
QUEER
KOREA
Edited by
Todd A. Henry

QUEER KOREA

PERVERSE
MODERNITIES *A series*
edited by Jack Halberstam
and Lisa Lowe

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Todd A. Henry

QUEER KOREA

Duke University Press *Durham and London* 2020

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 2020 Duke University Press
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Designed by Courtney Leigh Baker
Typeset in Arno Pro and Avant Garde Gothic Std by
Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Henry, Todd A., [date] editor.
Title: Queer Korea / [edited by] Todd A. Henry.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2020.
Series: Perverse modernities | Includes bibliographical
references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2019032736 (print) | LCCN 2019032737 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478001928 (hardcover) | ISBN 9781478002901 (paperback) |
ISBN 9781478003366 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Homosexuality—Korea (South) |
Sexual minorities—Korea (South) | Gays—Korea (South) |
Lesbians—Korea (South) | Homosexuality—Korea. |
Sexual minorities—Korea. | Gays—Korea. | Lesbians—Korea.
Classification: LCC HQ.16.K6 . Q44 2020 (print) | LCC HQ75.16. K6
(ebook) | DDC 306.76/6095195—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019032736
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019032737

This work was supported by Core University Program for Korean Studies through the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and Korean Studies Promotion Service of the Academy of Korean Studies (AKS-2013-OLU-2250002).

Cover art: Early South Korean representation of female homoeroticism in film *Chilt'u* (*Jealousy*, 1960), directed by Han Hyŏng-mo. Cover photograph compliments of the Korean Film Archive (donation by Cho Hŭi-mun).

This printing of *Queer Korea* includes a number of changes and corrections and supersedes the first printing.

Fontispiece: "Chilt'u" (*Jealousy*, 1960). Frontispiece compliments of the Korean Film Archive (donation by director of photography, Pak Sŭng-bae).

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

CONTENTS

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PART II CITIZENS, CONSUMERS, AND ACTIVISTS IN POSTAUTHORITARIAN TIMES

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Books, especially edited volumes, do not write themselves. This one is certainly no exception, and it has taken many years and much support to make the present volume possible. Replaying that history in reverse makes the point clear. This volume began as an international symposium, film festival, and art exhibition held at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), in 2014. "Remembering Queer Korea" was the first of its kind to bring together scholars, directors, and artists to rethink the peninsula's history and culture from the perspective of non-normative subjects and queer analytics. As discussants, Jin-kyung Lee, Minjeong Kim, and Han Sang Kim helped reshape the conference papers. Courtney Hibbard and Jennifer Dieli at UCSD's Program in Transnational Korean Studies (TKS) provided endless administrative support. Jaekyung Jung was instrumental in installing the artwork of Siren Eun Young Jung and creating the promotional materials for the exhibition, "Yeosung Gukgeuk Project: (Off)Stage/Masterclass (2013)." I thank the student workers who staffed the exhibition while it was open to the public. The film festival would not have been possible without Han Sang Kim who helped coordinate the screening of several historical films from the Korean Film Archive, including *The Pollen of Flowers* (1972) and *Sabanji* (1988). Brian Hu, the artistic director of the San Diego Pacific Arts Movement and currently a professor at San Diego State University, was a wonderful co-collaborator in reaching a wider audience of Southern Californians who viewed the queer films of South Korea. Lee Ann Kim, the former director of the Pacific Arts Movement, is a true visionary in making this organization one of San Diego's most prominent. Major financial support was provided by the Academy of Korean Studies, which also helped launch UCSD's TKS with a generous grant of $600,000. Additional assistance was offered by UCSD's Division of Arts and Humanities, the Visual Arts Department, the Association for Asian Studies, and Film Out San Diego.

A smaller version of the film festival took place in 2013 at Hanyang University's Research Institute of Comparative History and Culture (RICH). I thank Jie-Hyun Lim for allowing me to curate a film event on Korea's forgotten

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

pasts. It is my firm belief that filmmakers are some of the best historians of queer Korea, and I wanted to showcase their remarkable achievements. I am grateful to have hosted some of these persons in the context of the 2013 (and 2014) event: Kwŏn Chong-gwan, So Chun-mun, Kim Hye-jŏng, and Pak Chae-jo. In screening their films, I benefited from the assistance and hard work of Kang Kim, Yeonbo Jeong, and Seong-hee Hong at RICH. Intellectuals of Korean gender and sexuality joined us for some memorable dialogues; they include Han Ch'ae-yun, Pak Jŏng-mi, Ruin, Kim Chi-hye, and Kim Kyŏng-t'ae.

Since the early 2000s, involvement with activist organizations and community groups dedicated to the protection and well-being of Korean "sexual minorities" has facilitated my knowledge and approach to the issues raised in this volume. I continue to rely on their indefatigable passion and generous guidance. Over fifteen years ago, I was fortunate to befriend Sŏ Tong-jin who, in 1995, created the first LGBT student group, Come Together, at Yonsei University. He would be happy to know that, as of 2019, there are nearly seventy-five such groups scattered across the country. And although he often claims to have "retired" from LGBT studies, a recent reunion over food and spirits convinced me that he is one of many living treasures of South Korea's queer activism. So, too, is Han Ch'ae-yun, whose tireless dedication to sexual minorities is unparalleled. Countless others continue to staff numerous LGBTI organizations that have flourished since the late 1990s. I cannot possibly name all of them here, but a visit to the booths that today populate annual queer pride celebrations, many of them relatively new, will convince any reader of their dynamism. So many inspiring people in these organizations have generously shared their intimate knowledge, deep commitment, and endless passion with me over the years. They include Tari Young-jung Na, Siren Eun Young Jung, Kim Chi-hye, Candy Yun, Ruin, Yi Min-hŭi, Kim/Cho-Kwang-su, Heezy Kim Yang, Yi Ho-rim, Kim Kyŏng-muk, Kim Tae-hyŏn, Heo Yun, Yi Hyŏk-sang, Yi Chong-gŏl, Kim/Yun Myŏng-u, Chung'gangye, Ch'oe Ŭn-kyŏng, Kim Yŏng-min, and Kim Bi. I also thank Stephano Park, Sang Lee, Seung Chang, and their comrades in Los Angeles for showing me what a vibrant Korean gay/queer community looks like in the diaspora.

Largely "outside" of South Korea but always in interactive dialogue with it, a growing coterie of scholars dedicated to scholarship on queer Korea and its diasporas have supported me in my work and done so much themselves to build this field. They are Jesook Song, Ju Hui Judy Han, John (Song Pae) Cho, Sam Perry, Allan Simpson, Dredge Kang, Patty Ahn, Erica Cho, Timothy Git-

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

zen, John Treat, Eunjung Kim, Layoung Shin, Carter Eckert, Rachael Miyung Joo, Anthony Y. Kim, Woori Han, Minwoo Jung, Kyunghee Sabina Eo, Yeong Ran Kim, Chelle Jones, Soo Ryon Yoon, and Ungsan Kim.

In bringing this volume to fruition, I thank Ken Wissoker, my editor at Duke University Press who believed in this project from the beginning and assisted me at all stages to make it a reality. I have learned so much from his wisdom and friendship. Nina Foster, Olivia Polk, and Sara Leone as well as many others at Duke University Press helped polish the manuscript. Two talented reviewers provided criticism that sharpened the prose and made the volume more accessible. I am grateful to Lisa Lowe and Jack Halberstam for including *Queer Korea* in their pathbreaking series, Perverse Modernities. I also thank Anjali Arondekar, Howard Chiang, Janice Kim, Stephen Sohn, and Sonja Kim for reading my own contributions and helping me to make them more compelling. My co-writers endured many editorial demands in making *Queer Korea* cohere. I thank them for putting up with my "crazy love" (*yŏlae*)—coincidentally, the name of one of South Korea's first transgender bars. Kyunghee Sabina Eo and Max Balhorn have done a tremendous service in translating the essays of Korea-based scholars whose important work Anglophone readers have access to for the first time. I hope that more of this translingual labor continues and that the flow of liberating knowledge and praxis moves increasingly in the direction of enlightening those of us on this side of the Pacific. The willingness of so many South Koreans to regularly take to the streets for social change is what keeps me going. So, too, are the many graduate students who continue to produce scholarship on queer subjects without any promise of future employment. All too many of them enter their respective disciplines knowing that their work will likely be misunderstood, devalued, and even shunned. I will not rest until at least one of them gains tenure-track employment at a Korean university. That work is, in short, the basis of my activism.

It brings me great personal pleasure to complete these acknowledgements where this project really began. In 1999, exactly twenty years ago, I arrived in Seoul to begin my journey of studying Korea and the language, and familiarizing myself with its queer communities. A stint working at an It'aewŏn gay bar in 2003–2004 and participation in Seoul National University's LGBTI student group, then called Maŭm 005, allowed me to make my intellectual work more meaningful to the communities about whom I try to think, speak, and write. I am especially grateful for the loving support of my family and Derek Shin who kept me brutally honest about how I can and cannot relate to

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

queer and other marginalized folks. It is to all these peoples—known and unknown . . . from the past, in the present, and into the future—that I dedicate this volume. May individual and collective peace, happiness, and, above all, liberation (however defined) arrive very soon.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Introduction

QUEER KOREA

TOWARD A FIELD OF ENGAGEMENT

Todd A. Henry

On September 7, 2013, two South Korean men—gaudily clad in shiny, beige-colored tunic jackets with mandarin collars—held a public wedding ceremony in downtown Seoul.[1] Along the Ch'ŏnggye Stream, a site of recreation typically occupied by straight couples and heterosexual families, Kim/Cho Kwang-su, a gay activist and filmmaker, and Kim Sŭng-hwan, his longtime boyfriend and cinematic collaborator, professed their love for one another at a Las Vegas–style spectacle. In addition to congratulatory remarks offered by media celebrities, the wedding ceremony included upbeat songs performed by the gay men's chorus and a musical serenade comically enacted by the newlyweds themselves. Even more controversial, Kim/Cho and Kim vowed to use their symbolic union as a national test case for marriage equality, contributing their wedding donations *(ch'ugŭigŭm)* to create a private organization in support of other same-sex couples. However, even before the country's judicial system (which ultimately denied them a marriage license in 2016) could deliberate on the legality of their relationship, fundamentalist Christians waged an equally spectacular protest by covering the stage with human feces, reminding well-wishers and event onlookers of the Bible's purported denunciation of homosexuality as sinful.[2] Since

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

this dramatic confrontation, most progressive politicians have succumbed to ultraconservative constituents who regularly use pride festivals and other queer celebrations to oppose policies aimed at protecting "sexual minorities" *(sŏngsosuja)*. For example, in 2014, just months after being elected to a second term as the mayor of Seoul, Pak Wŏn-sun suggested that South Korea become the first country in Asia to legalize gay marriage, if only as a token gesture of tolerance aimed at proving the country's cosmopolitan credentials to the region and the wider world.[3] But, unfortunately for South Korean proponents of same-sex unions, including Kim/Cho and Kim, Taiwan won that honor in May 2017 when the Constitutional Court passed a landmark ruling establishing the illegality of current marriage laws, a decision that has paved the way for gay and lesbian couples in that Asian nation to wed.

From the vantage point of queer activists who have repeatedly called on government officials to adopt nondiscriminatory policies toward LGBTI citizens and their continued demonization by fundamentalist conservatives who brazenly claim that "anal sex is not a human right" *(hangmun seksŭ inkwŏn i anida)*, it appears that South Korea, like Taiwan, can be located along a teleological, if highly contentious, trajectory of liberal inclusion at whose end point stands the Holy Grail of marriage equality. Indeed, over the past fifteen years, movements advancing marriage equality have quickly gained currency across many parts of the world, with same-sex weddings becoming legal in much of Western Europe and North America, parts of Latin America and Oceania, and one nation in Africa. In this sense, Pak Wŏn-sun's controversial call for South Korea to engage in what might be called "matrimonial one-upmanship" and activists' own citation of global precedents, including the U.S. Supreme Court's 2015 ruling in favor of gay marriage, suggest that the country simply lags behind other parts of the world in this respect.[4] According to this progressive model of "global queering" (on which more later), South Korea will, with the passage of time, eventually join its more advanced counterparts, as the country has since the 1980s in terms of capitalist development and procedural democracy.[5]

However, a closer examination of the sexual minority movement and the conservative heteronationalists who oppose such activism reveal a related but different narrative of queer life in this postcolonial, postauthoritarian society—one that has tended to fall outside the empirical and epistemological purview of a queer studies that continues to privilege North America and Western Europe. Indeed, that most LGBTI-identified South Koreans (for whom marriage equality is ostensibly being advanced) refuse to take a public

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

stance on this fraught issue suggests the need to interrogate the social consequences and intimate stakes of making known or visible their non-normative sexuality or gender variance. As in other parts of the world, in South Korea the practice of marriage not only involves two atomized individuals seeking legal recognition from the state but also deeply implicates family members, intimate friends, and co-workers. For most heterosexual couples entering matrimony, these overlapping communities play crucial roles in actively promoting—but, in the case of queer subjects, potentially endangering—their material security and psychological well-being. Even for the most vocal advocates of same-sex marriage, including Kim/Cho Kwang-su, it took several years to convince his partner, Kim Sŭng-hwan—and, by extension, his partner's family—to acquiesce to a public ceremony that undoubtedly would catapult them into the national limelight. Although ultimately deciding to bless their sons' relationship, participation by the couple's parents at the 2013 wedding ceremony, which included an emotional speech by Kim/Cho Kwang-su's mother, subjected them and other relatives to the possibility of what might be called "homophobia (or transphobia) by association," a concept invoked by several authors in this volume.[6] A variant of "guilt by association" *(yŏnjwaje)*, a system of collective culpability that was used both before and after the Korean War (1950–53) to punish family members of alleged communists, the phrase refers to a similar stigma that marginalizes sexual minorities and, by extension, their kin.[7] Such homophobic and transphobic associations can even follow queer Koreans into the diaspora. In the U.S., for example, church and other organizations often form the community around which diasporics seek to protect themselves against racial violence and the economic vicissitudes of their host country, but where they also regularly encounter the anti-LGBTI agenda of conservative community groups.[8] In this sense, the visible participation of some parents in support of their "out" children at recent pride festivals and other public events marks a highly controversial dimension of a queer politics that, in South Korea as elsewhere, remains as much family-oriented as individually based.[9]

In recent years, the plight of sexual minorities has become a rallying point for some progressive-minded individuals, particularly among millennial South Koreans who, when compared with their older counterparts, tend to support cultural diversity. But the increased visibility and heightened stakes of same-sex marriage have ironically diverted the attention of many non-normative communities away from public advocacy for liberal forms of inclusion, human rights protection, and identity-based politics. Especially in the current age of

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

neoliberal consumption, the internet and other digital technologies, such as smart phone–based dating applications, have enabled a new generation of South Koreans to pursue a wide range of self-oriented practices of intimacy, but without necessarily creating public personas that subject them to endangering forms of alienation from family, society, or nation. Although a Western-centric lens might simplistically characterize their lives as "closeted," a locally grounded analytic insists that individuals politicized as sexual minorities have deftly carved out an "under-the-radar" presence.[10] Such clandestine sociality in both on- and off-line spaces has allowed LGBTI South Koreans to cultivate intimacies with other gender-variant or sexually non-normative subjects while attempting to shield themselves from the public scrutiny that only a small number of activists, such as Kim/Cho Kwang-su and Kim Sŭnghwan, are willing to endure. Just as remarkable as the large crowds that gathered along the Ch'ŏnggye Stream in the fall of 2013 to support their symbolic union were many more under-the-radar queers who avoided participating in the celebration precisely because they feared that their presence at that public site would subject them to the kind of legibility they had worked so carefully to avoid.[11] In spite of these efforts, high-ranking military officers have, in recent years, exploited digital technologies to infiltrate gay male subcultures. Subjecting active-duty soldiers to arcane regulations that criminalize same-sex acts (even when consensual and done off base), high-ranking leaders have transformed the private practice of anal sex *(kyegan)* into charged matters of public concern and national security.

