

CHRISTA ALBRECHT-CRANE
UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY

Theory Aside does not set as its goal to discard theory as such. As Ian Balfour notes in the volume's astute last chapter that discusses the entire volume, discourse in the academy is, as a matter of course, informed by theoretical assumptions of some sort. However, as he explains, the goal is to do something slightly different with mainstream theory: to present "asides," approaches and scholarly projects that suggest *alternative* lines of thought. The editors, Jason Potts and Daniel Stout, explain more specifically in the introduction that they intend to sidestep the standard methodological and intellectual approach to doing theory that usually includes two elements: a reliance on oracular figures and an apocalyptic model that rejects traditional views and instead develops a self-proclaimed, revolutionary correction. They modify this established project and successfully propose a number of thought-provoking asides that include interdisciplinary and multi-methodological scholarship. In this review, I will highlight a number of essays that illustrate the volume's aims and showcase a variety of approaches and methodologies.

The opening essay in the section titled "Chronologies Aside" is an unpublished talk by the late Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. Here, Sedgwick approaches the topic of homophobia obliquely by exposing how authoritative texts (in this case the *Britannica* entries on Dreyfus and Oscar Wilde) operate by creating and compartmentalizing knowledges about sexuality in disciplinary ways that obscure homophobic misappropriations. In Potts and Stout's framing, one could then say that Sedgwick's aside of histories of sexuality happens in her parallel studies of sexuality and the homophobic and specific histories of law, criminality, religion, and economics. Another pointed aside in this section is provided by Elizabeth A. Provinelli, in "On Suicide, and Other Forms of Social Extinguishment," in which she urges progressively minded scholars to consider the full implications of arguing that individuals from minority groups deserve social and political recognition. Provinelli asks, how does the Other inhabit an equally ethical and legitimate space? She points out that LGBTQ advocates for social change also simultaneously but covertly tend to demonize, scapegoat, and "extinguish" other views of sexual practices, among them "so-called ultraconservative Christians" (87). As she comments, this difficult work ought to be done by liberal minded theorists if they want more fully to account for both the production of new modes of being as well as the extinguishment of traditional views of sexuality.

The essays in the second part, "Approaches Aside," experiment with alternative and non-dualistic theoretical methods. For instance, in "The Biopolitics of Recognition: Making Female Subjects of Globalization," Pheng Chea addresses the difficulty of resisting global capitalism; rather than taking the usual, oppositional (and Marxist) approach that sees global capitalism as working oppressively against subjects' interests, Chea's aside views global capitalist power as a productive force that enables individuals to become subjects who then can claim rights. Chea uses as an example women workers in Asia and Latin America who, rather than being hapless victims of external, repressive forces, should be seen as rational and willing subjects who participate in global capitalism in order to improve their needs that have been shaped by government policies. For Chea, these women mark capitalism's limits—created as

global capital, women become subjects with legitimate claims to human rights.

Another interesting aside in this second section is presented by Irene Tucker in “Before Racial Construction.” While established arguments in Critical Race Theory view racial construction as primarily a linguistic process, Tucker suggests an alternative history that examines instead the biological and visual aspect in racialized thinking. She asks, “what does an earlier history suggest about why are so interested in reading skin as the sign of race in the first place” (145)? To that end, Tucker links developments in medicine and a philosophical argument by Immanuel Kant about political equality. She suggests that modern medicine advances the insight that bodies are all the same anatomically; in the critical philosophy of his later work Kant then defines race as the clearest signifier of human sameness made instantly readable in skin color. Simply put, Kant claims that standard human bodies are adaptable to different climates and environments and thus exemplify humans’ fitness for all climates. Tucker sees this development as a “race without racism” (256), but reminds readers that contemporary racism’s mechanisms require an analysis of racist institutional structures since Kant’s time.

Two other essays from this section deserve mention, especially in their emphasis on expanding methodological approaches. In “Archive Fever: African American Literature before and after Theory,” Jordan Alexander Stein astutely points to a methodological disconnection in the structure of English Studies that sets up as oppositional bibliographic and interpretive/theoretical work. Stein argues that these two methodologies never were oppositional and, in fact, have informed specifically the material development of an African American literary canon from its beginnings. That is, Stein favors a more complex approach to the reading of African American literature that sees bibliographic elements of texts and interpretation as reciprocal activities.

