## 1NC

### 1NC

#### A spectre is haunting America—the spectre of queerness. All of the powers of straight sexuality have entered into an erotic alliance to exorcise these desires—President and Congress, Santorum and Scalia, Democrats in Kentucky and police officers in Louisiana all find a common enemy in the queer that they can kick and bash and burn and bruise as violently as they like.

#### Queers must OPENLY, in the face of all heterosexists in the world, announce their demands, their agendas, their desires, their tastes and styles, hopes and dreams. We queers should meet the absurd fantasy of straight civil society with their own revolutionary movement committed to victory by any means necessary.

#### Our demands are endless. We want everything, and that sure as hell includes the ballot. The state hasn’t done anything for queers except keep us locked in the closet. We echo the Mary Nardini gang when they write:

(Mary Nardini gang, clandestine criminal queers from Wisconsin, “Toward the Queerest Insurrection,” available at <http://zinelibrary.info/files/QueerestImposed.pdf>)

“We’ve despaired that we could never be as well-dressed or cultured as the Fab Five. We found nothing in Brokeback Mountain. We’ve spent far too long shuffling through hall­ways with heads-hung-low. We don’t give a shit about marriage or the military. But oh we’ve had the hottest sex - everywhere - in all the ways we aren’t supposed to and the other boys at school definitely can’t know about it.

And when I was sixteen a would-be-bully pushed me and called me a faggot. I hit him in the mouth. The inter­course of my fist and his face was far sexier and more liber­ating than anything MTV ever offered our generation. With the pre-cum of desire on my lips I knew from then on that I was an anarchist.

In short, this world has never been enough for us. We say to it, “we want everything, mother­fucker, try to stop us!”

#### Living daily with queerness is an experience of profound ontological vulnerability—even when you come out of the closet you only do so partially, code-switching and trying to hide queerness from some and reveal it to others. Queerness is made the object of an interminable violence, trapped in a culture premised upon the systematic extermination of anyone who’s not a straight man.

#### This antagonistic and parasitic relation between the straight and the queer produce violent clashes, sexualizing and pathologizing identity—war, whiteness and imperialism intertwine with heterosexism and capitalism to make international military conflict the highest expressions of straight machismo. The straight state is outdated and tacky—their politics are stale—it’s time to ACT UP and BASH BACK. Again, we echo the Mary Nardini gang:

(Mary Nardini gang, clandestine criminal queers from Wisconsin, “Toward the Queerest Insurrection,” available at <http://zinelibrary.info/files/QueerestImposed.pdf>)

See, we’ve always been the other, the alien, the criminal. The story of queers in this civilization has always been the narrative of the sexual deviant, the constitutional psychopathic inferior, the traitor, the freak, the moral imbecile. We’ve been excluded at the border, from labor, from familial ties. We’ve been forced into concentration camps, into sex slavery, into prisons. The normal, the straight, the american family has always constructed itself in opposition to the queer. Straight is not queer. White is not of color. Healthy does not have HIV. Man is not woman. The discourses of heterosexuality, whiteness and capitalism reproduce themselves into a model of power. For the rest of us, there is death. In his work, Jean Genet 1 asserts that the life of a queer, is one of exile - that all of the totality of this world is constructed to marginalize and exploit us. He posits the queer as the criminal. He glorifies homosexuality 2 and criminality as the most beautiful and lovely forms of conflict with the bourgeois world. He writes of the secret worlds of rebellion and joy inhabited by criminals and queers. Quoth Genet, “Excluded by my birth and tastes from the social order, I was not aware of its diversity. Nothing in the world was irrelevant: the stars on a general’s sleeve, the stock-market quotations, the olive harvest, the style of the judiciary, the wheat exchange, flower-beds. Nothing. This order, fearful and feared, whose details were all inter-related, had a meaning: my exile.”

#### Queerness is social death by way of sexualized alienation—the institution of the closet atomizes queers and prevents the development of a critical consciousness against heterosexism. There are no institutions of civil society to which the queer can appeal—the institutional labels enforced by the mainstream movement and codified in LGBT can’t do justice to the lived oppression of the queer. Every facet of heterosexual society is contoured to the extermination of queerness—reject their ideologies of neutrality.

#### The Mary Nardini gang writes:

(Mary Nardini gang, clandestine criminal queers from Wisconsin, “Toward the Queerest Insurrection,” available at <http://zinelibrary.info/files/QueerestImposed.pdf>)

VI

A fag is bashed because his gender presentation is far too femme.

A poor transman can’t afford his life-saving hormones.

A sex worker is murdered by their client.

A genderqueer persyn is raped because ze just needed to be “fucked straight”.

Four black lesbians are sent to prison for daring to defend themselves against a straight-male attacker.1

 Cops beat us on the streets and our bodies are being destroyed by pharmaceutical companies because we can’t give them a dime. Queers experience, directly with our bodies, the violence and domination of this world. Class, Race, Gender, Sexuality, Ability; while often these interrelated and overlapping categories of oppression are lost to abstraction, queers are forced to physically understand each. We’ve had our bodies and desires stolen from us, mutilated and sold back to us as a model of living we can never embody Foucault says that “power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the processes which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies.” We experience the complexity of domination and social control amplified through heterosexuality. When police kill us, we want them dead in turn. When prisons entrap our bodies and rape us because our genders aren’t similarly contained, of course we want fire to them all. When borders are erected to construct a national identity absent of people of color and queers, we see only one solution: every nation and border reduced to rubble.

#### This social death happens through operations of normalcy, predictability, heterosexuality. It cements itself through the creation of the state, embarking out into imperialism or colonialism or capitalism, racialized corporatism, fascism merging with ableism to construct the queer body against the health straight body, the operations of sexual difference coding desire onto the body as genital sex—every operation of domination and oppression are intertwined each with the others. Their plan is not removed from these histories of atrocity; the totality of social relations reveal themselves in the 1AC’s invocation of the state as an agent of change. These queers are ready to get all kinds of disrespectful: the only question is how can we break down this totality?

#### This impact is an ontological captivity that gives way to very real physical violence. The sexualization of violence transforms queer life into a life that is near-death, into a type of life vulnerable to its own extermination. From the mythic past of Sodom and Gomorrah to the sexualized and gendered program of colonization, straight society has always captured, incarcerated and obliterated queer corporality in a ritual purgation of its own sinfulness, moralizing queer extermination as a form of social “common sense” indispensable to antiqueer straight supremacy.

Stanley 2011 (Eric, “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture,” Social Text 107 s Vol. 29, No. 2 s Summer 2011)CJQ

 “Dirty faggot!” Or simply, “Look, a Gay!”

These words launch a bottle from a passing car window, the target my awaiting body. In other moments they articulate the sterilizing glares and violent fantasies that desire, and threaten to enact, my corporal undoing. Besieged, I feel in the fleshiness of the everyday like a kind of near life or a death- in- waiting. Catastrophically, this imminent threat constitutes for the queer that which is the sign of vitality itself. What then becomes of the possibility of queer life, if queerness is produced always and only through the negativity of forced death and at the threshold of obliteration? Or as Achille Mbembe has provocatively asked, in the making of a kind of corporality that is constituted in the social as empty of meaning beyond the anonymity of bone, “But what does it mean to do violence to what is nothing?”1 In another time and place, “ ‘Dirty nigger!’ Or simply, ‘Look, a Negro!’ ” (“Sale nègre! ou simplement: Tiens, un nègre!”) opened Frantz Fanon’s chapter 5 of Black Skin, White Masks, “The Lived Experience of the Black” (“L’expérience vécue du Noir”), infamously mistranslated as “The Fact of Blackness.”2 I start with “Dirty faggot!” against a logic of flattened substitution and toward a political commitment to non- mimetic friction. After all, the racialized phenomenology of blackness under colonization that Fanon illustrates may be productive to read against and with a continuum of antiqueer violence in the United States. The scopic and the work of the visual must figure with such a reading of race, gender, and sexuality. It is argued, and rightfully so, that the instability of queerness obscures it from the epidermalization that anchors (most) bodies of color in the fields of the visual. When thinking about the difference between anti- Semitism and racism, which for Fanon was a question of the visuality of oppression, he similarly suggests, “the Jew can be unknown in his Jewishness.” 3 Here it may be useful to reread Fanon through an understanding of passing and the visual that reminds us that Jews can sometimes not be unknown in their Jewishness. Similarly I ask why antiqueer violence, more often than not, is correctly levied against queers. In other words, the productive discourse that wishes to suggest that queer bodies are no different might miss moments of signification where queer bodies do in fact signify differently. This is not to suggest that there is an always locatable, transhistorical queer body, but the fiercely flexible semiotics of queerness might help us build a way of knowing antiqueer violence that can provisionally withstand the weight of generality.4

#### Overkill is ontologically different from other types of violence: the law protects and sustains these forms of violence by treating them as criminal aberrations or as individual homophobia, failing to conceptualize the possibility that heterosexual society founds itself through a bargain bought at the price of queer life. The first question for this debate must be “what does it mean to do violence to what is nothing.” Until that question has been answered we can have no further impact calculus.