Although same-sex marriage poignantly underscores one fraught aspect of queer life in South Korea today, other historical modes of same-sex sexuality, cross-gender identification, and non-normative intimacies—on the Korean Peninsula and in the diaspora, as well as in relation to Asia and the wider world—remain a troubling oversight that the present volume seeks to address. This blind spot not only plagues present debates about acceptable boundaries of hotly debated issues, such as class inequalities, rampant suicide, sexual harassment, and patriarchal domination as well as labor migration and citizenship rights. It also limits how the past is imagined and recounted in terms of similarly contested processes of Korean modernity, which include colonial rule, nationalist politics, and authoritarian development. The problematic occlusion of queerness in the politicized narration of history is perhaps most apparent in the media's power to frame present manifestations of non-normative practices of gender and sexuality in terms of past traditions, especially by highlighting the purported lack thereof. To return

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

to the frenzied fanfare of 2013, mainstream newspapers heralded the union of Kim/Cho Kwang-su and Kim Sŭng-hwan as the country's *first* same-sex wedding.[12] To be sure, efforts to gain official recognition of their relationship marked a turning point insofar as their public ceremony sparked a national debate over legal definitions of matrimony.[13] However, lost in sensational accounts of this recent case is that gay marriage—whether performed as public ceremonies seeking state protection, conducted to dignify queer relationships in the eyes of family and friends, or adopted as a practical mechanism to protect the economic well-being of marginalized individuals—is neither new nor foreign to the peninsula.[14] Indeed, alarmist reports of the 2013 celebration overlooked previous attempts by same-sex couples to secure recognition of their unions. For example, as early as 2004 a lesbian woman tried to sue her ex-girlfriend to have their relationship accepted as a de facto marriage *(sasilhon)*, an arrangement that protects most heterosexual partners who do not officially wed one another. In the end, the court refused to rule on this attempt to divide the lesbian couple's assets. But the presiding judge, a young man who had studied European precedents, did respond to the precarious situation of sexual minorities by advocating civil unions as a possible way of protecting their relationships.[15]

Although this progressive proposal remains politically unpopular and has yet to bear legal fruit, South Korea boasts an even longer but largely unknown history of same-sex unions, particularly among working-class women. As my contribution documents, such bonds took root after the Korean War, a deadly conflict that severely disrupted heteropatriarchal kinship practices. In response to gynocentric subcultures that emerged in the wake of this national tragedy, journalists routinely covered female-female wedding ceremonies from the 1950s to the 1980s, if only as an entertaining tactic of profitmaking that minimized the economic struggles of single or abandoned women. Not unlike media accounts of the 2013 celebration, postwar reports repeatedly cited these queer unions as the county's first, even to the point of obvious incredulity. Their accuracy notwithstanding, sensational accounts of same-sex weddings, I argue, sought to accommodate nonconforming practices of kinship into the country's hetero-marital culture. They did so by describing male-dressed women as "husbands" and female-dressed women as their "wives," rather than referencing the subcultural terms *paji-ssi* (Ms. Pants) and *ch'ima-ssi* (Ms. Skirt) used by queer women to express their desires for one another. Underscoring the unsustainability and evanescence of their relationships, such profitmaking reports also functioned as cautionary tales aimed at

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

redirecting subversive forms of homoeroticism toward advancing the (re)productive goals of capitalist accumulation and national loyalty.

In addition to offering historicized accounts that recall such charged moments of social and cultural anxiety, *Queer Korea* examines the ongoing effects of these pasts in "a field of power that seeks to silence, erase, and assimilate all non-normative expressions and desires."[16] To this end, we use interdisciplinary methods such as close reading, archival research, visual analysis, and ethnographic fieldwork to trace the understudied ways in which queerness has been represented and, more often than not, exploited to consolidate idealized notions of family and community, as well as compulsory paths of development and citizenship. By exploring the instrumentalist nature of discourses and practices of non-normative sexuality and gender variance, the volume challenges privileged but limited forms of knowledge that have tended to advance nationalist trajectories and similarly homogenizing operations of power. Like media accounts, most academic narratives of Korea continue to neglect critical insights offered by a sustained focus on queerness, which they often implicitly consider a foreign or threatening presence to collective images of the self, whether defined in national, religious, sexual/gendered, or other terms. To be sure, the number of students interested in LGBTI-related topics at South Korean universities has grown dramatically in recent years. But in a society that discouraged queer subjects from documenting or verbalizing their experiences until at least the 1990s, even the most eager researchers struggle to locate relevant texts to analyze and willing informants to interview. Perhaps more detrimental, many students lack institutional support for their research, forcing some to pursue graduate degrees at overseas universities. Although a small coterie of dedicated scholars have succeeded in publishing pioneering studies on non-normative sexuality and gender variance, few can succeed in an academy that remains disinterested in, if not hostile to, queer studies.[17] For their part, most activists, although often trained in graduate programs, are so occupied with countering LGBTI discrimination that they cannot adequately investigate how past representations of "problematic" bodies endanger their present-oriented tactics of survival.

Such epistemological and political conditions inform the urgent nature of this intellectual project, which began as an international conference, film festival, and art installation at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), in the fall of 2014. From its inception, the project, then entitled "Remembering Queer Korea," aimed to facilitate a multilingual and multidirectional traffic in textual and visual forms, both from Korean contexts to English ones

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

and vice versa.[18] Unfortunately, readers of this volume no longer have access to the films that UCSD subtitled and screened in partnership with the Pacific Arts Movement, a San Diego–based film organization, or a version of Siren Eun Young Jung's "(Off)Stage/Masterclass (2013)," an exhibition that addressed the nearly forgotten history of South Korea's all-female theater *(yŏsŏng kukkŭk)*.[19] However, that spirit of transnational dialogue appears here in terms of two expertly translated essays by scholars and activists based in South Korea. These essays offer readers unprecedented access to pioneering research on queer Korea produced by intellectuals working in linguistic and cultural environments that differ from, but engage with, those of our English-language authors, many of whom were also raised in Korean and diasporic communities.

As editor, I thus attempted to foreground scholars, filmmakers, and artists based in South Korea on whom many of us based outside the peninsula rely for inspiration. But in the end, many essays published in this volume were written by academics anchored in North America. A critical and geographic distance from Korea likely enabled these authors to approach their subjects without having to negotiate the myriad institutional and cultural barriers that make generating knowledge about queerness on the peninsula so difficult. Such conditions are perhaps most noticeable in the notable absence of work on North Korea, information about which most scholars lack access or interest.[20] However, this apparent dearth does not mean that North Korea fails to impinge on the consciousness of South Korea—or that South Korea fails to impinge on the consciousness of the North. Nor should it signal that North Korea cannot or should not be a part of what is written about the peninsula, which remains dominated by a focus on South Korea. If these rival states succeed in formally ending the Korean War (or eventually reunifying) and opening their borders to one another, silenced histories of non-normative sexuality and gender variance in North Korea will likely teach us much about the lived experiences of this postcolonial authoritarian state, one guided by nationalist-socialist principles and Kim family rule. Indeed, the guiding premise of *Queer Korea* is that such Cold War geopolitics directly inform the vernacular languages and the local politics of non-normativity on the peninsula and among its diasporic communities. As such, the chapters that follow do not simply explore these trans- and intranational articulations of queerness as recuperative exercises that only aim to locate LGBTI subjects in Korean history. By authenticating their marginalized position in the nation, the resurrection of such "subjugated knowledges" will likely benefit sexual minorities, especially those who

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

embrace identity politics and other forms of liberal inclusion. While encouraging these possibilities, we also explore past expressions of Korean queerness to reveal the regulatory mechanisms and resistant forces foreclosed or enabled by a shifting set of geopolitical conditions and related epistemologies. We aim to support related narratives of and struggles for empowerment—for example, by the disabled, foreign migrants, "half-bloods," single women, and the proletarian classes—that revolve around similar and overlapping dynamics of mystification, obfuscation, and marginalization.

In this spirit, *Queer Korea* problematizes how practices of non-normative sexuality and gender variance have been consistently ignored or thought away, as suggested earlier by the purported novelty and foreignness of same-sex marriage. To counter such popular and academic myths, we attend to pervasive forms of "queer blindness" that surround the peninsula and its inhabitants, typically described in nationalist narratives as the collective victims of Japanese colonialism, civil war, national division, Cold War rivalries, and other tragedies of the twentieth century (and before). Due to these traumatic experiences, scholars have tended to frame Korean society and culture in terms of ethnoracial and heteropatriarchal purities. To be sure, these "survivalist epistemologies" aimed to create living spaces for a community understood as consistently beleaguered by outside forces. However, both nationalist and postnationalist narratives have overlooked critical light that non-normative sexuality and gender variance can shed on the operation of successive and intersecting structures of power, including colonialism, nationalism, capitalism, and neoliberalism. When considered in these expansive ways, queerness emerges as an important dynamic of Korean history and a revealing analytic of its society and culture, rather than appearing as a disruptive force or an internecine form of subversion.

In addition to queering a Korean studies that remains nationalistically heteronormative, our examination of the peninsula contributes to critiques of queer studies that have focused on displacing Euro-American forms of non-normative sexuality and gender variance. Despite its ongoing reputation as the world's "hermit kingdom," the peninsula functioned as a particularly intense site of transnationality during both the colonial and postcolonial periods.[21] Queer studies of Korea thus serve as much more than an Orientalist object of inquiry or a Cold War application of area studies.[22] In the essays that follow, Korea serves as a critical space to examine what Anjali Arondekar and Geeta Patel have called the "geopolitics of queer studies"—in this case, one closely connected to such historical processes as colonial modernity, authoritarian

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

development, and neoliberal familialism.[23] Like much new scholarship on queer Asia, the volume aims to "provincialize" approaches to non-normative sexuality and gender nonconformity that remain anchored in North American and Western European contexts of liberal pluralism and multicultural assimilation. As the example of same-sex marriage mentioned earlier illustrates, some South Korean activists are clearly pushing their state to create the conditions necessary for the political inclusion of sexual minorities as normalized objects of human rights. However, in a postcolonial society that, even after the formal end of authoritarian rule in 1993, continues to exclude them from such protections and regularly exposes them to various forms of cultural alienation, most queer subjects have consciously avoided the kind of public visibility that typically undergirds identity politics. Foregrounding such predicaments, *Queer Korea* shifts our attention to historical junctures when nonliberal regimes have sought to control the purported monstrosity of bodily differences or erase them as threats to organic conceptions of family, society, nation, or empire. In highlighting these politicized moments of the peninsula's past, we strive to formulate new ways to think and act beyond the politics of despair and violence that have come to dominate the present.[24] Although legal arrangements such as same-sex marriage may solve this predicament for some individuals, we should not assume that its liberal and assimilationist tenants will necessarily create conditions of survival and well-being for many others whose life practices relegate them to the fringes of social respectability and cultural acceptability. Perhaps it is only from this uncomfortably queer position, or what Lauren Berlant has called "cruel optimism," that marginalized subjects on the peninsula and in similar sites of abjection can imagine new possibilities for liberation, but ones that do not necessarily rely on a hostile state or a sensationalizing media to promote their economic viability and emotional fulfillment.[25]

Unruly Subjects under Colonial and Postcolonial Modernity

Whether the object of empirical study or the subject of critical analysis, queerness has remained largely invisible in research on the peninsula, buried under male- and elite-centered accounts that have overwhelmingly focused on the tribulations of a modernizing nation. In historical accounts of Korea, the experiences of Japanese rule (1910–45) and, later, of anticommunist or anticapitalist development under postcolonial authoritarianism have tended to

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

dominate, leaving little room for non-normative stories of the past.[26] When mentioned at all, individuals who do not figure as "proper" subjects of these collectivized narratives—including, but not limited to, those engaging in non-normative sexuality or exhibiting gender variance—were made hypervisible as social threats or, worse yet, rendered as pro-Japanese collaborators.[27] Although such labels gained currency during the colonial era, pundits later deployed them as potent tools of subjectification during and after the Korean War.[28] In the ongoing context of Cold War politics, triumphant expressions of heteronormativity and cisgenderism have persisted as powerful ideologies of national security that aim to promote and ensure bodily purity on both sides of the 38th Parallel. In North Korea, for example, media and literary images of reproductive wholesomeness continue to function as a key strategy of collective mobilization in its historic struggle against an allegedly hedonistic south, which, along with the U.S., its patron state, Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) leaders regularly accuse of fomenting homosexuality and related "perversions."[29] Much the same can be said of South Korea, where in recent years a growing number of fundamentalist Christians boldly charge sexual minorities with harboring pro–North Korean tendencies and spreading the AIDS virus, but without providing evidence to validate their exaggerated and exclusionary claims.[30] In these alarmist formulas, "homophobia (and transphobia) by association" extends far beyond the stigmatizing confines of one's biological family, transforming individual expressions of non-normative sexuality or gender variance into national threats that purportedly demand vigilant surveillance, repeated punishment, and even further marginalization.

Through such instrumentalist discourses of deviance, representations of queerness have aimed to accommodate nonconforming bodily practices to the (re)productive aims of successive regimes on the Korean Peninsula.[31] Although never fully successful, these "epistemological interventions," as I call them in my essay on female homoeroticism (see chapter 6), worked to assimilate the imagined monstrosity of corporal differences, harnessing them to collective ends. When not already denigrated in these ways, nationalist and most postnationalist scholars have largely ignored the subcultures of "perverse" bodies, deeming them insignificant or embarrassing to their respective intellectual agendas, whether feminist, Marxist, or otherwise. By contrast, the authors in this volume actively recall such moments of forgetfulness and denunciation in both historical and epistemological processes of cultural homogenization. Together, they question such heteronormalizing forces as imperialism, nationalism, militarism, and industrialization, focusing on the lived experiences of

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

"unruly" subjects and their subordinated status in archival, visual, literary, and ethnographic registers. Meanwhile, we eschew ghettoized approaches to marginality that treat queerness only in terms of minority or visibility paradigms. As mentioned earlier, this liberal model emerged in South Korea only during the 1990s and still does not include North Korea. Rather than assuming the pervasiveness of a globalized logic of identity politics, we deploy queer analytics to interrogate disciplinary, biopolitical, and necropolitical structures of normalization that have come to weigh on *all* residents of the peninsula, albeit in considerably uneven ways. *Queer Korea* thus seeks to complicate narratives that tend to advance, rather than to question, collective state goals, such as androcentric familialism and capitalist (or socialist) development.

Several decades before Japanese officials managed to forcibly annex the peninsula in 1910, a concerned group of male intellectuals, most trained in the Confucian classics, appointed themselves as the patriarchal guardians of the Chosŏn Court (1392–1910), which, in their view, desperately required "modernization" to retain national autonomy. Although sharing many of the same reformist goals, these elites adamantly opposed the tactics of their lower-class counterparts, including the millenarian ideas advocated by Eastern Learning *(tonghak)* adherents and the antiestablishment agendas of other grassroots movements, including the first generation of Korean feminists.[32] To guide the masses under their tutelage, some nationalist leaders abandoned Confucian praxis in favor of Western- and Japanese-inspired models of "civilization and enlightenment" *(munmyŏng kaehwa)*. However, the epistemic frames of this modernist paradigm tended to replicate those of their imperialist counterparts, thereby undercutting the ability of nationalists to retain Korea's sovereignty.[33] Although couched in familiar terms of Confucian statecraft, even "Eastern values and Western skills" *(tongdo sŏgi)*, an indigenous style of modernization aimed at placating conservative court stalwarts, also foundered as a strategy to protect the Great Han Empire (1897–1910) at a dangerous time of imperialist incursions.[34] After annexation, the nature and pace of reform fell into the hands of Japanese rulers who adroitly hijacked the nation-building efforts of Korean elites while actively resurrecting and idealizing heteropatriarchal traditions as the moral basis of a new colonial modernity, not unlike early Meiji leaders had done at home.

For emasculated leaders now expected to serve a foreign empire, the traumatic experience of Japanese occupation informed which individuals appeared in an increasingly defensive narrative of the nation and how Koreans were positioned, or sought to position themselves, as legitimate subjects of

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

that collective history. For example, patriarchal invocations of women's lowly status as a worrisome barometer of Korea's purportedly lagging "level of civilization" *(mindo)* nationalized the concerns of this marginalized, but increasingly vocal, subpopulation. On the one hand, bourgeois instrumentalizations of illiterate Korean women produced an androcentric view of femininity that ironically converged with imperialist and Christian views of "benighted" and "heathen" subjects in desperate need of education, if only to promote their cultivation as "wise mothers and good wives" *(hyŏnmo yangch'ŏ)*. On the other hand, such male-dominated discourses did encourage a small group of educated New Women *(sinyŏsŏng)* to seek liberation from a refortified system of heteropatriarchy.[35]

Amid this gender warfare, government officials, medical doctors, and other regulatory professionals in colonial Korea came to define "women" and "men" in epistemologically binary and biologically dimorphic terms. In mirrorlike fashion, these terms extended to equally rigid notions of femininity and masculinity. Such powerful categories of sex and gender worked to obfuscate a wide range of queer practices and non-normative life courses adopted by colonized Koreans and Japanese settlers.[36] During the Asia-Pacific War (1937–45), officials adopted the same binary paradigm to categorize "imperial subjects" *(hwang guk sinmin)* as dutifully abiding by or treacherously deviating from bodily norms aimed at maintaining a system of reproductive heterosexuality on which colonial capitalism relied. A lack of empirical traces in colonialist, nationalist, and missionary archives, especially those voiced by queer subjects themselves, have restricted scholars' ability to appreciate how unruly bodies were, like those of so-called New Women, of critical importance to the powerful confluence of imperialism and nationalism, as well as other modes of collective mobilization and individual contestation, such as socialism and anarchism.[37]

In her essay on shamanism, Merose Hwang reveals this important point by demonstrating the understudied role that this folk religion, later described as the quintessential spirit of the Korean people, played in the regulatory imagination of both imperial authorities and colonized nationalists. She locates the queerness of sorcerers, fortunetellers, and female entertainers—a motley group placed under police surveillance by the Government-General and the intellectual scrutiny of native intellectuals—in their ability to disrupt elite- and male-dominated formulas of colonial modernity, both of which treated popular practices of spiritual healing as superstition. For bourgeois nationalists seeking to promote a morally "healthy" society as the foundation of in-

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

dependence, members of the Sowi Church Guild thus figured as an unruly problem of (self-)governance. Although accused by male nationalists as collaborators (a label many would later apply to them), adherents of the guild boldly dressed in the cultural garb of their colonial overlords as devotees of Shintō, the Japanese spirituality used by the Government-General to "assimilate" Koreans.[38] Imagining the marginalized perspective of the guild, Hwang argues that its resourceful members, many of them female masters of ritual performance, donned the disruptive "drag" of spiritual respectability to survive under an increasingly watchful regime, especially in the wake of a major nationalist uprising in 1919. Even as they provided their colonizers with outward compliance, shamans questioned elites' embrace of heteropatriarchy and their concern with controlling the nation's religious traditions. Hwang also shows that colonial-period efforts at regulation followed longer histories of state violence and social displacement, contexts that explain why disaffected Koreans gravitated to these healers.

