Sex and violence

Issues in representation and experience

Edited by
Penelope Harvey and Peter Gow

ROUTLEDGE

London and New York

First published 1994
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Typeset in Times by LaserScript, Mitcham, Surrey
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ Press (Padstow) Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalogue for this book is available from the Library of Congress

ISBN 0–415–05733–7 (hbk)
ISBN 0–415–05734–5 (pbk)

Contents

Introduction

Penelope Harvey and Peter Gow

This volume is a collection of papers written by people working in anthropology and cultural studies on the common theme of sex and violence. The papers were all presented at a conference in May 1989 in Oxford, with the help of the Centre for Cross Cultural Research on Women. It has the failings and virtues of such an origin. It makes no claims to being an authoritative statement on these issues. The problems, and the ways in which they are approached in this book, do not call out for authoritative statement. Instead, it presents a set of approaches, unified by the common focus on the issues in question. It has the virtue that all the contributors were present at the original conference, and thus heard the original papers and participated in the discussions which motivated this introductory chapter.

In line with the nature of the papers herein collected, this introduction is neither an overview of the general literature, nor an attempt to give the background to the internal debate of the volume, nor yet an attempt to provide a succinct summary of that debate. This is not a derogation of editorial duty. The literature on the subject is vast, and the debate has been carried on in so many diverse times and places as to defy summary. But, more importantly, the issues raised by our title, *Sex and Violence*, are so close to our common, everyday experiences that any attempt at summary of debate or background would be both impossible and pointless. And distasteful, for how could we claim to know what anyone brings to their thinking on these issues?

This introduction is just that, a way in to the reading of the separate papers in the volume. It is our own reading, and it is designed as an invitation to readers to make their own.

The title of this book, *Sex and Violence*, refers to a certain interface between anthropological studies of cultural difference, feminist concerns with the politics of western gender relations and their social effects, and an acknowledgement of a genre of mass appeal, the commodification of persons and bodies, the desire for participation without responsibility that

sells so many newspapers, magazines, and novels. Why might people buy a book on sex and violence, or flick through it surreptitiously? Why might such a title draw people's attention to the work?

Anthropological studies of sexuality and violence apparently hold out the promise of delving into two central western fantasies – the eroticization of domination and the eroticization of 'the (dominated) Other'.[1] To read and to write about sexuality and violence in other cultures might in itself be an activity that affords pleasure.

Violence, a self-evident and everyday occurrence in Britain, is nevertheless legislated, controlled, and studied as outside or beyond normal, constructive human practice. Violence is by definition unacceptable, out of control, beyond reason. Furthermore, it is transgressive; transgressive of our sense of bodily integrity and the spirit enclosed therein which enables the notion of violation to apply to more than physical hurt. It is in this sense that the concept of violence is so closely associated with western understandings of human sexuality. Despite what Foucault had to say on the matter,[2] sexuality is also associated in Anglo-American cultures with the transgressive individual, that aspect of self that emerges through lack of control, that exists and finds expression against reason enabling the momentary transcendence of individuating boundaries.

Western cultures have constituted and responded to sexuality and violence by discourses and policies of exclusion, expulsion, and repression. Violence is excluded by its defining anti-social nature, sexuality by its location in an intensely personal space of embodiment. A volume on violence and sex promises to look at things that we usually confine to our private fantasy worlds, associated with the erotic danger of that which we keep on the edge. Once put in this way, however, it is also important to point out that our familiarity with such material and the experience of it as pleasurable, crucially depends on the distance which exists between our own lived personal experiences and the experiences of those who have become the object of the voyeuristic gaze. Distance is essential if the fantasy is to maintain its ability to please.

Is this the field of interpretation into which the anthropological texts will be read/interpreted? If so, should we remain silent on these issues? And in addition to a concern with how these texts might be interpreted, should we not also address a concern about how such texts are produced? Is the objectification of highly charged emotional events itself a form of violence? Does writing, representational practice, not involve us in a process of effacing social relations between people in order to produce the text as cultural artefact? How, in other words, does a book on sex and violence speak to the current moral crisis in contemporary ethnography where representation of otherness is seen to imply both disassociation and objectification?

In the process of western colonial expansion out over the globe, the other cultures contacted and dominated came increasingly to work as fantasy images of the metropolitan culture. From Montaigne and Voltaire on native South American cultures through Gauguin and R. L. Stevenson on the South Pacific to Freud on Australia and Picasso on Africa, these other human cultural worlds came to provide the basis for a critique of all that was bad about the world of the western writer or artist. Increasingly, alternative images of social possibility required the backup of concrete exemplars. Depictions of the Tupinamba as acephalous cannibals gave added authority to a critique of absolutist monarchy, while the rampant primitive sexuality of the Tahitians or Samoans gave added authority to a critique of European sexual repression. By the same token, these actually existing others provided equally powerful support for reactionary critiques, as fantasy images of the social results of weak or absent states or of uncontrolled sexuality in a dark world of cannibalism, insecurity, and, especially, inadequate technical control over nature. Images of the other are inherently polyvalent (Torgovnick 1990).