Stanley 2011 (Eric, “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture,” Social Text 107 s Vol. 29, No. 2 s Summer 2011)CJQ

Overkill is a term used to indicate such excessive violence that it pushes a body beyond death. Overkill is often determined by the postmortem removal of body parts, as with the partial decapitation in the case of Lauryn Paige and the dissection of Rashawn Brazell. The temporality of violence, the biological time when the heart stops pushing and pulling blood, yet the killing is not finished, suggests the aim is not simply the end of a specific life, but the ending of all queer life. This is the time of queer death, when the utility of violence gives way to the pleasure in the other’s mortality. If queers, along with others, approximate nothing, then the task of ending, of killing, that which is nothing must go beyond normative times of life and death. In other words, if Lauryn was dead after the first few stab wounds to the throat, then what do the remaining fifty wounds signify? The legal theory that is offered to nullify the practice of overkill often functions under the name of the trans- or gay- panic defense. Both of these defense strategies argue that the murderer became so enraged after the “discovery” of either genitalia or someone’s sexuality they were forced to protect themselves from the threat of queerness. Estanislao Martinez of Fresno, California, used the trans- panic defense and received a four- year prison sentence after admittedly stabbing J. Robles, a Latina transwoman, at least twenty times with a pair of scissors. Importantly, this defense is often used, as in the cases of Robles and Paige, after the murderer has engaged in some kind of sex with the victim. The logic of the trans- panic defense as an explanation for overkill, in its gory semiotics, offers us a way of understanding queers as the nothing of Mbembe’s query. Overkill names the technologies necessary to do away with that which is already gone. Queers then are the specters of life whose threat is so unimaginable that one is “forced,” not simply to murder, but to push them backward out of time, out of History, and into that which comes before.27 In thinking the overkill of Paige and Brazell, I return to Mbembe’s query, “But what does it mean to do violence to what is nothing?”28 This question in its elegant brutality repeats with each case I offer. By resituating this question in the positive, the “something” that is more often than not translated as the human is made to appear. Of interest here, the category of the human assumes generality, yet can only be activated through the specificity of historical and politically located intersections. To this end, the human, the “something” of this query, within the context of the liberal democracy, names rights- bearing subjects, or those who can stand as subjects before the law. The human, then, makes the nothing not only possible but necessary. Following this logic, the work of death, of the death that is already nothing, not quite human, binds the categorical (mis)recognition of humanity. The human, then, resides in the space of life and under the domain of rights, whereas the queer inhabits the place of compromised personhood and the zone of death. As perpetual and axiomatic threat to the human, the queer is the negated double of the subject of liberal democracy. Understanding the nothing as the unavoidable shadow of the human serves to counter the arguments that suggest overkill and antiqueer violence at large are a pathological break and that the severe nature of these killings signals something extreme. In contrast, overkill is precisely not outside of, but is that which constitutes liberal democracy as such. Overkill then is the proper expression to the riddle of the queer nothingness. Put another way, the spectacular material- semiotics of overkill should not be read as (only) individual pathology; these vicious acts must indict the very social worlds of which they are ambassadors. Overkill is what it means, what it must mean, to do violence to what is nothing.

#### The alternative is THE ABORTION OF REALITY, to sign your ballot for NONE OF THE ABOVE in an act of queer mutiny that throws into question heterosexual logics of reproduction and efficiency that would straightwash the violence done to queers by articulating it only as individual criminal acts. This social order has given nothing to queers that they couldn’t build on their own: use your ballot to embrace a queer reclamation of this and every other space.

Edelman 2004 (Lee, Prof. English Tufts, “No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive,” Pp. 4-5)CJQ

Rather than rejecting, with liberal discourse, this ascription of negativity to the queer, we might, as I argue, do better to consider accepting and even embracing it. Not in the hope of forging thereby some more perfect social order-such a hope, after all, would only reproduce the constraining mandate of futurism, just as any such order would equally occasion the negativity of the queer-but rather to refuse the insistence of hope itself as affirmation, which is always affirmation of an order whose refusal will register as unthinkable, irresponsible, inhumane. And the trump card of affirmation? Always the question: If not this, what? Always the demand to translate the insistence, the pulsive force of negativity into "some determinate stance or "position" whose determination would thus negate it: always the imperative to immure it in some stable and positive form. When I argue, then, that we might do well to attempt what is surely impossible-to withdraw our allegiance, however compulsory, from a reality based on the Ponzi scheme of reproductive futurism -I do not intend to propose some "good" that will thereby be assured. To the contrary, I mean to insist that nothing, and certainly not what we call the "good," can ever have any assurance at all in the order of the Symbolic. Abjuring fidelity to a futurism that's always purchased at our expense, though bound, as Symbolic subjects consigned to figure the Symbolic's undoing, to the necessary contradiction of trying to turn its intelligibility against itself, we might rather, figuratively, cast our vote for "none of the above," for the primacy of a constant no in response to the law of the Symbolic, which would echo that law's foundational act, its self-constituting negation. The structuring optimism of politics to which the order of meaning commits us, installing as it does the perpetual hope of reaching meaning through signification, is always, I would argue, a negation of this primal, constitutive, and negative act. And the various positivities produced in its wake by the logic of political hope depend on the mathematical illusion that negated negations might somehow escape, and not redouble, such negativity. My polemic thus stakes its fortunes on a truly hopeless wager: that taking the Symbolic's negativity to the very letter of the law, that attending to the persistence of something internal to reason that reason refuses, that turning the force of queerness against all subjects, however queer, can afford an access to the jouissance that at once defines and negates us. Or better: can expose the constancy, the inescapability, of such access to jouissance in the social order itself, even if that order can access its constant access to jonissance only in the process of abjecting that constancy of access onto the queer.

#### Cross apply stanly 11 from the case flow they stole it from the wiki and still has our cite signature LOL

#### Their invocation of the state at the top of the 1ac is not just rhetorically neutral. Their belief in the redemptive potential of the state proves they don’t understand anti-queerness