Rather than being denigrated as a dangerous presence in their colonized nation, shamanic leaders appeared in another politicized guise as heroically resistant, even in their very queerness. Hwang thus reveals that Korean ritualists straddled a narrow space among colonial control, cultural erasure, and nationalist appropriation. Although reviled for not marrying women and accused of engaging in sexual perversion, well-known male intellectuals such as Ch'oe Nam-sŏn (1890–1957) and Yi Nŭng-hwa (1869–1945) exploited the precolonial traditions of these marginalized women to forge a glorious story of the nation, one that re-centered Korea and Manchuria in a larger, continental culture of shamanism. Having elevated this Pan-Korean identity above a Japan-dominated ideology of common ancestry, transgender practices, same-sex unions, and other queer customs now appeared as core attributes of a proud indigenous culture. If masculinized under the guidance of nationalist intellectuals, this culture could, according to their heteronormalizing agenda, serve as a bulwark against colonial assimilation. Demonstrating how shamans negotiated their position and livelihood through archives of official denunciation and cultural appropriation, Hwang highlights the subversive nature of these popular ritualists, exposing the powerful but contradictory dynamics of colonial rule and nationalist politics.

Like Hwang's essay on the regulatory anxieties and disruptive practices of shamanism, John Treat uses the pioneering prose of Yi Sang (b. 1910) to reveal a similarly troubling dimension about this in(famous) writer and his position in the queer temporality of a colonized nation. Since his premature death

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

in 1937, scholarly evaluations of Yi have tended to vacillate widely. Whereas early narratives bemoaned his literary style as embarrassingly individualistic and thus not representative of serious and collective concerns, later accounts championed his writing as admirably avant-garde and thus befitting a Korean modernist of his day. Seeking to transcend nationalist interpretations, Treat adopts José Esteban Muñoz's notion of queer time in a nonidentitarian reading of "Wings," a short story penned by Yi in 1936. Rather than focus on the author's sexual desire or gendered selfhood as the standards by which to assess his conformity (or lack thereof), Treat highlights the disjoined temporality of the work itself, which, he argues, exposes an overdetermined concurrence of postcolonial and queer stylistics. While foregrounding the migratory nature of this modernist's prose, he shows how the straight time of colonial modernity, embedded in public icons like the clock of the Seoul train station, is continually displaced in "Wings," a title that underscores the author's peripatetic movements across the colonial capital of Seoul and the imperial metropolis of Tokyo. Through such unruly practices, the male narrator "I" and his wife manage to deviate from a heteronormative life course of monogamous and reproductive sexuality, a system of power institutionalized by both Japanese colonizers and Korean nationalists. In his nuanced reading of "Wings," Treat also suggests that the queer time of the story should not be understood as a utopian critique of straight time writ large wherein Korean authors are assumed to write only as colonized subjects or in queer time. Rather, he understands Yi's prose as a vexed encounter between the reproductive futurism of a colonized nation and the reality that most subjects in this occupied territory existed on the fringes of an alienating system that made liberation nearly impossible. However, according to Treat's analysis, that alienation also provided unconventional writers like Yi with hope for a more unencumbered future, whether that emancipation arrived on personal or collective terms.

The essential queerness of colonial modernity, defined by seemingly insurmountable structures of domination and the uncanny ability of deviant subjects to reveal its disabling power through utopic expressions, is further developed in Pei Jean Chen's examination of "free love" (*yŏnae*; *renai* in Japanese; *lian ai* in Chinese) in occupied Korea. Building on studies that have begun to examine the colonial sensibilities and affective underpinnings of Japanese rule, she argues that literary representations of and public debates about non-normative sexuality and gender nonconformity primarily functioned as regulatory mechanisms.[39] In her analysis of queer expressions under colonial modernity, Chen borrows Elizabeth Povinelli's notion of the intimate

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

event, which Povinelli conceptualized as encounters between "autological," or self-authored (and thus free), and "genealogical," or discursive (and thus constraining), forms of knowledge. With this framework, Chen argues that homosexual (and heterosexual) forms of love were dislodged from traditional paradigms of Confucian kinship and subsequently framed as engagements of choice, if risky ones that often ended in tragedy. A transculturated and translated form of liberalism that arrived in Korea from the West via Japan, expressions of romantic freedom were severely hampered by sexological frames disseminated under a modernizing regime of civilization and enlightenment. Often described as laboratories of modernity, Korea and colonies like it became fertile grounds for the dissemination of genealogical modes of knowledge, whose primary function was regulatory and exploitative rather than self-determining and liberatory. To a degree unseen in the metropole, where more liberal forms of love thrived, colonial discourses on queer desires and other non-normative embodiments worked alongside state policies and nationalist ideologies aimed at managing the gendered and sexualized (dis)abilities of Korean bodies.[40]

In her analysis of literary and media representations from the 1910s to the 1930s, Chen also demonstrates that male authors spiritualized same-sex intimacies as a way of circumventing what they came to view as "perverted" under a scientific paradigm of sexology. But whereas these writers framed intimate relationships between men as homoerotic connections of sympathy *(tongjŏng)* and as tolerable expressions of nationalist fervor, they often engaged in voyeuristic practices of narration that sexualized similar bonds between young women. Chen reveals how seemingly liberating (or autological) depictions of female homoeroticism—double suicides committed by schoolgirls, for example—discouraged adult lesbianism, a life course deemed antithetical to the (re)productive goals of colonial modernity. In response to representations of same-sex relations as deviations from "proper" relations of love, Chen reevaluates them as incomplete projects that, even if thwarted expressions of unruly desires, contained within them subaltern traces of a counterdiscourse. Often articulated as a backward-looking nostalgia for their youth or a refusal to transition from homoerotic bonds to heterosexual marriage, this counterdiscourse appeared as personal tragedies that implicitly questioned normalizing "traditions" of feminine love narrowly defined as heterosexual, monogamous, and reproductive in Korean culture.

Launching her analysis where Chen ends her discussion of same-sex sexuality, Shin-ae Ha explores the queer underside of Korea's literary world of

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

the late 1930s and early 1940s. As studies of this period have demonstrated, mobilization for the Asia-Pacific War led Japanese officials to develop new models of governance and citizenship that could compete with those of their enemy Allies while paving the way for a postwar order.[41] Despite increasingly extensive efforts to integrate despised others into an avowedly multiethnic and postracist empire, officials continued to rely on older methods of resource extraction, including heavy industries and munitions and mining, as well as forced sexual labor.[42] As historically marginalized subjects, Koreans and other colonized subpopulations bore the brunt of proving their loyalties to the Japanese emperor.[43] Ha's essay further complicates the uneven effects of and varied responses to "imperial subjectification" *(hwangminhwa)* by offering a feminist analysis of Korean literature produced during this controversial period. She argues that becoming "Japanese" entailed an added burden for colonized women. As military mothers, they had far more to lose than their male counterparts, whose soldierly service allowed some of them and their families to benefit from self-sacrifice. If the biopolitical concerns of imperial subjectification offered Korean men new possibilities for empowerment, this highly gendered project of mass mobilization further disenfranchised colonized women, whose agonizing "choice" to serve as "wise mothers and good wives" exposed deep and irresolvable fissures in wartime iterations of colonial modernity.

Ha's postnationalist revision of the wartime period addresses changes in the cultural significance of same-sex intimacies between Korean "sisters." Although increasingly despised under the normalizing mandates of mass mobilization, these gynocentric relationships, she argues, shed important light on female domination and subjectivity during the late colonial period. She criticizes unreflective scholars who, like their patriarchal predecessors under Japanese rule, minimized female same-sex relationships as a transitory phase along an inevitable path toward heterosexual matrimony and reproduction. To be sure, these biopolitical imperatives foreclosed liberatory possibilities that modern education hitherto had offered Korea's New Women. Even as mass mobilization reduced same-sex love to antisocial practices deemed unpatriotic, powerful memories of all-female classrooms and dormitories continued to haunt wholesome images of Korean women. Exposing the messy underbelly of propagandistic stories written by two women writers, Chang Tŏk-jo (1914–2003) and Ch'oe Chŏng-hŭi (1912–90), Ha innovatively excavates the internal subjectivities of female subjects by disclosing the gender and sexual norms of imperial subjectification. Furthermore, she reveals the agony of war-

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

time injunctions and the joys of prewar freedoms as a charged threshold at which women entered, if only tentatively, into a hyper-patriarchal regime that trivialized gynocentric expressions of modernity as deviant. Throughout this externalized process of identification, refusals to follow officially sanctioned values quietly reemerged in nostalgic memoires of liberation, which, as entrenched forms of everyday resistance, delayed and disrupted the domination of women under late colonialism.

Upon liberation in 1945, Korean leaders worked to rehabilitate damaged kin networks as the basis of establishing a sovereign nation, but the fragile hegemony of the late colonial period continued into the postliberation period.[44] Amid internecine conflicts that began as outgrowths of decolonization, wartime strategies of military defense quickly merged with new Cold War exigencies that, after 1948, sought to protect a divided nation with two opposing economic systems. Even after the deadly Korean War, rival states employed similar strategies of mass mobilization and ideological suasion, with queerness playing a pivotal role on both sides of the 38th Parallel. As the two chapters on postcolonial journalism and film demonstrate, Cold War geopolitics led to the creation and maintenance of rigid, but not impenetrable, boundaries aimed at demarcating the normative and non-normative qualities of each state's citizens and their participation in such important areas as family life, economic development, and mass culture.

Although given greater license in South Korea than in the north, popular representations of queerness during the period of Park Chung Hee (1961–79) sought to tame unruly subjects and non-normative practices at a volatile time of revolutionary fervor. Addressing cultural productions created and disseminated during this period, Chung-kang Kim and I demonstrate the important role played by the media in the development of what Jie-hyun Lim [Yim Chi-hyŏn] calls "mass dictatorship."[45] Coined in the early 1990s at a time when democracy was rapidly replacing authoritarian societies across the world, this concept aimed to capture the unexpected ways in which nonelites participated in illiberal political formations and, to varying degrees, continued to do so after the formal demise of autocracies. Such dictatorial legacies have been especially pronounced on the peninsula, where the politics of national division continue to subordinate queer individuals and communities to heteropatriarchal and gender-normative dictates. These Cold War conditions and the self-disciplinary habits they produced discourage scholars from addressing questions of same-sex sexuality and gender variance, including otherwise progressive intellectuals who have adopted mass dictatorship theory to

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

explain how authoritarian regimes relied heavily on social cohesion and cultural conformity for their own power. Nor have they devoted adequate attention to the role of the mass media in manufacturing such forms of consent.[46] As Kim and I both demonstrate, popular images of the nation under South Korean dictatorships regularly featured and profited from queer subjects, while disavowing them in efforts to buttress the heteropatriarchal and cisgender bases of anticommunist development.

In her essay on B-grade films from the late 1960s and early 1970s, Kim highlights tensions created by visual representations of gender variance in this popular but understudied genre.[47] Arguing against anatomically binary notions of sexual difference, she posits that non-normative embodiments proliferated during Park's reign—a period typically studied either in terms of political and economic repression by the state and capital or in relation to public protest movements led by students and laborers. Rather than assume the omnipotence of this developmental regime, Kim also shows how female-dressed men *(yŏjang namja)* in comedy films exposed the antihegemonic underside of mass culture in Cold War South Korea. To be sure, Park's authoritarian government actively regulated the film industry, using the promulgation of laws and censorship codes to propagate images of the nation that idealized conventional gender norms and wholesome sexual roles. However, as in the aftermath of the Korean War, a crisis of patriarchal control and Confucian morality reappeared during the mid-1960s, an era of social dislocation caused by rapid industrialization and intense urbanization.[48] Rather than simply bemoan fissures in the national body, B-grade directors creatively exploited them in producing comedy films that appealed to the sensibilities of various audiences, especially lower-class laborers moving to cities in increasing numbers.

For example, in Sim U-sŏp's *Male Kisaeng* (1969), the focus of Kim's essay, Mr. Hŏ, the male patriarch and a company president, is transformed into an object of derision by his potent wife. Meanwhile, Mr. Ku, a former employee, flees to a *kisaeng* house where he becomes a female-dressed entertainer and engages in what appears as (but is not) a lesbian relationship with a co-worker. However, because the audience assumes that Mr. Ku is a biological man masquerading as a woman, Mr. Hŏ's attraction to him, captured in a scandalous scene where the latter gropes the former and requests that the two men spend the night together, suggests the irrepressibility of queer desires. This homoerotic possibility is perhaps best underscored by a scandalous kiss that Mr. Hŏ bestows on a now gender-normative Mr. Ku, who returns as a male employee at Mr. Hŏ's company. According to Kim's nuanced analysis, what remains for

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

viewers of comedy films such as *Male Kisaeng* is an irresolvable instance of "gender trouble" wherein heteronormative recuperation and queer subversion intermingle uncomfortably.

My contribution on the historical meanings of female homoeroticism in authoritarian South Korea locates a similar tension between normalizing narratives of heteropatriarchy and allegedly disruptive subcultures of gynocentric intimacies. Using newspaper weeklies and other popular accounts published from the 1950s to the 1980s, I argue that media reports about same-sex weddings drew on medicalized notions of sexual and gender dimorphism, producing compelling stories that could entertain a wide range of intrigued readers while simultaneously moralizing them. Repeatedly emphasizing the alarming novelty (rather than the entrenched tradition) of female-female unions, these sensational accounts sought to dissuade women who, although perhaps numerically insignificant, were challenging heteropatriarchy by opting out of this oppressive system, even as they seemed to depend on its most visible symbols. To minimize their cultural protest, media reports and related images underscored that same-sex weddings relied on the sartorial and ceremonial conventions of heterosexual marriage. Refusing to examine the subcultural meanings of these gendered rituals, intrusive journalists strategically deployed them as epistemological interventions aimed at containing their purportedly corrosive effects. To this end, they designated male-dressed partners as "husbands" and their female-dressed counterparts as "wives," a dichotomized pair that indicated the instability of these very categories. In the end, even such heteronormative labels—coincidentally, not the terms that queer women used to refer to their own gendered subjectivities—could not adequately address the challenge of female homoeroticism, which a voyeuristic media was forced to implicitly admit by describing queer women as distinct and even dangerous.

Rather than documenting the subcultural realities of these women, middlebrow forms of mass media combined the narrative conventions of pulp fiction in its secondary exploitation of the female proletariat. In addition to entertaining readers through profitmaking strategies, popular reports functioned as cautionary tales for gendered projects of anticommunist citizen making. Although largely aimed at the libidinal energies of bourgeois men, their misogyny was, according to the desexualizing logic of the mass media, driving mistreated women into the arms of their female and American counterparts. In these alarmist narratives, women who formed symbolic unions with each other predictably appear as destined for unhappy lesbian futures. Accounts about their short and tragic lives thus provided female readers with a moralizing guide

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

for self-regulation and discouraged them from "veering off track" (*t'alsŏn*), an ideological catchword popular during this period. However, when consumed by "shadow readers," even such disparaging texts could offer queer women uncanny ways to imagine a community of like-minded subjects. In an era of limited and censored media, these popular accounts came to function as veritable guides with which the female proletariat and other marginalized readers could carve out spaces of intimacy and pleasure in South Korea's public culture of authoritarian development.