Anthropology developed as a scientific extension of this enquiry into those human cultural worlds which were most other to the lived worlds of the agents of western expansion. As with these older uses of images of other cultures, anthropology has always been a more or less explicit critique of the home culture, whether affirmative or oppositional. But anthropology added a new dimension to the issue, for it made explicit its role of critical reflection on the images of other cultures operating in the home culture itself. Accounts of these other cultures ceased to be the starting point of a critique of the home culture, and became an end itself. Ethnography as the accurate and objective description of other cultural worlds became a central activity of anthropology, the groundwork on which analysis was built. Ethnographies are true representations of the other. But, because they are images of the other, they are also polyvalent. Ethnographic texts therefore occupy an uneasy place in imagery of the other because they claim, at some level, to be true. Far from solving the problem of the unscientific uses of this imagery, ethnographies extend it in novel ways and with unforeseen effects. Each ethnography, as it sets out to challenge some previous erroneous image of the people described, produces a new and more potent image of the other.

A good example of the problem is provided by Gregor's account of sexuality and institutionalized gang rape among the Mehinaku of the Alto Xingu of Central Brazil (discussed further by McCallum in Chapter 4 of this volume) (Gregor 1985). Starting from the premise that the very cultural otherness of these people will provide an important perspective on western sexuality, he produces an ethnographic account of them that provides an

image of a culture at once very similar to western culture, but in very important senses different from it. Gregor clearly hopes that these differences and similarities will shed important light on aspects of his home culture which remain opaque or confusing to its members. In particular, gang rape is one of the most shocking and dramatic forms of sexual violence by men against women, but western people have no clear and overt language in which to discuss the motivations of the aggressors or the implications for the victims. The Mehinaku by contrast, in Gregor's account, have institutionalized gang rape, and provide an open and public discourse about why it occurs. Because the Mehinaku, who seem to talk about sex with remarkable frankness, can openly discuss this act and why it happens, they provide an important perspective for our own culture, by openly revealing what we conceal.

But, as a produced image of the other, Gregor's ethnography of the Mehinaku provides the point of attachment for other images of alterity. What kind of culture institutionalizes gang rape as a public activity, indeed as a religious one? Gregor's attractive image of the Mehinaku, a people at ease with talk of their sexual desire and activity, conjures up a deeply unattractive image of the Mehinaku, a culture in which the collective domination by men of women is supported by religiously sanctioned acts of collective male violence against any woman who challenges their power. Both images provide the grounds for action, but the actions diverge in the extreme. Gregor's overt image suggests that we western people should do something about our inability to talk openly about sexuality and sexual violence, and by doing so learn more about its motives. We should, in short, become more like them. But the other image, equally overt in Gregor's text even if never intended by him, suggests that we should continue to repress and exclude the other. We should, in short, become as different from the Mehinaku as possible.

This problem runs deeper, for imagery of other cultural possibilities has always functioned for western people as the source of another type of action: changing the other. Western culture is intrinsically bound up with doing something about the other. An image of the other has no sooner been invoked as a call to do something about ourselves, than it inverts its valency, and becomes a call to do something about them. Times have changed, and we might be reluctant to send missionaries to clear away the gross moral darkness of their religions, but we would not be reluctant to insist that development projects must address the position and interests of women, even when these conflict with those of men or of traditional cultural practices. Western people, often uneasy about the domination intrinsic to their modes of action, are happiest when domination is done to empower the dominated.

And the problem runs deeper yet. The image of the other is a call to action, and action requires some sort of change in the parameters of our relationship with the actually existent other. Our unease about the actions which result from our images of the other reaches its fullest form in the suspicion that the truth of our relationship to the other is purely that of the domination of the image of the other. This is the suspicion that all representations of the other are pornographic (Kappeler 1987). This problem assails all of anthropological endeavour. Perhaps the interest that anthropologists take in Gregor's *Anxious Pleasures*, or Mead's *Coming of Age in Samoa*, or Malinowski's *The Sexual Life of Savages* is really not that different to the interest taken by 'other people' (never explicitly identified) in 'snuff movies' or other forms of hard-core pornography. Certainly, the popularity of ethnographies of sex or violence among non-anthropologists suggests that this is so. Is anthropology simply the representational domination of the other for the gratification of the self? Should anthropologists stop doing it? Does the harm it carries outweigh the good? This is a question that constantly assails most politically concerned practitioners, and makes anthropological politics among the most nervous of all academic politics.

