



Sexualities News

Newsletter of the Sociology of Sexualities Section of
the American Sociological Association

Volume 5, Issue 2—Winter 2002

2002-2003 Section Officers

Chair

Melissa Sheridan Embser-Herbert
Hamline University
embserherbert@gw.hamline.edu

Chair-Elect

Barry Adam
University of Windsor
adam@uwindsor.ca

Past Chair

Jodi O'Brien
Seattle University
jobrien@seattleu.edu

Secretary-Treasurer

Tom Linneman
William and Mary College
tjlinn@wm.edu

Newsletter Editor

Teddy E. Weathersbee
University of Wisconsin-Madison
tweather@ssc.wisc.edu

Webmaster

Jeffrey Sweat
University of California-Davis
jwsweat@ucdavis.edu

Council

Paola Bacchetta
University of California-Berkeley
p.bacchetta@worldnet.att.net

Julia Eriksen
Temple University
julia@vm.temple.edu

Jyoti Puri
Simmons College
jyoti.puri@simmons.edu

David Whittier
*HIV Center for Clinical and
Behavioral Research*
davidwhittier@hotmail.com

Wendy Chapkis
University of Southern Maine
chapkis@maine.edu

Gloria Gonzalez-Lopez
University of Texas-Austin
gloria_gonzalez_lopez@yahoo.com

Eve Clark (grad student rep)
University of Kansas
eveclark@ku.edu

Kevin David Vryan (grad student rep)
Indiana University
kdv@indiana.edu

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

I hope everyone enjoyed a safe and happy new year and that this message finds you looking forward to 2003! First, I wish to thank our past chair, Jodi O'Brien (Seattle University), for her service to the section and her assistance in my transition from chair-elect to chair. Second, appreciation is in order for all those who have served the section in elected and non-elected roles. And, extra special thanks must go to Kevin Vryan (Indiana University) for his work on membership and electronic communication and Jeff Sweat (UC-Davis) for getting our web site up and running. But, more on that in a moment!

The 2003 ASA annual meeting will be held August 16-19 in Atlanta, Georgia. The Sexualities section will have one session, a roundtable organized by Karl Bryant (UC-Santa Barbara) and Gloria Gonzalez-Lopez (UT-Austin). We had hoped to also have a paper session, but we are eligible for only one session because our membership sits just below the 300 mark required for two sessions. The council came to the decision that—especially given the representation of graduate students in our section—if we only had one session it should be a roundtable so that more people could participate and more scholarship be shared. For planning purposes, please note that our “day” at the meetings is Sunday, August 17. Though both our session and our council/business meetings are on the same day (as was the case in 2002) it is likely that council will meet separately on that day so that the ASA time allocated for council and business can be used for the business meeting and the Simon and Gagnon talk. Watch for announcements regarding meeting times/places as well as reception information.

As noted above, despite valiant efforts, we were not successful in our attempt to push membership over the 300 mark prior to the ASA deadline. Although the vitality of our section means that we succeed in surpassing the other ASA “benchmarks” for a successful section, we must reach the 300 mark if we want to have more than one session in 2004. If you have colleagues/friends whose research or teaching interests suggest that they should be members—or who just wish to support the important work of our section—please, do ask, do tell, do recruit! This is a particularly good time to join as the entire year of membership still lies ahead. If only one in ten of our members signs someone up, we will have about 326 members and would be insured a second section for the meetings in San Francisco. You are also encouraged to send any creative ideas for membership recruitment to Kevin Vryan at kdv@indiana.edu. Thanks!

cont'd. on pg. 2

Message from the Chair cont'd. from pg. 1

As for our Internet presence, if you haven't already done so, check out the section web site at: <http://www.asanet.org/sectionsex>. Again, special thanks to Jeff Sweat for this accomplishment. Also, though you are not automatically signed up for the Sexualities discussion listserv, everyone is welcome to subscribe (see details from Kevin Vryan later in this newsletter).