Citizens, Consumers, and Activists in Postauthoritarian Times

Whether appearing on the peninsula or in the diaspora, more recent, postauthoritarian expressions of non-normative sexuality and gender variance among Korean subjects also depart from (neo-)liberal logics of visibility politics, human rights, and multicultural diversity, issues that continue to dominate queer analyses of Western societies. Insofar as our intellectual project focuses on the illiberal underside of Korean modernity and its uneven effects on marginalized subpopulations, this volume resonates with queer-of-color critiques, which have sought to expand the purview of queer studies beyond the privileged vantage point of white, middle-class, gay men. Through transnational and diasporic approaches, queer-of-color critiques have exposed the subordinated status but insurgent agency of racial minorities who inhabit the contradictory cracks of liberal societies in North American and Western Europe.[49] We highlight the historical forces and dissident subjectivities of Korean queers who, although not necessarily articulating their sense of self only in terms of identity politics, similarly struggle for sustenance and survival in their own national and diasporic communites. As in the West, they are currently waging those struggles under global capitalist logics of consumerism and atomization, as well as amid growing threats of vigilante trolls and religious xenophobes who, in both on- and off-line sites, seek to silence, erase, and even injure social minorities, including women, Muslims, and refugees.[50]

In addition to its alignment with queer-of-color critique, this volume draws on insights from the increasingly vibrant field of Asian queer studies. Although encompassing a wide geographical area and disparate methodological approaches, much of this work has also sought to "provincialize" the Western-centric foci and nativist proclivities of queer studies. Moreover, Asian queer studies has questioned the heteronormative assumptions of area studies and,

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

more recently, its ethnonationalist underpinnings.[51] The causes of the emergence of Asian queer studies since the 1990s are multiple and complex. One important undercurrent connecting the region is the nearly simultaneous development of LGBTI organizations, film festivals, and political organizations during a period that witnessed the establishment of democratic institutions across much of Asia and the Pacific. The preconditions for increased visibility of queer, trans, and intersex communities were thus clearly regional and global in scope.[52] Despite obvious transnational connections, scholars trained in anthropology, history, literature, and other humanistic disciplines responded to these transformations by analyzing non-normative sexuality and gender variance in local contexts. Conditioned in part by Cold War traditions of area studies, this research aimed to specify the terminology, temporality, and texture of queer and transgender communities, often in a single nation-state. In recent years, such inquiries have been advancing in increasingly intraregional directions.[53] In addition to countless book chapters and journal articles, one can now find monographic work in almost every national subfield of Anglophone Asian studies, to say nothing of their Asian-language counterparts.[54] These include Japan; the Sinophone states of China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore; Indonesia; Thailand; and India.[55] By including Korea within the purview of Asian queer studies, this volume is intended as a preliminary but necessary effort to analyze local manifestations of gender variance and non-normative sexuality. As suggested earlier, we also aim to expand the temporal scope of a small but growing field of Korean queer studies that tends to focus on the recent past (e.g., 1990s forward), often to the detriment of what came before our current age. Rather than treating these faint histories as irretrievable or irrelevant to the present, we seek to draw vital connections between manifestations of unruly bodies during the (post)colonial era and the current struggles of queer subjects on and beyond the peninsula.

Much research on Asian expressions of same-sex sexuality and gender nonconformity has developed in response to Western-centric arguments advocating queer globalization as a model suitable for understanding contemporary developments across the region. Indeed, it has become near de rigueur for critical scholars to challenge Dennis Altman who, in 1997, argued that LGBTI movements in North America and Western Europe were quickly spreading to their counterparts throughout Asia and the Pacific.[56] Although controversial, queer globalization helped spur important studies on the subjectivities of sexual minorities who, in part, embraced visibility politics and human rights. Altman's paradigm also generated productive debates

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

about studying same-sex sexuality and non-normative gender in cross-border and diasporic modes, especially as they relate to migrant subjects residing in white-dominated communities of the West.[57] Taken together, these studies revealed the interpretive difficulties of analyzing Asian and Pacific forms of queerness without over-simplistically adopting either a model of imperialist diffusion or one of nativist resistance.

As in other regions of the global South, alienating processes of foreign intervention, including imperialism/colonialism, military occupation, and transnational capitalism, have encroached on the diverse populations of Asia and the Pacific. As Tze-lan D. Sang has argued about the effects of these processes, "The complexity of translated modernity in the non-West means that, even when a particular non-Western space for inquiry is ostensibly identified as the nation, it is always already shot through with colonial, imperial, transnational, cosmopolitan, global—whatever we call it—presence and valence."[58] Concerns about the specter of Western (and, in pre–World War II Asia, we might also extend this to Japanese) influence on the developing world have similarly preoccupied many postcolonial critics. Searching for liberating ways of narrating knotted histories of dominated peoples, they identified unequal power relationships that had tended to homogenize their own histories. As Dipesh Chakrabarty articulated this intellectual project from the perspective of South Asia, "To 'provincialize' Europe was precisely to find out how and in what sense European ideas that were universal were also, at one and the same time, drawn from very particular intellectual and historical traditions that could not claim any universal validity."[59]

By contrast, some intellectuals, particularly those living and working in Asia and the Pacific, have responded to the historical predicament of postcolonialism and the perceived threat of queer globalization by asserting nativist accounts of gender variance and non-normative sexuality. Although a minority, they argue for the alleged impenetrability of Western categories. Instead, nativists posit the radical difference of Asian queers in a formula that Howard H. Chiang has aptly described as "self- or re-Orientalization."[60] In the field of Chinese studies, for example, Wah-Shan Chou has boldly suggested that "the family kinship system, rather than an erotic object choice, is the basis for a person's identity."[61] Although useful in elucidating local specificities of homoeroticism in Taiwan, China, and Hong Kong, Chou's model tends to treat these societies as socially undifferentiated in terms of sex, class, religion, and generation. By suppressing internal differences, he asserts an unchanging cultural essence. Moreover, Chou frames his argument in terms of the region's

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

isolation from, rather than interaction with, the outside world. In this "hermit kingdom" paradigm, Chinese societies are analytically sealed off from one another and from cross-cultural interactions, as well as from culture areas beyond the Sinophone world.[62]

Even as some scholars adopt nativist models that reject or minimize outside forces, many practitioners of Asian queer studies have sought to reorient knowledge from the West and other dominant locations by subjecting it to a relational and agent-based analytic of translation. Whether conducted as ethnographic fieldwork, textual exegesis, or studies of visual or auditory materials, the translation model recognizes the undeniable power of globalizing structures (i.e., LGBTI identity categories) but emphasizes the ability of local subjects to actively negotiate these transnational forces. For example, Tom Boellstorff has deployed the technological and cultural connotations of dubbing as a framework for understanding the complex subjectivities of lesbian and gay Indonesians who, he argues, are neither fully voluntaristic nor wholly dominated by outside messages. As Boellstorff writes, "Just as the range of possibilities for a dubbed soundtrack is shaped by images originating elsewhere, so a 'dubbed' subject-position, and the persons who occupy that position in some fashion, cannot choose their subjectivities as they please."[63] Focusing on the role of foreign films, television shows, and other mass media, he also addresses the complex issue of authenticity, which nativist studies of queer Asia tend to reduce to a function of unchanging traditions. By contrast, his nuanced ethnography demonstrates how Indonesian consumers resignify the original meaning of cultural products. Through such mediated processes of translation, some (but not necessarily all) individuals, Boellstorff argues, can also experience "gay," "lesbi(an)," or other identity categories as authentic—even as their non-normative subjectivities are connected to fractured but influential discourses emanating from distant societies and cultures including, but not limited to, those of the West.[64]

Using anthropological and other critical approaches to interrogate the place of queer and transgender subjectivities in contemporary South Korea, the concluding three chapters similarly focus on actor-centered and culturally specific analyses of normative politics under neo-liberal capitalism, postauthoritarian democracy, and heteropatriarchal conformism. With the Cold War still impacting everyday life on the peninsula, these cross-cutting dynamics continue to impose collective demands on the population as individual citizens while simultaneously encouraging personal endeavors as consumers and activists. These studies of postauthoritarian South Korea engage with

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

what Michael Warner once termed "homonormativity" in his analysis of assimilationist movements for same-sex marriage in the U.S.[65] For nearly two decades, critiques of heteronormativity in North America and Western Europe have occupied the energy of many intellectuals and activists working in queer studies. As discussed earlier, queer-of-color critiques highlighted the uneven effects of what David Eng calls "queer liberalism."[66] For example, Jasbir Puar's conception of homonationalism challenged unprobed assumptions about whiteness and citizenship privilege by exposing how gender variance and non-normative sexuality disempower terrorist subjects in a globalized world of labor migration, mass displacement, and securitized geopolitics.[67] In his pioneering analysis of Latinx drag performers, José Esteban Muñoz proposed the concept of disidentification to underscore how multiply marginalized subjects transform stigmatized images generated by heteronormativity, white supremacy, and misogyny into an empowering aesthetic of resistance and survival that exudes sexiness and glamour.[68]

While drawing inspiration from these studies, the authors in this volume also adopt provincializing analytics developed in Asian queer studies. We question ahistorical applications of heteronormativity and homonormativity, which tend to assume a high degree of atomization and the hegemony of a rights-based model of LGBTI politics. As Petrus Liu writes, "While US-based queer theory enables a rethinking of the relations between the diacritical markers of personhood—race, gender, class, sexuality, and religion—this queer theory's conception of social differences remains restricted to a liberal pluralist culture of identity politics that is distinctively American."[69] To better capture power dynamics in and between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China (Taiwan), a divided nation also separated as a result of Japanese imperialism and the Cold War, Liu explores Sinophone intellectuals working in the tradition of what he calls "nonliberal queer theory." While recognizing the modularity of LGBTI politics as identity, visibility, and consumption, this epistemological framework refuses to accept capitalist globalization and human rights as the only dominant logic of contemporary Asian societies. In a similar vein, Yau Ching has problematized culturally specific notions of normativity that often appear in discussions of queer liberalism anchored in Western Europe and North America. As she writes, "Not only does that normativity need to be foregrounded and interrogated as 'variegated, striated, contradictory' . . . , it is also important to remember that normativity as a relative ideal might not be accessible for many people in most parts of the world."[70] Through a subject-centered study, she argues that

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

many inhabitants of China and Hong Kong struggle to approximate idealized but powerful notions of normativity, often as a way of maintaining bonds of sustenance with family, friends, and co-workers. Using ethnographic approaches, Lucetta Y. L. Kam, Elisabeth L. Engebretsen, and other Sinologists have similarly sought to provincialize antinormative critiques by foregrounding the subjectivities of Chinese queers.[71] In pursuing "normal" lives, for example, lesbians express complex desires to sustain the comforting but demanding bonds of kinship, even as they pursue relationships that challenge but do not necessarily destroy entrenched structures of heteropatriarchy.[72] The prevalence of "contract marriages" between gays and lesbians is one instructive example of how East Asian queers, particularly those of the professional classes, navigate this knotty situation, relying on conjugal and filial conventions that privilege men at the expense of women.[73] Another example are *lala* households, new kinship formations located outside natal families wherein young Chinese lesbians "can socialize with each other without the fear of exposure and public scrutiny."[74]

Articulating his ethnography of male homosexuality in terms of successive normativities, John (Song Pae) Cho argues that two contradictory forces of capitalist development have shaped the subjectivities of South Korean gay men since the 1970s: biopolitical familialism and neoliberal individualism. According to this historical account, the heterosexual, nuclear family, a shifting but enshrined pillar of national life, played an important role in circumscribing how men could express same-sex desires and forge non-normative intimacies. Characterizing the 1970s and 1980s as late developmentalist, Cho reveals the centrality of a hypermasculine ideology of capitalist growth during an extended period of military dictatorship. He argues that South Korea's authoritarian development expressed itself in chrononormative terms, prescribing "proper" life courses for citizens based on a dimorphic notion of biological sex. Highly gendered in its assumptions, this Cold War ideology not only demanded that men contribute to the national economy through industrial labor and military service, but also beseeched them to abide by its heteropatriarchal strictures. As a result, men who harbored attractions for one another were ultimately forced to marry women and produce male heirs to carry on family lines. Discouraged from forming long-lasting relationships and homosexual identities, most postwar gays managed to engage only in fleeting practices of "skinship" in military barracks, male dormitories, and movie theaters, public sites that they transformed into temporary cruising grounds. The Korean term *pogal*, an inversion of the word similarly used to denigrate female sex

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

workers of the lower classes (*kalbo*), best captures this (self-)disparaging and bourgeois view of these shadowy men.[75]

During the subsequent decade of political liberalization and economic globalization (the mid- to late 1990s), queer subjects took advantage of new discursive, technological, and spatial networks to promote more autonomous selves. But, according to Cho, gay men—increasingly referred to as *iban* to denote their second-class status—tended to focus on finding an "ordinary" lover rather than engaging in identity politics. These expressions signified a deep-seated desire to create discrete, middle-class lives shielded from hetero-marital and homophobic pressures, including those that might shame the family members of "out(ed)" South Koreans. However, rather than understand their subjectivities as decidedly un-queer, Cho underscores subject-oriented meanings of normativity. For him, the very act of finding one another and creating durable networks of sociality constitute salient dimensions of gay life politics in contemporary South Korea, even if those personal politics have not always transmogrified into the rights-based activism that one might expect from a diffusionist or teleological notion of queer globalization.

Although Cho traces a shift from biopolitical familialism to atomized individualism, his discussion of the early twenty-first century underscores how discourses and practices of heteropatriarchal conformity continue to inflect neoliberal expressions of the self amid new, alienating forces of stigma against queer subjects. Perhaps most illustrative of these contradictory forces is the recent phenomenon of gay "bats." A strategic response to the insecurities of globalization, these neoliberal men have chosen to retreat from same-sex communities and, instead, focused on self-cultivation and financial security. However, rather than using these resources to seek exile from the heteronormative pressures of family life, gay bats, particularly those living in costly cities, have decided to remain within the materially and psychologically comforting confines of consanguineous relations. In sum, the complex imbrication of familial constraints, individual freedom, and political homophobia reveal that the path of South Korean gay men cannot be reduced to a progressive story of increased visibility or enhanced rights, but must be situated within the political, social, and cultural matrix of successive regimes of Cold War capitalism.

Like Cho, Layoung Shin takes a materialist approach in examining the gendered practices and embodied subjectivities of queer female youth, an increasingly precarious sector of South Korea's LGBTI population. Seeking to provincialize Western-centric discussions of gender conformity and homonormative assimilation under neoliberal capitalism, she argues that government-

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

led policies of economic restructuring after the International Monetary Fund crisis of 1997 reenshrined the nuclear family as the basis of personal survival. Shin's ethnography demonstrates how these socioeconomic transformations had a particularly negative impact on lower-class lesbian women, who, when compared with their bourgeois and male counterparts, were forced to rely on family members for material support. To be sure, the rise of the Korean Wave, a state-led response to a downturn in the manufacturing sector by investing in the media activities of large corporations, provided young women new aesthetic styles with which to refashion their gendered sense of self. But individual expressions of female masculinity by queer women, briefly showcased at public sites such as Sinch'on Park, had led by the early 2010s to a homophobic backlash among South Koreans. Through such visible expressions, human rights activism, and exploitative media representations, the public became aware of female homosexuality, which they correlated with the nonconforming bodies of butch lesbians. Thereafter, queer women who harbored desires for one another refashioned themselves in gender-normative ways or, if they were unwilling to "straighten" their outward appearance, actively avoided public visibility through more furtive, online interactions.

Rather than locating these ethnographic observations in a narrative of queer liberalism or homonormative assimilation, Shin explains the notable shift from gender-variant expressions to a heterosexual style of presentation among lesbian youth in terms of associatively homophobic institutions that fail to provide legal protections for LGBTI people. Foregrounding local causes of gender conformity, public displays of queerness subject lesbian women to dangerous forms of familial alienation, stigmatizing gazes of social disapproval, and precarious experiences of economic misery. Rather than reading young women's desire for invisibility as a depoliticized practice marking the emergence of homonormative assimilation or queer liberalism in South Korea, Shin identifies them as a troubling symptom of a postauthoritarian system that continues to neglect the emotional and material well-being of queer people, especially those of the lower classes. Through a subject-centered analysis, she also considers sartorial, tonsorial, and other expressions of normativity as survival strategies necessary to navigate a society that persistently threatens queer women with various forms of harm and loss if they come out or, worse yet, are outed by a friend, relative, or co-worker on whom they must rely for sustenance and support.