In a similar advocacy of methodological pluralism, Karen Beckman’s essay, “What Cinema Wasn’t: Animating: Film Theory’s Double Blind Spot,” points to a prescription and oversight in cinema and media studies that has consistently ignored the role of animation in Ethnocentric film history and theory. In reviewing a number of intellectual and institutional conditions for this neglect, Beckman advocates for a conceptual reorganization of the field that would include a renewed emphasis on language training in Ph.D. programs in film studies (to enable translations into English of film scholarship on animation from Japan and France, for instance), as well as more interdisciplinary collaborations.

The final section, “Figures Aside,” offers a set of essays on contemporary issues that avoid drawing on the established set of oracular French of Continental philosophers. William Flesh shows in “Hyperbolic Discounting and Intertemporal Bargaining” that the theorization of the experience of reading benefits from considering the work of George Ainslie, a behavioral economist who studied motivation and bargaining—activities that readers also employ in the event of a literary and fictional experience with stories. Mark B.N. Hansen’s essay, “The Primacy of Sensation: Psychophysics, Phenomenology, Whitehead,” concerns itself with contemporary, postmodern discussions about subjectivity, perceived experience, and interactions with new media. Hansen argues that Alfred North Whitehead’s notion of “asubjective” subjectivity directly addresses a non-anthropocentric view of agency that stresses a fuller experience of the world. And finally, Heather Love shows in “Reading the Social: Erving Goffman and Sexuality Studies” how a careful reassessment of Goffman’s work contributes to at least two significant benefits for sexuality studies: first, queer studies has tended to undervalue empirical research (specifically “deviance studies”), and secondly, his late work on gender offers an

astute contribution to contemporary queer and transgender scholarship.

In sum, *Theory Aside* invites rethinking of the best kind. All the essays, including the ones not mentioned above, would help both the graduate student and the more seasoned scholar in English appreciate theory anew. While it focuses only on “theory” as it functions in the English-speaking world, especially in North America, it does reflect on its own historical condition and institutional positioning. Balfour posits in the afterword that a judgment of theory depends on “how intensely, how self-consciously, how explicitly, how usefully, how well” (280) it is done; the essays do theory well, in a way that invites further work that would complement and expand current methodological approaches.

Kathryn Quinn-Sánchez. *Identity in Latin American and Latina Literature: The Struggle to Self-Define in a Global Era Where Space, Capitalism, and Power Rule*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015. 127p.

MARÍA ISABEL MARTÍN SÁNCHEZ
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

Las diásporas y la proliferación de la literatura latina y latinoamericana en Estados Unidos en las últimas décadas obliga a reconsiderar las categorías tradicionales de identidad, poder y Estado. En *Identity in Latin American and Latina Literature: The Struggle to Self-Define in a Global Era Where Space, Capitalism, and Power Rule*, Kathryn Quinn-Sánchez examina la evolución de la identidad femenina de las comunidades latina y chicana en las letras, así como su relación con las dominantes estructuras patriarcales. Para ello, la académica analiza las obras de diferentes escritoras en un periodo de estudio que abarca veinticinco años y finaliza en 2010.

Como si de una continuación del trabajo de la frontera cultural de Gloria Anzaldúa se tratase, Quinn-Sánchez aborda la representación y la negociación de la identidad cultural a través de las nociones de poder, hegemonía y capitalismo. Los trabajos analizados enfatizan la reinterpretación del género e incorporan a su lectura nuevos puntos de vista étnicos. Su objetivo es reflejar la autoafirmación identitaria que las mujeres latinas y latinoamericanas llevan a cabo en la sociedad contemporánea norteamericana. Para ello, la teoría del espacio juega un papel predominante en la metodología empleada. De este modo y de acuerdo con el planteamiento de Henri Lefebvre, el espacio es entendido en el libro como un sistema de opresión que funciona en contra de las minorías que son consideradas inferiores socialmente.

La propuesta de la autora es que, cuestionando la supremacía y las relaciones espaciales que le dan forma, la literatura femenina puede conquistar el espacio y combatir sus desigualdades. Así pues, las mujeres y los personajes de las obras seleccionadas reescriben su propia alegoría nacional de manera solidaria y sublevándose contra los relatos impuestos. Siempre desde el punto de vista de la marginalización y acorde con las lógicas del capitalismo y la globalización.

El carácter transnacional del estudio de Quinn-Sánchez es patente desde sus primeras páginas, pese a lo arriesgado de concentrar bajo una única etiqueta—la de “latina”—las realidades culturales y sociales de diferentes comunidades. Más que limitarse al análisis de un único autor, país o etnia, el libro establece conexiones transfronterizas que ponen en contacto a escritores que a priori podrían parecer distantes o que poco tienen en común. El éxito de este trabajo reside, pues, en hacer que los textos recopilados conversen entre ellos pese a su diversidad, de