former sex slaves reveals additional evidence of their gendered marginalization. This included the defeminized utterances of “man,” “guy,” and “bastard” as terms of denigration by Japanese soldiers during acts of sexual and physical violence on sex slaves; the use of weekly No. 606 injections that transformed once-female bodies into nonreproductive entities construed as “sanitary toilets”;⁹ the provision of masculine military clothing as the “uniform” for sex slaves; the defeminized, diseased, and scarred sex slave bodies unable to participate in heterosexual institutions—such as marriage, functional family units, and sexual reproduction—after the war; and the masculinized “homogenderal” alliances between Korean sex slaves and Korean male soldiers and sailors drafted into the Japanese Imperial Army.¹⁰

In contrast, Japanese women, including Japanese military prostitutes during World War II, were for the most part represented and representable as reproductive, feminine supports for the reification of Japanese masculinity within the field of civility comprised by Japanese nationalism. Because Korean sex slaves were reterritorialized as subhuman, they were factored out of an economy in which representable and recognizable genders circulated within Korean as well as Japanese fields of civility and respectability. In fact, several former sex slaves attest that they do not experience their gender as similar to that of “other women” who have not undergone sex slavery and militarized bastardization.

As Mohanty has stated, Third World feminist testimonials remember against the grain of “public” or hegemonic history, locating silences and asserting knowledge outside the parameters of the dominant. As discursive productions, the testimonials of former military sex slaves suggest a rethinking of sociality itself. Through their discursive production, then, they challenge the most fundamental meanings of race and gender.¹¹

I have found the application of transgender/transsexual paradigms particularly useful in my work on Korean military sex slavery and on gendered marginalization and unrepresentability. These paradigms enable a context in which not only the definition of *woman* but also that of *heterosexuality* is challenged. In U.S. gay and lesbian discourses, heterosexuality has often been associated with marriage, nuclear family formation, legal and social recognition, civility, and respectability. How is this definition of heterosexuality, and of sexuality itself, challenged through the examination of repetitive “heterosexual” rapes of adolescent and teenage female bodies that were deliberately rendered sexually nonreproductive in a highly managed institutional framework?

Furthermore, the imposition of “woman” by U.S. feminist paradigms often erases or obscures specific racial performativities. It is only through an interrogation of racial performativities, however, that the gender performativities of Korean sex slaves can fully emerge. The sex slaves, subjected to military bastardization, directly experienced the contested meanings of race, racism, and gender with their bodies.

In examining transgender/transsexual paradigms in relation to Korean military sex slavery, another important consideration is the resonance between the body and intensive engagements with modern formations of power as semiotization through “body-reflexive practice.”¹² There is an “intelligence” to this design whereby the body must engage with specific institutions for a fuller semiotization. For Korean sex slaves, engagement with legal institutions made possible the fuller articulation of their experiences through testimonies and personal narratives.¹³ Before 1991 there was no knowledge of their experiences outside a few very specific circles in Korea and Japan. Former sex slaves encountered enormous skepticism regarding their experiences during World War II in both South Korea and Japan; they also encountered denial by the Japanese government. On August 14, 1991, Kim Hak Sun, a former sex slave, announced her willingness to testify publicly about her experiences. On December 6, 1991, Kim was joined by two other former sex slaves, who filed a lawsuit against the Japanese government. This lawsuit, widely reported around the world, inspired Yoshimi Yoshiaki, a Japanese pro-

fessor, to investigate and provide irrefutable evidence that the Japanese military was responsible for the sex slavery system.¹⁴ By January 12, 1992, almost forty-seven years after World War II, the fact of military sex slavery was finally acknowledged internationally.

An engagement with modern formations of power, therefore, allows and expresses fuller semiotization through body-reflexive practice. The previous political negotiations and attempts to resolve World War II filtered through nationalist interests and impulses—such as the Tokyo war trials at the end of the war, the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1952 between Japan and the Allies, and the Japanese–South Korean Basic Treaty of 1965—did not allow for this semiotization of military sex slave experiences, narratives, and testimonies.

This fuller semiotization through body-reflexive practice also contributes to the rethinking of sociality itself. Kim's preliminary lawsuit was followed by additional lawsuits and acknowledgment, which have opened up further spaces of articulation that enable the expression of other experiences once considered "beyond humanity."

