**Their criticism of the practices of torture are rooted in the idea of queer otherness, where certain sex acts are seen to be unnatural and befitting for the sexualized Muslim to experience because of their placement outside of US citizenship Exceptionalism.**

**Puar,** Jasbir K. “Abu Ghraib: Arguing Against Exceptionalism”.

THE TORTURE OF IRAQI PRISONERS at Abu Ghraib is neither exceptional nor singular, as many people, including Donald Rumsfeld, the Bush administration, the U.S. military establishment, and some good liberals would have us believe. The opposite is shown by the prison guard backgrounds of several soldiers facing prosecution for the Iraqi prisoner situation and by the incarceration practices within the U.S. prison industrial complex or even by the brutal sodomizing of Abner Louima by New York police. Nor is it, however, possible to normalize it as "business as usual" within the torture industry. Yet, as has been made clear by public and governmental rage alike, a line has been crossed. Why that line is so demarcated as the place of "sexual torture"—specifically, violence that purports to mimic sexual acts closely associated with homosexuality such as sodomy and oral sex, as well as sadomasochistic practices of bondage, leashing, and hooding—and not as the slow starvation of millions due to U.S. sanctions against Iraq, the deaths of thousands of Iraqi civilians since the U.S. invasion in April 2003, the plundering and carnage in Falluja—is indeed a spectacular question, one this essay seeks to address. The reaction of rage misses the point: this violence is neither an exception to nor a simple extension of the violence of an imperialist occupation. Rather, the focus on purported homosexual acts obscures other forms of gendered violence and serves a broader racist and sexist, as well as homophobic, agenda.

#### The discourse of the terrorist as the monster or as difference that needs to be policed results from a larger fear and policing of sexual deviance.

**Puar and Rai 2k2** [Jasbir and Amit, Moster, assistant professor of women's studies and geography at Rutgers University and professor of cultural and literary studies at the New School University in New York City, Terrorist, Fag: the war on terrorism and the production of Docile patriots, accessed via project muse]