While Cho and Shin focus on how financial and emotional insecurity resulting from the neoliberalization of a global marketplace and the hetero-

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

normalization of local life have informed the complex subjectivities of South Korean gays and lesbians, the final chapter emphasizes another important feature of this postauthoritarian democracy, one that also tends to endanger the well-being of queer citizens in the name of national defense and capitalist accumulation. Ruin, a self-identified "transgenderqueer" intellectual and activist, demonstrates the need to route sexual difference and gender variance through the collectivizing dynamics of Cold War geopolitics rather than simply understanding non-normative expressions as an atomizing function of neoliberal identities.[76]

Zhe (Ruin's preferred gender pronoun) examines the biopolitical effects of South Korea's resident registration system while offering liberating ways to deconstruct this alienating institution for the nonconforming citizens it most negatively affects. Tracing the system's origins from the Chosŏn Dynasty through the colonial period, Ruin argues that resident registration took root during the reign of Park Chung Hee and led to state-led violence against individuals accused of harboring communist sympathies. Over time, this omnipotent mechanism of population control became deeply entangled in South Korea's system of military conscription, labor mobilization, family registration, and medical regulation. Insofar as a dimorphic (and, until recently, an immutable) conception of biological sex still structures these national institutions, bodies that do not conform to strict boundaries between men and women face intense scrutiny and various forms of material and psychological suffering.[77] Not unlike the situation of alleged "reds" (*ppalgaeng'i*) after the Korean War, transgender and intersex South Koreans struggle to survive as internal exiles in a postauthoritarian society that continues to define itself in rigid terms of anticommunist militarism and cisgender heteropatriarchy. The ongoing breakdown of the South Korean family—evidenced in increasing numbers of single women and divorced people as well as a plummeting birth rate, the rise of the LGBTI rights movements, and the influx of foreign brides and migrant workers—has only exacerbated these tensions, with Christian conservatives decrying such demographic changes as an apocalyptic cause for grave concern and hateful protest.

Although sympathetic to efforts aimed at abolishing national identification cards and compulsory fingerprinting, Ruin asks a series of incisive questions that aim to deconstruct the binary logic of South Korea's sex-gender system. The lived experiences of transgender people provide the critical fodder for interrogating the dehumanizing effects this system—even under a

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

democratic system that avows to protect the rights of all citizens but does so in highly uneven and discriminatory ways. For example, military and civil laws have created strict boundaries between men and women while medical professionals take charge of policing the boundaries between them. Meanwhile, transgender and intersex South Koreans who must inhabit sexed and gendered bodies disrupt this politicized binary, if only in subtle and unsanctioned ways. For example, Ruin occupies both male and female positions in how zhe addresses family members with terms of appellation. To survive in a rigid environment of gender policing, transgender activists have sought to change the first digit in the second half of their national identification numbers. Although seeming to accept the sex-gender binary fortified by the resident registration system, Ruin interprets this activist position as one aimed at personal survival and psychological well-being. Considered in this way, efforts to change one's registration number seek to guarantee the rights of transgender people to designate their own sense of self within a sex-gender system already narrowed by Cold War exigencies, while doing so in a manner that does not rely on definitions determined by military, government, and medical authorities.

Conclusion

As Ruin's fiery appeal makes clear, activism remains an essential but insufficient means of ensuring the humanity and livelihood of transgender people, gay soldiers, aspirants to same-sex marriage, and a wide range of other marginalized subjects, including the disabled, the poor, and migrants. Although obviously experienced in different ways based on one's gender, class, sex, orientation, generation, location, and more, LGBTI South Koreans face innumerable obstacles in a society in which homophobia, transphobia, toxic masculinity, misogyny, and other marginalizing pressures cause an alarmingly high number of queers (and other alienated citizens) to commit suicide or inflict self-harm.[78] Even today, when democratic institutions nominally provide a procedural mechanism for voicing one's needs and wants, being LGBTI in South Korea entails much more than visibly manifesting an all-encompassing identity or engaging in a rights-based politics of recognition, especially when such "out and proud" modes of expression endanger one's ability to please kin networks, maintain intimate relationships, and succeed (or even survive) in the labor market. That some HIV-positive South Koreans would—from a pervasive fear of being known as infected to and stigmatized by friends, co-workers, (potential)

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

lovers, and family members—avoid taking anti-retroviral medications known to effectively manage their illness (because treatment requires registration with the national government) indicates the saddening degree to which a mere diagnosis can itself lead to premature and preventable deaths. Although not technically prohibited, public presentations of non-normative sexuality and gender variance in North Korea are anecdotally known to be severely punished for contravening the state's heteropatriarchal credo of socialist nationalism. Fragmentary but inconclusive evidence of the death penalty for such behavior suggests the necropolitical consequences of this extralegal policy.[79]

In the chapters that follow, we address such precarious modes of queer existence by highlighting how nonconforming subjects have disproportionately faced state violence, media scrutiny, social stigma, cultural alienation, and economic poverty. Whether articulated as modern nationalism under colonial rule, anticommunism during the authoritarian period, or national security in the current era of neoliberal globalization and troll vigilantism, repeated struggles for collective survival on both sides of the 38th Parallel and in the diaspora have tended to devalue and dehumanize gender variance, same-sex sexuality, and other non-normative life-forms.[80] If we look beyond behind the liberal rhetoric of tolerance and legal forms of inclusion that aim to promote the happiness and welfare of some LGBTI communities (but often at the expense of other social minorities) in Western Europe and North America, we will also discover highly uneven forms of privilege and accessibility to heteronormative power. Not unlike their queer Korean counterparts, migrants, women, and transgender people continue to experience intense alienation and virulent discrimination, even in societies that boast democratic protections. For example, vulnerable communities living in the United States, often touted as the "land of the free and home of the brave" and held up by some South Korean progressives as an inspiration for their own activism, face the added burden of perpetuators who verbally abuse, physically assault, and brutally murder queer and transgender people, especially women and those of color.[81] The officially sanctioned virulence of the Trump administration has only made this cruel reality all the more apparent. In that sense, the United States and the Koreas share far more in common than most liberals on both sides of the Pacific (and across the 38th Parallel) are willing to admit.

Precisely because violent state mobilizations, objectifying media practices, and alienating cultural norms have seriously jeopardized the livelihoods of queer, transgender, and other socially despised subjects, marginalized communities, where possible, have sought to forge spaces of intimacy,

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

labor, and pleasure to protect and sustain their well-being. Given those basic human needs and their virtual erasure from narratives about the peninsula (and elsewhere), it is worth recalling these forgotten stories of subordination, lest similar ones continue to emerge. Since the late nineteenth century, various and overlapping exigencies of collective survival have, ironically, come to endanger the very existence of "unruly" and "deviant" Koreans who have not fit normative frameworks of imperial resistance, nationalist politics, capitalist power, and other culturally homogenizing systems of domination and development. With this historical hindsight, the time has finally arrived for scholars, students, activists, and other like-minded allies to recognize the distinctively perverse underside of the peninsula's modernity, whether expressed in illiberal or liberal terms or as something in between these two imagined extremes. It is toward this shared goal of disruptive inquiry and the empowering insights it will produce that *Queer Korea* directs its critical energy.

In closing, I propose that the obscured queerness of the peninsula's recent past provides critical insights to overcome the current impasse of both LGBTI activism and neoliberal consumerism, allowing (South) Koreans to forge intergenerational alliances, cross-community collaborations, and a rehabilitated mass politics that looks beyond individualized suffering and state protection. Since the establishment of procedural democracy and the emergence of "sexual minorities" as a putative constituency during the 1990s, efforts to empower LGBTI citizens have understandably focused on eradicating discriminatory conventions, including military penal code 92-6. Given the stronghold of authoritarian-era practices, ridding society of such illiberal institutions are, of course, a necessary first step. However, rather than engage in spirited dialogue or transformative education, these efforts often take the form of angry confrontation, especially with culturally conservative and politically reactionary citizens. Alongside the recent growth of sexual minority activism, fundamentalist movements advancing homophobia, transphobia, and misogyny have also emerged as significant obstacles to a liberal politics of recognition centered on personalized suffering and legalistic remedies. Meanwhile, the seemingly liberatory ability to express one's gender and sexuality in a myriad of consumer spaces (many of them online) has, ironically, created an increasingly atomized, competitive, and antagonistic culture in which most LGBTI people have retreated from public view to enjoy the fruits of economic development in isolated spheres.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

By contrast, a more radical and expansive model of intergenerational cooperation and post-identity alliances across class offers a viable alternative to the current milieu of despair and fragmentation. Indeed, lacking in most movements today is a historical appreciation of how non-normative subjects, many of them quite poor, sought to promote their well-being without dependence on an unreliable state or an antagonistic society. Revisiting their past livelihoods and bonds provides one way to transcend activism that is today focused on atomized individuals and state-sanctioned remedies, often to the detriment of collective politics. Confronted by this neoliberal impasse, it is worth recalling how agents from the past took meaningful action in the face of seeming impossibility and overwhelming alienation. Rather than consider these actions as prepolitical or authoritarian-era vestiges that no longer suit the present, their strategies of personal survival and "under-the-radar" alliances offer empowering resources for a diverse range of marginalized individuals to engage and learn from one another as part of an intergenerational, cross-community, and trans-class movement. If *Queer Korea* can somehow aid in that process of radical transformation, the struggle to publish this volume will have been well worth the effort.

Notes

1 Their hybrid ensemble combined Prussian school uniform, Nehru suit, and the outfit worn by a queer character in *The Rose of Versailles*, a Japanese shōjo manga. For insights on the sartorial meanings of their outfits, I thank the respondents to my Facebook post on Koreanists from August 15, 2016.

2 For an analysis of this confrontation, see Joseph Yi, Joe Phillips, and Shin-Do Sung, "Same-Sex Marriage, Korean Christians, and the Challenge of Democratic Engagement," *Culture and Society* 51 (2014): 415–22.

3 I predicted this possibility in my 2013 interview for Arirang Television. To view it, see the clip from 17:30 at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vNFXWoi20sU. On Pak's controversial statement, see "Seoul Mayor Park Won-soon Wants Same-Sex Marriage in Korea as First in Asia," *San Francisco Examiner*, October 12, 2014. For more on the ongoing controversy, see "Seoul Mayor Wants South Korea to Legalize Same-Sex Marriage," *KoreAm Journal*, October 13, 2014. On the double-edged sword of exploiting LGBTI-based consumerism for national purposes, see Eng-Beng Lim, "Glocalqueering in New Asia: The Politics of Performing Gay in Singapore," *Theatre Journal* 57 (2005): 383–405.

4 On Korean queer activists' use of foreign powers to promote their cause, see Woori Han, "Proud of Myself as LGBTQ: The Seoul Pride Parade, Homonational-

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

ism, and Queer Developmental Citizenship," *Korea Journal* 58, no. 2 (Summer 2018): 27–57.

5 On this conception of sexual politics as it relates to the current era of globalization, see Dennis Altman, "Global Gaze/Global Gays," *GLQ* 3, no. 4 (1997): 417–36. Even progressive media outlets have presented similarly teleological accounts about the "lag" in repealing the military's ban on anal sex, upheld by the Constitutional Courts in 2002, 2011, and 2016. For a narrative of this variety, see "Constitutional Court Upholds Military's Ban on Sodomy," *Hankyoreh*, August 4, 2016.

6 For a co-produced account of their path to marriage, see Jang Hee-Sun, dir., *My Fair Wedding*, documentary (Rainbow Factory, Seoul, 2015). That the South Korean family continues to influence the livelihood of its queer offspring can also be seen in regulations requiring that parents provide consent for their transgender children to undertake gender confirmation surgery, even when they are legal adults: Tari Young-Jung Na, "The South Korean Gender System: LGBTI in the Contexts of Family, Legal Identity, and the Military," *Journal of Korean Studies* 19, no. 2 (Fall 2014): 361.

7 Heonik Kwon, "Guilty by Association," *Papers of the British Association for Korean Studies* 13 (2011): 89–104. For a sanguine narrative about the rise and fall of homophobia by association, see Kim-Cho Kwang-su, dir., *Two Weddings and a Funeral* (Generation Blue Films, Seoul, 2011). See also Kim Su-hyŏn, dir., *Life Is Beautiful* (television series, 2010).

8 On the experience of queer Koreans in the U.S. diaspora, see Jeeyeun Lee, "Toward a Queer Korean American Diasporic History," in *Q & A: Queer in Asian America*, ed. David L. Eng and Alice Y. Hom (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), 185–212; Ju Hui Judy Han, "Incidents of Travel," in Eng and Hom, *Q & A*, 185–212; Ju Hui Judy Han, "Organizing Korean Americans against Homophobia," *Sojourner* 25, no. 10 (June 2000): 1–4; Margaret Rhee, "Towards Community: *KoreAm Journal* and Korean American Cultural Attitudes on Same-Sex Marriage," *Amerasia Journal* 32, no. 1 (2006): 75–88; Anna Joo Kim, "Korean American LGBT Movements in Los Angeles and New York," in *Asian Americans: An Encyclopedia of Social, Cultural, Economic, and Political History*, ed. Xiaojian Zhao and Edward J. W. Park (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2014), 683–85. For a story of a Korean gay man living in Japan, see Nakata Toiichi, dir., *Osaka Story: A Documentary* (First Run/Icarus Films, New York, 1994).

9 For accounts by the parents and families of LGBTI South Koreans, see *Na nŭn sŏngsosuja ŭi pumonim imnida: Tongsŏng'aeja, yangsŏng'aeja, tŭrensŭjendŏ chanyŏ rŭl tun pumodŭl ŭi chinsul han iyagidŭl* (Seoul: Sŏngsosuja Pumo Moim, 2015).

10 When beginning to occupy public spaces for political protests, East Asian queers, like their counterparts in Latin America and elsewhere across the global South, often opted for forms of expression that departed significantly from modes of visibility common in North American and Western Europe but that may have subjected onlookers to even more potent critiques. For studies of these practices of protest, see Fran Martin, "Surface Tensions: Reading Productions of Tongzhi

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

in Contemporary Taiwan," *GLQ* 6, no. 1 (2000): 61–86; Katsuhiko Suganuma, "Associative Identity Politics: Unmasking the Multilayered Formation of Queer Male Selves in 1990s Japan," *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 8, no. 4 (2007): 485–502; José Quiroga, *Tropics of Desire: Interventions from Queer Latina America* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), esp. 1–29.

11 On the other hand, a survey of more than four thousand LGBTI-identified South Koreans in 2013 conducted by Ch'ingusai, the South Korean gay men's human rights organization, found that nearly 60 percent of those surveyed favored the institutionalization of same-sex unions, while another 36 percent advocated civil unions, but only when posed the *conditional* and *future-oriented* question, "If the following measures regarding same-sex unions were to become possible, which one would you choose?": Ch'ingusai, "The Key Results of the South Korean LGBTI Community Social Needs Assessment Survey," Ch'ingusai, Seoul, 2014, 24.

12 See, e.g., "Han'guk ŭi 'tongsŏng kyŏlhon' hapbŏphwa rŭl wihan ch'ŏt korŭm i sijak toetta!" *Huffington Post Korea*, July 6, 2015; "Gay Couple Sue for Recognition of Their Same-Sex Marriage in South Korea," *The Telegraph*, July 7, 2015.

13 See, e.g., "Same-Sex Couple Seeks to Gain Legal Status," *Korea Times*, December 10, 2013.

14 See, e.g., "Han'guk ŭi 'tongsŏng kyŏlhon' hapbŏphwa rŭl wihan ch'ŏt korŭm i sijak toett!"; "Gay Couple Sue for Recognition of Their Same-Sex Marriage in South Korea."

15 On this case, see Chang Sŏ-yŏn, "Han'guk esŏ tongsŏng kyŏlhap sosong ŏttŏke hal kŏsinga?" Tongsŏng kyŏlhap sosong ŭi ŭimi wa kwaje (2013): 4–40; "Hyŏnjik p'ansa 'tongsŏng kyŏlhon hŏyong ipbŏp koryŏ haeya," *Daŭm*, December 13, 2005. I thank JB Hur for alerting me to this case and the articles about them. For a report on South Korea's first(?) public wedding between two men, see "Uri nara 'pubu' anin tongpanja imnida: Han'guk ch'ŏt namsŏng tongsŏng aeja kong'gae kyŏlhon," *Chosŏn Ilbo*, March 8, 2004.

16 Petrus Liu, *Queer Marxism in the Two Chinas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 50. For a critical statement of and an intellectual response to this situation, see Todd A. Henry, "In this Issue—Queer/Korean Studies as Critique: A Provocation," *Korea Journal* 58, no. 2 (Summer 2018): 5–26.

17 See, e.g., Kwiŏ Iron Munhwa Yŏn'guso Moim, ed., *Chendŏ ŭi ch'aenŏl ŭl tollyŏra* (Seoul: Saram Saeng'gak, 2008); Kwŏn/Kim Hyŏn-yŏng, Chŏng Hŭi-jin, Na Yŏng-jŏng, Ruin, Ŏm Ki-ho, eds., *Namsŏngsŏng kwa chendŏ* (Seoul: Chaŭm kwa Moŭm, 2011); Kwŏn/Kim Hyŏn-yŏng, Han Ch'ae-yun, Ruin, Yu Chin-hŭi, and Kim Chu-hŭi, eds., *Sŏng ŭi ch'ŏngch'i, sŏng ŭi kwŏlli* (Seoul: Chaŭm kwa Moŭm, 2012); Pak/Ch'a Min-jŏng, *Chosŏn ŭi k'wiŏ: Kŭndae ŭi t'ŭmsae e sumŭn pyŏnt'aedŭl ŭi ch'osang* (Seoul: Hyŏnsil Munhwa Yŏn'gu, 2018); and the essays in *Korea Journal* 58, no. 2 (Summer 2018).