FEMINISM AND ANTHROPOLOGY

The very issue that has caused a crisis in anthropological representation is the explicit starting point for feminist analyses of the relationship between violence and sexuality. Here the analyst seeks both to name/objectify/reveal the violence of particular social relations, and to disassociate themselves, and hopefully their readers, from engagement or collusion in such relations. Feminist scholarship is thus problematic for the ethnographer. The objectification and disassociation involved in the politics of naming and revealing requires the imposition of absolute values on particular practices regardless of how these are understood by those involved. What are the political and theoretical consequences of relativizing or not relativizing violent acts and their motivations?

Discussion of the relationship between feminist scholarship and anthropological treatments of gender was a strong sub-text to the conference proceedings – perhaps less evident in the papers themselves than in the motivations for participation. While the conference did the usual anthropological task of relativizing the concepts 'sex' and 'violence' and questioning the basis for any kind of cross-cultural comparison through these terms, it also revealed very strongly held and opposing views among the conference participants about the relationship between gender difference as an anthropological issue and gender politics in a more general

sense. Beyond the topics of specific papers, the conference itself produced a series of debates/confrontations which were not so much to do with the possibility of cultural difference, a position which all participants would have upheld, but had more to do with the extent to which anthropology can sustain/contain any kind of political commitment and if so what kind? Can an anthropological commitment to incommensurability which acknowledges that cultural difference is not merely the difference of political interest, simultaneously address such issues?

The relationship between anthropological and feminist understandings of gender has occurred in a sequence where previous traces are never entirely covered over.[3] We are thus not at a moment of consensual plurality – both the politics and the anthropological concerns that various writers are addressing are of their own times and circumstances. Gender emerged with force into anthropological debate in the 1970s. The context of the 1990s into which the anthropology of gender is now produced has changed. Anthropological knowledge is no longer self-evident. Researchers are increasingly aware of the extent to which the relationships in which they come to know things are themselves integral to the resulting knowledge. The accumulation of comparative data on gender has removed certainties about gender as a category of comparison. At the same time 'gender' is no longer the 'issue' it was twenty years ago. Gender is mainstream, an aspect of research of quite varied political and theoretical approaches, a central component of all undergraduate courses, generally accepted to form an integral aspect of economic, political, and ritual practice.[4]

Anthropologists have always had an interest in what both men and women do, particularly in the field of kinship.[5] However, early analyses, concerned with the structure and function of social life, were highly normative; indeed it was the norms that scholars sought to reveal. Men and women were understood to act as 'men' and 'women', maleness and femaleness were thought about in terms of what men and women *are* and *do*. Socialization was essentially the acquisition of normative sex roles, the internalization of the rules through which children came to behave as adult men and women.

This focus was not antithetical to feminist interests in exploring and explaining the extent of male domination in contemporary societies. In fact anthropology, the comparative study of human social practice, entered a phase of very direct dialogue with feminist scholarship. During this phase powerful meta-narratives were produced to explain this apparent cultural universal in which the concept of gender was articulated to various theoretical interests within anthropology. Ortner's (1974; Ortner and Whitehead 1981a) consideration of prestige and value identified the construction of sex and gender as essentially symbolic practice through which the value of

female association with nature was systematically undermined by virtue of men's additional access to the symbolic domains of culture; Rosaldo (1974, 1980) articulated a more sociological approach in her identification of the private/domestic sphere of female practice as universally encompassed by the public sphere of largely male concerns; and Chodorow (1978) drew on psychological theory to establish that male domination of women was related to the differences in male and female experiences of the mother as a figure of attachment and authority in childhood.

These studies had an impact, not least in the important work that was immediately produced in refutation of the universalist assumptions on which they were based. A clear tension emerged between anthropological and feminist projects in the deconstruction of the nature/culture, public/private dichotomies. These studies drew attention to the fact that this emergent consciousness of the symbolic domain had produced a theory of the 'natural' that failed to identify central concepts such as nature/culture, public/private, man/woman as culturally specific not merely in their universal salience but also in their dichotomized relationships of opposition.[6]

The cross-cultural comparison of gender-related issues became an amazingly powerful heuristic within many different fields of anthropology, making visible the ways in which analytic connections and categories that had previously been deemed natural and thus neutral were in fact embedded in western practices and understandings. There was extensive investigation of what it meant to be a woman and how cultural understandings of this category varied through space and time. There was also considerable emphasis on the nature of women's experience which generated discussion concerning the cultural specificity of central concepts such as production, reproduction, household, family, marriage, and the concepts of property which systems such as bridewealth and dowry entailed. Within these studies the focus was both on women's experience and on culturally specific understandings of a sexual division of labour and particularly the value of gendered activity.[7]