A recent exchange on the listserv addressed the language surrounding issues of sexuality. Though it would be unfair to attempt to capture the full character of the exchange in this brief note, I did want to bring it to the attention of those who do not participate in the list. One member raised a question about the ASA interest category of "Sexuality and Homosexuality" and whether or not that language was accurate, appropriate, etc. Various points were made about inclusivity, marginalization, the need to identify GLBTQI (etc.) perspectives/identities but not be seen as excluding non-GLBTQI (etc.) perspectives/identities, and so on. At one point the conversation morphed into a question regarding the naming of the section (as opposed to the ASA interest category). I offered to place both on the agenda of our business meeting in 2003. Although such a concern may be expressed to the ASA via a number of avenues, I think that, regarding the interest category language, if we can achieve and demonstrate consensus from the section membership, we place ourselves in a stronger position to challenge the ASA custom regarding that language. In the interim, comments/concerns on this issue may be directed to me at embserherbert@gw.hamline.edu. It would be most helpful if I could assemble a collection of arguments, examples, etc., prior to our meeting in August.

In closing, I want to encourage members to contribute to the newsletter. I know that we are all overly committed and have little to no extra time, but I have two particular thoughts—one is that you write a *short* piece on a particular issue, question, or concern related to sexuality. The other is that you share *brief* accounts of specific moments—epiphanies, horror stories, whatever—from teaching about sexuality or conducting research on sexuality. A variety of such contributions would make for a great newsletter!

A few possibilities, in no particular order and on no particular theme, are as follows: 1) Have you read Judith Levine's *Harmful to Minors: The Perils of Protecting Children from Sex?* She writes, "Sex is not harmful to children. It is a vehicle to self-knowledge, love, healing, creativity, adventure, and intense feelings of aliveness. There are many ways even the smallest children can partake of it. Our moral obligation to the next generation is to make a world in which every child can partake safely, a world in which the needs and desires of every child—for accomplishment, connection, meaning, and pleasure—can be marvelously fulfilled" (p. 225). What do you think of her work? Interested in writing a review or comment for the next newsletter? Or, is there another issue of public debate or recent publication on which you might share your thoughts? 2) Unlike many topics that we could choose to study, we are all—in one way or another—sexual beings. In what ways does your biography inform your research? Your teaching? Should it? Where do you draw the line (if at all) between the scholar and the individual? To what degree is this determined by external forces such as the climate in which you teach? 3) What are your thoughts on the relationship between politics and sexuality? As potential presidential candidates start testing the waters what are the questions that we should be asking? Are we headed into more dangerous times—specifically with regard to sexuality and civil rights—or is it just more of the same? What's happening in your area of which we should all be aware? 4) If you had just one question you could pose to the entire membership, what would it be? Perhaps we could begin posing several questions in one newsletter and publishing responses in the next. Do you have other ideas for enhancing communication across our membership?

If you have responses to any of the above, please send them to our newsletter editor, Teddy Weathersbee (tweather@ssc.wisc.edu). Let's make this a newsletter that provokes thought and conversation, one we look forward to reading! Have a fabulous Winter/Spring and please do not hesitate to send me your ideas and/or concerns regarding the section. I look forward to hearing from you!

—**Melissa Sheridan Embser-Herbert**
(embserherbert@gw.hamline.edu – 651.523.2564).

*For current job listings check out the
ASA Employment Bulletins online at
<http://www.asanet.org/pubs/eb/>*

Editor's Corner ~ Well, I am now off and running as your new newsletter editor! In this issue we are pleased to include the complete text of the 2002 Simon-Gagnon award speech from recipient Martin Weinberg. Also inside you will find membership news, calls for papers and section award nominations, along with notes from a couple of new releases from our members. Please note that the submissions deadline for the next newsletter is June 01, 2003. I look forward to your submissions! Happy New Year! *Teddy E. Weathersbee*

Simon-Gagnon Award Speech
ASA Meetings-Chicago, Illinois - 8/16/2002

Sexual Diversity, Diversity in Sex Research, and Humanity
Martin S. Weinberg—Indiana University

Most of us who are involved in sexuality studies celebrate sexual diversity. As educators, both formally (in classrooms, in legislatures, and courtrooms) and informally (in dealings with acquaintances, colleagues, relatives, and friends), we try to inform others about different sexual preferences, practices, and views of sexuality and try to disseminate a non-judgmental attitude toward a diversity of consenting sexualities. At the same time, it is not uncommon in the field of sexuality studies to see a lack of such kindheartedness when considering different preferences in the study of sexuality.