Personal Investments

Sel: Reflecting on semiotization through body-reflexive practice and engagements with modern formations of power allows me to think of my own identity as a trans person. I have benefited from many legal and medical reforms, although there is still a lot of work to do in these areas. I am also aware that many of these benefits arise from my particular class, education, and citizenship statuses.

As someone who legally changed his name in 1999 (for racial reasons) and again in the spring of 2004 (for gender reasons), I understand that distinct resonances accompany such a change. For me, a legal name change is about being entitled to and receiving recognition on personal, social, political, and institutional levels. It is a great comfort to me that I can effect such breadth and depth of gendered recognition. And it is far more comforting to me than the repetition of a "nickname" with no accompanying legal change, no matter how long or how often that repetition occurs.

I also want to discuss briefly what it has been like for me to undergo testosterone supplementation. When I started my transition in 2001, I was lucky to be living in New York City and to be able to go to the Callen-Lorde Community Health Center. After a screening, I was given a prescription for testosterone and for needles. My health care provider also gave me the option of taking testosterone at full or reduced doses (often referred to as "lo-ho," for "lower doses of hormones").

I chose the latter primarily for health reasons. At this lower dose, which I can vary, I am a nonpassing or semipassing transsexual—it depends on how much testosterone I take over a given amount of time.

It was and still is profound for me that my transition was medically sanctioned because the U.S. medical field, in general, has historically been heavily invested in maintaining gender binaries. Yet several medical centers facilitated my transition to an identity and a body that do not fit into a gender binary and are unrecognizable in many heterosexual, homosexual, and even some transgender circles. Furthermore, the Callen-Lorde Community Health Center taught me how to self-inject, which allowed me greater independence in my transition. I was given a limitless prescription for twenty-three-gauge needles, and I have been given multiple six-month prescriptions for testosterone by doctors over the past three years in New York, Texas, and Rhode Island. I derive a certain sense of power and freedom from knowing that my transition as a lo-ho transsexual has been sanctioned by medical institutions in three vastly different states.

I have always been highly skeptical of medical institutions, yet during my transition I have found myself intensely engaged with them in ways that are new to me. My relative success with these institutions indicates to me that there is room for greater reform and partnership with medical institutions, and institutions in general, than I had previously considered.

Dean: Your discussion of how the Korean sex slaves were recognized and their stories amplified through legal action, and how that history connects with your narrative about your own transition, brings up some core issues that I face as an advocate and a scholar regarding decisions to use or not use autobiographical information about my transition in my work. One of the most glaring manifestations of transphobia in our culture is the obsessive focus on trans people's bodies and surgical statuses, which supports the principle that it is up to nontrans people, who are afraid of being fooled, to decide whether trans people are "legit." To the extent that trans people appear in mainstream media, it is usually by way of a formulaic reference to a straight man tricked by a beautiful woman who turns out to be "really" a man. Even in purportedly fact-based journalism, trans people are more often than not referred to by pronouns associated with our birth genders, by our birth names, and by our surgical status. In the first five minutes of any interaction with journalists who are aware that I am trans—no matter that what they are calling to ask me is utterly not about me but about the state of the law or a case I am working on or an activist endeavor I am part of—they ask me about my own surgical status and about how long I have been transgender.

I strongly believe in the power of personal narrative and autobiography to ground scholarship and activism, but I am also concerned about the extreme focus on trans bodies and the use of trans bodies (and histories) as evidence of the legitimacy of trans gender identities. As we trans people have been forced to mold our personal narratives to match the conservative and gender-norm-producing institutional medical narratives about us in order to access the medical interventions we seek for our bodies, we have often been accused of constructing those medical narratives and propping up conservative notions of gender. As a community, we have been trapped in the bind that if we do not convince our doctors (often over the course of years of therapy) that we believe in normative binary gender and that we seek to pass as norm-abiding nontrans men and women, we are denied access to the technologies of body modification that we desire. At the same time, when these legitimizing narratives are propped up, trans people are widely accused of defending normative and oppressive constructions of gender.¹⁵