This work, which sought to undermine universalizing tendencies and to reveal western cultural categories, took up and developed the central notion that gender was concerned with social/cultural constructions and was thus firmly situated in the domain of symbolic practice. Gender existed everywhere and, in those studies where the focus shifted from looking at expressions of gender difference as instances of male domination, scholars found that attention to idioms of gender enabled powerful connections to be revealed between apparently discrete domains of social practice. Studies of how women operated as cultural signifiers revealed how, in many cases, cultural practice which operated through the articulation of gendered identities was in fact directed towards the production of androgynous

non-gendered social realities.[8] Gender symbolism was complex, its values contextual, its cultural purpose frequently not about the activities of men and women at all. In this vein it became quite straightforward within anthropology to carry out studies of gender with no reference to feminist agendas. The interest which particular symbolic 'systems' were identified as serving were not necessarily gendered ones.

A subsequent/parallel point of common interest emerged in the interest in studies of agency and subjectivity. Feminists were concerned to reveal women's practice as active and to undermine models which only attribute agency to men's activities. In a reversal of the data offered by anthropologists to confirm theories of universal domination, anthropology was now offering evidence of effective gendered agency. One of the implications of these studies was that gender difference was not necessarily indicative of gender hierarchy.[9] The difference again in focus between anthropological and feminist versions of this issue was the extent to which gendered agencies were held to be commensurate with the agencies of men and women. From within anthropology it was argued that men and women did not always act as 'men' and 'women', that identities were not coherent and prior to the interactions through which they were constituted. Persons are gendered in and through their daily practice. Gender is thus a process of becoming rather than a state of being. To insist *a priori* that women be treated as social actors is to ignore the complexity and variability of indigenous notions of the person.[10] For example, it has been argued that in Melanesia persons are regarded as objectifications (personifications) of relationships.

> In Melanesian culture, people are imagined in contrasting modes – male and female, same-sex and cross-sex, a person always one of a pair of interrelated forms. As persons women and men are equally the objects of the regard of others, and thus objectify their relationships. Since persons are the objective form of relationships, the outcomes of their acts are held to originate in and thus belong to those relationships.
>
> (Strathern 1988: 338)

Strathern has paid particular attention to the ways in which western models of the active subject pervade both anthropological and feminist scholarship, and she seeks in her work to reveal how western models of exploitation and male domination depend on notions of the possessive individual, on commodity logics, and on a particular relationship between experience and identity.

When we look at gender concepts we are not necessarily looking at how people construct identities but rather at how they constitute relationships. The critique is thus not simply directed at essentialist notions of gender but also at the implications of models in which gender is unproblematically produced as a social construction. The problem with social constructionism is that it depends on a cultural concern with symbolic analysis and representational practice, a concern which cannot be taken as a cultural universal.

Such disagreements within anthropology were also articulated as incompatibilities between anthropological and feminist scholarship. The real difference lies in 'the nature of investigators' *relationship* to their subject matter' (Strathern 1987a: 284). Feminism operates on the basis of a common identity among women while anthropology builds on the premise of difference and the possibility of incommensurability. The radical aspect of feminist scholarship is the concern to challenge the misrepresentation of women's experiences brought about by the totalizing discourses of male-dominated disciplines. The radical aspect of anthropology is of a different kind, as anthropologists attempt to construct knowledge in relation to, rather than in antagonistic separation from, an other. The antagonistic relationship is with that part of oneself that embodies habitual practice and anthropologists attempt to reveal that side of themselves in order to maintain an awareness of it. The relationship between anthropology and feminism is one of mutual mockery in which feminists laugh at anthropological pretensions to joint authorship, a delusion which they say overlooks asymmetrical power relations and the politics of how the world is structured, and anthropologists in turn laugh at the feminist pretensions of achieving separation from their antithetical other. Feminists point out that dialogic texts cannot represent the voice of the other when their interests are not convergent with those of the anthropologist, and anthropologists reply that feminists are inevitably trapped within their own ethnocentrism which produces male and female antagonism through particular understandings of personhood and relationships which condemn women to collude in their own oppression. The terms of this paradoxical relationship between the feminist and the anthropologist are, of course, often embodied in one scholar (Strathern 1987a).