The Topics

I will consider two realms of research preference. The first is the academic discipline of the researcher. For this short address, I will consider just the disciplines of biology and sociology. Then I will consider another oversimplified division of work, this time within the discipline of sociology: qualitative and quantitative approaches. I will note the prejudice directed at the disciplinary and research perspectives that differ from one's own. Then I will point out the assumptions, misconceptions, and misrepresentations that I believe often underlie such prejudice. I will end with a plea for conciliation.

Biology

Sexuality is a fascinating aspect of life that has many facets to it. Thus, there is plenty of room for a variety of disciplines to study it. It seems a truism to

say that a variety of perspectives can inform us more fully about sexuality, yet many sociologists do not acknowledge this. There is a feeling of competition. Personally, I do not see the need for it.

Reflecting this competitiveness, when I heard a graduate student who I had worked with (and who I greatly admire) say in her lecture to a sociology class that "biology has nothing to teach us about sexuality," I was disappointed. The biology of sex may not be of interest to many of us, but coming from the Kinsey tradition I believe that biology has something to teach us about sexuality. I do conceive of my self as embodied. To provide one simple example, it is clear to me that without any androgen I would not have a sexual response.

An assumption that is often involved in the negativity toward the consideration of biological factors is that they will demean the role of sociological factors. I do not agree. I am secure in my belief that social factors have a lot to do with shaping human sexuality. Why do we need to be defensive about biological considerations? It seems to me that biological researchers are more likely to acknowledge the role of social factors in sexuality than we are to acknowledge the role of biological factors. Perhaps they feel more secure about the status of their discipline.

There is an additional political element beyond disciplinary competition. This is the concern that biological findings can lead to discriminatory practices (e.g., if biological factors are found to be involved in what we consider to be gendered differences this finding could be used to restrict women's roles; likewise findings about biological factors in sexual preference could result in the abortion of fetuses showing such signs). While such possibilities exist, and I understand the concern, this seems to be an overreaction to studies that usually show small or moderate correlations between the biological and the social-sexual. Moreover, to automatically impute malevolence to the researcher (without further evidence of it) is, in my eyes, inappropriate.

People who have malevolent intentions are able to put a spin on all kinds of findings (sociological as well as biological) to support their malevolence. To overindulge a fear of these people would freeze research of all kinds. Research ordinarily results in unanticipated findings. Isn't its purpose to uncover information we lack? Are we to censor our
cont'd. on pg. 4

Simon-Gagnon Award Speech cont'd. from pg. 3

intellectual curiosity because no one can anticipate the findings of research and how they might be used by reactionary people?

To show how the concerns over malevolent usage can extend beyond biological investigation, after Colin Williams and I published a sociological paper on gay baths the response of some sociologists was that such a paper was irresponsible because it publicized (in a professional sociological journal) that facilities for recreational sex existed in the gay world, and that this information could fuel prejudice against gays. Well, I think fewer of us are currently willing to play the assimilation game—hiding sexual lifestyles that are not consonant with restrictive conceptions of the dominant conservative culture. Now, more of us are openly celebrating a world of sexual pluralism.

Another personal example, this time with regard to research reflecting biological considerations, refers to a book I co-authored with Alan Bell and Sue Hammersmith entitled *Sexual Preference*. In a chapter called “Biology?” (note that there was a question mark after the word “biology” in the chapter title), we reiterated our finding that a history of gender non-conformity was reported more by gay than non-gay study participants. We pointed out that this was not inconsistent with the notion that biological factors could be involved in the development of sexual preference. Thus, we noted, that PERHAPS for SOME people, biological factors MIGHT be involved. However, our belief, as Alan Bell developed in article form, was that if this was the case, biology would probably have an indirect and not a direct link to sexual preference. In short, in our view, biological factors probably do not simply point an individual sexually toward a particular sex, but rather are mediated by social and psychological processes that affect the self in a way that influences a particular affectional-sexual preference. (We also noted in *Sexual Preference* that one in three cases of these so-called cross-gender histories were also found among the people in the study who defined as heterosexual—so we certainly were not suggesting any hard determinism). Well, this was not the way many members of the sociological community interpreted it. The exaggeration of what we had said was probably contributed to by the mass media’s overstatement of what we had written (e.g.,

newspaper titles reading, “Biology Causes Homosexuality”). A number of people informed me that I was a malevolent traitor to sociology (hopefully this address will not reactivate that status).