It is perhaps even more disturbing for me that legal understandings of transgender people have followed medical constructions, so that our quests for legal recognition or equality remain tied to our medical statuses. For us to be recognized in our gender identities for the purposes of identity documents (passports, birth certificates, driver's licenses), marriage (which raises the issues of inheritance, child custody and visitation, immigration, and health benefits), placement in sex-segregated facilities (bathrooms, prisons, jails, homeless shelters, group homes, drug treatment facilities), and so much more, courts and administrative agencies demand detailed evidence about our bodies and our conformity to medical standards of binary gender. While any recognition of our gender identities at all is a welcome improvement, I am deeply concerned about any aspect of or struggle for liberation that involves adopting or affirming legal and medical definitions of binary gender that privilege people whose bodies "match" their identities according to those standards and/or who desire or can afford treatments that would create such uniformity.¹⁶

The overdetermined relationship between our rights to medical care and legal recognition and our abilities to produce medically sanctioned narratives about our histories and bodies worries me. A central purpose of my work is to achieve a world in which people are recognized for what they say they are and in which the state is stripped of the power to determine or compel a person's gender identity or expression. Thus I am cautious about using information about my own transition or body for fear of participating in an exercise whereby I am more or less "real" depending on how much medical recognition and intervention I have undergone.¹⁷ At the same time, I have used personal narrative in some of my writing,

particularly to expose the operations of norm-producing and coercive medical and legal practices. Overall, though, I think that trans people need to make sure that even during our rare moments of legal and medical recognition we keep our eye on a broader goal, which is the deregulation of gender, and keep our alliance with those people who, because of class-based access issues related to trans medical care, still cannot achieve the most basic recognition of their gender identities. We need to remember that most of us are still living in homeless shelters where we are forbidden to wear clothing associated with our gender identities; are in jails and prisons where we are placed on the basis of birth gender and face terrible violence; are in low-wage jobs or engaged in illegal work because of discrimination in employment; are struggling to get by without a high school education because of severe harassment and illegal expulsions based on gender identity and expression; and are being rejected from hospitals and doctors because we are trans. We need to make sure that those who live under the most serious duress and in the most dangerous circumstances as a consequence of the binary gender system are at the forefront of our struggles for liberation, and that our victories include and centralize their issues. This understanding requires a vision beyond the simple recognition of our gender identities by medical and legal institutions within binary models—a vision of gender self-determination for all people.

Notes

We thank Lynn Comella for comments on this essay.

1. Although some scholars situate *transgender* as different from, and even oppositional to, *transsexual*, I use *transgender/transsexual* to refer to intersecting and/or mutually informing identities and communities. This term emerges from my own experiences and observations in tg/tx communities and events, including the American Boyz, the annual True Spirit conference, female-to-male (FTM) and tg/tx support groups in New York City; Boston; Austin, Texas; and Providence, Rhode Island; and the symposium “Transecting the Academy.”
2. Lawrence Grossberg, “Identity and Cultural Studies: Is That All There Is?” in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (London: Sage, 1996), 96.
3. In *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 4–5, 70–71, 270–71, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari discuss multiplicity within arborescent schemas versus rhizomatic schemas. The plane of transcendence, as a plane of organization and development, only allows recognition of certain perceptions, whereas the plane of consistency also allows for perceptions that are not recognizable within the plane of transcendence. For

- a discussion of the European/American gender ideology see R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995), 185–203.
4. While transgender people remain understudied in all areas, including HIV/AIDS, some staggering statistics have been gathered about HIV in the male-to-female (MTF) population (FTM people are almost completely ignored by researchers in all areas, including health). One large-scale study in San Francisco put MTF women of color in the highest-risk category, with seroprevalence as high as 63 percent in the subpopulation of African American MTF women (K. Clements-Nolle et al., “HIV Prevalence, Risk Behaviors, Health Care Use, and Mental Health Status of Transgender Persons: Implications for Public Health Intervention,” *American Journal of Public Health* 91 [2001]: 915–21). While no study has been conducted in New York, a needs assessment conducted there suggests similarly high numbers (Kelly McGowan, *Transgender Needs Assessment* [New York: New York City Department of Health, HIV Prevention Planning Unit, 1999], 4). The San Francisco study also found that fewer than half of the trans women who knew that they were HIV positive were receiving medical care.
 5. Chandra T. Mohanty, “Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses,” in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra T. Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 51–56.
 6. George Chauncey Jr., “Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion? Homosexual Identities and the Construction of Sexual Boundaries in the World War I Era,” in *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, ed. Martin Baum Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey Jr. (New York: Penguin, 1990), 312–13.
 7. Approximately two hundred thousand military sex slaves, sometimes referred to as “comfort women,” were conscripted from East and Southeast Asian countries, 80–90 percent of them from Korea. Virginal females were targeted, some as young as eleven. Most came from the lowest class of Koreans, where the poor, uneducated, rural, and female intersected (see David Andrew Schmidt, *Ianfu—the Comfort Women of the Japanese Imperial Army of the Pacific War* [Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2000]; Chin Sung Chung, “The Origin and Development of the Military Sexual Slavery Problem in Imperial Japan,” *positions* 5 [1997]: 219–54; George Hicks, *The Comfort Women: Japan’s Brutal Regime of Enforced Prostitution in the Second World War* [New York: Norton, 1995]; and John Dower, *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* [New York: Pantheon, 1986]). For discussion of the ambiguity of the euphemistic *comfort women* and the alternative term *military sex slaves*, see Chung, “Origin and Development.” Like Chung, I prefer the latter term because of the experiential, social, and semiotic specificities that a gender-neutral term makes possible and because such a term also avoids the foreclosures that the gendered term *women* may cause. For this piece I had originally used the term *Korean military sex slaves*, in which *Korean* was the adjective and *military sex slave* the noun. However, after a recent visit to South

