changes in the language of gay-identified people there. This essay will mark some of these changes in the texts of publications focused at postwar Japanese gei (the Japanese transliteration of the American term) communities. Special attention will be paid to those gei magazines published from the Occupation Period (1945-52) and throughout the “Olympic Years” (ca 1960-70). By mapping diachronic drifts in the perception of selves, practices and places, as revealed in conversations, the confines of identity are fleshed out and made real. Focus is on the “Forum” sections of the magazines, where readers were invited to be candid about being gei, their changing social positions and their desires.

Kanner, Melinda (Antioch), “Queering the Gay Text: Karen as the Queer Center of ‘Will and Grace.’” The character of Karen in Will and Grace, is examined as a site of queerness inside a gay text. As one of the two heterosexual female characters, Karen stands apart from gay male characters and themes. Karen functions as a fulcrum around which both gay and straight sex, sexualities and sensibilities are organized and explored. Distinct from Grace, who consistently expresses active desire for an engaging heterosexual liaison, Karen’s creation of a queer space inside an expressly gay terrain is achieved through two ongoing narrative strategies: first Karen regularly interrogates and problematizes the normality and desirability of heterosexuality. Although her obligations to her wealthy husband occasionally entail sex, much of the plot and Karen’s dialogue are devoted to rejection of heterosexual sex and romance. Nonetheless, Karen remains perhaps the most sexualized of the four major characters. When Karen does behave overtly sexually, she typically selects nonnormative potential partners and circumstances. Second Karen functions as tour guide and narrator through both gay and straight relationships, sexual styles and cultural responsibilities. She is positioned in a narrative space in which she is neither gay nor straight. Much like minstrelsy affords white performers in blackface the guarantee that they are understood as white rather than black by audiences, Karen’s performance of heterosexuality assures that she is understood expressly as not completely straight. These narrative strategies will be explored through an examination of episodes from the first two seasons of Will and Grace.

Leap, Bill (American U), “Rethinking the Language of Gay City.”

At the 3rd Lavender Languages Conference (1995), I made some preliminary comments about the ways in which gay-identified residents of Washington, DC, talk about gay places and spaces in this city, eg, what I termed language of gay city. Studying this language and the understandings of urban gay geography that it conveys has been the central concern in my gay English research since that time. This paper reviews high points of this research to date and comments on discursive themes (and their syntactic and lexical representations) that are regularly attested in gay city-related ways of speaking. This paper also asks, “Who is speaking in these instances?” and explores how the language of gay city diversifies in response to race, ethnic and class backgrounds.

Nakamura, Karen (Yale) and Hikoko Matsuo, “What’s Queer about Takarazuka?”

Takarazuka, an all-female theater and dance troupe in Japan, has been seen as a site of aberrant female sexuality. However, up to now the analytical perspective of the troupe and its fans has been limited by the lens of American gay and lesbian studies. Labeling the attraction that fans feel toward the actors playing male roles (otokoyaku) as either heterosexuality or homosexuality obliterates the complex relationship between the two. By refocusing through the eyes and experiences of the fans, themselves mostly middle-aged married housewives, we can move away from a simplistic view of sexuality and desire. There’s something queer about Takarazuka, but it’s more about the liberation of gender than alternative genderings and sexualities.


As Israel continues to expand its medical resources for treating those citizens affected by HIV/AIDS, little has been done in the arena of AIDS education. Existing socioreligious taboos and a lack of public health educational funding have left individuals who have questions about AIDS little choice of informative materials. As a result, an incomplete and misleading message is presented in materials targeting a gay male audience in contrast to a more comprehensive message presented to a female audience. For example, in materials for gay men, the “cocktail” combination antiviral treatment is touted as a miracle drug and its existence alone is conveyed as a reason to release any anxiety about being HIV positive. In texts geared toward a general female audience, however, the woman’s specific emotional concerns are addressed and medical information is presented in a cogent and factually accurate manner. This analysis shows that in these selected materials, the message geared toward gay men is far more corporeal in nature, while the message for women places emphasis on psychological as well as physical health. I will also contrast these materials to similar pamphlets in English and discuss different methods of discursively engineering an HIV/AIDS educational message.