However this particular formulation of the 'awkward relationship' is more complexly located within feminist scholarship than Strathern's dichotomy proposes. The deconstruction of the category 'woman' was also, indeed originally, associated with the realization that feminist politics had become a politics of exclusion for many women. Both essentialism and the explanation of women's domination in terms of particular western notions of women's practice, particularly the associations with motherhood, child-bearing and domestic labour, were located by feminist scholars as stemming from modernist philosophy. Postmodernism, as a method, with its anti-totalizing approach and awareness of both the complex nature of human subjectivity and the contingency of historical fact, made visible

the tendency within modernist feminisms to generalize from the experiences of western, white, heterosexual, middle-class women.[11]

> There is nothing about being 'female' that naturally binds women. There is not even such a state of 'being' female, itself a highly complex category constructed in contested sexual scientific discourses and other social practice. Gender, race, or class consciousness is an achievement forced on us by the terrible historical experience of the contradictory social realities of patriarchy, colonialism, and capitalism.
>
> (Haraway 1991: 155)

It is clear that gender is epistemologically central to our attempts to understand the dynamics of human sociality. It is clear that gender is no longer taken simply as the 'add women and stir' approach, but its centrality, the success of earlier generations of feminist scholars, has gone hand in hand with diminishing heuristic effect. It is also clear that the works of writers such as Strathern and Haraway are producing new awkward relationships – an awkwardness that still revolves around the possibilities for an effective political practice. Their work is scientific, directed to specific specialist audiences. Their deconstructionism is one of ever receding horizons in which subject positions are continually removed. Strathern reveals that the expression of an awareness of cultural constructions is itself a cultural construct. Moving beyond gender has produced the essentially androgynous relational persons of Melanesia. These are mirrored by the cyborgs of Haraway's work, science-fiction's amalgam of humans and machines, hybrids that work against totalization and its concomitant exclusions. Haraway works against 'the dream of a common language' (Rich 1978). Both Strathern and Haraway practise a politics of destabilization and disruption. This politics provokes reaction from those who feel excluded on other grounds: on grounds of accessibility, on grounds of isolation, objections which are easily exploited by reactionary writers, such as the ubiquitous Camille Paglia, who can offer recognizable stereotypical fixities. Attempts to reject common language can all too easily have the effect of privileging a particular critical horizon.

Cameron (1992) has argued that 'communication is about the attempt to create intelligible realities . . . there must be something between the totalising code of the (feminist) dream and the untrammelled heteroglossia of the cyborg, both equally Utopian in the nature of language'. She suggests the creole as the new icon for feminist politics, an icon that allows for 'the interplay of the body and history, the fact that language is embedded both in the generality of our human inheritance and in the particularities of our social relations. Creoles are precisely communication systems developed by people without a common language.'

It should be clear from this brief review of the relationships between anthropological and feminist understandings of gender that there is no consensus within anthropology on how gender should or could be used as an analytical tool. The concept of gender has been brought into anthropology in relation to particular and varied theoretical concerns, which co-exist, in tension, in debate, sometimes in ignorance of each other. The concept of gender is effortlessly evoked in relation to discussion of social structure, symbolism, the relationship of structure and practice, and of representation and experience, the nature of difference and even the contemporary concern to reveal the rhetorical practices through which anthropologists produce texts and through them their objects of study.

The contributions to this volume reflect this diversity of theoretical approach. Such theoretical diversity also implies contrasting understandings of political effect. Each of the authors has dealt with this aspect of analysing sex and violence from different perspectives.

Four of the papers focus on the politics of ethnography. Toren is concerned with the experiential reality of violence in Fiji (both against children and against women) as a constitutive part of Fijian notions of kinship. Here, violence (including sexual violence) is fully integrated within the production of kinship as an overarching value. Politically the contrast is with those older studies which tend to see violence as 'collapse of social order'. Toren shows how violence is intrinsic to the Fijian social order, and implicitly critiques a tradition in ethnography which would mask that centrality. Harris operates in a similar frame, but within a different tradition of ethnographic writing which has sought to underplay the role of violence in Andean cultures in order to subvert the racist images which have stressed that violence. Without undermining the ethnographic project of subverting those images, Harris seeks to address her field experience of violence. Like Harris, McCallum is concerned to challenge unanalysed and pernicious popular images of the cultures described, in this case indigenous Amazonian people. She shows the fit between religious gang rape and the emphasis on peaceful relations between men and women in the Alto Xingu by showing how the former does *not* stand for what it would in the west. Harvey, by contrast, is concerned to reveal the complexity of meaning in acts of violence in another Andean context. Certain forms of violence may be celebratory of community and regeneration, but others are not.

Wade and Moore address the politics of theory in ethnography. Wade starts with an account of personally unattractive aspects of relations between men and women in his field site, and then shows how they 'make sense'. Here the stress is on making sure the theoretical frame is right. This concern is revealed even more clearly in Moore's paper, where the focus is on getting the theory right as a political act. For Moore, the problems of

ethnographic description are the effects of ideological prejudices or of inadequate theorization. She proposes a general theory of sexual violence in order to reveal the hidden logic of particular ethnographic cases.