To begin, let us consider the monster. Why, in what way, has monstrosity come to organize the discourse on terrorism? First, we could merely glance at **the language used by the** dominant **media** in its interested depictions of Islamic militancy. So, as an article in the *New York Times* **points out, "Osama bin Laden**, according to Fox News Channel anchors, analysts and correspondents, **is 'a dirtbag,' 'a monster'** overseeing a 'web of hate.' His followers in Al Qaeda are **'terror goons.' Taliban fighters are 'diabolical' and 'henchmen.'**" [2](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT2) Or, in another Web article, we read: "It is important to realize that the Taliban does not simply tolerate the presence of bin Laden and his terrorist training camps in Afghanistan**. It is part and parcel of the same evil alliance. Al-Qa'ida and the Taliban are two different heads of the same monster**, and they share the same fanatical obsession: imposing a strict and distorted brand of Islam on all Muslims and bringing death to all who oppose him." [3](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT3) In **these invocations of terrorist-monsters an absolute morality separates good from a "shadowy evil."** [4](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT4) As if caught up in its own shadow dance with the anti-Western rhetoric of radical Islam, [5](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT5) **this discourse marks off a figure**, Osama bin Laden, or a government, the Taliban, **as the opposite of all that is just, human, and good. The terrorist-monster is pure evil and must be destroyed,** according to this view. [6](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT6) But does the monster have a mind? This begs another question: Do such figures and such representational strategies have a history? We suggest **this language of terrorist-monsters should be read by considering how the monster has been used throughout history in Western discourses of normality**. We could begin by remembering, for instance, that **the monster was one of three elements that Foucault linked to the formation of the "abnormals.**" The group of abnormals was formed out of three elements whose own formation was not exactly synchronic. 1. The human monster. An Ancient notion whose frame of reference is law. A juridical notion, then, but in the broad sense, as it referred not only to social laws but to natural laws as well; t**he monster's field of appearance is a juridico-biological domain. The figures of the half-human, half-animal being . . ., of double individualities . . ., of hermaphrodites . . . in turn represented that double violation; what makes a human monster a monster is not just its exceptionality relative to the species** **[End Page 118]** form; **it is the disturbance it brings to juridical regularities (whether it is a question of marriage laws, canons of baptism, or rules of inheritance). The human monster combines the impossible and the forbidden.** . . . 2. **The individual to be corrected**. This **is a more recent figure than the monster**. It is **the correlative** **not so much of the imperatives of the law as of training techniques with their own requirements.** The emergence of the "incorrigibles" is contemporaneous with the putting into place of disciplinary techniques during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in the army, the schools, the workshops, then, a little later, in families themselves**. The new procedures for training the body, behavior, and aptitudes open up the problem of those who escape that normativity which is no longer the sovereignty of the law.** [7](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT7) According to Foucault**, the monster can be both half an animal and a hybrid gender** (later in this text Foucault will go on to position the onanist as the third of the abnormals**). But crucially the monster is also to be differentiated from the individual to be corrected on the basis of whether power operates on it or through it.** In other words, **the absolute power that produces and quarantines the monster finds its dispersal in techniques of normalization and discipline**. What **Foucault** does, we believe, is **enable an analysis of monstrosity within a broader history of sexuality**. **This genealogy is crucial to understanding the historical and political relays, reinvestments, and resistances between the monstrous terrorist and the discourse of heteronormativity**. And that is **because monsters and abnormals have always also been sexual deviants.** **Foucault tied monstrosity to sexuality through specific analyses of the deployment of gendered bodies, the regulation of proper desires, the manipulation of domestic spaces, and the taxonomy of sexual acts such as sodomy**. As such, **the sexualized monster was that figure that called forth a form of juridical power but one that was tied to multiform apparatuses of discipline as well.** [8](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT8) We use Foucault's concept of monstrosity to elaborate what we consider to be central to the present war on terrorism: **monstrosity as a regulatory construct of modernity that imbricates not only sexuality, but also questions of culture and race**. Before we tie these practices to contemporary politics, let us note two things: First, **the monster is not merely an other; it is one category through which a multiform power operates.** As such, discourses that would mobilize monstrosity as a screen for otherness are always also involved in circuits of normalizing power as well: the monster and the person to be corrected are close cousins. Second**, if the monster is part of the West's family of abnormals, questions of race and sexuality will have always haunted its figuration**. The category of monstrosity is also an implicit index of civilizational development and cultural adaptability. **As the machines of war begin to narrow the choices and life [End Page 119]** **chances people have here in America and in decidedly more bloody ways abroad, it seems a certain grid of civilizational progress organized by such keywords as "democracy," "freedom," and "humanity" have come to superintend the figure of the monster.** We turn now to this double deployment of the discourse of monstrosity in "terrorism studies."

#### And your evidence about terrorism tries to explain terrorism in terms of oedepalization. Our k solves all of that and refuses to structure terrorist deviance as based on something implicitly linked to the family structure.

**Puar and Rai 2k2** [Jasbir and Amit, Moster, assistant professor of women's studies and geography at Rutgers University and professor of cultural and literary studies at the New School University in New York City, Terrorist, Fag: the war on terrorism and the production of Docile patriots, accessed via project muse]