This paper examines the intersections of race, class and sexuality as they relate to the politics of place in a southeast Washington, DC, community. By identifying the ways in which the resident population is “erased” from the local landscape by print media, we see how non-resident groups are able to re-present that landscape in ways that meet their own needs. Conversely, this “erasure” impacts the ways in which the local population can resist the gentrifying forces at work in their neighborhood.

Please send any articles, research news or information you would like posted in our column to Stass at estassinos@annamaria.edu. Our co-chairs are Lawrence Cohen, cohen@clink.berkeley.edu, and Sandy Faiman-Silva, safimansilva@bridgew.edu. Our treasurer and website jedimaster is Todd White, ctw@usc.edu.

Society for Linguistic Anthropology

RICHARD J. SENHAS AND CYNDI DUNN, CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

With the San Francisco meeting just behind us, now is the time to start thinking ahead to next year! The call for proposals goes out next month, but if you hope to announce any proposed sessions in the Feb 2001 column, it must reach us by Dec 12 (see email addresses of contributing editors at the end of the column). You can also make announcements or solicit participants via the SLA email list (sla@list.sscnet.ucla.edu) or the LINGANTH list (linganth@ats.rochester.edu).

We would also like to draw your attention to two items. First, the SLA has extended the deadline (now Jan 1, 2001) for the student paper prize in linguistic anthropology; please see the Awards Alert column in this issue for details. Second, the National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages (NCOCLTL) will hold its 4th annual conference Apr 6-8, 2001, in Arlington, VA. Details will be found in the Meeting Calendar.

Lavender Languages IX

Plans for next year’s Lavender Languages IX conference are already under way. The program committee has formed, including Birch Moonwoman, Anna Livia, Liz Morris, Denis Provencen, Jay Lemke and Norman Labrie. Because the text analysis workshop continues to be a substantial draw each year, the organizers anticipate having several workshop sessions next year, including a session devoted exclusively to analysis of lesbian, gay, bi, trans, queer (lgbtq) narrative; a (separate) session on conversation analysis; a session exploring analysis of print media text; a session exploring francophone lgbtq narrative, with discussion conducted entirely in French; as well as a session examining "homosex" messages and meanings presented in 19th-century literary and medical texts. David Peterson (diperso@bobcat.paragus.org) is contact person for the 19th-century literature workshop. Otherwise, please direct inquiries to Bill Leap (see below).

One thematic focus for next year’s conference will be “Lavender Language and Political Economy.” Jeff Maskovsky (Temple) has agreed to coordinate a workshop/discussion session in which participants review basic issues and themes in political economy that might be rele-
wanting to join the Lavender Languages email list or send ideas, suggestions of suitable participants at North Atlantic and other locations. Anyone wanting to join the Lavender Languages email list business should contact Bill Leap at wlm@american.edu. (Details on past Lavender Languages events were still available at www.american.edu/lavenderlanguages at the time we went to press.)

**Paradoxes of Public Silence**

By Elizabeth Spreng

Public language involves not only what is said but also what is not said. Silence is integral to language. Although it is difficult to assign ownership to silence, it nevertheless still structures the patterns of units such as words and sentences while simultaneously expressing individuality and emotional emphasis. Determining ownership of a silence presents a theoretical dilemma. A speaker can create silence with a shocking utterance or can pause in conversational turn-taking to produce a silence. An audience, especially in public discourses, can own the silence of their individual response or as the response of intended recipients. The properties of silence elude quantification other than their duration, frequency or placement in speech patterns. The contrast between silence and nonsilence has been a focus of my research in the interview between Barbara Walters and Monica Lewinsky.

Public policy and language interacted during the investigation and subsequent impeachment of President Bill Clinton, where silences powerfully affected the discourse. Monica Lewinsky’s interview with Barbara Walters in Mar 1999 about her relationship with Bill Clinton represents a microcosm of the scandal and a source of linguistic data. However, public speech events often involve backbone participants in the actual interaction. The interview was a media-constructed speech event that included the Office of Independent Council and political figures as participants because despite their absence and silence these participants affected the dissemination of Lewinsky’s narrative.