All I am suggesting is that we more carefully read what discussions of biology are actually saying, that we don’t misrepresent them, and that we do not get discombobulated by the possibility that biological factors are involved in human sexuality. If we believe an author is overstating the case or that there are problems with the study, then, of course, she or he should be taken to task. But, in general, I am proposing that we do not engage in a form of wholesale rejection, and that we extend the non-judgmental diversity perspective that we apply to consenting sexualities to include a diversity of academic perspectives that engage in the study of sexuality.

Qualitative versus Quantitative Work in Sociology

Of more importance to me than the disciplinary clash, is the continuing antagonism that many sociologists of sex feel toward those who differ from themselves in their preferred research methods. Certainly there are real differences in studies that tend to be objectivist (which may study behaviors or their effects without much consideration for the meanings that organize and surround them) and those that tend to be subjectivist (which make the meanings of the behavior the key concern). There certainly is a difference in what qualitative research and quantitative research (and research that combines qualitative and quantitative approaches) has to offer. And, of course, there are the philosophical-methodological issues that are involved. But again I believe that much of the bad feeling involves misconceptions and misrepresentations. As with disciplinary conflict, conflict with regard to method involves competitiveness and politics. A predominant view on the part of qualitative researchers is that their work is not as valued as quantitative work is and that the latter rules the roost—e.g., it is more likely to appear in major journals. I believe, however, that a great many quantitative researchers do respect and value qualitative work. I certainly see this in my own department at Indiana University. To paraphrase a colleague whose work is highly quantitative, a main difference between the approaches is that you need to be more brilliant to do qualitative research well!

cont'd. on page 6

Section Membership 2002 & 2003: Achievements & Opportunities

In 2002, we achieved our highest membership level since the section was founded: 296 members! Thanks to current Membership Committee members Natalie Bennett, Mary Bernstein, and Erin Davis and thanks to everyone for your recruitment efforts. For the much-anticipated 2004 San Francisco ASA meetings, we will gain an additional session just by increasing our membership to 300 in 2003. Please ask a colleague or two if they'd consider joining the section (only \$10 for non-student ASA members). Also, consider sponsoring a membership for one of your students (only \$5 for student members!). If you have any questions feel free to contact me at: kdv@indiana.edu. Thanks, Kevin D. Vryan, Chair, Membership Committee.

BOOKS

Sex Matters (for release Spring 2003). Mindy Stomblor, Dawn Michelle Baunach, Elisabeth Burgess, Denise Donnelly, & Wendy Simonds, Eds. Allyn & Bacon.

Sex Matters: The Sexuality and Society Reader is a combination of original and reprinted *research-based* articles that take a sociological approach to the study of sexuality. Emphasizing the diversity of sexualities and sexual experiences, this edited volume weaves the themes of racial and ethnic variation, sexual orientation and identity, life course challenges and changes, and (dis)ability throughout. Designed to provide broad coverage of major current issues in sexuality, the book contains 11 chapters, with topics such as the sexual body, culture and sexuality, commercial sexuality, sexual disease, and sexual practices. Research and theory are supplemented with essays from the popular press, interviews with active sex researchers, and boxed inserts containing crucial facts, opinions, and approaches to sexuality. For more information contact: stomblor@gsu.edu

Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Francisco, 1950-1994. Armstrong, Elizabeth A. 280 p. (est.), 18 halftones, 12 figures, 8 tables. 2002 Cloth \$60.00tx 0-226-02693-0 Fall 2002 Paper \$22.50tx 0-226-02694-9 Fall 2002

