

ing for victims of apartheid torture and sponsoring rallies around same-sex marriage and AIDS treatment access.

In 1996, Rowan Smith, an openly gay and colored priest, was appointed Dean of St George's and became immensely popular with parishioners. However, in January 2000, the Dean appeared in a 20-second public service announcement for Out in Africa, the South African gay and lesbian film festival. In it, the Dean, dressed in his liturgical clothing and standing on the altar at St George's, says to the camera, "They say that homosexuals are the devil's spawn, but I don't believe that." As he turns and walks away, the audience sees a devil's tail peeping out from under his robes. After a photo of the Dean with his devil's tail appeared in the *Sunday Cape Times*, furor erupted within the church and all over Cape Town, with the media intensely covering every detail and fueling the controversy.

In this paper, I analyze the uproar surrounding the "Devil Dean," as he came to be known, including the campaign for his dismissal. I consider the Dean's political use of camp and why it backfired in the face of expectations about appropriate gay citizenship, and I ask when and why the inclusive national rhetoric of South Africa breaks down, especially interrogating the nexus of race and sexuality that informed the popular outcry surrounding the Dean's actions.

From these questions, I argue that those who identify themselves as "colored," and those who identify themselves as "gay" or "lesbian," as well as those, such as the Dean, who identify as both, are rhetorically included in both the community at St George's and the "Rainbow Nation," but simultaneously experience themselves as "aliens" in key ways. This is because those who identify as gay and colored are welcome within the nation, as well as within its microcosm, St George's, as long as their "difference" does not actually make a difference, ie, as long as their presence does not call attention to itself, demand change, or disturb the normative center. In addition, I argue that the ways that gays and lesbians have become included in the nation, and the St George's community, is through constructing homosexuality as a "race."

The complexity of this dynamic is, I assert, because there are two seemingly contradictory processes happening simultaneously: the creation of difference, and the disavowal of difference. I argue that the inclusive rhetoric of St George's and the post-apartheid Rainbow Nation is predicated on a disavowal of difference. Thus, I conclude that the inclusive rhetoric (which is based on a disavowal of difference), as well as its breaking down (based on the creation of difference), are both ways of creating and maintaining the white heteronormative center.

Please send your comments, new column ideas, or other information to David Houston at dlrh@uvm.edu. To sign up for the SOLGA listserv, send a message to listserv@american.edu with "subscribe solga-l" in the body of the message.

Society for Linguistic Anthropology

JAMES STANLAW AND MARK PETERSON,
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

The Globalization of Hate

By Mark Allen Peterson

Among the last phrases uttered by Jesus while hanging on the cross were the words, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" Of course Jesus did not actually say "God" because he did not speak English.

As an Aramaic speaker, Jesus would have said "Eloi," the vocative possessive of "Ele," "God." Or he may have spoken in Hebrew, "Eli." Hebrew and Aramaic are both members of the same language family as Arabic, a relationship similar to that between English and German. "Ele" is thus to "Allah" more or less as "Gott" is to "God."

All of which is to say that the comments last October of Lt Gen William G Boykin, the American deputy undersecretary of defense for intelligence, that Allah "is a false god," are not only inflammatory, they are just wrong. If Boykin were to attend a local Christian prayer service in one of the countries he has fought in, he would have heard "Allah," the Arabic word for God, read from the Bible.

Of course, Boykin's words were taken out of context. He uttered them in a church, and his goal was not to defame Muslims but to "recruit" his audience "to be warriors of God's kingdom," as he explained last year at the First Baptist Church in Broken Arrow, OK. He wore his uniform to signify not his new White House job so much as to continue the metaphor of the "recruitment" of "Christian soldiers."

A week after the Boykin story broke, the media reported that Malaysia's Prime Minister Mahathir said at an Islamic summit, "Jews rule the world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them." This utterance is also false, although Mahathir claimed the outcry his words provoked in Western media proved their truthfulness—which is also untrue.

But Mahathir's language was *also* taken out of context. Mahathir's speech was primarily a condemnation of Islamic intellectuals who, he said, had failed the Islamic world by abandoning science for theology.

To make such a sweeping condemnation, Mahathir had to first rhetorically demonstrate that he was not speaking as a Western lapdog. Anti-Semitic comments, sadly unremarkable in most Middle Eastern media but virulently condemned in the West, fulfilled this function quite nicely.

Now that the hype about freedom of speech, and questions about whose hate is more venomous have died down, it is worth considering what lessons we, our students, and public officials might profitably take from these incidents.

I think the lesson is that ripping things out of context and displaying them in other, very different contexts, is what the world media does to verbal performances. And what this means is that

for anyone in a position of authority, every utterance must be weighed, whether it is said at an international summit or a church meeting.

I don't want to imply that this is a "media" problem. Intertextuality is a normal part of all linguistic performance. Indeed, I regard the current work on intertextuality and entextualization as some of the most exciting work in linguistic anthropology, with far reaching implications.

World media is implicated in that it takes this human capacity for decontextualization and recontextualization and expands it, allowing images, discourses and performances to be recontextualized in a bewildering number of sites around the globe in an astonishingly short time.

Mahathir, a canny politician for 22 years, almost certainly knew exactly what he was doing. Boykin, the decorated soldier with the new higher profile job, almost certainly did not. When he spoke to his fellow churchgoers, I doubt it crossed his mind that he was giving those who recruit for terrorist networks, both nearby and across the world, just the kind of material they most need for their own rhetorical performances.

Too often, in thinking about globalization, pundits focus on trade and war, and forget that globalization is also about the circulation of words, performance-bits, and ideas—in a word, of discourses. And the war on terror is a war of discourses and the ideas embedded in them.

It is perhaps too much to hope that the administration might learn from such incidents is that the pen (or one of its electronic extensions) is mightier than the sword. But is it too much to hope that they might learn that we can only use warriors who know how to appropriately wield both?

(A slightly different version of this appeared in the *Cincinnati Post*.)

Please send your comments, contributions, news and announcements to Mark Allen Peterson (petersm2@muohio.edu) or James Stanlaw (stanlaw@ilstu.edu). The editors wish to elicit opinions of SLA members on linguistic aspects of current events and issues.

Society for Medical Anthropology

NANCY VUCKOVIC AND JANELLE TAYLOR,
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

SMA Award Winners

Congratulations to the winners of the 2003 SMA prizes, awarded at the annual meeting in Chicago. This year's winner of the Rivers Undergraduate Prize is Jennifer Staple, who graduated last year from Yale's Department of Anthropology. Her essay, titled: "Forging Activist Identities in the Kalaupapa Community of Leprosy Patients." The winner of the Hughes Graduate Student Paper Prize went to Nili Kaplan-Myrth, also from Yale, for her essay entitled: "Black, White or Brindle: Community Advocacy in Australian Aboriginal Health." The 2003 Polgar Prize for the best essay in volume 16 of MAQ was awarded to James Pfeiffer for his essay entitled: "African