### 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.

#### Queer must not OPENLY declare war on heterosexism: the debate community has been engaged in extremely valuable discussion of antiblackness within the debate space but has not yet interrogated the anti-queer demands of the debate space.

#### Our demands are endless. We want everything, and that sure as hell includes the ballot. Society hasn’t given anything to queers that we couldn’t build on our own. 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!”

#### Debate expresses and reifies the antiqueerness of society at-large: speaker points award a masculine form of speech, forcing queers to embody a masculine self-presentation or risk a minor extermination in the form of the ballot loss.

#### This antagonistic and parasitic relation between heterofascism and queerness is profoundly violent, 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.

#### 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, heteronormativity. 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, erasing queer/trans persons even as it strives to make possible their inclusion—every operation of domination and oppression is intertwined with all the others. Their plan is not removed from these histories of atrocity and reifies the overdetermination of queerness beneath other forms of oppression. We 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. Straight society has always captured 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

#### And, antiqueerness produces an idealized straight-male machismo that metastasizes into militaristic expansionary policies: failure to account for the homo-social hetero-patriarchy that grounds American exceptionalism ensures a return of antiqueer warfare.

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 lindifference, 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

#### 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.

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.

### 2NC

#### Queerness is not solely a white category of identification—it intersects with other forms of domination. They have conceded our queer social death thesis which means that we experience violence as a form of structural antagonism.

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

Indeed, not all who might identify under the name queer experience¶ the same relationship to violence. For sure, the overwhelming numbers of¶ trans/queer people who are murdered in the United States are of color.5¶ Similarly, trans/gender nonconforming people, people living with HIV/¶ AIDS and/or other ability issues, undocumented and imprisoned trans/¶ queer people, sex workers, and working- class queers, among others, experience¶ a disproportionate amount of structural violence. In turn, this structural¶ violence more often than not predisposes them to a greater amount¶ of interpersonal violence. Yet many lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender¶ (LGBT) folks in the United States who have access to normative power¶ may in their daily lives know very little about either structural or personal¶ violence. The long history and magnified present of gay assimilation illustrates¶ these varying degrees of possibility and power available to some at¶ the expense of others. In contrast, I am marking queer as the horizon where¶ identity crumbles and vitality is worked otherwise. To this end, queer might¶ be a productive placeholder to name a nonidentity where force is made to¶ live. This is not to suggest that the negativity of queer and methodologies of violence define the end of queer worlding or that the parameters of opposition¶ are sedimented as such.6 On the contrary, the very fact that queers do¶ endure is evidence, as Fred Moten has beautifully argued about the history¶ of blackness in relation to slavery, that “objects can and do resist.”

#### Whiteness is made possible in part because of heterosexism – their anti-intersectional politics can’t account for the ways race is eroticized by white society. These two forms of domination are not identical but whiteness cannot be discussed in isolation from heterosexual domination.

Yep 03 (Gust A., Ph.D., Professor of Communication Studies at San Francisco State University, “The Violence of Heteronormativity in Communication Studies: Notes on Injury, Healing, and Queer World-Making”, Journal of Homosexuality 45:2-4, pp. 11-59. Project Muse. //tjs)

*Heterosexuality and Whiteness*. It is apparent that an examination of heterosexuality produces parallel and analogous findings to investigation of whiteness. I am using whiteness to refer to a “historical systemic structural race-based superiority” (Wander,Martin,&Nakayama,1999,p.15) which produces a racial subject that is “privileged, normalized, deified, and raceless”(Johnson, 1999, p. 1). Both heterosexuality and whiteness are everywhere and strategically invisible, universalized, naturalized, and taken for granted, seemingly formless, shapeless, and without content, and normalized to evade theoretical scrutiny and critical analysis. Heterosexuality and whiteness appear as the very air we breathe, “the stuff that creates us with no reminder *hatit is doing* *so*” (Stokes, 2001, p. 14, my emphasis), thus underscoring their normalizing and self-generating power. Observing the similarities between heterosexuality and whiteness, Smart (1996a) points out that heterosexual identity is “akin to a white colonial identity. It entails an effortless superiority, a moral rectitude, a defeat of the emotional and the neurotic by the power of unconscious struggle and, of course, the certain knowledge of masculine superiority” (p. 173). However, a closer examination of heterosexuality and whiteness reveals that the relationship is deeply ambivalent and eminently troubled: Heterosexuality is simultaneously the means of ensuring and the site of endangering the reproduction and perpetuation of whiteness (Dyer, 1997; Stokes, 2001). On the one hand, heterosexuality is absolutely indispensable for the reproduction of whiteness; on the other, it is also the mechanism through which whiteness can annihilate itself (Dyer,1997). In this sense, heterosexuality makes there production of whiteness unstable. Such an unstable mixture of excitement and horror results in a compulsive imagining of interracial sex (Ferber, 1998; Stokes, 2001; Young, 1995). In the process, white women become silent markers in the systems of exchange that make both whiteness and heterosexuality cultural givens. Simultaneously imagined as the key to whiteness’s future and its weakest defense, white women enable whiteness at the same time that they are denied its fruits. They make it possible, yet are kept from the fullness of its franchise, given their status as women in the always patriarchal shape that whiteness assumes. (Stokes, 2001, p. 17) Once again, gender becomes inextricably linked to sexuality in the ongoing tension and struggle between heterosexuality and whiteness to reproduce and sustain a white heteropatriarchy – a self evident standard against which all differences are measured.

### 1NR

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.