For the other two papers, the political issue is representation. For Cameron and Frazer, representation is first and foremost an issue of politics, and theory is a branch of politics. The gender of the representers matters, and women making representations are intrinsically challenging to the dominant representational and theoretical codes. As they challenge these codes, they reveal new and unexpected connections within them, as the Serial Sex Murderer is opened out as hero of post-Enlightenment philosophy. For Day, the problem is one of ethnographic representation. In addressing the lives of London sex workers, Day shows how these women can most easily expose the problems of representation and experience, but how they are simultaneously least able to do so. They are the subjects with the best evidence of rape as personal violation (the breaking of a formally agreed contract governing intimacy), but are the least able to defend themselves in public (because their profession is illegal, precisely because the contracts they draw up violate the category-divisions of English society). This ethnography, coming as it does from the home culture of the ethnographer, is able to speak for itself. As a representation, it stands in vivid contrast to the lived experience of those described.

VIOLENCE AND SEXUALITY

As was mentioned above, participants to the conference were all open to the idea that both violence and sexuality are culturally embedded concepts which do not necessarily have commensurable salience cross-culturally. This was one of the issues which the conference set out to discuss. Contributors were given no specific brief or definitions to work to. Discussion of violence, limited by the association with sexuality, thus ranges beyond Riches's minimal cross-culturally valid definition of violence as the 'contestable rendering of physical hurt' (1991: 295). The particular substantive categories of violence are generally recognizable in terms of this frame; murder, sex-murder, warfare, torture, beating, chastisement, and physical violation, but also include less visible categories of broken contract and the notion of threat. Contributors also reveal particular understandings of violence as associated with contestation, by discussing the celebratory, life-affirming, positively transformative effects of rendering physical hurt. The incommensurability of these non-western practices with the transcendental self-affirmation of a post-Enlightenment western context is well illustrated in Chapter 7 by Cameron and Frazer.

The connections drawn between violence and sexuality also vary considerably across the contributions but in all cases that connection is understood as an effect of social relations rather than of individual pathology and it is these relations which then are the subject of enquiry. Eroticized violence, violence for sexual pleasure, is discussed explicitly by Cameron and Frazer and addressed more tangentially by Harvey and McCallum. Violence motivated by the sexual relationship and particularly if contested, and notions of appropriate behaviour within such relationships are the subject of the chapters by Day, Harvey, Toren and Wade. Finally, Day and McCallum discuss the relationship between violence and sexuality with reference to acts directed towards the private, sexual body.[12]

It seems likely that a dominant western discourse which constitutes violence as explicit and public and sexuality as private and subjective has made it easier for us to be more open about violence than we have been about sexuality.[13] Furthermore there is an implicit ambiguity in the volume concerning the relationship between sex and gender. Gender, concerned with sexual difference as cultural signifier, is easier to talk/write about than sex, articulations of desire that cannot necessarily be reduced to gendered bodies, particularly in the psychoanalytic tradition which insists on the inherent bisexuality of the subject.[14] This point reveals a link between the papers which concerns the effects of sexuality and violence in the achievement and expression of inter-relatedness. We tend to think of sexuality and violence as contrasting modes of relating, sexuality associated with attraction, violence with separation. When the two come together in western cultures the paradox that lies behind our sense of transgression is produced. It is also this view that enables some to argue that sexual intercourse is inherently violent, involving penetration and the transgression of bodily boundaries. Torture, shown again and again to be a highly sexualized activity, dwells on this notion of bodily autonomy, on attempts to rupture the boundaries of the self.[15]

This brings us back to the beginning of this chapter. Bodily excess has long been used as a western technique through which to reveal the self. Europe's others have long been thought of in terms of bodily inversions, displacements and duplications which, as Mason (1990) has shown, are modes of excess. As Cameron and Frazer (Chapter 7) show, sexual violence has also been used as an excessive means of reclaiming self from society, revealing self by individuated opposition. Taken collectively the articles that comprise this volume reveal the partial nature of these western concepts while nevertheless addressing the social relations in which they are produced.

