### 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.

#### The affirmative’s call for agonistic respect in the face of irreducible difference codes over the antagonism of straight society: queerness is made the object of interminable violence and endless exclusion. Their demand is a demand that we respect this antagonism—that queers should respect those who would tie us to fences and bash us to death.

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

Thinking violence as individual acts versus epistemic force works to support the normative and normalizing structuring of public pain. In other words, privatizing antiqueer violence is one of the ways in which the national body and its trauma are heterosexualized, or in which the relegation of antiqueer violence, not unlike violence against women, racist violence, violence against animals (none of which are mutually exclusive), casts the national stage of violence and its ways of mourning as always human, masculinist, able- bodied, white, gender- conforming, and heterosexual. For national violence to have value it must be produced through the tangled exclusion of bodies whose death is valueless. To this end, as mainstream LGBT groups clamber for dominant power through attachment of a teleological narrative of progress, they too reproduce the argument that antiqueer violence is something out of the ordinary.22 The problem of privatizing violence is not, however, simply one of the re- narration of the incidents. The law, and specifically “rights” discourse, which argues to be the safeguard of liberal democracy, is one of the other motors that works to privatize this structural violence. Rights are inscribed, at least in the symbolic, with the power to protect citizens of the nation-state from the excesses of the government and against the trespass of criminality. In paying attention to the anterior magic of the law, it is not so much, or at least not only, that some are granted rights because they are human, but that the performative granting of rights is what constitutes the promise of humanity under which some bodies are held. This is important in thinking about the murder of Brazell, and about antiqueer violence at large, because it troubles the very foundations of the notion of protection and the formative violence of the law itself. According to the juridical logic of liberal democracy, if these rights are infringed upon, the law offers remedy in the name of justice. This necessary and assumptive formal equality before the law is the precursor for a system argued to be based on justice. In other words, for the law to lay claim to something called justice, formalized equality must be a precondition. The law then is a systematic and systematizing process of substitution where the singular and the general are shuttled and replaced to inform a matrix of fictive justice. Thus for the law to uphold the fantasy of justice and disguise its punitive aspirations, antiqueer violence, like all structural violence, must be narrated as an outlaw practice and unrepresentative of culture at large. This logic then must understand acts like the murder of Brazell in the singular. Through a mathematics of mimesis the law reproduces difference as similarity. By funneling the desperate situations and multiple possibilities into a calculable trespass kneading out the contours and the excess along the way, equality appears. To acknowledge the inequality of “equality” before the law would undo the fantastical sutures that bind the U.S. legal system. In the hope of being clear, for the law to read antiqueer violence as a symptom of larger cultural forces, the punishment of the “guilty party” would only be a representation of justice. To this end, the law is made possible through the reproduction of both material and discursive formation of antiqueer, along with many other forms of violence.

#### Agonistic democracy dissolves antagonistic politics by funneling radical energy into false choices between corruption and conservatism

Žižek ‘2 Slavoj Žižek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, Welcome to the Desert of the Real, Verso, 2002, p. 78-79

So are we preaching the old lesson of how the ideological meaning of an element does not dwell in this element itself, but hinges on the way it is ‘appropriated’, articulated into a chain? Yes — with one fateful proviso: that we should summon up the courage to abandon ‘democracy’ as the Master-Signifier of this chain. Democracy is today’s main political fetish, the disavowal of basic social antagonisms: in the electoral situation, the social hierarchy is momentarily suspended, the social body is reduced to a pure multitude which can be numbered, and here the antag­onism is also suspended. A decade ago, in the State of Louisiana’s governor elections, when the only alternative to the ex-KKK David Duke was a corrupt Democrat, many cars displayed a sticker: ‘Vote for a crook — it’s important!’ In the May 2002 French presidential elections, Front National leader Jean-Marie le Pen got through to the final round against the incumbent, Jacques Chirac, who is suspected of financial impropriety. Faced with this unenviable choice, demonstrators displayed a banner reading ‘L’arnaque plutot que la haine [Swindling is better than hating]’. That is the ultimate paradox of democracy: within the existing political order, every campaign against corruption ends up being co-opted by the populist extreme Right. In Italy, the ultimate outcome of the ‘clean hands’ campaign which destroyed the old political establishment centred on Christian Democracy is Berlusconi in power; in Austria, Haider legitimized his rise to power in anti-corruption terms; even in the USA, it is accepted common wisdom that Democratic Congressmen are more cor­rupt than Republican ones. The idea of a ‘honest democracy’ is an illusion, as is the notion of the order of Law without its obscene superego supplement: what looks like a contingent dis­tortion of the democratic project is inscribed into its very notion — that is, democracy is democrassouille. The democratic political order is of its very nature susceptible to corruption. The ultimate choice is: do we accept and endorse this corruption in a spirit of realistic resigned wisdom, or can we summon up the courage to formulate a Leftist alternative to democracy in order to break the vicious cycle of democratic corruption and the Rightist campaigns to get rid of it?33

#### 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. 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 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

#### 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.

### 1NR

The state co-opts your libidinal attachments, and solves the case because anti-queerness is the rootcause of structural violence

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.