Rodriguez 2010 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

‘The state’ is fundamentally a conceptual term that refers to a mind-boggling array of geographic, political, and institutional relations of power and domination. It is a term of abstraction: certainly the state is ‘real’, but it is so massive and institutionally stretched that it simply cannot be understood and ‘seen’ in its totality. Thus, the way a given public comes come to comprehend the state’s realness – or more accurately, the way the state makes itself comprehensible, intelligible, and materially identifiable to ordinary people – is through its own self-narrations and institutional mobilizations. By way of example, consider the narrative and institutional dimensions of the ‘war on drugs’ during its most heightened period of political currency: New York City mayor Edward Koch, in a gesture of masculine challenge to the Reagan-era federal government, offers a prime example of such a narration in a 1986 op-ed piece published in the pages of The New York Times: I propose the following steps as a coordinated Federal response to [the war on drugs]: Use the full resources of the military for drug interdiction. The Posse Comitatus doctrine, which restricts participation of the military in civilian law enforcement, must be modified so that the military can be used for narcotics control … Enact a Federal death penalty for drug wholesalers. Life sentences, harsh fines, forfeitures of assets, billions spent on education and therapy all have failed to deter the drug wholesaler. The death penalty would. Capital punishment is an extraordinary remedy, but we are facing an extraordinary peril … Designate United States narcotics prisons. The Bureau of Prisons should designate separate facilities for drug offenders. Segregating such prisoners from others, preferably in remote locations such as the Yukon or desert areas, might motivate drug offenders to abandon their trade. Enhance the Federal agencies combating the drug problem. The Attorney General should greatly increase the number of drug enforcement agents in New York and other cities. He should direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation to devote substantial manpower against the cocaine trade and should see to it that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is capable of detecting and deporting aliens convicted of drug crimes in far better numbers than it now does. Enact the state and local narcotics control assistance act of 1986. This bill provides $750 million annually for five years to assist state and local jurisdictions increase their capacities for enforcement, corrections, education and prosecution. Rodríguez: The Terms of Engagement 163 These proposals offer no certainty for success in the fight against drugs, of course. If we are to succeed, however, it is essential that we persuade the Federal Government to recognize its responsibility to lead the way. (Koch 1986, emphasis added) Koch’s manifesto builds a mechanism of self-legitimating violence: the state (here momentarily manifest in the person of the New York City mayor) constantly tells stories about itself, facilitated by a politically willing corporate media. This storytelling – which through repetition and saturation assembles the popular ‘common sense’ of domestic warfare – is inseparable from the on-the-ground shifting, rearranging, and recommitting of resources and institutional power that we witness in the everyday mobilizations of a state waging intense, localized, militarized struggle against its declared internal enemies, structurally embodied in the nationalist animus that epidermally 3 (Fanon 1967) criminalizes black and indigenous populations and distends into localized racist state violence waged on differently racially and ethnically pathologized brown populations, from Puerto Ricans and Filipinos to Mexicans and Iranians. Consider, for example, how pronouncements like Koch’s are consistently accompanied by the operational innovation of different varieties of covert ops, urban guerilla war, and counterintelligence warfare that specifically emerge through the state’s declared domestic wars on crime/drugs/gangs/etc. (Parenti 2000) Hence, it is no coincidence that Mayor Koch’s editorial makes the stunning appeal to withdraw (‘modify’) the Posse Comitatus principle (tantamount to a call for martial law), in order to facilitate the federal government’s formal mobilization of its global war apparatus for battle in the domestic urban theater of the war on drugs.

### Pakistan

#### Drone strikes in Pakistan are inevitable because of the structures of white straight society: their policy reform does nothing to address the libidinal economy of whiteness that requires brown death as the condition for white life.

Musiol 2013 (Hanna, PhD in English Literature from Northeastern University, “Museums of Human Bodies” in *College Literature* 40.3 Summer 2013 via Project Muse on 31 July 2013)CJQ

Yet drones do not perceive and kill on their own, and although they are unmanned in the air, the ‘success’ of their missions depends on how they are piloted from the ground (Bone and Bolkcom 2003, 22). Piloting a Predator involves, among other things, first arranging human subjects on the “kill list” canvas of the world. Moreover, the physical distance between a pilot stationed at the Creech airbase in Nevada, for example, and his or her target in Afghanistan, Pakistan, or Yemen certainly virtualizes the lethal action. Yet such lethal reconnaissance can also be understood as a morbid curatorial project for human bodies, conducted as it is on a transnational scale. In other words, the enhanced visual technologies offer new and astounding possibilities for the creative destruction of those human bodies whose legibility is predetermined as “enemy” (in this case, of Western political interests). Drones are thus tools of the museum-like rearrangement of observable bodies, arranged in a planetary museum of human persons to be preserved or destroyed. Thus, the new UAV-enhanced global rearrangements of humans in fact sustain the asymmetries in global aesthetic assessment and human-rights protection processes. This is analogous to the ways in which pre-digital museum display techniques brought together and arranged disparate artifacts from around the world in order to partition its material and human heritage. Such carefully ordered exhibitions empowered Western subjects to become meaning-makers of non-Western bodies and objects a century or two earlier.

#### And, they project an abstract fear of death into the political landscape—this isolates hope in a future-to-come that never quite arrives. Embrace a queer nihilism in the face of death: object to the whole order of sovereign execution, and not merely its particular instances.

Winnubst 2006 (Shannon, Asst. Prof. Women’s Studies, “Queering Freedom,” 2006 Pp. 184)CJQ

While death is unarguably a part of the human condition, for Bataille the fear of death is a historically habituated response, one that grounds cultures of advanced capitalism and phallicized whiteness. In those frames of late modernity, death introduces an ontological scarcity into the very human condition: it represents finitude, the ultimate limit. We must distance ourselves from such threats, and we do so most often by projecting them onto sexualized, racialized, and classed bodies. But for Bataille, servility to the order of knowledge is as unnecessary as servility to the order of utility. To die humanly, he argues, is to accept “the subordination of the thing” (1988– 91, 2:219), which places us in the schema that separates our present self from the future, desired, anticipated self: “to die humanly is to have of the future being, of the one who matters most in our eyes, the senseless idea that he is not” (1988–91, 2:219). But if we are not trapped in the endless anticipation of our future self as the index of meaning in our lives, we may not be anguished by this cessation: “If we live sovereignly, the representation of death is impossible, for the present is not subject to the demands of the future” (1988–91, 2:219). To live sovereignly is not to escape death, which is ontologically impossible. But it is to refuse the fear, and subsequent attempts at disavowal, of death as the ontological condition that defines humanity. Rather than trying to transgress this ultimate limit and prohibition, the sovereign man “cannot die fleeing. He cannot let the threat of death deliver him over to the horror of a desperate yet impossible flight” (1988–91, 2:219). Living in a temporal mode in which “anticipation would dissolve into NOTHING” (1988–91, 2: 208), the sovereign man “lives and dies like an animal” (1988–91, 2:219). He lives and dies without the anxiety invoked by the forever unknown and forever encroaching anticipation of the future. As Bataille encourages us elsewhere, “Think of the voracity of animals, as against the composure of a cook” (1988–91, 2:83).

### Solvency

#### The affirmative incorrectly isolates hope for justice in the future—this produces a cacophony of futures that confound queer activism. Radical pessimism is the only queer standpoint.

Edelman and Berlant 2014 (Lee, Prof. English at Tufts and Lauren, Prof. Literature at Univ. Chicago, *Sex, or the Unbearable,* Pp. 39-40)CJQ

Fantasy tethers you to a possible world but makes you passive too, she suggests, “waiting—waiting with dread” to discover what you already know, that the shoe of realism will drop (Sedgwick 2000, 172). In one version of Eve’s project the subject of this unbearable knowledge shuttles between the paranoid rupture and the depressive position’s compulsion to repair the attachment tear that she feels too intimately. In another version, though, in the space of dread and hesitation, there is no agency-generating project, not even a welcome mat. Dread’s hesitation might be consumed in a flash, endure a long stretch, or become a state of withheld relaxation that spans an entire life’s existence. Dread gives a fundamentally queer shape to life, multiplying a cacophony of futures and attachments. This is a relational style made stark, and collective, by illness. “Dread, intense dread, both focused and diffuse . . . [was] the dominant tonality of” the first phase of aids consciousness, she writes, “for queer people, at least for those who survived” (Sedgwick 2011, 138). Dread maps out what’s weak in reparative desire; in Eve’s work, its power is in the tableau of ambivalence it produces, in contrast to shame’s familiar contrapuntal dynamic of cloaking, exposing, and desperate attaching, or paranoia’s rhythm of projection, attack, and vulnerability. Dread raises uncomfortable questions about repair, the unclarity of what repair would fix, how it would feel as process and telos, and whether it would be possible, desirable, or worth risking. As we will see, the work of dread in Eve’s oeuvre points in many directions, and indeed that is its clarifying power. Dread slices between noticing the mood made by the abrasion of loneliness and the discovery that nothing at the moment compels the drives or action toward cultivating anything, or even pretending to: this aggressive passivity is where fantasy offers consolation for living on while failing to provide a reliable cushion. A Dialogue on Love demonstrates prolifically the irreparable problem-a scene made by dread, staging the interregnum that paces, dilutes, and sometimes abandons the fantasy of repair. At one point Eve borrows Mark Seltzer’s phrase the “melodrama of uncertain agency” to describe this fantasmatic space of flailing or animated suspension (Sedgwick 2000, 157).1 The impasse not yet or perhaps never caught up in the drama of repair is neither life existentially nor life post-traumatically but existence, revealed in the stunned encounter: with the contingencies of structuring fantasy; in what one loves in one’s own incoherence; and in the bruise of significant contact, with people and with words.