18 Some Korean studies specialists based outside the peninsula have forged close connections to queer activists in South Korea, allowing knowledge produced

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

through political struggles there to filter into the Anglophone academy. This volume seeks to expand these intellectual connections. For one example, see Na, "The South Korean Gender System." For a foundational text of this sort, see Seo Dong-jin, "Mapping the Vicissitudes of Homosexual Identities in South Korea," *Journal of Homosexuality* 40, nos. 3–4 (2001): 56–79.

19 To read more on the film festival and art installation, see http://festival.sdaff.org/2014/remembering-queer-korea/ and http://kore.am/san-diego-asian-film-festival-remembers-queer-korea. One of the films, *The Pollen of Flowers* (1972), can be viewed with English subtitles at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jLvJBBHSRaw. For a bilingual discussion of Siren's work, see Chŏng Ŭn-yŏng et al., *Chŏnhwan kŭkjang: Yŏsŏng kukkŭk p'ŭrojekt'ŭ* (Seoul: P'orŭm Ei, 2016).

20 For one exception, see Haruki Eda, "Outing North Korea: Necropornography and Homonationalism" (master's thesis, London School of Economics, 2012).

21 Yi T'ae-jin, "Was Early Modern Korea Really a 'Hermit Nation'?" *Korea Journal* 38, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 5–35.

22 For a critique of this paradigm, see Bruce Cumings, "Boundary Displacement: The State, the Foundations, and Area Studies during and after the Cold War," in *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*, ed. Masao Miyoshi and Harry Harootunian (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 261–302.

23 Anjali Arondekar and Geeta Patel, "Area Impossible: Notes toward an Introduction," *GLQ* 22, no. 2 (2016): 151–71. In the field of Chinese studies, Petrus Liu has similarly advocated for a necessary dialogue between U.S.-based queer theory and Cold War geopolitics: Liu, *Queer Marxism in Two Chinas*.

24 On the consequences of forgoing pain and loss as foundational structures of queer life, see Heather Love, *Feeling Backward: Loss and the Politics of Queer History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

25 Lauren Berlant, *Cruel Optimism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011). For a queer analysis that offers a bold political imaginary, see José Esteban Muñoz, *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity* (New York: New York University Press, 2009).

26 On the development of nationalist historiography as a postcolonial by-product, see Henry H. Em, *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013).

27 On the question of collaboration in history writing, see Koen De Ceuster, "The Nation Exorcised: The Historiography of Collaboration in South Korea," *Korean Studies* 25, no. 2 (2001): 207–42; Kyu Hyun Kim, "Reflections on the Problem of Colonial Modernity and 'Collaboration' in Modern Korean History," *Journal of International and Area Studies* 1, no. 3 (2004): 95–111. For an account of one prominent woman accused of antipatriotic activities, see Insook Kwon, "Feminists Navigating the Shoals of Nationalism and Collaboration: The Post-Colonial Korean Debate over How to Remember Kim Hwallan," *Frontiers* 27, no. 1 (2006): 39–66.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

28 Pak/Ch'a, *Chosŏn ŭi k'wiŏ*; Hŏ Yun, "1950 k'wiŏ chang kwa bŏpjŏk kyuje ŭi chŏpsok: 'Pyŏngyŏkbŏp,' 'kyŏngbŏmbŏp,' ŭl t'ong han sekshuŏllit'i ŭi t'ongje," *Pŏp Sahoe* 51 (April 2016): 229–50.

29 See, e.g., "Koyongbyŏngdŭl ŭi muri," *Nodong Sinmun*, January 24, 2000; "Sesang usŭm kŏri," *Nodong Sinmun*, April 29, 2001; "Kwaei han 'chŏngch'i munje,'" *Nodong Sinmun*, August 21, 2003; "Ingan todŏkjŏk bup'ae pijŏnaenŭn chabonjuŭi sahoe," *Nodong Sinmun*, May 28, 2011; "Miguk esŏ sasang ch'oeak ŭi ch'onggyŏk sakkŏn: 100 yŏ myŏng sasangja palsaeng," *Nodong Sinmun*, June 14, 2016. For a short story on the alleged homosexuality of American soldiers captured during the 1968 Pueblo Incident, see "P'yŏngyang ŭi nun pora," *Chosŏn Munhak* 11 (2000): 1–22. I thank Benoit Berthelier for providing me with these articles. See also "North Korea Slams UN Human Rights Report Because It Was Led by Gay Man," *Washington Post*, April 22, 2014. On nativist accounts of North Korean purity, see B. R. Myers, *The Cleanest Race: How North Koreans See Themselves—and Why It Matters* (New York: Melville House, 2010). For accounts of "queer" life in North Korea, see "Being Gay in the DPRK," NK News.org, November 13, 2013, https://www.nknews.org/2013/11/being-gay-in-the-dprk/; "A Gay NK Defector's Journey to Find Love," *Korea Herald*, May 28, 2015; "North Korean Defector Opens Up about Long-Held Secret: His Homosexuality," *New York Times*, June 5, 2015. For an autobiographical story of living as a gay man in the DPRK, see Chang Yŏng-jin, *Pulgŭn nekt'ai: Chang Yŏng-jin changp'yŏn sosŏl* (Seoul: Mulmangch'o, 2015).

30 On current associations of queerness with communism, see Judy Han Chu-hŭi [Ju Hui Judy Han], "K'wiŏ chŏngch'i, k'wiŏ chŏngchi'ihak," *Munhwa Kwahak* 83 (2015): 62–81. For a documentary critiquing the politicized connections forged between non-normative practices and antinationalist sentiments in South Korea, see Yi Yŏng, dir., *Troublers*, documentary (WOM Docs, Seoul, 2015).

31 On bureaucratic practices of modern rule on the peninsula, see Kyung Moon Hwang, *Rationalizing Korea: The Rise of the Modern State, 1894–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015).

32 On the complex intellectual background of the Eastern Learning movement, see, e.g., Susan S. Shin, "Tonghak Thought: The Roots of Revolution," *Korea Journal* 19, no. 9 (September 1979): 204–23; Shin Yong-ha, "Tonghak and Ch'oe Che-u," *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 3 (1990): 83–102; George L. Kallander, *Salvation through Dissent: Tonghak Heterodoxy and Early Modern Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013). For the early feminist movement, see Yung-Hee Kim, "Under the Mandate of Nationalism: Development of Feminist Enterprises in Modern Korea, 1860–1910," *Journal of Women's History* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 120–36; Hyaeweol Choi, *Gender and Mission Encounters in Korea: New Women, Old Ways* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

33 Andre Schmid, *Korea between Empires, 1895–1919* (New York: Columbia University, 2002). See also Em, *The Great Enterprise*.

34 On these modernizing efforts, see Kim Dong-no, John B. Duncan, and Kim Do-hyung, eds., *Reform and Modernity in the Taehan Empire* (Seoul: Jimoodang,

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

2006). On other nation-saving endeavors, see Yumi Moon, *Populist Collaborators: The Ilchinohoe and the Japanese Colonization of Korea, 1896–1910* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013).

35 On these politics, see Choi, *Gender and Mission Encounters in Korea*; Hyaeweol Choi, ed., *New Women in Colonial Korea: A Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 2012). For the position of Korean women during the immediate precolonial period, see Kim, "Under the Mandate of Nationalism."

36 For a wide-ranging study of this period, see Pak/Ch'a, *Chosŏn ŭi k'wiŏ*.

37 For other studies of the colonial period, not all of which connect queer expressions to larger social or intellectual concerns, see Sin Chi-yŏn, "1920–30 nyŏndae 'tongsŏng(yŏn)ae' kwallyŏn kisa ŭi susajŏk maengnak," *Minjok Munhwa Yŏn'gu* 45 (2006): 265–92; Pak Kwan-su, "1940 nyŏndae 'namsŏng tongsŏng'ae' yŏn'gu," *Pigyo Minsokhak* 31 (2006): 389–438. See also Layoung Sin's chapter in this volume.

38 Todd A. Henry, *Assimilating Seoul: Japanese Rule and the Politics of Public Space in Colonial Korea, 1910–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 62–91, 168–203.

39 For these approaches to Japanese imperialism, see the essays in *Positions: East Asia Culture Critique* 21, no. 1 (Winter 2013), a special issued edited by Jordan Sand. See also Christopher P. Hanscom and Dennis Washburn, eds., *The Affect of Difference: Representations of Race in East Asian Empire* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016).

40 Theodore Jun Yoo, *It's Madness: The Politics of Mental Health in Colonial Korea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016); Eunjung Kim, *Curative Violence: Rehabilitating Disability, Gender, and Sexuality in Modern Korea* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), esp. 42–80.

41 See, e.g., Prasenjit Duara, "The Imperialism of 'Free Nations': Japan, Manchukuo, and the History of the Present," in *Imperial Formations*, ed. Ann Laura Stoler, Carole McGranahan, and Peter C. Perdue (Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007), 211–39; Takashi Fujitani, *Race for Empire: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as Americans during World War II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

42 For a study that follows the nationalist paradigm of cultural erasure *(malsal)* to describe how colonized Koreans experienced the Asia-Pacific War, see Ch'oe Yu-ri, *Ilche malgi singingji chibae chŏng ch'aek yŏn'gu* (Seoul: Kukhak Charyowŏn, 1997).

43 For a subject-oriented analysis of colonized Taiwanese, see Leo T. S. Ching, *Becoming "Japanese": Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Formation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

44 For related studies of this period, see Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War*, vol. 1 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981); Suzy Kim, *Everyday Life in the North Korean Revolution, 1945–1950* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013).

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

45 For an overview of this revisionist concept, see Namhee Lee, "The Theory of Mass Dictatorship: A Re-examination of the Park Chung Hee Period," *Review of Korean Studies* 12, no. 3 (September 2009): 41–69.

46 For a feminist critique of this male-dominated paradigm, see Chŏng Hŭi-jin, "Han'guk sahoe ŭi chisik saengsan pangbŏp kwa taejung tokjaeron," in *Kŭndae ŭi kyŏnggye esŏ tokjae rŭl ikkda: Taejung tokjae wa Pak Chŏng-hŭi ch'eje*, ed. Chang Mun-sŏk and Yi Sang-nok (Seoul: Kurinbi, 2006), 403–19. For an exceptional study of the print media during the Park era, see Yi Sang-nok, "Pak Chŏng-hŭi ch'eji ŭi 'sahoe chŏnghwa' tamnon kwa ch'ŏngnyŏn," in Chang and Yi, *Kŭndae ŭi kyŏnggye esŏ tokjae rŭl ikkda*, 335–76.

47 For another related study, see So Kok-suk, "1960 nyŏndae huban'gi han'guk pyŏngjang k'omidi yŏnghwa ŭi taejungsŏng yŏn'gu: Pyŏnjang mot'ip'u rŭl t'onghan naerŏt'ib'ŭ chŏllyak ŭl chungsim ŭro" (PhD diss., Dongguk University, Seoul, 2003).

48 On the fluidity of postliberation masculinities, see Hŏ Yun, *1950 nyŏndae han'guk sosŏl ŭi namsŏng chendŏ suhaengsŏng yŏn'gu* (Seoul: Yŏnnak, 2018); Charles R. Kim, *Youth for Nation: Culture and Protest in Cold War South Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2017), 43–74.

49 For studies central to queer-of-color critique, see José Esteban Muñoz, *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); Roderick A. Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004); Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); Fatima El-Tayeb, *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

50 I thank one anonymous reviewer for suggesting the possibility that vigilante trolls may be seeking to compete with or even displace the globalized regime of neoliberalism. If that is indeed the case in South Korea, such forces have appeared at a time that LGBTI subjects are only just beginning to benefit from the fruits of liberal inclusion.

51 The following anthologies mark the vibrancy of this field: Chris Berry, Fran Martin, and Audrey Yue, eds., *Mobile Cultures: New Media in Queer Asia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); Fran Martin, Peter A. Jackson, Mark McLelland, and Audrey Yue, eds., *AsiapacifiQueer: Rethinking Genders and Sexualities* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008); Raquel A. G. Reyes and William G. Clarence-Smith, *Sexual Diversity in Asia, c. 600–1950* (London: Routledge, 2012). For an overview of this field, see Megan Sinnot, "Borders, Diaspora, and Regional Connections: Trends in Asian 'Queer' Studies," *Journal of Asian Studies* 69, no. 1 (February 2010): 17–31; Evelyn Blackwood and Mark Johnson, "Queer Asian Subjects: Transgressive Sexualities and Heteronormative Meanings," *Asian Studies Review* 36, no. 4 (2012): 441–51.

52 For a manifesto announcing this political position, see Seo, "Mapping the Vicissitudes of Homosexual Identities in South Korea." On the role of film, see Jeongmin Kim, "Queer Cultural Movements and Local Counterpublics of Sexuality: A Case

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

of Seoul Queer Films and Videos Festival," *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 8, no. 4 (2007): 617–733. For accounts that historicize the sexual minority movement more generally, see Youngshik D. Bong, "The Gay Rights Movement in Democratizing Korea," *Korean Studies* 32 (2009): 86–103; Hyun-young Kwon Kim and John (Song Pae) Cho, "The Korean Gay and Lesbian Movement 1993–2008: From 'Identity' and 'Community' to 'Human Rights,'" in *South Korean Social Movements: From Democracy to Civil Society*, ed. Gi-Wook Shin and Paul Chang (London: Routledge, 2011). For a wider, regional account, see Josephine Ho, "Is Global Governance Bad for East Asian Queers?" *GLQ* 14, no. 4 (2008): 457–79.

53 On the development of area studies, particularly of East Asia and its critique, see Miyoshi and Harootunian, *Learning Places*. For work on what might be called "intra-Asian queer studies," see Ara Wilson, "Queering Asia," *Intersections* 14 (November 2006), http://intersections.anu.edu.au/issue14/wilson.html; Tom Boellstorff, *A Coincidence of Desires: Anthropology, Queer Studies, Indonesia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), 181–218; Fran Martin, *Backward Glances: Contemporary Chinese Cultures and the Female Homoerotic Imaginary* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010); Howard Chiang, "(De)Provincializing China: Queer Historicism and Sinophone Postcolonial Critique," in *Queer Sinophone Cultures*, ed. Howard Chiang and Ari Larissa Heinrich (London: Routledge, 2014), 19–51; Howard H. Chiang, Todd A. Henry, and Helen Hok-Sze Leung, "Trans-in-Asia, Asia-in-Trans: An Introduction," *TSQ* 5, no. 3 (August 2018): 298–310; Todd A. Henry, *Japan's Gay Empire: Sex Tourism, Military Culture, and Memory Making in Postcolonial Asia-Pacific* (forthcoming).

54 Another indication of the growing prominence and institutionalization of this subfield is the creation of a Facebook page for queer East Asian studies in 2012 and the establishment of the Society for Asian Queer Studies in 2015 as an affiliate organization of the Association for Asian Studies. Although not focused on Asian studies, the Association for Queer Anthropology, formerly known as the Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists, was founded in 1988 as a section of the American Anthropological Association.