Unlike many social movements, the gay and lesbian struggle for visibility and rights has succeeded in combining a unified group identity with the

celebration of individual differences. In *Forging Gay Identities*, Elizabeth Armstrong explores how this happened, developing a new approach that draws on both social movement and organizational theory. She traces the evolution of gay life, gay organizations, and gay identity in San Francisco from the 1950s to the mid-1990s, identifying two events as pivotal in this evolution. First, in 1969 the encounter between early homophile organizing and the New Left produced gay liberation and its signature contribution—coming out. Second, the sudden decline of the New Left in the early 1970s reduced the viability of the radical gay-liberation goal of societal transformation and prompted gay activists to redirect their movement to the affirmation of gay identity and the pursuit of gay rights. *Forging Gay Identities* will be indispensable for anyone studying social movements, culture, identity politics, or organizational theory.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education: An International Quarterly Devoted to Research, Policy & Practice: Special Feature Section on: BEYOND RISK: RESILIENCE IN THE LIVES OF SEXUAL MINORITY YOUTH.

Two decades of research have documented significant risk in the lives of LGBT adolescents, and much of that risk has been traced to educational environments. Yet, most LGBT youth grow up to be healthy, contributing adults. This paradox—of adolescent resilience and risk—is beginning to receive more attention. This special section will include research or reflection articles that address two central questions: How do LGBT youth develop and exhibit resilience in light of their origins in cultures characterized by sexual prejudice? How can schools / educators respond—that is, work to prevent risk outcomes while fostering resilience? Additional topics might include: What do studies of the sexual identity development of LGBT youth add to our understanding of adolescent development in general? With regard to educational policy, what purpose(s) has the historic focus on risk among LGBT youth served, and at what cost(s)?

Approximate length: for scholarly articles, no longer than 35 typed, double-spaced pages; essays, 20 typed, double-spaced pages. For detailed guidelines on submissions, see journal website:

<http://www.jtsears.com/jglieguide.htm>

SUBMISSIONS DEADLINE: March 1, 2003.

QUESTIONS? Contact Stephen Russell, Associate Editor, strussell@ucdavis.edu.

Call for Papers cont'd. on page 7

SECTION AWARDS

The section sponsors two annual awards, the Graduate Student Paper Award and the Simon and Gagnon Award. Details of each are below.

• Graduate Student Paper Award

This award is given to a paper authored by a student currently enrolled in a sociology graduate program. A paper may be co-authored by two or more students who would share the award (papers co-authored with faculty are not eligible). The predominant focus of the paper should be sexualities broadly defined. Papers should be manuscript length and no longer than 35 typed, double-spaced pages. An original and four copies of the paper should be sent by **May 15, 2003** to Dr. Wendy Chapkis, Department of Sociology, University of Southern Maine, 96 Falmouth St., P.O. Box 9300, Portland, ME 04104-9300.

• Simon and Gagnon Award

This award commemorates decades of research and writing on sexualities by Professor William Simon (University of Houston), who died on July 21, 2000, and his longtime collaborator, Professor John Gagnon (SUNY-Stony Brook). The Simon and Gagnon Award honors career contributions to the study of sexualities as represented by a body of work or a single book. The recipient of the award will make a presentation to the Sexualities section at the Annual Meetings of the ASA. To nominate an individual or for more information, contact Jodi O'Brien, Dept. of Sociology, Seattle University, Seattle, WA ~ jobrien@seattleu.edu

Nomination Deadline: March 30, 2002

Subscribe to discussion listserv

In addition to the official announcement listserv to which all section members are automatically subscribed, we have an informal discussion listserv.

To subscribe, email: Majordomo@listserv.asanet.org

In the body of the message, type "subscribe sexualities" (without the quotation marks). Leave the subject line blank, and make sure that anything else in the body is removed, such as any signature your email program may automatically insert. For questions contact list administrator Kevin Vryan at kdv@indiana.edu