## 2NC

#### The antagonism between the straight and the queer is foundational to society—the state is a political apparatus that calcifies these power relations into a transcendent entity empowered to enact violence. This apparatus is FOUNDATIONALLY violent, not merely exceptionally; the queer is vulnerable in everyday life and in every space. Straight society is a warzone where queers must each and every day struggle for their own survival. The 1NC is an act of mutiny against a social order premised on our own death that the 1AC believes can be changed through particular policy changes. This whole world is ordered toward our death.

Queer Nation 1990 (Queer Nation, originally ACT UP [AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power], was a radical, militant queer liberation group. Text taken from <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/queernation.html>, altered to resist fascist censorship).

I have friends. Some of them are straight. Year after year, I see my straight friends. I want to see them, to see how they are doing, to add newness to our long and complicated histories, to experience some continuity. Year after year I continue to realize that the facts of my life are irrelevant to them and that I am only half listened to, that I am an appendage to the doings of a greater world, a world of power and privilege, of the laws of installation, a world of exclusion. "That's not true," argue my straight friends. There is the one certainty in the politics of power: those left out of it beg for inclusion, while the insiders claim that they already are. Men do it to women, whites do it to blacks, and everyone does it to queers. The main dividing line, both conscious and unconscious, is procreation ... and that magic word --- Family. Frequently, the ones we are born into disown us when they find out who we really are, and to make matters worse, we are prevented from having our own. We are punished, insulted, cut off, and treated like seditionaries in terms of child rearing, both damned if we try and damned if we abstain. It's as if the propagation of the species is such a fragile directive that without enforcing it as if it were an agenda, humankind would melt back into the primeval ooze. I hate having to convice straight people that lesbians and gays live in a war zone, that we're surrounded by bomb blasts only we seem to hear, that our bodies and souls are heaped high, dead from fright or bashed or raped, dying of grief or disease, stripped of our personhood. I hate straight people who can't listen to queer anger without saying "hey, all straight people aren't like that. I'm straight too, you know," as if their egos don't get enough stroking or protection in this arrogant, heterosexist world. Why must we take care of them, in the midst of our just anger brought on by their fucked up society?! Why add the reassurance of "Of course, I don't mean you. You don't act that way." Let them figure out for themselves whether they deserve to be included in our anger. But of course that would mean listening to our anger, which they almost never do. They deflect it, by saying "I'm not like that" or "Now look who's generalizing" or "You'll catch more flies with honey ... " or "If you focus on the negative you just give out more power" or "you're not the only one in the world who's suffering." They say "Don't yell at me, I'm on your side" or "I think you're overreacting" or "BOY, YOU'RE BITTER." They've taught us that good queers don't get mad. They've taught us so well that we not only hide our anger from them, we hide it from each other. WE EVEN HIDE IT FROM OURSELVES. We hide it with substance abuse and suicide and overarhcieving in the hope of proving our worth. They bash us and stab us and shoot us and bomb us in ever increasing numbers and still we freak out when angry queers carry banners or signs that say BASH BACK. For the last decade they let us die in droves and still we thank President Bush for planting a fucking tree, applaud him for likening PWAs to car accident victims who refuse to wear seatbelts. LET YOURSELF BE ANGRY. Let yourself be angry that the price of our visibility is the constant threat of violence, anti- queer violence to which practically every segment of this society contributes. Let yourself feel angry that THERE IS NO PLACE IN THIS COUNTRY WHERE WE ARE SAFE, no place where we are not targeted for hatred and attack, the self-hatred, the suicide --- of the closet. The next time some straight person comes down on you for being angry, tell them that until things change, you don't need any more evidence that the world turns at your expense. You don't need to see only hetero couple grocery shopping on your TV ... You don't want any more baby pictures shoved in your face until you can have or keep your own. No more weddings, showers, anniversaries, please, unless they are our own brothers and sisters celebrating. And tell them not to dismiss you by saying "You have rights," "You have privileges," "You're overreacting," or "You have a victim's mentality." Tell them "GO AWAY FROM ME, until YOU can change." Go away and try on a world without the brave, strong queers that are its backbone, that are its guts and brains and souls. Go tell them go away until they have spent a month walking hand in hand in public with someone of the same sex. After they survive that, then you'll hear what they have to say about queer anger. Otherwise, tell them to shut up and listen.

#### This means that they are WRONG about the nature of violence. heterosexuals are empowered to HATE US and to hate us PUBLICLY. There is no anomie in the law that would make the queers vulnerable: we are already vulnerable before we even enter into a relationship with the state.

Stanley 2011 (Eric, “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture,” Social Text 107 s Vol. 29, No. 2 s Summer 2011)CJQ

If for Agamben bare life expresses a kind of stripped- down sociality or a liminal space at the cusp of death, then near life names the figuration and feeling of nonexistence, as Fanon suggests, which comes before the question of life might be posed. Near life is a kind of ontocorporal (non) sociality that necessarily throws into crisis the category of life by orientation and iteration. This might better comprehend not only the incomprehensible murders of Brazell, Paige, and Weaver, but also the terror of the dark cell inhabited by the queer survivor of the Holocaust who perished under “liberation.”33 Struggling with the phenomenology of black life under colonization, Fanon opens up critical ground for understanding a kind of near life that is made through violence to exist as nonexistence. For Fanon, violence is bound to the question of recognition (which is also the im/possibility of subjectivity) that apprehends the relationship between relentless structural violence and instances of personal attacks evidenced by the traumatic afterlives left in their wake. For Fanon, the Hegelian master/slave dialectic, as theoretical instrument for thinking about recognition, must be reconsidered through the experience of blackness in the French colonies. For Fanon, Hegel positions the terms of the dialectic (master/slave) outside history and thus does not account for the work of the psyche and the historicity of domination like racialized colonization and the epidermalization of that power. In other words, for Fanon, when the encounter is staged and the drama of negation unfolds, Hegel assumes a pure battle. Moreover, by understanding the dialectic singularly through the question of self- consciousness, Hegel, for Fanon, misrecognizes the battle as always and only for recognition. Informed by Alexandre Kojève and Jean- Paul Sartre, Fanon makes visible the absent figure of Enlightenment assumed by the Hegelian dialectic. For Fanon, colonization is not a system of recognition but a state of raw force and total war. The dialect cannot in the instance of colonization swing forward and offer the self- consciousness of its promise. According to Fanon, “For Hegel there is reciprocity; here the master laughs at the consciousness of the slave. What he wants from the slave is not recognition but work.”34 Hegel’s dialectic that, through labor, offers the possibility of self- consciousness, for the colonized is frozen in a state of domination and nonreciprocity.35 What is at stake for Fanon, which is also why this articulation is helpful for thinking near life, is not only the bodily terror of force; ontological sovereignty also falls into peril under foundational violence. This state of total war, not unlike the attacks that left Brazell, Paige, and Weaver dead, is at once from without — the everyday cultural, legal, economic practices — and at the same time from within, by a consciousness that itself has been occupied by domination. For Fanon, the white imago holds captive the ontology of the colonized. The self/Other apparatus is dismantled, thus leaving the colonized as an “object in the midst of other objects,” embodied as a “feeling of nonexistence.”36 While thinking alongside Fanon on the question of racialized difference, violence, and ontology, how might we comprehend a phenomenology of antiqueer violence expressed as “nonexistence”? It is not that we can take the specific structuring of blackness in the French colonies and assume it would function the same today, under U.S. regimes of antiqueer violence. However, if both desire and antiqueer violence are embrocated by the histories of colonization, then such a reading might help to make more capacious our understanding of antiqueer violence today as well as afford a rereading of sexuality in Fanon’s texts. Indeed, Fanon’s intervention offers a space of nonexistence, neither master nor slave, written through the vicious work of epistemic force imprisoned in the cold cell of ontological capture. This space of nonexistence, or near life, forged in the territory of inescapable violence, allows us to understand the murders of queers against the logics of aberration. This structure of antiqueer violence as irreducible antagonism crystallizes the ontocorporal, discursive, and material inscriptions that render specific bodies in specific times as the place of the nothing. The figuration of near life should be understood not as the antihuman but as that which emerges in the place of the question of humanity. In other words, this is not simply an oppositional category equally embodied by anyone or anything. This line of limitless inhabitation, phantasmatically understood outside the intersections of power, often articulated as “equality,” leads us back toward rights discourse that seeks to further extend (momentarily) the badge of personhood. The nothing, or those made to live the death of a near life, is a break whose structure is produced by, and not remedied through, legal intervention or state mobilizations. For those who are overkilled yet not quite alive, what form might redress take, if any at all?