Korea (Republic of Korea), where I presented some of this research, it became clear that in this highly militarized social field, there is an inextricable link between a nation-state modifier and the term *military*. Since 1950 the U.S. military has been such a dominant presence in the Korean social field that *U.S.* and *military* are inevitably linked. The terms *U.S. military prostitutes* and *American military prostitutes*, therefore, refer not to military prostitutes who are American but to Korean prostitutes who serve the U.S. military. Thus many Korean scholars were confused by my term and thought that *Korean military sex slaves* might be misinterpreted as sex slaves for the Korean military. Some suggestions were offered, such as using *Korean sex slaves for the Japanese military*; however, I find it somewhat unwieldy to use this as a constantly repeated term and have therefore shortened it to *Korean sex slaves* throughout the rest of this piece. I use this latter term reluctantly, because it elides the militarization component, a fundamental aspect of this cultural phenomenon. I am also concerned about the confusion that U.S. readers may experience with *sex slaves*, since this term is often used in the context of sadomasochist practices in certain U.S. social fields, which may include the readership of this journal.

8. In general, Korean sex slaves were raped much more frequently than sex slaves of other races and ethnicities. Because of Japan's colonial history with Korea, a mythology had developed in which both male and female Koreans were viewed as possessing superior physical prowess, which made them ideal for intensive labor needs. Because Japan did not have a mythology in regard to the physical capabilities of other Asian races and ethnicities, the physical stamina of non-Korean sex slaves was seen as an unknown, and thus non-Korean sex slaves were raped less. The only forcibly recruited non-Asian sex slaves were Dutch women living in Indonesia, then a Dutch colony known as the Dutch East Indies. As Europeans, Dutch sex slaves were raped far less frequently than Asian sex slaves and were forced to serve only officers, not the rank and file. This reflected Japan's paradoxical relationship as an Asian nation that had desperately sought to divorce itself from Asia and to be accepted among the Western imperial powers. Because they served only officers, Dutch sex slaves were actually at the top of the military sex slave hierarchy, alongside Japanese military prostitutes, who also served only officers. See Chungmoo Choi, "Introduction," *positions* 5 (1997): ix; Hicks, *Comfort Women*, 41, 71, 113; Schmidt, *Ianfu*, 90; and Dower, *War without Mercy*, 263–90.
9. Korean sex slaves were called such masculine-inflected epithets as *konoyaro*, *bakayaro*, and *kisamayaro* during sexual and physical violence. When translated, these terms have several meanings, including masculine-inflected "bastard," male "rogue," male "rascal," "man," and "guy" (see Dae-il Kim, Yoon-shim Kim, and Pil-gi Moon, quoted in Sangmie Choi Schellstede, ed., *Comfort Women Speak: Testimony by Sex Slaves of the Japanese Military* [New York: Holmes and Meier, 2000], 26–27, 45, 66; Hak Sun Kim, quoted in Schmidt, *Ianfu*, 120; Kaneko [pseud.], quoted in Schmidt,

Ianfu, 122; Omok Oh, "I Thought I Was Going to a Textile Factory," in *True Stories of the Korean Comfort Women*, ed. Keith Howard, trans. Young Joo Lee [New York: Cassell, 1995], 66; Yi Yang-su, quoted in Hyun Sook Kim, "History and Memory: The 'Comfort Women' Controversy," *positions* 5 [1997]: 97; Seigo Nakao, *Random House Japanese-English and English-Japanese Dictionary* [New York: Ballantine, 1995], 15, 135, 260; and Richard C. Goris and Yukimi Okubo, *HarperCollins Shubun Pocket English-Japanese Dictionary* [New York: HarperCollins, 1993], 224, 434). No. 606 was a mercury-based antibiotic, probably Salvarsan (Chung, "Origin and Development," 229, 250; Schmidt, *Ianfu*, 90), that was believed to prevent pregnancy by rendering female bodies barren. It was also believed to cure venereal disease and to induce abortions.

