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In the discipline of history, “transnational” is the word of the day, or maybe the decade, but what it actually means is difficult to decipher. In the December 2006 issue of this journal, six historians discussed transnational history and circled around a definition. Their collective deliberations outlined the contours of an area of study and suggested a few core premises that might read as follows: At their most obvious, transnational histories question the nation as the default unit of analysis and remind us of the artificiality and permeability of political borders. Transnational histories, though, are neither world histories with comprehensive accounts of everything everywhere nor comparative histories that compare and contrast isolated or static entities. Instead, they attend to specific movements, transits, and circulations that crossed or transcended one or more national borders. These transnational flows involved people, capital, goods, and knowledge; they took place through migrations, trade, conquest, and communications; and they included the spread and reworking of religion, science, popular culture, art, public policies, and social movements. Transnational histories may focus on interconnections, but they also recognize the power that some empires, nations, groups, or individuals held (and hold) over others. They acknowledge uneven connections and flows as well as the processes and networks that connected some people and excluded others. Although one can easily imagine other ways to construe transnational histories, a number of us seem to have groped our way from multiple directions—from postcolonial and cultural studies, from social, intellectual, economic, and political history, from the history of immigration and diaspora, and from the Atlantic world and Pacific Rim—toward this particular version, and we can now track it as it works its way through our various historiographic domains.¹

For the history of sexuality, this transnational approach seems especially apt.

For organizing and pursuing this forum, many thanks to Margot Canaday and Sarah Knott; and for comments on earlier drafts, many thanks to George Chauncey, Clare Lyons, and the anonymous readers for the AHR.

Sexual behavior, in some of its more common forms, is fundamentally about interconnection, and it is not unusual for sexual actors to transgress the boundaries constructed to constrain them. In various times and places, people have crossed national borders and in the process found or pursued romance or sex, and sometimes perpetrated sexual violence. For centuries now, sexual arts, commodities, sciences, and services have traveled the globe, and so have sexually transmitted diseases. Explorers, missionaries, travelers, and anthropologists recorded the sexual practices of people they encountered; traders, rulers, spies, and diplomats used sex for alliance, information, and exchange; and colonial officials and local authorities attempted to regulate the sexual behavior of those they hoped to control. Bicultural heterosexual couplings, some voluntary and some not, resulted in generations of “métis,” “mestizo,” “mulatto,” “half-caste,” “creole,” and “mixed-blood” children. In transnational histories of imperialism, slavery, war, and labor, sex has appeared and reappeared as a site of pleasure and exploitation, of vexed and troubling interactions, of simultaneous regulation and unruliness.

As in other subfields, though, much of the work in the history of sexuality has focused at the national or local level. Historians know a fair amount now about the history of sexuality in the United States, which is my area of expertise, and historians also know something of the history of sexuality in Germany, Mexico, Thailand, Turkey, and Zimbabwe, which are the geographic specializations (in contemporary national terms) of the other participants in this forum. But what might we gain if we paid closer attention to the transnational circulations that transcend the localized histories? My own recent research on transsexuality focused on the United States, but it nonetheless convinced me that the history of transsexuality was inextricably transnational. From the early twentieth century on, it involved international circulations of medical literature, surgical techniques, and conceptions of biological sex, gender, and sexuality. The medical interventions that transformed bodily sex inspired the foreign travels of people seeking sex-change surgery, first in Berlin, then in Copenhagen and Amsterdam, then in Casablanca and Tijuana, and now in Bangkok, Trinidad (Colorado), and elsewhere. In the 1950s, Christine Jorgensen, the celebrity transsexual, made “sex change” an international media phenomenon. After the worldwide publicity about her surgery, her doctor in Denmark received 465 letters from people in 37 different nations. Jorgensen herself traveled as a transsexual performer in the United States and Canada, Europe, Latin America, and the Pacific Islands, attracting audiences everywhere she went, and sometimes crowds as well. What might we learn from these circulations of sexual science, sexualized medical services, and sexual celebrity?

Transnational histories will not replace the histories of nations, nationalism, and national identities or erase the need for fine-tuned local and regional studies. But they remind us, if we need reminding, that nations and their laws and traditions did not develop in isolation. They ask us to rethink causation, to trace the movements of texts, goods, and people across national borders, and to place our understanding of exchange, conflict, and the operations of power on a larger stage. For the history

---

of sexuality, they may push us to acknowledge multiple modernities that emerged separately and together over the course of several centuries. They may move us, for example, to study how travel and tourism promoted, distorted, and transformed regional sexual practices or how concepts of “licentious” foreigners shaped national and imperial identities. Or they may help us explain why “sexual revolutions” occurred virtually simultaneously in the 1960s in Argentina, Germany, the United States, and elsewhere. Or they may further our understanding of how a multifarious gay liberation movement spread internationally in the 1970s and after, and how various people appropriated, reworked, and rejected its language to describe their own sexual acts or identities. In short, transnationalizing sexuality invites us to reframe some of the histories we have only recently begun to write.

Before considering a few transnational possibilities, let me begin, then, with a nod to the relative youth of the history of sexuality as a professional subfield. Thirty years ago, it did not exist. In U.S. history, the area that I know best, a few books and articles (on sex among the Puritans, say, or on obscenity laws) addressed sexuality, but they hardly constituted a field or subfield in any sense of the word.3 In the 1970s, histories of sexual behavior and sexual ideals began to appear more frequently along with the rise of social history, but even then they often fell under the rubric of what was sometimes called “women’s and family” history.4 Gay and lesbian history challenged the “women and family” model, but through the 1970s it found its home in community-based social history projects more often than in the academy.5 In the social history moment, the history of sexuality seemed to serve as the ultimate in history from the bottom up, the most private of the private side, peering into the bedrooms of the anonymous masses of the past. For social historians, the history of sex could help reveal the intimate texture of everyday life, the subordination and exploitation (or the resistance and agency) of women, or an obvious source of demographic change. But for the critics of social history, sexual behavior, and bodies and bodily functions more generally, sometimes stood for the lunatic fringe, a social history gone wild, and if my acute memory of slights and insults serves me correctly, it provoked eye rolls and sneers almost as often as it piqued interest.

It was not until the 1980s that the history of sexuality came into its own as an independent subfield. And from early on, it was, in U.S. history as elsewhere, influenced heavily by volume 1 of Michel Foucault’s History of Sexuality, which helped shift the center of gravity from private to public and from social to cultural history. Historians of sexuality turned away from the bedroom— that is, away from the study


of sexual experience—and toward discourse, representation, science, and the construction of modern identities. From the late 1980s on, Joan Scott’s article “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis” contributed via analogy to the rise of sexuality as an axis of historical inquiry. The new approach suggested that the discourse on sexuality, like the language of gender, had served historically not only to constitute sexual relations but also to construct, signify, and legitimate other social and political hierarchies.6

By the 1990s, the history of sexuality had finally accumulated the trappings of an independent historiographic field. In U.S. history, John D’Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman’s 1988 book *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America* helped mark the rise of the field by providing the first synthetic survey.7 Two years later, the first issue of the *Journal of the History of Sexuality* established a venue for scholarly publication. But even though we can track the rise of the field, it is worth noting again that the history of sexuality is still a fairly new and somewhat marginal endeavor, especially to some of our colleagues who work in other areas. (I remember serving on a program committee for a major historical conference in the mid-1990s and listening to my colleagues argue against a panel on sexuality on the grounds that we already had lots of sessions on women and on masculinity. I tried to explain, without great success, that the history of sexuality was not the same as the history of women or gender.) Aside from its recent advent, and therefore its lack of the legitimation of tradition, the history of sexuality has had other burdens to bear. It had to (and maybe still has to) justify itself in ways that other new subfields did not, to dissociate itself from the seemingly trivial and embarrassing, from the lingering sense that sex is private and therefore distasteful when aired in public.

Nonetheless, in the past ten years, the field has grown exponentially. Anyone who teaches courses on the history of sexuality knows how hard it has become to pare down the voluminous available readings to appropriate syllabus size. The new work in the field is all over the map—both geographically and topically. It looks at the intersections of sexuality with class, race, and gender and at the deployment of sex in constructing ethnic, national, and imperial identities. It draws on poststructuralist, critical legal, postcolonial, political science, and queer theories. Recent books on U.S. history address the histories not only of hetero- and homosexuality but also of sexual reform, sexual scandal, sexual science, sexual “slumming,” sex education, sex in prison, birth control, bisexuality, incest, masturbation, obscenity, nymphomania, pedophilia, polygamy, and prostitution.8 The new history of sexuality overlaps with

---


histories of love, intimacy, and leisure and also with histories of labor, politics, religion, and crime. The sense that sex, like the air we breathe, is just about everywhere suggests the difficulties of its historical containment; it seems to seep through and spill over borders, including those of nations.

In the histories of sexuality that focus on the United States, the transnational frame was, in limited ways, there from the start, especially in intellectual and legal history. Historians of “free love” acknowledged the transatlantic crossings of the arguments of Mary Wollstonecraft, Robert Owen, and Frances Wright, and historians of sexology recognized the undeniable influence of Havelock Ellis and Sigmund Freud on American sexual science. Historians who studied fornication or sodomy addressed the British legal tradition from which most American laws derived. In
social history, too, scholars suggested, for example, that early colonists and later immigrants brought their notions of sex and propriety with them from abroad and reworked them in new settings. Historians described how new arrivals engaged—or did not—in sexual liaisons with other people they encountered. In cultural history, they traced how ethnocentric Euro-American understandings of sexual behavior rendered the sexual mores of “others” as savage and depraved. For the past decade or so, the transnational turn has especially shaped early American histories of sexuality, with their growing attention to empire, conquest, borderlands, and the Atlantic world. Transnational histories of sexuality, then, are not exactly new.9

But in the current historiographic moment, transnational history has reached the top of the scholarly agenda, and as many historians have discovered, it has the potential to redirect our deliberations about the past. Since the mid-1990s, a handful of topics with potential for transnational reframing have attracted special interest among historians of U.S. sexuality. These “hot” topical areas—I will briefly mention only three—do not in any way cover the entirety of the variegated field, but they will, I hope, serve this forum’s purpose in two ways. First, they might inform colleagues, especially those whose specializations lie in other geographic regions, of some recent clusters of significant scholarship in the history of sexuality in the U.S.; and second, they might suggest a few areas that seem especially ripe for further transnational inquiry.

Take, for a first example, the outpouring of histories on interracial sex and marriage, histories that draw direct connections between the regulation of sexuality and the construction of racial hierarchies. Works by Martha Hodes, Kevin Mumford, Rachel Moran, Henry Yu, Peter Wallenstein, Renee Romano, Joshua Rothman, Charles Frank Robinson, Alecia Long, Michele Mitchell, Mary Ting Yi Lui, Peggy Pascoe, and a number of others point to the policing of interracial sex and interracial marriage in the United States, and also to the moments when and places where interracial sex or marriage was treated with a modicum of toleration. For example, in the antebellum South, historians now find, sexual relations between white women and African American men did not evoke the punitive, violent, racist responses that they often did later in the nineteenth century. Some of the recent literature addresses the ways that sexual intimacy could subvert the unstable boundaries of racial and ethnic difference. Much of it, though, emphasizes the laws, court cases, social science, and sensationalized mass media that structured interracial sex and marriage as illicit, the multifaceted surveillance that restricted sexual behavior, and the sexual vulnerability and stigmatization of various subjugated groups.10

10 Martha Hodes, *White Women, Black Men: Illicit Sex in the Nineteenth-Century South* (New Haven, Conn., 1997); Hodes, ed., *Sex, Love, Race: Crossing Boundaries in North American History* (New York,
As Ann Laura Stoler, Philippa Levine, and others show, however, the regulation of interracial sexual contact was not simply a local or national phenomenon. It constituted and stabilized colonial relations around the globe and across centuries. The policies of incitement and prohibition differed in different times and places, but they also circulated along with the officials, missionaries, doctors, and social scientists who implemented them. Historians of early America, such as Kathleen Brown, Richard Godbeer, and Jennifer Spear, draw, in varying degrees, on this imperial context to explore the management of interracial sex and marriage in British and French American colonies. Other historians address later transnational dimensions of American approaches to interracial sex and marriage. In histories of nineteenth-century Afro-Indian families, Tiya Miles and Claudio Saunt, for example, explain how and why the Cherokee and Creek nations appropriated and reconfigured U.S. customs and policies forbidding and punishing interracial marriage—and how some individuals defied the prohibitions. Historians of U.S. imperialism, including Laura Briggs and Paul Kramer, examine policies that regulated sex between native prostitutes and white American soldiers and sailors in Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and elsewhere. At various sites and moments, U.S. officials and reformers consciously emulated, amended, or rejected British or Spanish imperial models of restriction, registration, and inspection. For the U.S. West, Nayan Shah studies the policing of sex between transient Asian immigrant and (mostly) white American men. In these case studies of interracial prostitution and interracial sodomy, U.S. officials displaced their anxieties about colonialism, immigration, and American masculinity onto dark-skinned foreigners and natives, who were cast as diseased, perverted, and corrupting.11 These works and others place local and national policy and law in the

broader supranational context of the sexual management of racialized populations that was unique in each setting but not peculiar to the United States. They highlight the sexual infrastructure of racism, an infrastructure that was constructed and revamped in part through transnational borrowings, transnational conversations, and transnational fantasies.

Recent works on the modern state and homosexuality offer another example of histories that invite transnational consideration. In U.S. history, the study of gay men and lesbians has partially moved away from earlier interests in community, science, and sexual identity and toward an emphasis on the state’s construction and devaluation of homosexual citizens. Books and articles by Leisa Meyer, Robert Dean, David Johnson, K. A. Cuordileone, Marc Stein, Andrea Friedman, Siobhan Somerville, and Margot Canaday, among others, have reinvigorated a broadened twentieth-century U.S. political and legal history. The new works attend to the ways in which politics and policy recast citizenship, with lesbians and gay men marked as less deserving citizens, especially after World War II. These new histories delineate how federal officials (and others) derogated suspected homosexuals, fired gay men and lesbians from government jobs, discharged them from the military, denied them veterans’ benefits, and refused them entry into the United States. The emphasis on the postwar “containment” of homosexuality sometimes underplays the concomitant postwar liberalization, but it nonetheless underscores an important sexualized redefinition of citizenship in the twentieth century. One provocative version of this argument suggests that the federal government constructed homosexuality as a distinct domain that was detrimental to the nation at the same historical moment that it retreated from overtly racial definitions of citizenship. Did heteronormativity in some sense supplant whiteness as an explicit legal attribute of respectable, healthy, and worthy citizens?

The transnational version of this history has yet to be written, but interesting threads of it weave their way through the existing literature. In her book on sexual


12 See also Hodes, *The Sea Captain’s Wife*.


15 Siobhan Somerville writes: “When the explicit language of race disappeared, the underlying fantasy of national purification—an unadulterated Americanness—was articulated instead through the discourse of sexuality.” Somerville, “Queer Loving,” 355.
science, Jennifer Terry shows that the circulation of European sexology, especially psychoanalysis, critically shaped the popular postwar American narrative in which mature and adjusted citizens were necessarily heterosexual. And in their discussions of immigration policy and its revision to bar the entry of homosexuals, Margot Canaday, Marc Stein, Siobhan Somerville, and Eithne Luibhéid point to the transnational implications of a sexualized redefinition of citizenship.\textsuperscript{16} Immigration authorities, for example, were increasingly asked to engage in a particular form of international sexual profiling that rendered certain border crossers suspect and unwelcome. More generally, the American anxiety about homosexuality may well have reflected broader transnational concerns of postwar reconstruction. Gary Kinsman, Dagmar Herzog, Matt Houlbrook, and others write of the post–World War II regulation of homosexuality in Canada, Germany, Britain, and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{17} Whether politicians, bureaucrats, and social scientists from the U.S. (or other nations) imported or exported policies of homosexual “containment” is not yet clear, but by the late 1950s, their opponents—those Americans who hoped to liberalize the laws and policies on homosexuality—routinely borrowed overseas examples. They publicized, for example, the British Wolfenden Report of 1957, which advocated the decriminalization of private consensual sexual relations between adult men. More recently, gay activists have showcased the nations that have legalized same-sex marriage or welcomed gay men and lesbians into the military. They draw on other nations’ policies in order to end the degraded status of gay and lesbian citizens within the United States. These borrowings suggest again how policies of sexual management have circulated transnationally, and sometimes served the ends of activists and reformers as well as government officials.

The history of sexual coercion, my final example, suggests somewhat different transnational possibilities. Several recent histories—by Cornelia Hughes Dayton, Saidiya Hartman, Laura Edwards, Mary Frances Berry, Kirsten Fischer, Diane Miller Sommerville, Lisa Lindquist Dorr, Stephen Robertson, Pablo Mitchell, Sharon Block, Thomas Foster, Hannah Rosen, and others—investigate American legal processes and the stories of sexual coercion told in courts, hearings, and print culture.\textsuperscript{18} These various histories use accounts of rape to illustrate forms of domination,


racial hierarchy, illicit masculine behavior, misogynist humor, sexist and racist adjudication, and the privileges of powerful men. Rape marked the vulnerability of poor and powerless girls and women (and sometimes boys and men) who lacked white patriarchal protection. In eighteenth-century American colonies, with their adapted European laws, and well into the nineteenth century, elite white men could coerce their servants and slaves with relative impunity. But an African American man accused of raping a white woman upset the social order and could expect punishment, and not infrequently death. (Historians disagree on when southern whites began to stereotype black men as rapists, but they generally agree that from early on, in all regions of the nation, prosecution, conviction, and penalties for rape depended heavily on the social standing—including the class, race, nationality, and age—of both the accuser and the accused.) Nonetheless, the new histories stress that the outcome of particular cases depended on a complicated calculus of local contingency, on the performance of respectability, and on the not always predictable interplay of changing conceptions of gender, race, and class. They also point to shifting understandings of childhood, consent, and aggressive sexuality. From the late nineteenth century on, middle-class observers drew tighter proscriptive lines around childhood sexuality and around coercive and violent masculinity. Social purity advocates, child protection reformers, “free love” proponents, and black and white women’s rights activists increasingly denounced the damage to victims of sexual coercion. Civil rights activists also conducted campaigns to stop the lynching and legal execution of African American men accused of rape and to protest the immunity of white men who raped women of color. In these different (though sometimes overlapping) social movements, the international press coverage demonstrated that both sexual coercion and its unequal punishment inspired transnational outrage and transnational reform movements.

Several historians of early America, including Antonia Castañeda, Richard Trexler, Stephanie Wood, James Brooks, Juliana Barr, Sharon Block, and Ramón Gu-
tiérrez, also address the transnational history of sexual coercion and war, in which sexual violence, captivity, and the traffic in women served as recognized tools and spoils of conquest. Of the multiple historic links between the masculine aggression traditionally required of war and the aggressive sexuality sometimes encouraged among male warriors, the most obvious are perhaps the many instances in which invading soldiers raped local girls and women (and as Trexler and Gutiérrez argue, also boys and men). In the pre-Columbian era, during the European conquest of Indian lands, during the American Revolution and the War of 1812, during and after the Civil War, during and after World War II, during the Vietnam War, and in the current war in Iraq, sexual coercion seems to have played a recurrent role in American military history. Rape has also served, of course, as a constituent component of wartime propaganda (and postwar memory), with combatants rallying their forces by portraying their enemies as savage abusers of power. As Sharon Block notes, the longstanding association of war and sexual violence seems, in some sense, transhistorical, but clearly it also has a history, still underexplored, involving masculinity, forced concubinage and prostitution, military strategy, state-sanctioned violence, techniques of propaganda and terror, international protest, and international law. Placed in this context, familiar historical episodes might take on less familiar forms. The postbellum reign of terror in the late-nineteenth-century U.S. South, for example, starts to resemble a prolonged war of (re)conquest, with southern white men reasserting their local dominance in part through sexual violence that targeted black women, and in part through sexual propaganda that cast black men as rapists and thereby sanctioned the collective violence seen in riot and lynching.

These three clusters of recent scholarship—interracial sex and marriage, the modern state and homosexuality, and sexual coercion—borrow from and build on the now-old Foucauldian model and also implicitly critique its relative neglect of race, citizenship, gender, and sexual violence. They also open out to transnational reconsideration. They ask us to investigate how knowledge, policies, and practices

---


circulated among localities, nations, and empires. They push us to examine similar forms of sexual regulation, incitement, subjugation, advocacy, or identity that appeared in disparate places, and they encourage us to investigate to what extent the parallel forms emerged independently, perhaps through a common logic of conquest, governance, or reform, and to what extent they borrowed and adapted from one another.

**WHERE MIGHT WE GO FROM HERE?** From my (admittedly limited) vantage point as a twentieth-century U.S. historian, let me suggest a few additional topics that might benefit from more transnational histories. For one, we might research the history of sexual commerce, including the history of prostitution with its well-known, but understudied, international dimensions, and also of sexual products (pornography or condoms, for example), sexual medicine (aphrodisiacs or penis enlargement, for example), and sexual tourism. Over the past few centuries, one could argue, sex for sale has undergone its own industrialization. If we adopt a labor history model, we might say that the center of sex for sale has gradually shifted in emphasis from the customized craftwork of prostitution to the commercial production of “leg shows,” “striptease,” “exotic dance,” and “live sex shows,” to the industrialized production of pornography, mass-produced in postcards, books, magazines, and videos and mass-distributed on the Internet. The shift seems to have entailed more impersonal relations of production and consumption, or, to put it another way, it may have involved an aggregate shift for (male) consumers from sex with prostitutes to masturbation with pictures, that is, from touching others to touching themselves. But like other forms of industrialization, it developed unevenly. We need more histories of the emergence of a preindustrial international sexual economy, its partial industrialization via mass production, its post-Fordist manifestations, its international division of sexual labor, and its centuries-long transnational circulations of people, goods, and images.

The sexual economy is perhaps related to another area, diasporic histories of sexual practices, identities, and ideals, which have been imported and exported by churches, occupiers, tourists, immigrants, refugees, and activists, and through the circulation of print and visual culture. Martin Manalansan, Gayatri Gopinath, and others write on the ethnography, cultural forms, and hybridities of contemporary queer diasporas, but the longer, broader history of diasporic sexualities has only begun to be written. In late-eighteenth-century America, for example, European erotica circulated freely through Philadelphia’s bookstores and may have shaped conceptions and categories of sexuality in the new nation’s cosmopolis. In the more recent United States, observers attributed certain sexual practices to particular immigrant groups. From the late nineteenth to at least the middle of the twentieth century, George Chauncey notes, southern Italian men “had a reputation,” in Europe and later in the United States “for their supposed willingness to engage in homosexual relations.” As Chauncey has written, this reputation may have signaled

---

the sexual stigma assigned to a subordinate group, and it may also have captured ethnic or regional differences in sexual practice. Did the distribution of print materials and the streams of immigration transport local sexual mores to other parts of the world, and if so, what did the local ideals and practices signify (and how did they change) in the mutual interplay of homeland, immigrant or expatriate communities, and host societies? In another direction, American sex reformers—free lovers, birth control advocates, anti-prostitution campaigners—have attempted in various ways and with varying degrees of success to publicize and promote their sexual ideals outside the United States. The historical investigations that focus on only one locale often fail to ask the larger questions about how and why particular sexual practices, ideals, and subjectivities circulated transnationally and sometimes played a part in international tensions.

Finally, more attention to international conflicts might direct us to the symbolic uses of sexuality, not only in the past but also in the present. In the twentieth-century U.S., to put it too simply, sexual expression became increasingly associated with freedom (for some liberals) and moral corruption (for some conservatives). Liberal proponents of “free speech,” for instance, repeatedly turned to sexual speech as a critical test case for freedom in a democracy. In contrast, their opponents argued that public sexual expression had invaded the nation’s homes and damaged its youth. Sex has been an insistent site of cultural conflict within the American middle class, often refracting concerns that have little to do with sex itself. But if we keep our vision trained solely on the battles within the United States, we miss their broader ramifications and their transnational permutations. Sexuality has played a key role in international disputes over the merits of liberalism, globalization, Westernization, and mass media. Depending on one’s point of view, the “sexualized societies” of the West might stand (positively) for freedom of expression or (negatively) for the corrosive effects of capitalism, imperialism, or secularism. As recent events have shown, the particular sexual modernism that blossomed in the twentieth-century U.S. (and in different ways in much of Europe) has not won universal acclaim. In various parts of the world, the sexualized society has become a symbol of decadence, amorality, decline, and the corruption of power. It was curious, seemingly irrelevant, but not coincidental that in the weeks after September 11, 2001, the New York Times reported that the father of Mohammed Atta, one of the terrorist attackers, had assailed the United States “for moral contagions like adultery and homosexual marriage.” In this account, an imagined vision of American sexual practices—depicted as aberrant—had come to stand for the nation and to encourage its repudiation by those outside its borders. His purported statement was just one minor counterpoint to the centuries of discourse in which Westerners have depicted Arabs (and other “Orientals”) as licentious (or, more recently, repressed), but it points nonetheless to the ongoing deployment of sexuality to define the character of peoples and nations.

25 For a recent history of responses to Western visions of Arab sexuality, see Joseph A. Massad,
sum, we might begin to explore more systematically how sexuality has served—and continues to serve—as a critical symbol in international debate.

**NOT ALL HISTORY IS TRANSNATIONAL**, and not all historians need to reposition their topics on the world stage. For U.S. history in particular, we run the risk of a scholarly imperialism, in which the rise of twentieth-century superpower status re-renders the entire world as American history. But it still seems worthwhile to ponder which topics lend themselves to the transnational turn. As many others have noted, the transnational approach questions “exceptionalist” narratives of U.S. history and places national histories, often treated separately, in dialogue with one other. Not least among the benefits, it encourages us to read the work of our colleagues in fields other than our own. It also reminds us that what we construe as private and local—“what happens in Vegas,” in the coy slogan—may well reach out and go beyond.

_Desiring Arabs_ (Chicago, 2007). On Western accounts of Middle Eastern sexuality, Jasbir K. Puar writes: “The Orient, once conceived in Foucault’s _ars erotica_ and Said’s deconstructive work as the place of original release [and] unfettered sin . . . now symbolizes the space of repression and perversion, and the site of freedom has been relocated to Western identity.” See Puar, “Queer Times, Queer Assemblages,” _Social Text_ 23, no. 3–4 (2005): 125.