#### Voting for the alternative is an act of total mutiny against straight society: you cannot endorse their plan if it means endorsing a social order built on the continuous sacrifice of queers. Queerness means following alternatives to heterosexism without knowing fully what promise they might contain.

Edelman 2007 (Lee, Prof. English at Tufts University, “Ever After: History, Negativity, and the Social,” South Atlantic Quarterly 106:3, Summer 2007)CJQ

As the social order’s domesticated and domesticating face, pursuing that order’s totalization—temporally and spatially both—by defining what always and everywhere affirms the self-evidence of the human, the Child, whose vulnerability conjures images of its suffering, reproaches the putative privilege for which sinthomosexuals stand accused. Though leveled by the Right and the Left alike, the accusation remains the same: the sinthomosexual (whom those on the Right might identify as anyone queer and those on the Left might construe more particularly as a white, middle-class, gay man) has the privilege of refusing the responsibilities that come with collective life, the privilege, that is, of sexual license, political disengagement, and thus, most important, the privilege of remaining indifferent to the vulnerabilities of others, who might include heterosexual children and Christian believers for the Right or persons of color and unemployed members of the working class for the Left. The sinthomosexual, on either hand, gets denounced for affirming a jouissance indulgently fixed on the self, while those who merit recognition as good, as communally minded, as properly social, address the suffering of the other for which the Child is our dominant trope. It remains the case that libidinal investment in the suffering of the other, regardless of whether its dividends come through preventing or producing that suffering, is also an investment tied to a specific knotting of jouissance. But the Child, as the image of a suffering that can never be simply a fact of the real without also becoming a figure for a cultural erotics of social reality, lets the good in their goodness deny their structuring determination by a jouissance that’s never permitted to be presented as such in their framing of what “is”—that’s never permitted to reveal, in other words, their own sinthomosexuality, though it clearly fuels the aggression with which they vituperate sinthomosexuals. That’s what sociality means, and that’s what Adorno meant as well when he insisted that “society stays alive, not despite its antagonism, but because of it.” As antagonism, as negativity, as the substance of the Real, sinthomosexuality returns us to the endlessly ramifying calamity that has always already been brought on the non-identical by identity—a calamity no Child can ever redeem, no future can reconcile. How could they when futurism and the Child alike are outposts of identity itself, repeating the very calamity they purport to overcome? We might call that calamity “aftering”: the temporal distribution of relations and identities that correlates the movement from before to after with a passage from an ignorance to a knowledge and so with the ideological conflation of historical development and genetic narrative, what Paul de Man calls “the pre-assumed concept of history as a generative process[,] . . . of history as a temporal hierarchy that resembles a parental structure in which the past is like an ancestor begetting, in a moment of unmediated presence, a future capable of repeating in its turn the same generative process.”9 The logic of this endless aftering, of course, bespeaks the persistence of something intrinsically incapable of being “aftered,” something that both resists and occasions reproductive futurism: the compulsory repetition of an “ever.” That “ever” denotes the antagonism to which Adorno directs our gaze— the antagonism at the core of the social that reflects the calamity of its self-constitution through the positing of an identity that occasions the storm of history. Like Benjamin’s Angel of History, though, the sinthomosexual looks back, not ahead, transfixed by that constant calamity, always focused on something within it that remains unrecognized and unrecognizable: the void, the sinthome, the particularity of the stubbornly non-identical, whose ironic retribution in the death drive’s negativity forever renews the will to find ourselves after negativity, after antagonism, after sex. As queer theory, like Adorno, reminds us, though, not aftering, but ever aftering, keeps society alive, which is why there isn’t, and there cannot be, queer theory “after sex.”

#### The perm is just another part of this Ponzi Scheme; existing imperialist forces will soak up radical queer energies as long as we tolerate the actions of the state. American hegemony is structurally build on the systematic but inconsistent incorporation and incarceration of queer subjects—violence is sexualized to the extent that it is hetero-sexualized.

Puar 2007 (Jaspir, Prof. Women’s and Gender Studies at Rutgers University, “Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times,” Pp. 14-15)CJQ

One mapping of the folding of homosexuals into the reproductive valorization of living-technologies of life-includes the contemporary emergence of "sexually exceptional" U.S. citizens, both heterosexual and otherwise, a formation I term "U.S. sexual exceptionalism." Exceptionalism paradoxically signals distinction from (to be unlike, dissimilar) as well as excellence (imminence, superiority), suggesting a departure from yet mastery of linear teleologies of progress. Exception refers both to particular discourses that repetitively produce the United States as an exceptional nation-state and Giorgio Agamben's theorization of the sanctioned and naturalized disregard of the limits of state juridical and political power through times of state crisis, a "state of exception" that is used to justify the extreme measures of the state.' In this project, this double play of exception speaks to Muslim and Sikh "terrorist" corporealities as well as to homosexual patriots. The "sexual torture scandal" at Abu Ghraib is an instructive example of the interplay between exception and exceptionalism whereby the deferred death of one population recedes as the securitization and valorization of the life of another population triumphs in its shadow. This double deployment of exception and exceptionalism works to turn the negative valence of torture into the positive register of the valorization of (American) life, that is, torture in the name of the maximization and optimization of life. As the U.S. nation-state produces narratives of exception through the war on terror, it must temporarily suspend its heteronormative imagined community to consolidate national sentiment and consensus through the recognition and incorporation of some, though not all or most, homosexual subjects. The fantasy of the permanence of this suspension is what drives the production of exceptionalism, a narrative that is historically and politically wedded to the formation of the u.s. nation-state. Thus, the exception and the exceptional work in tandem; the state of exception haunts the proliferation of exceptional national subjects, in a similar vein to the Derridean hauntology in which the ghosts, the absent presences, infuse ontology with a difference.

#### Their democratic agonism assumes the nature of the identities doing the recognizing—they cement existing social relations into eternal categories, locking in place the heterosexist order of domination.