Counterterrorism is a form of racial, civilizational knowledge, but now also an academic discipline that is quite explicitly tied to the exercise of state power. This knowledge, moreover, takes the psyche as its privileged site of investigation. As another article in *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* put it, “Models based on psychological concerns typically hold that 'terrorist' violence is not so much a political instrument as an end in itself; it is not contingent on rational agency but is the result of compulsion or psychopathology**. Over the years scholars of this persuasion have suggested that 'terrorists' do what they do because of** (variously and among other things**) self-destructive urges, fantasies of cleanliness**, **disturbed emotions combined with problems with authority and the Self, and inconsistent mothering. Articulate attempts at presenting wider, vaguer, and** (purportedly) **generalizable psychological interpretations of terrorism have been made by, among others,** Jerrold M. Post, who has proposed that " . . . political terrorists are driven to commit acts of violence as a consequence of psychological forces, and . . . their special psychologic is constructed to rationalize acts they are psychologically compelled to commit." We should note how white mythologies such as "inconsistent mothering" (and hence the bad family structure apparently common in the East) are presented as psychological compulsions that effectively determine and fix the mind of the terrorist. In this way, psychologists working within terrorism studies have been able to determine and taxonomize the terrorist mind. In a recent article in the journal *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, Charles L. Ruby has noted that there are two dominant frameworks in the interpretation of the terrorist "mindset": "The first camp includes theories that portray terrorism as the result of defects or disorders in one's personality structure. This first group of theories uses a broadly psychodynamic model. The second camp consists of theories that approach the phenomenon of terrorist behavior as a form of political violence perpetrated by people who do not have sufficient military resources to carry out conventional forms **[End Page 122]** of political violence." [14](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT14) The personality defect model of terrorism holds that terrorists have fundamental and pathological defects in "their personality structure, usually related to a damaged sense of self." Moreover, these defects result from "unconscious forces in the terrorist's psyche." **And, of course, the psyche is the site of a familiar family romance: "Terrorism is a reflection of unconscious feelings of hostility toward parents and . . . this feeling is an outgrowth of childhood abuse or adolescent rebellion. The terrorist's hostile focus is so great during childhood and adolescence that it continues into adulthood and becomes very narrow and extreme, ostensibly explaining the terrorist's absolutist mindset and dedication**." As a leading light in the constellation of "terrorism experts," Jerrold Post has proposed that terrorists suffer from pathological personalities that emerge from negative childhood experiences and a damaged sense of self. [15](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT15) Post argues for two terrorist personality types, depending on the specific quality of those childhood experiences. First, Post suggests, **there is the "anarchic-ideologue." This is the terrorist who has experienced serious family dysfunction and maladjustment, which lead to rebellion against parents, especially against the father.** Anarchic-ideologues fight "against the society of their parents . . . an act of dissent against parents loyal to the regime." **Second, there is the terrorist personality type known as the "nationalist-secessionist"—apparently the name indicates "a sense of loyalty to authority and rebellion against external enemies." During childhood, a terrorist of this personality type experienced a sense of compassion or loyalty toward his or her parents.** According to Post, **nationalist-secessionists have pathologically failed to differentiate between themselves and the other (parental object). Consequently, they rebel "against society for the hurt done to their parents . . . an act of loyalty to parents damaged by the regime.**" Both the anarchic-ideologue and nationalist-secessionist find "comfort in joining a terrorist group of rebels with similar experiences." [16](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT16) The personality defect model views terrorists as suffering from personality defects that result from excessively negative childhood experiences, giving the individual a poor sense of self and a resentment of authority. As Ruby notes, "Its supporters differ in whether they propose one (Kaplan), two (Post and Jones & Fong), or three (Strentz) personality types." **What all these models and theories aim to show is how an otherwise normal individual becomes a murderous terrorist, and that process time and again is tied to the failure of the normal(ized) psyche.** Indeed, **an implicit but foundational supposition structures this entire discourse: the very notion of the normal psyche, which is** in fact **part of the West's own heterosexual family romance—a narrative space that relies on the normalized,** **[End Page 123]** **even if perverse, domestic space of desire supposedly common in the West.** Terrorism, in this discourse, is a symptom of the deviant psyche, the psyche gone awry, or the failed psyche; the terrorist enters this discourse as an absolute violation. So **when Billy Collins** (the 2001 poet laureate) **asserted on National Public Radio** immediately **after September 11: "Now the U.S. has lost its virginity," he was underscoring this fraught relationship between (hetero)sexuality, normality, the nation, and the violations of terrorism**. Not surprisingly, then, coming out of this discourse, **we find that another very common way of trying to psychologize the monster-terrorist is by positing a kind of failed heterosexuality**. **So we hear often the idea that sexually frustrated Muslim men are promised the heavenly reward of sixty, sixty-seven, or sometimes even seventy virgins if they are martyred in jihad**. But As'ad Abu Khalil has argued, "In reality, **political—not sexual—frustration constitutes the most important factor in motivating young men, or women, to engage in suicidal violence. The tendency to dwell on the sexual motives of the suicide bombers belittles these sociopolitical causes**." [18](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT18) Now of course, **that is precisely what terrorism studies intends to do: to reduce complex social, historical, and political dynamics to various psychic causes rooted in childhood family dynamics.** As if the Palestinian *Intifada* or the long, brutal war in Afghanistan can be simply boiled down to bad mothering or sexual frustration! In short, **these explanatory models and frameworks function to (1) reduce complex histories of struggle, intervention, and (non)development to Western psychic models rooted in the bourgeois heterosexual family and its dynamics; (2) systematically exclude questions of political economy and the problems of cultural translation; and (3) attempt to master the fear, anxiety, and uncertainty of a form of political dissent by resorting to the banality of a taxonomy**. [19](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_text/v020/20.3puar.html#FOOT19) Our contention is that **today the knowledge and form of power that is mobilized to analyze, taxonomize, psychologize, and defeat terrorism has a genealogical connection to the West's abnormals, and specifically those premodern monsters that Western civilization had seemed to bury and lay to rest long ago**. The monsters that haunt the prose of contemporary counterterrorism emerge out of figures in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that have always been racialized, classed, and sexualized. The undesirable, the vagrant, the Gypsy, the savage, the Hottentot Venus, or the sexual depravity of the Oriental torrid zone shares a basic kinship with the terrorist-monster. As we know, in the twentieth century these disparate monsters became case studies, objects of ethnographies, and interesting psychological cases of degeneracy**. The same Western, colonial modernity that created the psyche created the racial and sexual monster. [End Page 124]** **In other words, what links the monster-terrorist to the figure of the individual to be corrected is first and foremost the racialized and deviant psyche. Isn't that why there is something terrifyingly uncanny in the terrorist-monster?** As one specifically liberal article in the Rand journal put it, **"Members of such groups are not infrequently prepared to kill and die for their struggles and, as sociologists would attest, that presupposes a sort of conviction and mindset that has become uncommon in the modern age. Thus, not only the acts of 'terrorism' but also the driving forces behind them often appear incomprehensible and frightening to outsiders.** Terrorism studies emerged as a subcategory within the social sciences in the early 1970s seeking to explain the resurgence of the seemingly inexplicable.