55 Monographic treatments of Japan include Hideko Abe, *Queer Japanese: Gender and Sexual Identities through Linguistic Practices* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Sharon Chalmers, *Emerging Lesbian Voices from Japan* (London: Routledge, 2014); Gary Leupp, *Male Colors: The Construction of Homosexuality in Tokugawa Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Jonathan D. Mackintosh, *Homosexuality and Manliness in Postwar Japan* (London: Routledge, 2010); Mark McLelland, *Male Homosexuality in Modern Japan: Cultural Myths and Social Realities* (Richmond, VA: Curzon, 2000); Mark McLelland, *Queer Japan from the Pacific War to the Internet Age* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005); Gregory M. Pflugfelder, *Cartographies of Desire: Male-Male Sexuality in Japanese Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); James Reichert, *In the Company of Men: Representations of Male-Male Sexuality in Meiji Literature* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006); Jennifer Robertson, *Takarazuku: Sexual Politics*

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

and Popular Culture in Modern Japan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Katsuhiko Suganuma, *Contact Moments: The Politics of Intercultural Desire in Japanese Male-Queer Cultures* (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Press, 2012); J. Keith Vincent, *Two-Timing Modernity: Homosocial Narrative in Modern Japanese Fiction* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

On China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, see Howard Chiang, ed., *Transgender China* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Howard Chiang and Ari Larissa Heinrich, eds., *Queer Sinophone Cultures* (London: Routledge, 2013); Yau Ching, ed., *As Normal as Possible: Negotiating Sexuality and Gender in Mainland China and Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2010); Lynette J. Chua, *Mobilizing Gay Singapore: Rights and Resistance in an Authoritarian State* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2014); Elisabeth L. Engebretsen, *Queer Women in Urban China: An Ethnography* (London: Routledge, 2015); Elisabeth Engebretsen, William F. Schroeder, and Hongwei Bao, eds., *Queer/Tongzhi China: New Perspectives on Research, Activism and Media Cultures* (Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, 2015); Bret Hinsch, *Passions of the Cut Sleeve: The Male Homosexual Tradition in China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Loretta Wing Wah Ho, *Gay and Lesbian Subculture in Urban China* (London: Routledge, 2011); Hans Huang, *Queer Politics and Sexual Modernity in Taiwan* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011); Lucetta Y. L. Kam, *Shanghai Lalas: Female Tongzi Communities and Politics in Urban China* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2013); Wenqing Kang, *Obsession: Male Same-Sex Relations in China, 1900–1950* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009); Travis S. K. Kong, *Chinese Male Homosexualities: Memba, Tongzhi and Golden Boy* (London: Routledge, 2012); Helen Leung, *Undercurrents: Queer Culture and Postcolonial Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009); Liu, *Queer Marxism in Two Chinas*; Martin, *Backward Glances*; Fran Martin, *Situating Sexualities: Queer Representation in Taiwanese Fiction, Film and Public Culture* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003); Lisa Rofel, *Desiring China: Experiments in Neoliberalism, Sexuality, and Public Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); Tze-Lan D. Sang, *The Emerging Lesbian: Female Same-Sex Desire in Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Matthew Sommers, *Sex, Law, and Society in Late Imperial China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002); Denise Tse-Shang Tang, *Conditional Spaces: Hong Kong Lesbian Desires and Everyday Life* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011); Giovanni Vitiello, *The Libertine's Friend: Homosexuality and Masculinity in Late Imperial China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Cuncun Wu, *Homoerotic Sensibilities in Late Imperial China* (London: Routledge, 2012); Audrey Yue and Jun Zubillaga-Pow, eds., *Queer Singapore: Illiberal Citizenship and Mediated Cultures* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2013); Tiantian Zheng, *Tongzhi Living: Men Attracted to Men in Postsocialist China* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).

On Indonesia, see Evelyn Blackwood, *Falling into Lesbi World: Desire and Difference in Indonesia* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010); Boellstorff, *A*

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Coincidence of Desires; Tom Boellstorff, *The Gay Archipelago: Sexuality and Nation in Indonesia* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005); Michael Peletz, *Gender Pluralism: Southeast Asia since Early Modern Times* (London: Routledge, 2009).

On Thailand, see Peter A. Jackson, *Dear Uncle Go: Male Homosexuality in Thailand* (Bangkok: Bua Luang, 1995); Peter A. Jackson, *Male Homosexuality in Thailand: An Interpretation of Contemporary Sources* (Elmhurst, NY: Global Academic, 1989); Peter A. Jackson, *Queer Bangkok: 21st Century Markets, Media, and Rights* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011); Peter A. Jackson and Gerard Sullivan, eds., *Lady Boys, Tom Boys, Rent Boys: Male and Female Homosexualities in Contemporary Thailand* (New York: Haworth, 1999); Megan Sinnott, *Toms and Dees: Transgender Identity and Female Same-Sex Relationships in Thailand* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004).

On India, see Gayatri Gopinath, *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Serena Nanda, *Neither Man nor Woman: The Hijras of India* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1999); Gayatri Reddy, *With Respect to Sex: Negotiating Hijra Identity in South India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Ruth Vanita, *Queering India: Same-Sex Love and Eroticism in Indian Culture and Society* (London: Routledge: 2013).

56 Altman, "Global Gaze/Global Gays." For early critiques of Altman in queer Asian and Asian American studies, see Lisa Rofel, "Qualities of Desire: Imagining Gay Identities," *GLQ* 5, no. 4 (1999): 451–74; Martin F. Manalansan IV, "Diasporic Deviants/Divas: How Filipino Gay Transmigrants 'Play with the World,'" in *Queer Diasporas*, ed. Cindy Patton and Benigno Sánchez-Eppler (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 183–203.

57 For foundational work in this area, see Arnoldo Cruz-Malavé and Martin F. Manalansan IV, eds., *Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism* (New York: New York University Press, 2002); Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, "Global Identities: Theorizing Transnational Studies of Sexuality," *GLQ* 7, no. 4 (2001): 663–79; Tithne Luibhéid and Lionel Cantù Jr., eds., *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, U.S. Citizenship, and Border Crossings* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); Martin F. Manalansan IV, *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); Cindy Patton and Benigno Sanchéz-Eppler, eds., *Queer Diasporas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Elizabeth A. Povinelli and George Chauncey, eds., "Thinking Sexuality Transnationally," *GLQ* 5, no. 4 (1999): 439–50.

58 Sang, *The Emerging Lesbian*, 9.

59 Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), xiii. For a related intellectual project rooted in East Asia, and to a lesser extent in Southeast Asia, see Kuan-Hsing Chen, *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010). On responses in South Korea, see Em, *The Great Enterprise*, esp. 138–60.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

60 Chiang, "(De)Provincializing China: Queer Historicism and Sinophone Postcolonial Critique," 32.

61 Wah-Shan Chou, *Tongzhi: Politics of Same-Sex Eroticism in Chinese Societies* (New York: Haworth, 2000), 1.

62 For a collection of works advancing this notion of a Chinese-speaking world, see Shu-mei Shih, Chien-hsin Tsai, and Brian Bernards, eds., *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

63 Tom Boellstorff, "I Knew It Was Me: Mass Media, 'Globalization,' and Lesbian and Gay Indonesians," in Berry et al., *Mobile Cultures*, 25.

64 For another study that underscores the multidirectional sources of queer subjectivities, see Lim, "Glocalqueering in New Asia."

65 Michael Warner, *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999). For an elaboration, see Lisa Duggan, *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy* (Boston: Beacon, 2003).

66 David L. Eng, *The Feeling of Kinship: Queer Liberalism and the Racialization of Intimacy* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).

67 Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*, xiv.

68 Muñoz, *Disidentifications*. For other important work in people-of-color critique, see Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black*.

69 Liu, *Queer Marxism in Two Chinas*, 7. Similarly, Puar has suggested the limitations of intersectionality—an analytic predominant in U.S. ethnic studies, but one entrenched in regulatory (state-centered) models of multiculturalism and diversity. By contrast, she advocates for assemblages as a concept that "moves away from excavation work, deprivileges a binary opposition between queer and not-queer subjects, and, instead of retaining queerness exclusively as dissenting, resistant, and alternative (all of which queerness importantly is and does), . . . underscores contingency and complicity with dominant formations": Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*, 205. For another attempt to de-idealize oppositional politics as the basis for queer analytics, see Kadji Amin, *Disturbing Attachments: Genet, Modern Pederasty, and Queer History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).

70 Yau Ching, "Dreaming of Normal while Sleeping with Impossible: Introduction," in Ching, *As Normal as Possible*, 1–14.

71 This problematic resonates with recent debates about the normativity of queer theory. However, to date these important debates remain grounded in the U.S. academy, bracketed from discussions animating the field of Asian queer studies and other non-Western contexts. On these debates, see the essays in *Differences* 26, no. 1 (May 2015), a special issue edited by Robyn Wiegman and Elizabeth A. Wilson. For a critical rebuttal, see Jack [Judith] Halberstam, "Straight Eye for the Queer Theorist: A Review of 'Queer Theory without Antinormativity,'" *Bully Bloggers*, September 12, 2016, https://bullybloggers.wordpress.com/2015

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

/09/12/straight-eye-for-the-queer-theorist-a-review-of-queer-theory-without-antinormativity-by-jack-halberstam.

72 Engebretsen, *Queer Women in Urban China*.

73 On this practice, see John (Song Pae) Cho, "The Wedding Banquet Revisited: 'Contract Marriages' between Korean Gays and Lesbians," *Anthropological Quarterly* 82, no. 2 (2009): 401–22; Engebretsen, *Queer Women in Urban China*, 104–23.

74 Kam, *Shanghai Lalas*, 36.

75 *Yangbogal*, a related term that one can still hear in South Korea today, refers to Korean men who historically crossed as women and engaged in sexual relations with white men, often for money or other material rewards. The term bears a close relationship to *yanggongju* (Western whore). In fact, these two figures tended to work in close proximity to each other near U.S. military bases, such as the one next to It'aewŏn in downtown Seoul. For more on this history, see Ruin, "Kaemp'ŭ T'ŭraensŭ: It'aewŏn chiyŏk t'ŭraensŭjendŏ ŭi yŏksa ch'ujŏk hagi, 1960–1989," *Munhwa Yŏn'gu* 1, no. 1 (2012): 244–78.

76 For more on the place of geopolitics in queer studies, see Liu, *Queer Marxism in Two Chinas*; Arondekar and Patel, "Area Impossible."

77 For more on the experiences of transgender South Koreans, see Kim Sŭngsŏp, *Ap'ŭm i kil i toeryŏmyŏn: Chŏngŭiroun kŏn'gang ŭl ch'aja, chilbyŏng sahoejŏk ch'aegim ŭl mutta* (Seoul: Tong Asia, 2017); Yi Horim and Timothy Gitzen, "Sex/Gender Insecurities: Trans Bodies and the South Korean Military," *TSQ* 5, no. 3 (Summer 2018): 376–91.

78 According to a 2013 survey of four thousand LGBTI-identified South Koreans, 28.4 percent revealed that they had attempted suicide, and 35 percent said that they had engaged in self-harm. Of young respondents (eighteen and younger), 45.7 percent had attempted suicide, and 53.3 percent had inflicted self-harm. In addition, of those who had experienced discrimination or violence due to their sexual minority status, 40.9 percent had attempted suicide, and 48.1 percent had inflicted self-harm. These figures are much higher than those of people who had not experienced discrimination or violence, which were 20.9 percent for suicide attempts and 26.9 percent for self-harm attempts: Ch'ingusai, "The Key Results of the South Korean LGBTI Community Social Needs Assessment Survey," 34–35.

79 "North Executes Lesbians for Being Influenced by Capitalism," *Korea Times*, September 29, 2011.

80 For the most recent documentation of these forms of marginalization, see "Human Rights Situation of LGBTI in South Korea, 2016," Korean Society of Law and Policy on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, Seoul, 2017, available at http://annual.sogilaw.org. See also Ch'ingusai, "The Key Results of the South Korean LGBTI Community Social Needs Assessment Survey."

81 On this phenomenon, see Doug Meyer, "An Intersectional Analysis of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) People's Evaluations of Anti-Queer Violence," *Gender and Society* 26, no. 6 (2012): 8, 49–73.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Works Cited

NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

Chosŏn Ilbo
Chosŏn Munhak
Daŭm
The Hankyoreh
Huffington Post Korea
Korea Herald
KoreAm Journal
Korea Times
New York Times
Nodong Sinmun
San Francisco Examiner
The Telegraph
Washington Post

KOREAN-LANGUAGE SOURCES

Chang Sŏ-yŏn. "Han'guk esŏ tongsŏng kyŏlhap sosong ŏttŏke hal kŏsinga?" *Tongsŏng kyŏlhap sosong ŭi ŭimi wa kwaje* (2013): 4–40.

Chang Yŏng-jin. *Pulgŭn nekt'ai: Chang Yŏng-jin changp'yŏn sosŏl*. Seoul: Mulmangch'o: 2015.

Ch'oe Yu-ri. *Ilche malgi singingji chibae chŏng ch'aek yŏn'gu*. Seoul: Kukhak Charyowŏn, 1997.

Chŏng Hŭi-jin. "Han'guk sahoe ŭi chisik saengsan pangbŏp kwa taejung tok-jaeron." In *Kŭndae ŭi kyŏnggye esŏ tokjae rŭl ikkda: Taejung tokjae wa Pak Chŏng-hŭi ch'eje*, ed. Chang Mun-sŏk and Yi Sang-nok, 403–19. Seoul: Kurinbi, 2006.

Chŏng Ŭn-yŏng et al., *Chŏnhwan kŭkjang: Yŏsŏng kukkŭk p'ŭrojekt'ŭ*. Seoul: P'orŭm Ei, 2016.

Han, Chu-hŭi [Ju Hui Judy Han]. "K'wiŏ chŏngch'i, k'wiŏ chŏngchi'ihak." *Munhwa Kwahak* 83 (2015): 62–81.

Hŏ Yun. "1950 k'wiŏ chang kwa bŏpjŏk kyuje ŭi chŏpsok: 'Pyŏngyŏkbŏp,' 'kyŏngbŏmbŏp,' ŭl t'ong han sekshuŏllit'i ŭi t'ongje." *Pŏp Sahoe* 51 (April 2016): 229–50.

Hŏ Yun. *1950 nyŏndae han'guk sosŏl ŭi namsŏng chendŏ suhaengsŏng yŏn'gu*. Seoul: Yŏnnak, 2018.

Kim Sŭng-sŏp. *Ap'ŭm i kil i toeryŏmyŏn: Chŏng'ŭiroun kŏn'gang ŭl ch'aja, chilbyŏng sahoejŏk ch'aegim ŭl mutta*. Seoul: Tong Asia, 2017.

Kwiŏ Iron Munhwa Yŏn'guso Moim, ed. *Chendŏ ŭi ch'aenŏl ŭl tollyŏra*. Seoul: Saram Saeng'gak, 2008.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Kwŏn/Kim Hyŏn-yŏng, Chŏng Hŭi-jin, Na Yŏng-jŏng, Ruin, and Ŏm Ki-ho, eds. *Namsŏngsŏng kwa chendŏ*. Seoul: Chaŭm kwa Moŭm, 2011.
Kwŏn/Kim Hyŏn-yŏng, Han Ch'ae-yun, Ruin, Yu Chin-hŭi, and Kim Chu-hŭi, eds. *Sŏng ŭi ch'ŏngch'i, sŏng ŭi kwŏlli*. Seoul: Chaŭm kwa Moŭm, 2012.
Na nŭn sŏngsosuja ŭi pumonim imnida: Tongsŏng'aeja, yangsŏng'aeja, tŭrensŭjendŏ chanyŏ rŭl tun pumodŭl ŭi chinsul han iyagidŭl. Seoul: Sŏngsosuja Pumo Moim, 2015.
Pak/Ch'a Min-jŏng. *Chosŏn ŭi k'wiŏ: Kŭndae ŭi t'ŭmsae e sumŭn pyŏnt'aedŭl ŭi ch'osang*. Seoul: Hyŏnsil Munhwa Yŏn'gu, 2018.
Pak Kwan-su. "1940 nyŏndae 'namsŏng tongsŏng'ae' yŏn'gu." *Pigyo Minsokhak* 31 (2006): 389–438.
Ruin. "Kaemp'ŭ T'ŭraensŭ: It'aewŏn chiyŏk t'ŭraensŭjendŏ ŭi yŏksa ch'ujŏk hagi, 1960–1989." *Munhwa Yŏn'gu* 1, no. 1 (2012): 244–78.
Sin Chi-yŏn. "1920–30 nyŏndae 'tongsŏng(yŏn)ae' kwallyŏn kisa ŭi susajŏk maengnak." *Minjok Munhwa Yŏn'gu* 45 (2006): 265–92.
So Kok-suk. "1960 nyŏndae huban'gi han'guk pyŏngjang k'omidi yŏnghwa ŭi taejungsŏng yŏn'gu: Pyŏnjang mot'ip'u rŭl t'onghan naerŏt'ib'ŭ chŏllyak ŭl chungsim ŭro." PhD diss., Dongguk University, Seoul, 2003.
Yi Sang-nok. "Pak Chŏng-hŭi ch'eji ŭi 'sahoe chŏnghwa' tamnon kwa ch'ŏngnyŏn." In *Kŭndae ŭi kyŏnggye esŏ tokjae rŭl ikkda: Taejung tokjae wa Pak Chŏng-hŭi ch'eje*, ed. Chang Mun-sŏk and Yi Sang-nok. Seoul: Kurinbi, 2006.

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE SOURCES

Abe, Hideko. *Queer Japanese: Gender and Sexual Identities through Linguistic Practices*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Altman, Dennis. "Global Gaze/Global Gays." *GLQ* 3, no. 4 (1997): 417–36.
Amin, Kadji. *Disturbing Attachments: Genet, Modern Pederasty, and Queer History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.
Arondekar, Anjali, and Geeta Patel, eds. "Area Impossible: Notes on an Introduction." *GLQ* 22, no. 2 (2016): 151–71.
Blackwood, Evelyn. *Falling into Lesbi World: Desire and Difference in Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010.
Blackwood, Evelyn, and Mark Johnson. "Queer Asian Subjects: Transgressive Sexualities and Heteronormative Meanings." *Asian Studies Review* 36, no. 4 (2012): 441–51.
Berlant, Lauren. *Cruel Optimism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.
Berry, Chris, Fran Martin, and Audrey Yue, eds. *Mobile Cultures: New Media in Queer Asia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.
Boellstorff, Tom. *A Coincidence of Desires: Anthropology, Queer Studies, Indonesia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
Boellstorff, Tom. *The Gay Archipelago: Sexuality and Nation in Indonesia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Boellstorff, Tom. "I Knew It Was Me: Mass Media, 'Globalization,' and Lesbian and Gay Indonesians." In *Mobile Cultures: New Media in Queer Asia*, ed. Chris Berry, Fran Martin, and Audrey Yue, 21–51. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.