Butler 2009 (Judith, Prof. Rhetoric and Comp. Lit at UC Berkeley, “Frames of War,” Pp. 138-139)CJQ

One is not only entitled to a certain status as a citizen, but this status is itself determined and revised in the course of social interaction. We might say that this dialogic form of social ontology is all well and good, but that legal recognition makes juridical subjects of us all. Although that may well be true, there are extralegal conditions for becoming a citizen, indeed, for even becoming a subject who can appear before the law. To appear before the law means that one has entered into the realm of appearance or that one is positioned to be entered there, which means that there are norms that condition and orchestrate the subject who can and does appear. The subject who is crafted to appear before the law is thus not fully determined by the law, and this extra-legal condition of legalization is implicitly (non-juridically) presupposed by law itself. We might be tempted then to resolve on formulating a new conception of the subject, one that might be termed "coalitional." But what will constitute the parts of the coalition? Shall we say that there are several subjects within a single subject, or that there are "parts" that enter into communication with one another? Both alternatives beg the question of whether the language of the subject suffices. Consider the scenario invoked by those who pursue the normative goal of tolerance: if one subject exercises tolerance toward another, or two different subjects are enjoined to exercise tolerance reciprocally, then these two subjects are considered differentiated from the start. But what accounts for that differentiation? And what if "differentiation" is precisely what must be repressed and relocated in order for the subject to appear within such a scenario? Posited within some discourses of tolerance, for instance, are two different kinds of subjects, such as "homosexuals" and "Muslims," who either do or do not tolerate each other in the spheres of public transaction and policy. As Wendy Brown has persuasively argued, tolerance is a weak instrument, often presupposing a disdain for those toward whom it is directed.4 Others favor recognition as a more robust and affirmative alternative to tolerance (less tolerant, and so more tolerant!). But recognition becomes a less than perspicacious concept when we think about how it might work in relation to such scenarios. Apart from the question of who confers recognition and what form it takes, we also have to ask what is it precisely that would be "recognized"? Is it the "homosexuality" of the gay person? Is it the religious belief of the Muslim? If our normative frameworks presuppose that these ostensibly defining features of singly determined subjects are its proper objects, then recognition becomes part of the very practice of ordering and regulating subjects according to pre-established norms. If recognition reconsolidates the "sexual subject," the "cultural subject," and the "religious subject," among others, does it make or find the subject of recognition, and is there any way of distinguishing between making and finding within the scene of recognition based on such terms? What if the very features that are "recognizable" prove to rely on a failure of recognition?

#### They construct political limits on what questions may be asked of the libidinal ecnomy—this amounts to a political neutrality bought at the expense of the queer, affirming a certain kind of heterosexual privilege which overdetermines queer activism.

Winnubst 2006 (Shannon, Asst. Prof. Women’s Studies, “Queering Freedom,” 2006 Pp. 22-23)CJQ

As the fences in my gentrifying, whitening neighborhood grow higher and higher, the political, economic, and personal functions of limits in cultures of phallicized whiteness become more and more clear. Limits constitute property and propriety. Demarcating a ‘body’ or ‘subject’ from the vagueness of backgrounds, conditions, cultures, or histories, they serve as the site of individuation. They circumvent an entity, orienting us toward the criterion of ‘wholeness,’ a primary demand of legibility in cultures of phallicized whiteness. Not unlike the rituals of urination contests among male dogs, limits mark out our territories. They ground our deep senses of ourselves as individuals, our narratives of ahistorical autonomous self-determination, and the many cultural forms of that selfdetermination. In a slightly different mode, limits also function as internal and external constraints of possibility that frame personal, social, or even economic fields. We understand ourselves, for example, as limited internally by our social and cultural backgrounds or as constrained by our financial resources. Or, externally, limits also function as thresholds that stand at the outer limit of experiences and cannot be trespassed, exercising an external authoritative restraint that expresses itself as a prohibition. For example, nations (most nations, at least) are restrained and limited by international law; or, more locally, I may simply realize that, with age encroaching, my limit is three drinks. In all of these, limits function as that which one (a social attitude, a political entity, a person) cannot or must not go beyond. They indicate thresholds of experience, forming the contours of our desire and subjectivity, whether internally or externally imposed. When framed as prohibitions, they incite our desire: death and drugs, along with sex and love, are the most commonly explored ‘limit experiences.’ Across all of these functions, a common operation is at work. From the function of limits as internal conditions of possibility or external boundaries of restraint to the demarcations of wholeness and individuation, limits constitute legibility.

#### There’s a whiteness turn in here: their democratic deliberation glorifies a transhistoricla ratonality rooted in an understanding of white masculinity as natural.

Winnubst 2006 (Shannon, Asst. Prof. Women’s Studies, “Queering Freedom,” 2006 Pp. 45)CJQ

Broad cultural structures of race and sexual difference thus surface as a complicated nexus of power relations in post-bellum practices such as miscegenation, the one-drop rule, and lynching. In these practices, the intersections of race and sex produce a confusing conflation of values that serve as smoke screens to obfuscate the protected, unmarked subject position of the white man. Values such as purity, virginity, and passivity are written on the female body as inherent qualities. In what should appear as an obvious contraposition, values such as bestiality, aggression, and uncivilized nature are written on the black body. The black female body, left in the wreckage of embodying these contradictory ‘natural’ traits, becomes a general aberration that is treated with confusion and fear. And the white male body emerges as the unmarked, normative mode of subjectivity. Or, to put this in the terms above, the white male body solidifies his position as the modern man—the rational, transcendental man in control of both nature and history. The mode of rationality that defines high modernity—namely, as instrumental, transcendental, and detached from history—expresses itself directly in the mode of subjectivity inhabited by white propertied Christian (straight) men in the post-bellum United States. It is what enables and ensures their power over nature and the social field of relations, and their subsequent freedom.

#### And, advocating for others is a massive link – they believe that they can lobby for a queer politics independent of their social locations but the 1AC presents no experiential knowledge of what is means to be a queer person.

Alcoff 1991 (Linda, Prof. Philosophy at Hunter College, “The Problem of Speaking for Others,” at http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html)CJQ

A plethora of sources have argued in this century that the neutrality of the theorizer can no longer, can never again, be sustained, even for a moment. Critical theory, discourses of empowerment, psychoanalytic theory, post-structuralism, feminist and anti-colonialist theories have all concurred on this point. Who is speaking to whom turns out to be as important for meaning and truth as what is said; in fact what is said turns out to change according to who is speaking and who is listening. Following Foucault, I will call these "rituals of speaking" to identify discursive practices of speaking or writing which involve not only the text or utterance but their position within a social space which includes the persons involved in, acting upon, and/or affected by the words. Two elements within these rituals will deserve our attention: the positionality or location of the speaker and the discursive context. We can take the latter to refer to the connections and relations of involvement between the utterance/text and other utterances and texts as well as the material practices in the relevant environment, which should not be confused with an environment spatially adjacent to the particular discursive event. Rituals of speaking are constitutive of meaning, the meaning of the words spoken as well as the meaning of the event. This claim requires us to shift the ontology of meaning from its location in a text or utterance to a larger space, a space which includes the text or utterance but which also includes the discursive context. And an important implication of this claim is that meaning must be understood as plural and shifting, since a single text can engender diverse meanings given diverse contexts. Not only what is emphasized, noticed, and how it is understood will be affected by the location of both speaker and hearer, but the truth-value or epistemic status will also be affected. For example, in many situations when a woman speaks the presumption is against her; when a man speaks he is usually taken seriously (unless his speech patterns mark him as socially inferior by dominant standards). When writers from oppressed races and nationalities have insisted that all writing is political the claim has been dismissed as foolish or grounded in ressentiment or it is simply ignored; when prestigious European philosophers say that all writing is political it is taken up as a new and original "truth" (Judith Wilson calls this "the intellectual equivalent of the `cover record'.")11 The rituals of speaking which involve the location of speaker and listeners affect whether a claim is taken as true, well-reasoned, a compelling argument, or a significant idea.

#### Straigtness is constructed around an antiqueer libidinal economy: we need our own political movements—our contemporary era of assimilation proves that straight-queer coalitions fail. They’re afraid of what a queer politics might mean for their privilege.