NOTES

1 Benjamin (1983); Graziano (1992); Hulme (1986); Montrose (1991); Mason (1990); Theweleit (1987).
2 Foucault's position that sexuality is constituted discursively and is an effect of the ways in which 'the apparatuses of power are directly articulated on the body' (1976: 200), does not pre-empt this other, recognizable discourse on sexuality described further by Cameron and Frazer (Chapter 7).
3 Conversations with Sarah Franklin have been extremely helpful for clarifying this debate and providing much of the vocabulary with which to discuss it.
4 The integration of gender into studies of politics, economics and ritual began in the 1970s. The following are some of the more influential review articles and edited texts: Rosaldo and Lamphere (eds) 1974; Reiter 1975; Quinn 1977; Caplan and Bujra (eds) 1979; Rapp 1979; Etienne and Leacock (eds) 1980; MacCormack and Strathern (eds) 1980; Ortner and Whitehead (eds) 1981; Young *et al.* 1981; Atkinson 1982; Collier and Yanagisako (eds) 1987; Strathern 1987b. For the most recent overviews see Moore (1991) and di Leonardo (1991).
5 See, for example, Malinowski (1929); Evans-Pritchard (1940); Radcliffe-Brown and Forde (1950). In famous husband and wife teams there was also frequently a division of labour in which women wrote about aspects of women's lives. For further references on this topic see di Leonardo (1991: 6).
6 A key text in this regard was MacCormack and Strathern (1980). Critiques of the domestic/public dichotomy were made by Rapp (1979); Yanagisako (1979); Rosaldo (1980); Strathern (1984). For Marxist analyses which entailed an evolutionary understanding of male domination see Leacock (1972; 1978); Etienne and Leacock (1980); Sacks (1974).
7 Again there is a vast literature on these topics. For a good overview see Moore (1991, Chapters 3 and 4). Central texts are: Strathern (1972); Reiter (ed.) (1975); Sharma (1980); Croll (1981); Hirschon (1984); Caplan (1985).
8 See, for example, Bloch (1987).
9 See Harris (1980); Strathern (1987b); Harvey (this volume).
10 Gow (1991); McCallum (1989); Strathern (1988).
11 See, for example, Fraser and Nicholson (eds) (1990).
12 An evident gap in this discussion of sex and violence is any reference to the motivating force of sexuality in western institutions and the consequent importance of sexual difference in the 'violence' of social inequality. Prominent theorists in this field include: de Lauretis (1987); Martin (1987); Pateman (1988); Haraway (1989, 1991).
13 Psychoanalytic theory, a privileged and salient domain of western discourse on violence and sexuality, posits a contrast between a social public self and an inward private self. Analysis is the process through which the patient narrates the links between these conscious and unconscious dimensions of self. Although it is not necessary to psychoanalytic theories that the unconscious self is privileged as more real, this was the effect of some of the ways in which feminist scholars engaged with this model. For obvious political reasons the notion of an unconscious/repressed self became a powerful analogue of an authentic oppositional self which liberationist politics could work to redeem.
14 This issue points out another missing dimension to our discussion at the conference, that of the association between politics and sexuality as discussed in the literature which challenges the normative heterosexual perspective.
15 Scarry (1985); Graziano (1992).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkinson, Jane (1982) 'Anthropology: review essay', *Signs* 8: 236–58.
Benjamin, Jessica (1983) 'Master and Slave: the fantasy of erotic domination', in Snitow, A., Stansell, C. and Thompson, S. (eds) *Powers of Desire: the politics of sexuality*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 280–99.
Bloch, Maurice (1987) 'Descent and Sources of Contradiction in Representations of Women and Kinship', in Collier, J. F. and Yanagisako, S. J. (eds) *Gender and Kinship: Essays Toward a Unified Analysis*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Cameron, Deborah (1992) 'Why the Cyborg Doesn't Dream of a Common Language', Unpublished paper, Glasgow University.
Caplan, Patricia (1985) *Class and Gender in India: women and their organisations in a South Indian city*, London: Tavistock.
Caplan, Patricia and Bujra, Janet (eds) (1979) *Women United, Women Divided: Comparative studies of ten contemporary cultures*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Chodorow, Nancy (1978) *The Reproduction of Mothering: psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Collier, Jane and Yanagisako, Sylvia (eds) (1987) *Gender and Kinship: essays toward a unified analysis*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Croll, Elizabeth (1981) *The Politics of Marriage in Contemporary China*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
de Lauretis, Teresa (1987) *Technologies of Gender: essays on theory, film and fiction*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
di Leonardo, Micaela (ed.) (1991) *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: feminist anthropology in the postmodern era*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Etienne, Mona and Leacock, Eleanor (eds) (1980) *Women and Colonization*, New York: Praeger.
Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1940) *The Nuer: a description of the modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Foucault, Michel (1976) *Histoire de la Sexualité*, Paris: Gallimard.
Fraser, Nancy and Nicholson, Linda (eds) (1990) *Feminism/Postmodernism*, London: Routledge.
Gow, Peter (1991) *Of Mixed Blood: kinship and history in Peruvian Amazonia*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Graziano, Frank (1992) *Divine Violence: spectacle, psychosexuality, and radical Christianity in the Argentine 'dirty war'*, Boulder: Westview Press.
Gregor, Thomas (1985) *Anxious Pleasures: the sexual lives of an Amazonian people*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Haraway, Donna (1989) *Primate Visions: gender, race and nature in the world of modern science*, London: Routledge.
Haraway, Donna (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: the reinvention of nature*, London: Free Association Books.
Haraway, Donna (1992) 'The promises of monsters: a regenerative politics for inappropriate/d others', in Grossberg, Lawrence, Nelson, Cary and Treichler, Paula (eds) *Cultural Studies*, London: Routledge, 295–337.
Harris, Olivia (1980) 'The Power of Signs: gender, culture and the wild in the Bolivian Andes', in MacCormack, Carol and Strathern, Marilyn (eds) *Nature, Culture and Gender*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 70–94.