#### Queerness is not a struggle. Queers do not struggle; they are targeted and killed. Queers are in a constant state of war.

**The Queer Nation Manifesto,**

The Queer Nation Manifesto. “An Army of Lovers Cannot Lose”. <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/queernation.html>.

Straight people will not do this voluntarily and so they must be forced into it. Straights must be frightened into it. Terrorized into it. Fear is the most powerful motivator. No one will give us what we deserve. Rights are not given they are taken, by force if necessary. It is easier to fight when you know who your enemy is. Straight people are you enemy. They are your enemy when they don't acknowledge your invisibility and continue to live in and contribute to a culture that kills you. Every day one of us is taken by the enemy. Whether it is an AIDS death due to homophobic government inaction or a lesbian bashing in an all-night diner (in a supposedly lesbian neighborhood), we are being systematically picked off and we will continue to be wiped out unless we realize that if they take one of us they must take all of us.

#### A fluid Identity creates the transformative potential for liberation

Roland **Bleiker, 2003**. (Professor of International Relations Harvard and Cambridge, Discourse

and Human Agency, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. p. 31-32)

Recognizing the constructed and constantly shifting dimensions of being sits somewhat uneasily with many

established approaches that, in Eagleton’s words (1991, 197–198), claim that ‘a certain provisional stability of

identity is essential not only for psychical well-being but for revolutionary political agency.’ While recognizing the

need for provisional foundations to articulate critique, a feminist and discursive approach locates manifestations of human agency precisely in the fluidity of identity, in its constituted and multiple dimensions. Rather than sliding into ‘an irresponsible hymning of the virtues of schizophrenia,’ as Eagleton (1991, 198) fears, an exploration of the discursive struggles that surround the pluralistic nature of identity is the very precondition for human agency and for an adequate assessment of the processes through which its transformative potentials are unleashed.