Simon-Gagnon Award Speech cont'd. from pg. 4

While, on the whole, I am much more interested in qualitative research literature, I do both qualitative and quantitative research (often combined). Some of the research questions that I want to investigate are better studied with a qualitative approach, some with a quantitative approach, and some with a combined approach. I also find it stimulating to work on different types of research. I agree with my colleague that a high level of qualitative work is more difficult to achieve. Why? Quantitative work has a more established framework for a researcher to follow. More guidelines exist. It seems that quantitative work can be more derivative but still successful. Some such work presents an extant theory, deduces hypotheses, sees if the data are consistent or inconsistent with the hypotheses, and discusses the implications of the findings in the conclusion. This does not mean that originality and a great deal of intelligence are not involved, but simply that more structure surrounds the enterprise. As a result, fewer qualitative projects may make the grade and this may be the main reason why we see less qualitative work in major journals. Frankly, as a member of editorial boards of several journals, and a more occasional reviewer for many others, this has been my experience in reviewing manuscripts. I think this is more of a factor than any manifest prejudice in accounting for the absence of more qualitative work in major journals. Nowadays, I simply do not believe that qualitative work is broadly disrespected. In fact, within the overall area of sex research, I think the predominant view is that we have a greater influx of brilliant minds than ever in our history, that the outstanding scholars are sociologists, and that the sociologists they are referring to are so recognized for qualitative work.

As I previously mentioned, however, it is not just competitiveness, but also philosophical-methodological issues that underlie antagonism between qualitative and quantitative approaches. In a qualitative work, an example of a lower level issue can be vagueness involved in a failure to indicate how predominant a particular theme is when it is presented as a finding which only notes that "some people felt (whatever the theme is)." On the other hand, an example of a question raised about quantitative work is how it can present calculations from something like close-ended questionnaire items and make assumptions about the meanings involved *cont'd. on page 7*

Simon-Gagnon Award Speech cont'd. from pg. 6

in the study participant's answer. The fact of the matter is that all of our social research methods—qualitative and quantitative—have their particular limitations. A higher level issue, of course, is the philosophical assumptions of positivistic approaches as opposed to interpretive approaches. But, I would maintain that ordinarily it is the philosophical models that differ much more than the actual beliefs of the practitioners whose work is classified as representative of a particular model. Certainly, some practitioners make assumptions that strictly reflect the models, but a great many do not. For example, more and more sociologists (quantitative and qualitative) are cognizant of the subjective and constructed nature of what constitutes "knowledge." Their method's preference is often based more on their training—the way in which they have learned to conceptualize research problems and the research skills they have developed—than on any lofty philosophical foundation. So why not extend some of the kindness directed toward sexual diversity to the acceptance of different approaches to the study of sexuality? As with the disciplinary issue, if authors make assertions that seem unwarranted by their method, the matter should be argued. But this is different from a sweeping rejection of a particular mode of sex research.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I believe that the depictions of the disciplinary and methodological beliefs of many sex researchers often involve misconceptions and misrepresentations. How many sex researchers really are pure "essentialists," believing that sexuality only consists of transhistorical and transcultural elements? I think most sex researchers appreciate that social locations—historical, social-structural, and cultural factors—affect the meaning of sexuality. In contrast, how many sex researchers are really pure "constructionists," believing that sexuality is affected only by historical, social-structural, and cultural factors? These are NOT the sex researchers I know. Also, as I've already said, methodologically most sex researchers appreciate the constructed nature of knowledge namely, that it provides a representation rather than a hard rock of truth.

Furthermore, like everyone else, researchers' biographies influence their preferences. This includes their preference for, and skill in, studying some aspects of sexuality more than others (biological, sociological, etc.) and carrying out their

research in a certain way. Thus, I'm asking that we do not characterize those in sexuality studies who differ from ourselves in discipline or method as a "kind of people," as individuals who just don't get it. Wouldn't it be more fruitful to view them simply as having a biographical history that leads them to a different sex research preference? Aren't we more similar than different even though we have different preferences? Given that most of us are not judgmental about sexual preference, I'm asking for an extension of the same humanity to those who have different sex research preferences. We are a small group. We need each other, both for the kinds of information we can provide one another as well as for support and fellowship. Indeed, given that thinking about, reading about, researching about, writing about, and teaching about sexuality makes up most of a sex researcher's waking life (further supplemented by the personal enjoyment of the activity so ardently studied), we are often stigmatized, considered by members of the public as sexually obsessed. We are, in a sense, a sexual minority. As such, I think we should spend less time fighting among ourselves and more time combating the sexual reactionaries who oppose us all.