#### Queerness cannot be combined with their positive political program—queer is complete rejection of the tyranny of normalcy; recognizing the daily extermination and violence enacted against the queer and actually trying to do something about it requires that we also move away from things like the state. Any risk that any part of the plan or the rhetorical performance of the 1AC requires that a queer revolution fight against it. To quote the Mary Nardini gang:

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

Queer is not merely another identity that can be tacked onto a list of neat social categories, nor the quantitative sum of our identities. Rather, it is the quali­tative position of opposition to presentations of stability - an identity that problematizes the manageable limits of identity. Queer is a ter­ritory of tension, defined against the domi­nant narrative of white-hetero-monogamous-patriarchy, but also by an affinity with all who are marginalized, otherized and oppressed. Queer is the abnormal, the strange, the dan­gerous. Queer involves our sexuality and our gender, but so much more. It is our desire and fantasies and more still. Queer is the cohesion of everything in conflict with the heterosexual capitalist world. Queer is a total rejection of the regime of the Normal. II As queers we understand Normalcy. Normal, is the tyranny of our condition; reproduced in all of our relationships. Normalcy is violently reiterated in every minute of every day. We understand this Normalcy as the Totality. The Totality being the interconnection and overlapping of all oppression and misery. The Totality is the state. It is capitalism. It is civilization and empire. The totality is fence-post crucifixion. It is rape and murder at the hands of police. It is “Str8 Acting” and “No Fatties or Femmes”. It is Queer Eye for the Straight Guy. It is the brutal lessons taught to those who can’t achieve Normal. It is every way we’ve limited ourselves or learned to hate our bodies. We understand Normalcy all too well. III When we speak of social war, we do so because purist class analysis is not enough for us. What does a marxist economic worldview mean to a survivor of bashing? To a sex worker? To a homeless, teenage runaway? How can class analysis, alone as paradigm for a revolution, promise liberation to those of us journeying beyond our assigned genders and sexualities? The Proletariat as revolutionary subject marginalizes all whose lives don’t fit in the model of heterosexual-worker. Lenin and Marx have never fucked the ways we have. We need something a bit more thorough - something equipped to come with teeth-gnashing to all the intricacies of our misery. Simply put, we want to make ruins of domination in all of its varied and interlacing forms. This struggle inhabiting every social relationship is what we know as social war. It is both the process and the condition of a conflict with this totality. IV In the discourse of queer, we are talking about a space of struggle against this totality - against normalcy. By “queer”, we mean “social war”. And when we speak of queer as a conflict with all domination, we mean it.

#### There’s an assimilation disad to the perm; the perm overcodes queer difference within a heterosexist order by folding queer activism within a straight frame of reference—affirming the particularity of queer positionality is a prior question.

Bersani 2010 (Leo, Prof. French at UC – Berkeley, “Is the Rectum a Grave? And other essays,” Pp. 40-41, University of Chicago Press)CJQ

The psychoanalytic inquiry can be politicized in ways generally not allowed for by queer theorists. Like Eve Sedgwick, most of these thinkers feel that accounts of the origin of sexual preference and identity in individuals run counter to politically gay- affi rmative work. The trouble is that gay affirmation has become a tame affair, which is perhaps inevitable when we are that suspicious of sexual identities. Queer rhetoric, as in Butler’s definition of lesbians as people who know how homophobia operates against women, can be deliberately inflammatory, but in rejecting the sexual specificity of queerness we have become more and more inclined to define our communitarian goals in terms provided by the homophobic community. It seems at times as if we can no longer imagine anything more politically stimulating than to struggle for acceptance as good soldiers, good priests, and good parents. While I remain enough of a liberal to believe that we should defend people’s rights to serve whatever worthy or unworthy cause inspires them, I’m more excited by some glorious precedents for thinking of homosexuality as truly disruptive—as a force not limited to the modest goal of tolerance for diverse lifestyles, but perhaps even mandating the choice of an outlaw existence. That choice (which I’ll elaborate on in a moment) would be quite different from what currently passes for queer politics. Suspicious of any enforced identity, gays and lesbians play subversively—a word I’ve come to distrust, since it doesn’t seem to mean much more than engaging in naughty parodies—with normative identities, attempting, for example, to resignify the family for communities that defy the usual assumptions about what constitutes a family. These efforts can have assimilative rather than subversive consequences; having de-gayed themselves, gays melt into the very culture they like to think of themselves as undermining. Or, having “realistically” abandoned what Steven Seidman, in his essay for Fear of a Queer Planet, calls a “millenial vision” of dominations’s demise, we resign ourselves to the micropolitics of local struggles for participatory democracy and social justice—not shying away, as Seidman puts it, “from spelling out a vision of a better society in terms resonant to policy makers and activists.” We thus reveal political ambitions about as stirring as those reflected on the bumper stickers that enjoin us to “think globally and act locally.”