10. *Homogenderal* refers to same or similar gender identities, presentations, and/or performativities in a given social or couple formation. See Lillian Faderman, *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 173–74.
11. Chandra T. Mohanty, introduction to Mohanty, Russo, and Torres, *Third World Women*, 32–39.
12. Connell proposes "body-reflexive practice" as a framework for understanding masculinities that can be applied to all genders. In body-reflexive practice, bodies are seen as sharing in social agency, in generating and shaping courses of social conduct. Bodies are both objects and agents of practice, and the practice itself forms structures in which bodies are appropriated and defined. Body-reflexive practices are not internal to the individual but involve social relations, symbolism, and large-scale social institutions. Yet the materiality of bodies continues to matter. Through body-reflexive practice, a social world is formed that has a bodily dimension but is not biologically determined (*Masculinities*, 59–65).
13. In 1948 thirteen Japanese soldiers were punished, and three of them executed, by the Dutch Batavia Court for forcing Dutch women in Indonesia to serve as sex slaves. Between fifty-two and one hundred Dutch women had been forced into sex slavery. However, no charges were brought before the Tokyo war crimes tribunal, led by the United States, concerning the sexual enslavement of some two hundred thousand Asian females. The U.S. Army had known about the sex slavery at this time; indeed, some Allied soldiers had raped Asian sex slaves at the end of the war. But Western humanism, the philosophical basis of the Nuremberg and Batavia trials, assumed that Asians did not belong to the category of humanity and thus did not merit justice or reparation (Choi, "Introduction," vi; see also Hicks, *Comfort Women*, 168–69).
14. It is important to consider how this fuller semiotization through body-reflexive practice also allows for new political alliances. Yoshimi's contributions cut across the segregated nationalist and identificatory interests of Japan and South Korea. I do not want to set up another simplistic "colonial model" relationship between oppressor and

- oppressed in my examination of Korean sex slaves. The complicity of Koreans themselves needs to be addressed, alongside alliances—what Deleuze and Guattari term “line-blocks of becoming” in *A Thousand Plateaus*—that deterritorialize nationalist stratifications. I address both concerns in a more extensive elaboration of my analysis.
15. See Dean Spade, “Resisting Medicine, Re/modeling Gender,” *Berkeley Women’s Law Journal* 18 (2003): 15–37; and Spade, “Mutilating Gender,” *Makezine*, Spring 2000, www.makezine.org/mutilate.html.
 16. Sex-reassignment-related medical care remains excluded from Medicaid coverage in most states and excluded from most private insurance plans, and trans-friendly or even trans-accessible medical care is rare or impossible to find in most communities. For those who cannot afford medical transition or find appropriate care—arguably the majority of trans people, considering how disproportionately low-income our communities are due to widespread discrimination—the few avenues of legal recognition are not accessible.
 17. One misuse of my personal narrative occurred in the May 2, 2003, *Guardian* article “I’m a Girl—Just Call Me ‘He’: Hip New York Lesbians are Calling Themselves Boys. So Could It Happen Here? Asks Stephanie Theobald.” In this disrespectful, factually incorrect article, Theobald continually uses female pronouns to refer to the trans men she describes, but she uses male pronouns (once with scare quotes) to describe me after noting that I have undergone chest surgery. Her choice to distinguish me in that way, and to recognize my gender identity selectively while mocking the fact that the other trans men she describes prefer male pronouns, tracks the typical transphobic journalistic strategy of respecting trans people’s gender identities only when they are legitimized by medical evidence. I am not interested in participating in the production of hierarchies of realness among trans people or in the notion that gender identity is tied to anatomical structures. Given the state of journalism about trans issues, the use of autobiographical facts about me to support oppressive understandings of gender is both inevitable and regrettable.