

trepreneurs. These political and economic elites often collide and sometimes overlap with each other since market socialism is still largely subordinated to the state sector. The intermediate classes gain their positions through “possess[ion of] skills, knowledge and organizational experience” (93) rather than means of production or political power. Goodman uses the plural form of class to stress the fragmentation within this category and highlight how the party-state promotes the discourse of an ambivalent and inclusive middle class to encourage economic development and maintain sociopolitical stability. The subordinate classes, even more diverse than the middle classes, derive their position largely from their manual labor: urban workers, migrant peasant workers, and peasants.

Goodman’s categorizations, though not theoretically innovative, are useful for understanding the implications of social stratification and inequality for China’s political economy and social change. By looking into case studies of protests and contentious politics among different social groups in recent years, he suggests that socioeconomic changes are still unlikely to bring about regime change because of the dominance of the state sector in market socialism. The book nevertheless concludes with a curiously abrupt yet subtle anecdotal comment from a taxi driver who laughed at the idea of being a Chinese Communist Party member because he was one of the “simple members of the working class” and the “Party is not for people like us” (190). As suggested by Goodman, despite the abandonment of class struggle, the language and practice of class have been socialized in schools, shopping sites, and housing markets, which may have substantial consequences in the years to come.

One key concern for class analysis in today’s China is whether the subaltern groups would form political alliances and class solidarity to challenge the status quo. The rural-urban dividing household registration (*hukou*) system since the 1950s has played a particularly significant role in shaping the positions and experiences of these subordinate groups. Under Mao, urban workers enjoyed job security and basic welfare through the work unit (*danwei*) system and formed a strong sense of entitlement and working class identity. Peasants, by contrast, were deprived of both physical and social mobility during collectivization and suffered dearly from famine. In the reform era, the breakdown of the *danwei* system resulted in a large group of laid-off urban workers without pension, while over two million peasants migrated to towns and cities to become the new industrial and service workforce. The competition and antagonism between urban workers and migrant workers will likely prevent them from forming a new working class so long as institutional biases against peasants and migrants persist.

A veteran China scholar who has been studying China since the late 1960s, Goodman demonstrates his formidable command of the vast interdisciplinary literature, mostly in political science, sociology, and anthropology, under and after Mao. This book is well researched and highly condensed, though it sometimes suffers from repetitiveness due partly to its structure and partly to editing. The main strength of this book is its intimate knowledge of

Chinese publications on the issues of inequality and social stratification. This is particularly important because the Chinese party-state has been actively funding, shaping, and co-opting such research endeavours and results. Goodman’s synthesis and evaluation of the Chinese writings on the middle classes are particularly revealing. He demonstrates convincingly, by comparing different sociological studies of the Chinese middle class, how different definitions and calculations among Chinese scholars both contribute and reflect “a powerful state-sponsored discourse of the middle class designed to encourage economic growth, consumption and a rising standard of living” and “to mediate the increasing social inequality” (109).

Overall this book provides a valuable guide for China scholars and undergraduate students as well as non-specialists who are curious about social stratification, inequality, and class formation in contemporary China.

Minhua Ling

Graham, Mark: *Anthropological Explorations in Queer Theory*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2014. 169 pp. ISBN 978-1-4094-5066-5. Price: £ 54.00

“Anthropological Explorations in Queer Theory” (hereafter AEQT) is a fascinating book in which, true to his title, Mark Graham explores how queer theory can inform understandings of social topics otherwise considered outside its purview. In this regard, this book can be situated in a body of scholarship regarding what many have termed “travelling theory.” Against the idea that feminist theory speaks about gender, critical race theory speaks about ethnicity, queer theory speaks about sexuality, and so on, this scholarship examines how, say, feminist theory illuminates economics, or critical race theory illuminates science. Deparochializing theories otherwise assumed to be constrained by identity politics broadens all our conceptual frameworks. AEQT exemplifies the powerful potential of this approach. It exemplifies as well the frustrating limitations of such approaches when they do not fully account for the bodies of work they ostensibly engage. Thankfully, we can work with this insightful text to explore possibilities for a more comprehensive anthropological queer theory.

AEQT begins with an introduction that frames Graham’s goals with regard to both anthropology and queer theory. This introduction, which I discuss below, is followed by seven chapters in which Graham uses queer theory to speak to questions of anthropological interest in the “West,” particularly Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Australia. In chap. 1, “Things,” Graham explores ontology, materiality, and even the fetish, engaging with theories of metaphysics and materiality ranging from Spinoza, Bergson, and Deleuze to more recent scholarship on ontology and the quantum-physics inflected work of Karen Barad. A particular focus for Graham is “the enactment of boundaries around things” (31) and the ways that thingness is thereby socially constituted. These interests extend into chap. 2, “Sexonomics,” particularly through Graham’s careful attention to commodities and gifts as both things and circulating relationalities. Baudrillard is

the key theoretical focus of this chapter, along with Marx, as Graham works to develop an analysis of “the mutual interrelatedness of the economy, the sign, gender and sexuality” (43).