Berlant and Freeman 1993 (Lauren and Elizabeth, Prof. English Lit at Univ. Chicago and Prof. English at UC Davis, “Queer Nationality” in *Fear of a Queer Planet* ed. Michael Warner, 1993, Pp. 200-201)CJQ

"I Hate Straights," instead, "proceeds in terms of the unavoidable usefulness of something that is very dangerous."13 What is dangerous is rage, and the way it is deployed both to an "internal" audience of gay subjects and an "external" straight world. The broadside begins with personal statements: "I have friends. Some of them are straight. Year after year, I see my straight friends. I want to see them, to see how they are doing,... [and] [y]ear after year I continue to realize that the facts of my life are irrelevant to them and that I am only half listened to." The speaker remains unheard because straights refuse to believe that gay subjects are in exile from privilege, from ownership of a point of view that American social institutions and popular cultural practices secure: "[Ilnsiders claim that [gays] already are" included in the privileges of the straight world. But gay subjects are excluded from the privileges of procreation, of family, of the public fantasy that circulates through these institutions: indeed it seems that only the public discipline of gayness keeps civilization from "melt[ing] back into the primeval ooze." In the face of an exile caused by this arrogant heterosexual presumption of domestic space and privilege, the speaker launches into a list of proclamations headed by "I hate straights": "I" hates straights on behalf of the gay people who have to emotionally "take care" of the straights who feel guilty for their privilege; "I" hates straights for requiring the sublimation of gay rage as the price of their beneficent tolerance. "You'll catch more flies with honey," the speaker hears; "Now look who's generalizing," they say, as if the minoritized group itself had invented the "crude taxonomy" under which it labored.14 In response, the flier argues, "BASH BACK.... LET YOURSELF BE ANGRY... THAT THERE IS NO PLACE IN THIS COUNTRY WHERE WE ARE SAFE." The speaker's designation of "country" as the space of danger complexly marks the indices of social identity through which this invective circulates. "I" mentions two kinds of "we": gay and American subjects, all of whom have to "thank President Bush for planting a fucking tree" in public while thousands of PWAs die for lack of political visibility. The nation of the Bush and the tree here becomes a figure of nature that includes the malignant neglect of AIDS populations, including and especially (here) gay men. Straights ask the gay community to self-censor, because anger is not "productive": meanwhile, the administrators of straight America commit omissions of policy to assert that healthy heterosexual identity (the straight and undiseased body) is a prerequisite to citizenship of the United States. The treatise goes on to suggest that the national failure to secure justice for all citizens is experienced locally, in public spaces where physical gay-bashing takes place, and in even more intimate sites like the body: "Go tell [straights to] go away until they have spent a month walking hand in hand in public with someone of the same sex. After they survive that, then you'll hear what they have to say about queer anger. Otherwise, tell them to shut up and listen."

#### Their intersectionality turns don’t apply—any risk of a link carries a potential politics of seduction, the internalization of heterosexist desire which turns all revolutionary politics against itself.

Bersani 2010 (Leo, Prof. French at UC – Berkeley, “Is the Rectum a Grave? And other essays,” Pp. 14-15, University of Chicago Press)CJQ

The dead seriousness of the gay commitment to machismo (by which I of course don’t mean that all gays share, or share unambivalently, this commitment) means that gay men run the risk of idealizing and feeling inferior to certain representations of masculinity on the basis of which they are in fact judged and condemned. The logic of homosexual desire includes the potential for a loving identification with the gay man’s enemies. And that is a fantasy- luxury that is at once inevitable and no longer permissible. Inevitable because a sexual desire for men can’t be merely a kind of culturally neutral attraction to a Platonic Idea of the male body; the object of that desire necessarily includes a socially determined and socially pervasive definition of what it means to be a man. Arguments for the social construction of gender are by now familiar. But such arguments almost invariably have, for good political reasons, quite a different slant; they are didactically intended as demonstrations that the male and female identities proposed by a patriarchal and sexist culture are not to be taken for what they are proposed to be: ahistorical, essential, biologically determined identities. Without disagreeing with this argument, I want to make a different point, a point understandably less popular with those impatient to be freed of oppressive and degrading self- defi nitions. What I’m saying is that a gay man doesn’t run the risk of loving his oppressor only in the ways in which blacks or Jews might more or less secretly collaborate with their oppressors—that is, as a consequence of the oppression, of that subtle corruption by which a slave can come to idolize power, to agree that he should be enslaved because he is enslaved, that he should be denied power because he doesn’t have any. But blacks and Jews don’t become blacks and Jews as a result of that internalization of an oppressive mentality, whereas that internalization is in part constitutive of male homosexual desire, which, like all sexual desire, combines and confuses impulses to appropriate and to identify with the object of desire.

#### Inclusivity becomes politically devastating at the point where we care more about getting straights into the movement than making sure queers are free to revolt—their politics will reproduce capitalist domination.

Brown 2007 (Gavin, Prof. Geography at University of Leicester, “Mutinous eruptions: autonomous spaces of radical queer activism,” in Environment and Planning A 2007, Vol. 39 2685-2698)CJQ

Whilst mainstream gay rights organisations seek to assert their `normality' as the basis of equality claims, these diffuse anticapitalist queer activist networks are avowedly anti-assimilationist and sex positive. For them, the diversity of people who are attempting to live outside the confines of heteronormativity is something to be celebrated. They are not interested in claiming `equal rights' within the institutions that sustain heteronormativity. As well as critiquing current `gay rights' discourses, the group is critical of the ways in which the mainstream gay scene has become saturated by the commodity and our sexual identities exploited as just another niche marketing opportunity. In many ways, the network's critique is best encapsulated in a slogan that has crisscrossed the Atlantic over the last couple of years: ``Queer mutiny, not consumer unity!'' This critique has some parallels with Nast's (2002) assertion that some middle- class white gay men have enjoyed a certain degree of `liberation' as a result of their participation in capitalist social relations. As several commentators (Bell and Binnie, 2000; Hennessy, 2000) have opined, current gay rights discourses favour most the interests of those gay professional middle-class fractions that benefit from their position within the division of labour in postindustrial consumer capitalism.

## 1NR

#### American citizenship constructs itself originally and ontologically through the irrational and systematic exclusion of homosexual queerness. This exclusion is then eroticized—the underlying libidinal economy of heterosexuality is structured by the gratuitous violence that it can enact on the queer body.

#### Hegemony emerges as an irrational demand for power—an insistence on the part of a heterosexist unconscious to fill the gap left by the sex-o-cide enacted on the queer.

#### A kinky Uncle Sam jumps in, commanding that the lack be deployed as violent, erotic warfare—war is hetero-sexualized. This is an ONTOLOGICAL claim, not a POLITICAL claim—this irrationality comes prior to any other impact framing.

Hope 1994 (Trevor, PhD Comp. Lit at Cornell, “Melancholic Modernity: The Hom(m)osexual Symptom and the Homosocial Corpse,” in Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, Volume 6, Numbers 2+3 PP 174-198)CJQ