Bong, Youngshik D. "The Gay Rights Movement in Democratizing Korea." *Korean Studies* 32 (2009): 86–103.

Choi, Hyaeweol. *Gender and Mission Encounters in Korea: New Women, Old Ways*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Choi, Hyaeweol, ed. *New Women in Colonial Korea: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Chalmers, Sharon. *Emerging Lesbian Voices from Japan*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Chen, Kuan-Hsing. *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Chiang, Howard. "(De)Provincializing China: Queer Historicism and Sinophone Postcolonial Critique." In *Queer Sinophone Cultures,* ed. Howard Chiang and Ari Larissa Heinrich, 19–51. London: Routledge, 2014.

Chiang, Howard, ed. *Transgender China*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Chiang, Howard, and Ari Larissa Heinrich, eds. *Queer Sinophone Cultures*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Chiang, Howard H., Todd A. Henry, and Helen Hok-Sze Leung. "Trans-in-Asia, Asia-in-Trans: An Introduction." *TSQ* 5, no. 3 (August 2018): 298–310.

Ching, Leo T. S. *Becoming "Japanese": Colonial Taiwan and the Politics of Identity Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Ching, Yau, ed. *As Normal as Possible: Negotiating Sexuality and Gender in Mainland China and Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2010.

Ch'ingusai. "The Key Results of the South Korean LGBTI Community Social Needs Assessment Survey." Report. Ch'ingusai, Seoul, 2014.

Cho, John (Song Pae). "The Wedding Banquet Revisited: 'Contract Marriages' between Korean Gays and Lesbians." *Anthropological Quarterly* 82, no. 2 (2009): 401–22.

Chou, Wah-Shan. *Tongzhi: Politics of Same-Sex Eroticism in Chinese Societies*. New York: Haworth, 2000.

Chua, Lynette J. *Mobilizing Gay Singapore: Rights and Resistance in an Authoritarian State*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2014.

Cruz-Malavé, Arnoldo, and Martin F. Manalansan IV, eds. *Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.

Cumings, Bruce. "Boundary Displacement: The State, the Foundations, and Area Studies during and after the Cold War." In *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*, ed. Masao Miyoshi and Harry Harootunian, 261–302. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.

Cumings, Bruce. *The Origins of the Korean War,* vol. 1. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

De Ceuster, Koen. "The Nation Exorcised: The Historiography of Collaboration in South Korea." *Korean Studies* 25, no. 2 (2001): 207–42.
Duara, Prasenjit. "The Imperialism of 'Free Nations': Japan, Manchukuo, and the History of the Present." In *Imperial Formations*, ed. Ann Laura Stoler, Carole McGranahan, and Peter C. Perdue, 211–40. Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007.
Duggan, Lisa. *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. Boston: Beacon, 2003.
Eda, Haruki. "Outing North Korea: Necropornography and Homonationalism." Master's thesis, London School of Economics, 2012.
El-Tayeb, Fatima. *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
Em, Henry H. *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013.
Eng, David L. *The Feeling of Kinship: Queer Liberalism and the Racialization of Intimacy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
Engebretsen, Elisabeth L. *Queer Women in Urban China: An Ethnography*. London: Routledge, 2015.
Engebretsen, Elisabeth, William F. Schroeder, and Hongwei Bao, eds. *Queer/Tongzhi China: New Perspectives on Research, Activism and Media Cultures*. Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, 2015.
Ferguson, Roderick A. *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer Color of Critique*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
Fujitani, Takashi. *Race for Empire: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as Americans during World War II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
Gopinath, Gayatri. *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
Grewal, Inderpal, and Caren Kaplan. "Global Identities: Theorizing Transnational Studies of Sexuality." *GLQ* 7, no. 4 (2001): 663–79.
Halberstam, Jack [Judith]. "Straight Eye for the Queer Theorist: A Review of 'Queer Theory without Antinormativity.'" *Bully Bloggers*, September 12, 2016. https://bullybloggers.wordpress.com/2015/09/12/straight-eye-for-the-queer-theorist-a-review-of-queer-theory-without-antinormativity-by-jack-halberstam.
Han, Ju Hui Judy. "Incidents of Travel." In *Q & A: Queer in Asian America*, ed. David L. Eng and Alice Y. Hom, 397–404. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
Han, Ju Hui Judy. "Organizing Korean Americans against Homophobia." *Sojourner* 25, no. 10 (June 2000): 1–4.
Han, Woori. "Proud of Myself as LGBTQ: The Seoul Pride Parade, Homonationalism, and Queer Developmental Citizenship." *Korea Journal* 58, no. 2 (Summer 2018): 27–57.
Hanscom, Christopher P., and Dennis Washburn, eds. *The Affect of Difference: Representations of Race in East Asian Empire*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Ho, Josephine. "Is Global Governance Bad for East Asian Queers?" *GLQ* 14, no. 4 (2008): 457–79.
Henry, Todd A. *Assimilating Seoul: Japanese Rule and the Politics of Public Space in Colonial Korea, 1910–1945*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.
Henry, Todd A. "In this Issue—Queer/Korean Studies as Critique: A Provocation." *Korea Journal* 58, no. 2 (Summer 2018): 5–26.
Henry, Todd A. *Japan's Gay Empire: Sex Tourism, Military Culture, and Memory Making in Postcolonial Asia-Pacific*. Forthcoming.
Hinsch, Bret. *Passions of the Cut Sleeve: The Male Homosexual Tradition in China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
Ho, Loretta Wing Wah. *Gay and Lesbian Subculture in Urban China*. London: Routledge, 2011.
Huang, Hans. *Queer Politics and Sexual Modernity in Taiwan*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011.
"Human Rights Situation of LGBTI in South Korea, 2016." Korean Society of Law and Policy on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, Seoul, 2017.
Hwang, Kyung Moon. *Rationalizing Korea: The Rise of the Modern State, 1894–1945*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015.
Jackson, Peter A. *Dear Uncle Go: Male Homosexuality in Thailand*. Bangkok: Bua Luang, 1995.
Jackson, Peter A. *Male Homosexuality in Thailand: An Interpretation of Contemporary Sources*. Elmhurst, NY: Global Academic, 1989.
Jackson, Peter A. *Queer Bangkok: 21st Century Markets, Media, and Rights*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011.
Jackson, Peter A., and Gerard Sullivan, eds. *Lady Boys, Tom Boys, Rent Boys: Male and Female Homosexualities in Contemporary Thailand*. New York: Haworth, 1999.
Kallander, George L. *Salvation through Dissent: Tonghak Heterodoxy and Early Modern Korea*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013.
Kam, Lucetta Y. L. *Shanghai Lalas: Female Tongzi Communities and Politics in Urban China*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2013.
Kang, Wenqing. *Obsession: Male Same-Sex Relations in China, 1900–1950*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009.
Kim, Anna Joo. "Korean American LGBT Movements in Los Angeles and New York." In *Asian Americans: An Encyclopedia of Social, Cultural, Economic, and Political History*, ed. Xiaojian Zhao and Edward J. W. Park, 683–85. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2014.
Kim, Charles R. *Youth for Nation: Culture and Protest in Cold War South Korea*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2017.
Kim, Dong-no, John B. Duncan, and Kim Do-hyung, eds. *Reform and Modernity in the Taehan Empire*. Seoul: Jimoodang, 2006.
Kim, Eunjung. *Curative Violence: Rehabilitating Disability, Gender, and Sexuality in Modern Korea*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Kim, Jeongmin. "Queer Cultural Movements and Local Counterpublics of Sexuality: A Case of Seoul Queer Films and Videos Festival." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 8, no. 4 (2007): 617–733.
Kim, Kyu Hyun. "Reflections on the Problem of Colonial Modernity and 'Collaboration' in Modern Korean History." *Journal of International and Area Studies* 1, no. 3 (2004): 95–111.
Kim, Suzy. *Everyday Life in the North Korean Revolution, 1945–1950*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013.
Kim, Yung-Hee. "Under the Mandate of Nationalism: Development of Feminist Enterprises in Modern Korea, 1860–1910." *Journal of Women's History* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 120–36.
Kong, Travis S. K. *Chinese Male Homosexualities: Memba, Tongzhi and Golden Boy*. London: Routledge, 2012.
Kwon, Heonik. "Guilty by Association." *Papers of the British Association for Korean Studies* 13 (2011): 89–104.
Kwon, Insook. "Feminists Navigating the Shoals of Nationalism and Collaboration: The Post-Colonial Korean Debate over How to Remember Kim Hwallan." *Frontiers* 27, no. 1 (2006): 39–66.
Kwon Kim, Hyun-young, and John (Song Pae) Cho. "The Korean Gay and Lesbian Movement 1993–2008: From 'Identity' and 'Community' to 'Human Rights.'" In *South Korean Social Movements: From Democracy to Civil Society*, ed. Gi-Wook Shin and Paul Chang, 206–23. London: Routledge, 2011.
Lee, Jeeyeun. "Toward a Queer Korean American Diasporic History." In *Q&A: Queer in Asian America*, ed. David L. Eng and Alice Y. Hom, 185–212. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
Lee, Namhee. "The Theory of Mass Dictatorship: A Re-examination of the Park Chung Hee Period." *Review of Korean Studies* 12, no. 3 (September 2009): 41–69.
Leung, Helen. *Undercurrents: Queer Culture and Postcolonial Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009.
Leupp, Gary. *Male Colors: The Construction of Homosexuality in Tokugawa Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
Lim, Eng-Beng. "Glocalqueering in New Asia: The Politics of Performing Gay in Singapore." *Theatre Journal* 57 (2005): 383–405.
Liu, Petrus. *Queer Marxism in the Two Chinas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015.
Love, Heather. *Feeling Backward: Loss and the Politics of Queer History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
Luibhéid, Tithne, and Lionel Cantù Jr., eds. *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, U.S. Citizenship, and Border Crossings*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
Mackintosh, Jonathan D. *Homosexuality and Manliness in Postwar Japan*. London: Routledge, 2010.
Manalansan, Martin F., IV. "Diasporic Deviants/Divas: How Filipino Gay Transmigrants 'Play with the World.'" In *Queer Diasporas*, ed. Cindy Patton and Benigno Sánchez-Eppler, 183–203. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Manalansan, Martin F., IV. *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.
Martin, Fran. *Backward Glances: Contemporary Chinese Cultures and the Female Homoerotic Imaginary*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
Martin, Fran. *Situating Sexualities: Queer Representation in Taiwanese Fiction, Film and Public Culture*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003.
Martin, Fran. "Surface Tensions: Reading Productions of Tongzhi in Contemporary Taiwan." *GLQ* 6, no. 1 (2000): 61–86.
Martin, Fran, Peter A. Jackson, Mark McLelland, and Audrey Yue, eds. *AsiapacifiQueer: Rethinking Genders and Sexualities*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008.
McLelland, Mark. *Male Homosexuality in Modern Japan: Cultural Myths and Social Realities*. Richmond, VA: Curzon, 2000.
McLelland, Mark. *Queer Japan from the Pacific War to the Internet Age*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005.
Meyer, Doug. "An Intersectional Analysis of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) People's Evaluations of Anti-Queer Violence." *Gender and Society* 26, no. 6 (2012): 849–73.
Miyoshi, Masao, and Harry Harootunian, eds. *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.
Moon, Yumi. *Populist Collaborators: The Ilchinohoe and the Japanese Colonization of Korea, 1896–1910*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013.
Muñoz, José Esteban. *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
Muñoz, José Esteban. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
Myers, B. R. *The Cleanest Race: How North Koreans See Themselves—and Why It Matters*. New York: Melville House, 2010.
Na, Tari Young-Jung. "The South Korean Gender System: LGBTI in the Contexts of Family, Legal Identity, and the Military." *Journal of Korean Studies* 19, no. 2 (Fall 2014): 357–77.
Nanda, Serena. *Neither Man nor Woman: The Hijras of India*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1999.
Patton, Cindy, and Benigno Sanchéz-Eppler, eds. *Queer Diasporas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.
Peletz, Michael. *Gender Pluralism: Southeast Asia since Early Modern Times*. London: Routledge, 2009.
Pflugfelder, Gregory M. *Cartographies of Desire: Male-Male Sexuality in Japanese Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
Povinelli, Elizabeth A., and George Chauncey, eds. "Thinking Sexuality Transnationally." *GLQ* 5, no. 4 (1999): 439–50.
Puar, Jasbir. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Quiroga, José. *Tropics of Desire: Interventions from Queer Latina America*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
Reddy, Gayatri. *With Respect to Sex: Negotiating Hijra Identity in South India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
Reichert, James. *In the Company of Men: Representations of Male-Male Sexuality in Meiji Literature*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.
Reyes, Raquel A. G., and William G. Clarence-Smith. *Sexual Diversity in Asia, c. 600–1950*. London: Routledge, 2012.
Rhee, Margaret. "Towards Community: *KoreAm Journal* and Korean American Cultural Attitudes on Same-Sex Marriage." *Amerasia Journal* 32, no. 1 (2006): 75–88.
Robertson, Jennifer. *Takarazuku: Sexual Politics and Popular Culture in Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
Rofel, Lisa. *Desiring China: Experiments in Neoliberalism, Sexuality, and Public Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
Rofel, Lisa. "Qualities of Desire: Imagining Gay Identities." *GLQ* 5, no. 4 (1999): 451–74.
Sang, Tze-Lan D. *The Emerging Lesbian: Female Same-Sex Desire in Modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
Schmid, Andre. *Korea between Empires, 1895–1919*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
Seo, Dong-jin. "Mapping the Vicissitudes of Homosexual Identities in South Korea." *Journal of Homosexuality* 40, nos. 3–4 (2001): 56–79.
Shih, Shu-mei, Chien-hsin Tsai, and Brian Bernards, eds. *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
Shin, Susan S. "Tonghak Thought: The Roots of Revolution." *Korea Journal* 19, no. 9 (September 1979): 204–23.
Shin, Yong-ha. "Tonghak and Ch'oe Che-u." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 3 (1990): 83–102.
Sinnot, Megan. "Borders, Diaspora, and Regional Connections: Trends in Asian 'Queer' Studies." *Journal of Asian Studies* 69, no. 1 (February 2010): 17–31.
Sinnot, Megan. *Toms and Dees: Transgender Identity and Female Same-Sex Relationships in Thailand*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.
Sommers, Matthew. *Sex, Law, and Society in Late Imperial China*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.
Suganuma, Katsuhiko. "Associative Identity Politics: Unmasking the Multilayered Formation of Queer Male Selves in 1990s Japan." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 8, no. 4 (2007): 485–502.
Suganuma, Katsuhiko. *Contact Moments: The Politics of Intercultural Desire in Japanese Male-Queer Cultures*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2012.
Tang, Denise Tse-Shang. *Conditional Spaces: Hong Kong Lesbian Desires and Everyday Life*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011.
Vanita, Ruth. *Queering India: Same-Sex Love and Eroticism in Indian Culture and Society*. London: Routledge, 2013.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Vincent, J. Keith. *Two-Timing Modernity: Homosocial Narrative in Modern Japanese Fiction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
Vitiello, Giovanni. *The Libertine's Friend: Homosexuality and Masculinity in Late Imperial China*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2011.
Warner, Michael. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
Wilson, Ara. "Queering Asia," *Intersections* 14 (November 2006). http://intersections.anu.edu.au/issue14/wilson.html.
Wu, Cuncun. *Homoerotic Sensibilities in Late Imperial China*. London: Routledge, 2012.
Yi, Horim, and Timothy Gitzen. "Sex/Gender Insecurities: Trans Bodies and the South Korean Military." *TSQ* 5, no. 3 (Summer 2018): 376–91.
Yi, Joseph, Joe Phillips, and Shin-Do Sung. "Same-Sex Marriage, Korean Christians, and the Challenge of Democratic Engagement." *Culture and Society* 51 (2014): 415–22.
Yi, T'ae-jin. "Was Early Modern Korea Really a 'Hermit Nation'?" *Korea Journal* 38, no. 4 (Winter 1998): 5–35.
Yoo, Theodore Jun. *It's Madness: The Politics of Mental Health in Colonial Korea*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016.
Yue, Audrey, and Jun Zubillaga-Pow, eds. *Queer Singapore: Illiberal Citizenship and Mediated Cultures*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2013.
Zheng, Tiantian. *Tongzhi Living: Men Attracted to Men in Postsocialist China*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS