

decades. While we may argue that the global north has a greater responsibility because of resources available, it is clear that any response to a global phenomenon is going to require transnational collaborations that exceed the global north.

Even with these critiques, *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet* challenges the narrative in the media and popular culture where the human impact on the planet is presented in apocalyptic terms which tend to result in an inability to think or act as, in this teleological narrative, the inevitable is bound to happen (unless, of course, a superhero can intervene). In this context this text is a surprising read: it is enjoyable precisely because it is creative, rethinking metaphors and language, showing us that the world is not as we imagined. And, even if the reader is familiar with the theories, methods, research, there is likely to be something new in this expansive collection. Indeed, this collection will appeal to scholars, artists and activists across the social sciences and the humanities and potentially to those working in the so-called hard sciences. I gained what can only be described as pleasure from, for example, reading Peter Funch's piece on crabs and red knot birds, not because it is an uplifting story, but because it takes a very specific example to show how species are tied to and dependent on each other, that species that have lived for millions of years longer than homo sapiens are endangered by human activity, and that interventions must not think species as separate, individual beings disconnected from others and their environments. This observation about crabs offers the possibility of thinking about shared life on the planet where we need to recognise that 'individual extinctions are scary in part because they are never "individual"' (M151). The text encourages imaginative and creative responses, insisting that what we do has an impact and that our capacity to rethink the world could change the present.

Dr Donna McCormack

School of Literature and Languages

University of Surrey

DOI: 10.3366/soma.2018.0256

Lisa Downing, Iain Morland, Nikki Sullivan, *Fuckology: Critical Essays on John Money's Diagnostic Concepts*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2015. ISBN: 9780226186610, 224 pp. \$27.50.

Lisa Downing, Iain Morland, and Nikki Sullivan's joint monograph *Fuckology* aims to uncover the complexity and contradictions of John Money, the highly controversial New-Zealand-born, US-based

sexologist and psychologist who gained worldwide fame (and infamy) for his research often described, perhaps unsatisfactorily, as social constructionism taken to its extreme. While medical fields have been drawing upon Money's research for decades, this is the first monograph written on his work from a critical humanities perspective. Here, Downing, Morland, and Sullivan convincingly argue that in approaching his writings and practices from outside the disciplines in which he wrote, the thematic and methodological import of his legacy, which continues to affect transgender and intersex populations, can be necessarily complicated.

The book follows an innovative structure, with six single-authored chapters and a co-authored introduction and conclusion. The text is divided into two parts, 'Mapping' and 'Vandalizing' (named for key concepts in Money's work), with each author composing one chapter in each of these sections. It treats in depth three diagnostic concepts central to Money's work – 'transsexualism' (Chapters 1 and 5 by Sullivan), 'paraphilia' or perversion (Chapters 2 and 6 by Downing), and 'hermaphroditism' or intersexuality (Chapters 3 and 4 by Morland). In approaching these three concepts, the monograph makes critical interventions into wide-ranging topics such as the plasticity of genitals and gender, cybernetic theory, animal behavior, and brain organization theory. The book's title is a wink towards the subversiveness of Money, who proposed moving away from the politeness of phrases like 'making love' or 'having sex' to talk about the science of what people are actually doing. But the authors also subvert this subversion: 'the term 'fuckology,' used against the grain, strikes us as extraordinarily appropriate shorthand to describe the method of queering—or fucking with—sexology... In particular, we are aware of, and seek precisely to exploit, the readerly discomfort and uncertainty potentially engendered by the use of this nonacademic vocabulary' (3).

Money's work has often been critiqued by humanities scholars, at times rightly so, but often without substantial analytical depth into his actual writing and concepts. This volume rectifies this gap in the literature by engaging in deep and meticulous readings that trouble categorizations of Money and his work. For example, due to his influential role in the case of David Reimer, which has by now been documented at length, he has often been depicted as believing that nurture always trumps nature. Money, however, viewed himself as an 'interactionist,' professing that both culture and biology shape us; for him, 'gender identity/role' was neither wholly social nor completely biological. But here lie contradictions, for, as this volume demonstrates, he constantly vacillated between using biological and

social/environmental explanations to suit his purposes at hand. The authors are motivated by this ambiguity, stating that ‘our contributions are brought together by their determination to do critical justice to the ‘fucked-up-ness’ of Money’s texts, contradictory, repetitive, and dysfunctionally self-undermining as they are’ (13).

Another important point made by Downing, Morland, and Sullivan is that Money was just as much a sexologist as he was a theorist of language. He constantly played with words, introducing numerous neologisms to the field. As an astute manipulator of language, neologisms became for him a way of asserting authority and measuring his own accomplishments. Not only did Money create terms like ‘fuckology,’ ‘lovemaps,’ ‘vandalization’, and ‘bodymind,’ but he is also responsible for coining the word ‘gender’ (specifically in the concept of ‘gender identity/role’ or G-I/R), a contribution that alone would seem to merit a careful study of his work.

The authors take a cue from Money’s fascination with maps and diagramming to approach his work as critical cartographers. In following the labyrinthine and meandering paths he laid, *Fuckology* is successful in achieving its objective of critically mapping varied bodies of thought that influenced Money’s vision, while simultaneously ‘vandaliz[ing] our cartographic inheritance, fuck[ing] with the figures of (reproductive) futurity that orient Money’s map(ping)s, and like those stealthy graffiti artists whom we are told haunt our streets when all good citizens are tucked up safely in their proper places, add[ing] color and confusion to Money’s diagrammatic exhortations’ (188).

While *Fuckology* is clearly situated in disciplines like cultural studies and gender studies, it also makes significant contributions to a number of other fields, including history and philosophy of science, queer theory, sexuality studies, and psychology. This monograph is heavy on primary source material and is aided by numerous examples and in-depth analyses. Given that he was so highly prolific, having supposedly contributed to over two thousand publications, this is a clear intervention made by Downing, Morland, and Sullivan. Teasing apart and attempting to make sense of his contradictory and inconsistent theories on gender, sex, and sexuality is no small feat.

Dr Christine Quinan
Gender Studies

Utrecht University, The Netherlands

DOI: 10.3366/soma.2018.0257