A continuing focus on Baudrillard links chap. 2 with chap. 3 of AEQT, “Smells.” As in the previous chapter, there is an attention to commodification – “smell” in this chapter is almost exclusively discussed in relation to the marketing of perfumes and scents. While there is no engagement with the anthropology of the senses, this chapter does link up creatively with the ones that come before it to extend queer theoretical analyses into new domains. In chap. 4, “Species,” Graham turns to questions of nature and biology that have long been of interest to queer scholars, linking these to issues of diversity that shape not just self-identity, but forms of national belonging with regard to the contemporary United Kingdom. “Intersections,” the fifth chapter of AEQT, delves into the metaphors of “section” and “intersection” to chart the spatiality of sexuality. Graham builds as well on the existing scholarship in intersectionality – itself an exemplar of travelling theory, having moved from critical race theory and feminist theory out to a whole range of scholarly conversations. In chap. 6, “Failures,” Graham analyzes mass media to examine “the supposed dividing line between heterosexual and homosexual within the cultural imaginary” (107). In the seventh and final chapter, “Explications,” Graham draws on a range of writers, particularly Deleuze and Hocquenghem, to examine how desire and embodiment shape “the status of an object that has so far been taken for granted [in this book], the anthropologist” (127).

The object whose status is most taken for granted in AEQT, however, is queer anthropology. This is partially a methodological effect. Some readers might suspect the book would be more appropriately titled “Media Studies Explorations in Queer Theory,” given that analyses of magazines and television far outweigh any ethnography (almost the only example of which is a three-page discussion of sexual and other things in Australian homes, appearing in chap. 1). This is a missed opportunity in that a more careful framing would help indicate how these explorations of queer theory are anthropological. I do appreciate Graham’s desire to avoid equating anthropology with ethnography: as others have also argued (for instance, Tim Ingold in “Anthropology Is *Not* Ethnography,” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 154.2008: 69–92), anthropology is about comparative and generalizable theoretical knowledge, not just localized case studies (valuable as those may be).

This is precisely where pushing forward the exploratory framework of AEQT holds the greatest promise. In the “Introduction,” Graham explains the notion of “anthropological explorations in queer theory” by leaning heavily on Lyons and Lyons’s “Irregular Connections,” in which they provide an excellent overview of 19th and early 20th-century anthropologies of sexuality. But Graham discusses contemporary queer anthropology only in passing, invoking Kath Weston’s 1993 review article to conclude such current work “provid[es] ... new material for the ethnocartographic project ... My primary inter-

est in this book, however, is not cartographic. I do not aim to add a new ethnographic case study of gender and sexuality to the existing literature” (5). But this is not all that queer anthropology does. Indeed, in her review article Weston identified ethnocartography as a limited vision for scholarship and spoke of the danger whenever “the absence of theory becomes the submersion of theory.” Against the ethnocartographic vision and anticipating Ingold, Weston emphasized that queer anthropology is not comprised solely of case studies: it provides powerful theoretical insights.

Such scholarship is largely absent in AEQT. Save for a fascinating engagement with the work of David Valentine (93f.), Graham treats queer theory as external to queer anthropology. But queer anthropologists already explore queer theory, and in doing so have produced theoretical insights, not just ethnographic case studies. Many, many queer anthropologists have provided queer theoretical interventions with regard to things, commodities, smells, species, intersections, failures, and bodies. Graham’s near-total refusal to meaningfully engage with such work – even to cite it – contributes to what Gayle Rubin has identified as the widespread and deeply mistaken impression that queer theory “began in the 1990s, is derived almost entirely from French theory and is primarily located in fields such as modern languages and literature, philosophy, and film studies” (p. 18, “Studying Sexual Subcultures.” In: E. Lewin and W. Leap [eds.], *Out in Theory*. Urbana 2002: 17–68).

Graham participates in the marginalization of queer anthropology by assuming its main contribution is “cartographic” case studies, so that queer theory must come from outside queer anthropology. This additionally obscures how theorists like Baudrillard, Butler, Derrida, and Lacan are “cartographic” in their own way. Despite implicit or explicit claims of universality, these theorists are shaped by historical and social specificity. Their work is also cartographic – shaped by oftentimes unacknowledged backgrounds and experiences, unspoken “case studies.” It is unfortunate that Graham predicates the anthropological exploration of queer theory on the implicit claim that queer anthropology is not queerly theoretical, so that AEQT ostensibly brings queer theory to a “cartographic” queer anthropology limited to localized case studies. If we reframe AEQT as a text that moves alongside the important queer theoretical work queer anthropologists have already published and continue to produce, we can better appreciate the important contributions of this valuable and engaging book.

Tom Boellstorff

Haag, Sabine, Alfonso de Maria y Campos, Lilia Rivero Weber und Christian Feest (Hrsg.): Der altmexikanische Federkopfschmuck. Altstadt: ZKF Publishers; México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 2012. 152 pp., Fotos. ISBN 978-3-9811620-5-9; ISBN 978-3-9811620-6-6. Preis: € 19.90

Bei dem altmexikanischen Federkopfschmuck, dem einzigen erhaltenen Objekt seiner Art, handelt es sich wohl