2002-2003 Committee Chairs

Graduate Student Paper Award Committee

Wendy Chapkis

Simon and Gagnon Award Committee

Jodi O'Brien

Membership Committee

Kevin David Vyrant

Program Committee

Melissa Sheridan Embser-Herbert

Nominations Committee

Jodi O'Brien

CALL FOR PAPERS cont'd. from pg. 5

University of Manchester

Centre for the Study of Sexuality and Culture

SEXUALITY AFTER FOUCAULT

November 28-30, 2003

In 2003 the University of Manchester will launch an interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and cross-faculty Centre for the Study of Sexuality and Culture, with a particular focus on the relationships *cont'd. on page 8*

cont'd. from pg. 7

between sexuality, culture and history. To mark the establishment of the Centre at Manchester, and to foster a stimulating intellectual exchange between UK researchers and scholars elsewhere, we propose an international conference on "Sexuality After Foucault."

Next year also marks the 25th anniversary of the translation into English of Michel Foucault's *History of Sexuality*, vol. 1. Sexuality and gender studies have been dominated by the claims and assumptions of Foucault, though of late some scholars have suggested that the time is long overdue to explore new paradigms and approaches. The purpose of this conference is to debate the continuing relevance of Foucault's work in a changing historical context, to assess its strengths and limitations, and to develop new theoretical approaches to the study of sexuality.

Confirmed speakers include: Carolyn Dinshaw (New York University), David Halperin (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor), Don Kulick (New York University), Cindy Patton (Simon Fraser University), Valerie Traub (University of Michigan), and Jeffrey Weeks (South Bank University).

We invite submissions of panel proposals or individual papers from any disciplinary background which might address, but need not be limited to, the following topics and questions:

SEXUALITY, HISTORY AND MODERNITY

Does Foucault's historicism need revising? What other discursive forces contribute towards our understanding of sexuality?

SEXUALITY AND "GLOBALIZATION"

What are the effects of an increasingly 'integrated' capitalist world order on the disciplining of sexuality? What forms of resistance are possible?

GENDER, TRANSGENDER,

TRANSSEXUALITY AND SEXUAL IDENTITY

What are the (changing) relationships between sexual identification and gender identification? What tensions exist between queer/transgender politics and transsexual claims? Are we witnessing a return to essentialism?

SEXUALITY AND REPRESENTATION

Do sexual identities continue to determine sexual representation?

SEXUALITY AND ETHICS

How adequate are his reflections on sexual ethics? What is the relationship between sexual ethics and sexual politics? What are the ethical limits of sexual dissidence?

PANEL ORGANIZERS

We particularly welcome panel proposals. Please organize your submission as follows:

- * session title
- * name of organizer, institutional affiliation, discipline or department, postal address, phone number and email address
- * chair's name, institutional affiliation, discipline or department, postal address, phone number and email address
- * panelists' names, paper titles, institutional affiliations, disciplines or departments and full contact information (including email address)
- * a 500-word abstract describing the rationale of the panel and content of individual papers

INDIVIDUAL PAPERS

Please organize your submission as follows:

- * an abstract of between 200 and 300 words for a 20 minute paper
 - * a short biographical statement of up to 100 words
 - * institutional affiliation, discipline or department, postal address, phone number and email address
- DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS & PAPERS: 28th MARCH 2003** (Selected papers from the conference will be published in a special edition of GLQ).

Proposals may be sent by post or email to:

Dr Laura Doan
Women's Studies Centre,
Roscoe Building,
University of Manchester,
Oxford Road,
Manchester, M13 9PL UK
laura.doan@man.ac.uk

Dr David Alderson
Dept of English and American Studies,
Arts Faculty
University of Manchester
Oxford Road,
Manchester, M13 9PL UK
david.alderson@man.ac.uk

CALL FOR Newsletter Submissions:

Items for inclusion in the Summer 2003 newsletter must be submitted by June 01, 2003 to the editor at tweather@ssc.wisc.edu. Please email in MS Word or rtf format as an attachment (rather than in the body of an email). Thanks! *Teddy E. Weathersbee*