Hirschon, Renée (ed.) (1984) *Women and Property, Women as Property*, London: Croom Helm.
Hulme, Peter (1986) *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native American*, London: Routledge.
Kappeler, S. (1986) *The Pornography of Representation*, Oxford: Polity Press.
Leacock, Eleanor (1972) 'Introduction' to F. Engels' *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, New York: International Publishers.
Leacock, Eleanor (1978) 'Women's Status in Egalitarian Society: implications for social evolution', *Current Anthropology* 19 (2): 247–75.
McCallum, Cecilia (1989) 'Gender, Personhood and Social Organization among the Cashinahua of Western Amazonia', PhD Dissertation, London School of Economics.
MacCormack, C. and Strathern, M. (eds) (1980) *Nature, Culture and Gender*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Malinowski, Bronislaw (1929) *The Sexual Life of Savages*, London: Geo. Routledge and Sons.
Martin, Emily (1987) *The Woman in the Body: a cultural analysis of reproduction*, Boston: Beacon Press.
Mason, Peter (1990) *Deconstructing America*, London: Routledge.
Mead, Margaret (1928) *Coming of Age in Samoa*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Montrose, Louis (1991) 'The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery', *Representations* 33: 1–41.
Moore, Henrietta (1991) *Feminism and Anthropology*, Oxford: Polity Press.
Ortner, Sherry (1974) 'Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?', in Rosaldo, Michelle and Lamphere, Louise (eds) *Woman, Culture and Society*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 67–88.
Ortner, Sherry and Whitehead, Harriet (1981a) 'Introduction: accounting for sexual meanings', in Ortner, Sherry and Whitehead, Harriet (eds) *Sexual Meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–27.
Ortner, Sherry and Whitehead, Harriet (eds) (1981b) *Sexual Meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pateman, Carole (1988) *The Sexual Contract*, Oxford: Polity Press.
Quinn, Naomi (1977) 'Anthropological Studies on Women's Status', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 6: 181–225.
Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. and Forde, D. (eds) (1950) *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Rapp, Rayna (1979) 'Anthropology: a review essay', *Signs* 4(3): 497–513.
Reiter, Rayna Rapp (ed.) (1975) *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
Rich, Adrienne (1978) *The Dream of a Common Language*, New York: Norton.
Riches, David (1991) 'Aggression, War, Violence: space/time and paradigm', *Man* 26(2): 281–97.
Rosaldo, Michelle (1974) 'Woman, Culture and Society: a theoretical overview', in Rosaldo, Michelle and Lamphere, Louise (eds), *Woman, Culture and Society*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 17–42.
Rosaldo, Michelle (1980) 'The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding', *Signs* 5(3): 389–417.

Sacks, Karen (1974) 'Engels Revisited: women, the organization of production, and private property', in Rosaldo, Michelle and Lamphere, Louise (eds), *Woman, Culture and Society*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 207–22.
Scarry, Elaine (1985) *The Body in Pain: the making and unmaking of the world*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Sharma, Ursula (1980) *Women, Work and Property in North-west India*, London: Tavistock.
Strathern, Marilyn (1972) *Women in Between: female roles in a male world*, Mount Hagen, New Guinea; London: Seminar Press.
Strathern, Marilyn (1984) 'Domesticity and the Denigration of Women', in O'Brien, D. and Tiffany, S. (eds) *Rethinking Women's Roles: perspectives from the Pacific*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 13–31.
Strathern, Marilyn (1987a) 'An Awkward Relationship: the case of feminism and anthropology', *Signs* 12(2): 276–92.
Strathern, Marilyn (ed.) (1987b) *Dealing with Inequality: analysing gender relations in Melanesia and beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Strathern, Marilyn (1988) *The Gender of the Gift*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Theweleit, Klaus (1987) *Male Fantasies*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Torgovnick, M. (1990) *Gone Primitive: savage intellects, modern lives*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Yanagisako, Sylvia (1979) 'Family and Household: the analysis of domestic groups', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8: 161–205.
Young, Kate, Wolkowitz, Carol and McCullagh, Roslyn (eds) (1981) *Of Marriage and the Market*, London: CSE Books.