The fetishistic operations of the epistemology of the closet - an epistemology which maintains this sentence at the heart of all social relations- make all gestures of referentiality, even those that would propose a "symptomatic" critique of homophobia, ultimately ambivalent. This is true of the recent debates in lesbian, bisexual, and gay politics about the strategy of "outing" public figures who have, either actively or through indifference, persecuted lesbians, bisexuals, and gay men and courted heterosexual privilege and homophobic approval. The problem with such a strategy is that it implies, once again, that ultimately the responsibility for the closet- indeed the pathological core of homophobia, its symptomaticity - is to be detected within the psyches of lesbians, bisexuals, and gay men themselves, rather than in the structure of power relations that insistently maintain homosexuality within the structure of the "open secret." We might begin to unpack the dense relationship among male homosexuality, homophobia, the death drive, and the melancholic constitution of modernity in relation to the celebrated, incorporated paternal corpse by looking at one point where MacCannell's text attempts to hermeneutically uncover the insidious desire of the modernity which strives to conceal its aim. Her interpretive gesture insistently sutures the melancholic nature of this desire around the figure of male homosexuality: [While it is easier to picture the collective body as iconically a him or her, the thought is deeply repugnant to modern social forms. We find gender designations strangely inappropriate to the modern democratic collective. Mother countries and fatherlands are associated with radical political variants, and the great emblem of democracy, the United States, has settled on the "primitive " solution, the figure of the mother's brother, Uncle Sam, who can fill in for a parent without needing to be one. It is even more impolite to ask what It wants, to suggest that It desires. (10) In accordance with the etiquette of modern desire, then, MacCannell here politely confines her moment of hermeneutic re-covery to a footnote: In wartime, of course, Uncle Sam wants soldier males: his concrete response appears in First World War recruiting posters where his finger points directly at the viewer and the legend reads, "Uncle Sam wants You!" (184n3) This, then, should we be impolite enough to ask, is the bedrock of the injunction to "Enjoy!" We might, of course, see the very gesture of ostentation in this narrative as simultaneously a categorical imperative and a moment of interpellation, a subjectivation through desire. Thus, running beneath the neutrality of the collective and binding It that grounds sociality lies the suspicion (for we are dealing, here, with a hermeneutics of suspicion, a footnote hermeneutics, an obscure and agonistic epistemological re-covery whose relationship to the referential melancholies of Cartesian doubt we would do well to bear in mind) of a lingering pathology, a perversion: male homosexuality. Beneath the polite veneer of the fraternal regime, if one is indelicate enough to pursue the point, there lies an obscene homosexual desire. The corpus socians finally coheres, in wartime, in extremis (and the generalization of war, of death, is, of course, the very heart of liberal democracy's pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness) around the exquisite, because exquisitely mortal, tragically youthful corporeality of the soldier male. The American citizen is thus interpellated not only according to a gendered circuit of desire, but according to the deathly erotics of male homosexuality. "You!" (regardless of sex or, rather, through the active denial of sexual difference) are bound to the sociality of nationhood through the entrapping desire of a kinky Uncle. Furthermore, his accusatory finger and beady gaze ensure that You! are not unaware of the compulsory nature of Uncle Sam's wants: his desire holds You! and penetrates You! You! are petrified in that supervisory stare. Indeed, that petrification is your substance, your ontology, the self-consciousness of guilt your only consciousness. If You! enjoy citizenship and its attendant rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, it is precisely only insofar as You! in your petrification- your symptomaticity- have embodied, incorporated, encrypted, that fraternal Gestalt caught in the jouissance of deathly combat. It is, indeed, at the price of this morbid substitutability, this constant proximity to, embodiment of, death, that your life is purchased. The enjoyment of the soldier male's exquisite body is the enjoyment at the heart of the modern socius, but in its very onto-logic it is an enjoyment in the grip of- or at the end of the finger of- death: melancholic, masochistic, paranoid, constructed and de-structed in the shadow of the phantasm of annihilation, apprehending itself tragically, cathecting itself hypochondriacally, "desisting" at the point of the melancholic loss that is its kernel, enjoying and purchasing its "presence" only in (the anticipation of) its archaic grounding in loss: pre-siding only in the certainty that it has always already fallen, enjoying its liberty only in the knowledge of the judgment of guilt that hovers over it, desiring, at the end offinger, only where a policing gaze has already entrapped it.

#### Your reformism arguments are reasons why gay assimilation is good but that reaffies all social orders

Mattilda 2006 (Mattilda Bernstein Sycamore, self-described “gender queer, faggot, and a queen, on the trans continuum,” radical activist, writer, troublemaker, “Sweatshop-Produced Rainbow Flags and Participatory Patriarchy: Why the Gay Rights Movement Is a Sham” at <http://www.mattildabernsteinsycamore.com/gayrights_lip.html>)CJQ

A gay elite has hijacked queer struggle, and positioned their desires as everyone's needs -- the dominant signs of straight conformity have become the ultimate signs of gay success. Sure, for white gays with beach condos, country club memberships, and nice stock portfolios with a couple hedge funds that need trimming every now and then (think of Rosie O'Donnell or David Geffen), marriage might just be the last thing standing in the way of full citizenship, but what about for everyone else? Even when the "gay rights" agenda does include real issues, it does it in a way that consistently prioritizes the most privileged while fucking over everyone else. I'm using the term "gay rights," instead of the more popular term of the moment, "LGBT rights," because "LGBT" usually means gay, with lesbian in parentheses, throw out the bisexuals, and put trans on for a little window-dressing. A gay rights agenda fights for an end to discrimination in housing and employment, but not for the provision of housing or jobs; domestic partner health coverage but not universal health coverage. Or, more recently, hospital visitation and inheritance rights for married couples, but not for anyone else. Even with the most obviously "gay" issue, that of anti-queer violence, a gay rights agenda fights for tougher hate crimes legislation, instead of fighting the racism, classism, transphobia (and homophobia) intrinsic to the criminal "justice" system. Kill those criminals twice, this logic goes, and then there won't be any more violence. The violence of assimilation lies in the ways the borders are policed. For decades, there has been a tension within queer politics and cultures, between assimilationists and liberationists, conservatives and radicals. Never before, however, has the assimilationist/conservative side held such a stranglehold over popular representations of what it means to be queer. Gay marriage proponents are anxious to discard generations of queer efforts to create new ways of loving, lusting for, and caring for one another, in favor of a 1950s model of white-picket-fence, "we're-just-like-you" normalcy. The ultimate irony of gay liberation is that it has made it possible for straight people to create more fluid gender, sexual and social identities, while mainstream gay people salivate over state-sanctioned Tiffany wedding bands and participatory patriarchy. Many straight people know that marriage is outdated, tacky and oppressive -- and any queer who grew up in or around marriage should remember this well. Marriage still exists as a central site of anti-woman, anti-child and anti-queer violence, and a key institution through which the wealth and property of upper class (white) families is preserved. If gay marriage proponents wanted real progress, they'd be fighting for the abolition of marriage (duh), and universal access to the services that marriage can sometimes help procure: housing, healthcare, citizenship, tax breaks, and inheritance rights. Instead, gay marriage proponents claim that access to marriage will "solve" fundamental problems of inequality. This is not surprising, given that the gay marriage movement is run by groups like the Human Rights Campaign and the Log Cabin Republicans, who have more in common with the National Rifle Association than any sort of left agenda, queer or otherwise. These are the same gays who routinely instigate police violence against people of color, homeless people, transgender people, sex workers and other marginalized queers, in their never-ending quest to "clean up" the neighborhoods they've gentrified. Their agenda is cultural erasure, and they want the full Monty. For a long time, queers have married straight friends for citizenship or healthcare -- but this has never been enshrined as "progress." The majority of queers -- single or coupled (but not desiring marriage), monogamous or polyamorous, jobless or marginally employed -- would remain excluded from the much-touted benefits of legalized gay marriage. Furthermore, in order to access any marriage benefits, those not entirely "male" or "female" would need to accept gender tyranny. As gay marriage continues to dominate the mainstream gay agenda, resources are directed away from HIV prevention, AIDS services, drug treatment, domestic violence services, and other programs desperately needed by less privileged queers -- millions of dollars are being poured into the marriage coffin. The fight between pro-marriage and anti-marriage queers is not a disagreement between two segments of a "community," but a fight over the fundamental goals of queer struggle. Gay marriage proponents are anxious to further the media myth that there are only two sides to the gay marriage/assimilation debate: foaming-at-the mouth Christian fundamentalists who think gay marriage marks the death of Western civilization, and rabid gay assimilationists who act as if gay marriage is the best thing since Queer Eye for the Straight Girl. It is no coincidence that queers who oppose gay marriage are shut out of the picture, since it's much easier for a gay marriage proponent to win an argument with a crazed homophobe than with an anti-marriage queer. And every time some well-meaning straight leftist thinks they're being open-minded by taking the gay marriage side, they need to go back to Feminism 101. Of course, Christian fundamentalists make no distinction between diesel dykes and Diesel jeans, or, to be more direct -- they think all queers are gonna burn in hell, Tiffany or no Tiffany. (as in, "I think we're alone now...). Every time gay marriage proponents patiently explain to Fundamentalists, "One, two -- we're just like you -- three, four -- we bash queers more!" the Christian Right gains authority. But this false polarization serves gay assimilationists as well, by silencing queers who threaten the power that lies behind their sweatshop-produced nylon rainbow flags. When gay assimilationists cheerfully affirm, over and over again, to lunatics who want them dead, that of course gay identity is not a choice, because who would choose it, they unwittingly expose the tyranny of simplistic identity politics. Not only have the dominant signs of straight conformity become the central goals of the gay assimilationist movement, but assimilationists see a threat to Christian fundamentalist security as a threat to "progress." Forget about choosing our gender, sexual or social identities, forget about building community or family outside of traditional norms, forget about dismantling dominant systems of oppression -- let's just convince the Christian right to accept us on their own terms.