Four aspects of silence are salient in the interview. First, Lewinsky broke her silence by telling her story. Lewinsky presented her narrative publicly, although the contents were censored by her agreements with Starr’s office and ABC News. Lewinsky’s narrative represents a contrast to stereotypes of women’s talk that assume that women should remain silent about their relationships with men, especially powerful men. Second, Lewinsky disclosed a secret during the interview, bringing out of private silence information that was previously unknown to the American public: her abortion during the time of her relationship with Clinton. Even though Lewinsky states that Clinton was not the father, the disclosure of her choices about reproductive freedom demonstrates another type of broken silence. She revealed a very personal and controversial secret to the American public but did not include many details. In one way it seems as if the secret was revealed not by Lewinsky but by Walters, who first mentioned Lewinsky’s abortion in a studio commentary section before questioning Lewinsky about it. Third, Lewinsky’s speech patterns show powerful manipulations of silence during the interview. Silence patterns characterize an individual’s speech style, and changes in these patterns make certain silences more noticeable than others. In spoken interaction silence can serve as a discourse marker. Lewinsky often used longer pauses in turn-taking in her speech during the formal public interview. At times, the interview appeared more conversational, thus silence was used to change her speech style. Fourth, Linda Tripp’s tapes (referred to and played in the Walters/Lewinsky interview) demonstrate a different type of broken silence. What was at first a private conversation (at least to Lewinsky) became public and was described as gossip, a negative type of women’s talk that societally attempts to suppress. Participants are supposed to remain silent about their gossip, and Tripp did not. Lewinsky’s telephone conversations were not supposed to become public knowledge, yet Tripp’s tapes allowed their talk to become public and hence critical in the investigation and trial. Private conversations lost their sacred silence when publicized during the trial and discussed in the interview. Silence rings out in the Walters/Lewinsky interview. It acquires a presence in the public discourse of the Clinton/Lewinsky scandal, which contrasts strongly with cultural expectations of women’s talk. Sex and silence represent an intertwined metadiscourse. Americans rarely talk about their intimate interactions in formal conversations, but Lewinsky does in her interview with Walters. Silence and nonsilence also become powerful linguistic tools used by both Walters and Lewinsky during their interview. Silence operates in at least the four ways listed above within the public discourse of the Walters/Lewinsky interview to link power, gender role constructions, reproductive freedom and individual usage.
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**Dual Degree Programs in Anthropology and Public Health**

By Jeannine Coreil (U of S Florida)

Responding to the growing interest in interdisciplinary training combining social science and public health, the U of South Florida announces new graduate programs leading to dual degrees in applied anthropology and public health. Students may dually enroll in two master’s degrees (MA/MPH) or combine doctoral and master’s level education. The program builds on long-term collaboration in teaching and research between the Department of Anthropology and the College of Public Health. USF employs 10 full-time medical anthropologists involved in cross-disciplinary anthropological/public health scholarly work (Linda Whiteford, Michael Angrosino, Roberta Baer, David Himmelgreen, Nancy Romero-Daza, Jeannine Coreil, Carol Bryant Neil Henderson, Jay Sokolovsky and Maria Vesperi). The focus of this program is applied; its goal is to provide graduates with real world training as well as the academic skills to contribute to the resolution of contemporary health problems.

The dual master’s degree program allows students to pursue a concurrent program of study leading to both the Master of Arts (MA) degree in Applied Anthropology and the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree in one of eight concentration areas within public health: epidemiology, environmental health, tropical and infectious diseases, health education, maternal and child health, international health management, health policy programs and programs and health care organizations and management.

Students interested in pursuing a doctorate plus master’s degree have two choices: they may obtain a PhD in Applied Anthropology with an MPH in a public health concentration, or they may obtain a PhD in Public Health with an MA in Applied Anthropology. For the doctoral/master’s combination, students develop individual programs of study in consultation with an interdisciplinary academic advisory committee.

For both the dual master’s and doctoral/master’s programs, similar principles of curriculum design are followed. Students must be accepted independently by both programs, coursework involves approved substitutions and requirements for field placements (internships), and final proj-