**Society and politics structures itself around a desired future that is never to come by injecting discussions of morals to preserve it, by centering these discussions of the future around normative stances of good and evil we ensure those who reject it are queered and marked by the state for elimination**
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Noting Winnubst’s (surely unwitting) use of perversity as a term of disparagement here is no mere quibble, but rather a symbolically important entry point into the conversation regarding queer theory’s distinct contribution to left politics, and that is its opposition to moralism(s) of all sorts. Although much attention has been paid to the specifically Childish version of the future Edelman opposes, what too often gets missed is the fact that the particular content of that future is much less problematic than **the** dogmatic **insistence on that future’s irrefutable value and worth**, an insistence that **secures its own hegemony via the exclusion, abjection, and negation of those who** deny or **defy it.** Futurism’s oppressiveness, in other words, resides in its totalizing demand that everyone worship at its altar (the altar of, as Edelman puts it in one place, the Futurch)109 and that anyone refusing refuge in its sanctuary is “whatever a social formation abjects as queer.”110 While Edelman calls this operation reproductive futurism, I think **a** broader and more useful **designation for this oppression** and its punitive effects **is moralism**. Moralism can take any number of forms, of course; in this book I have focused on specifically biopolitical versions— “savagery,” as I argued in chapter 2, and “terrorism,” which I will discuss 120 SOCIETY MUST BE DESTROYED in chapter 5. Nevertheless, insofar as **morality** is and **functions** **like** one of Foucault’s “**totalitarian discourses**” or what Nietzsche calls “the ascetic ideal,” it is a discourse of truth and sociality **that “permits no other interpretation,** no other goal; it rejects, denies, affirms, and sanctions solely from the point of view of its interpretation.”111 Not only this, but it is a regime of truth that exists primarily in order to punish. Both Nietzsche and queer theory at their best recognize that morality and its idealizations are politics and in fact serve power’s authoritarian function of condemning all those who fail to comply with its mandates. Swathed in the invisible clothes of uprightness, responsibility, dignity, and worth, both Nietzsche and queer theory recognize the emperor’s nakedness, understanding all too well that only a sheer sanctimony shrouds his imperiousness as morality. That morality unveiled, however, is better understood as **a political tool that segregates populations according to** manufactured **idealizations** **of** merit or **worth** in order **to** stigmatize, demean, ostracize, and **punish those deemed undeserving** by its measure. In Foucauldian language (and minus the emperor), morality serves the normalizing and disciplinary functions of power, stigmatizing, ostracizing, and punishing some in the name of abstract and coercive ideals such as the common good, social welfare, law and order, and the protection of children. It is this sort of moralism and functioning of morality that I read No Future as a whole to be rejecting. This aligns Edelman not simply with Nietzsche, a perhaps unlikely forebear of queer theory, but also with Gayle Rubin, an indisputable founder of the field.112 Her justly famous essay from 1985, “Thinking Sex: Notes Toward a Radical Politics of Sexuality,” is known for, among other things, a set of charts that visually map the myriad ways in which various forms of sexual activity are hierarchized and (de)valued.113 It is also known for Rubin’s indexical listing of the many obstacles that impede the construction of a radical politics of sexuality. These five obstacles are (1) sexual essentialism (the presumption that sexual desire is an innate, presocial drive); (2) sex negativity (the belief that sex is dangerous, unhealthy, destructive, or depraved); (3) the fallacy of misplaced scale (the exceptionalizing of sex to the point that it becomes burdened with “an excess of significance”);114 (4) the domino theory of sexual peril (the fear that sex must be contained or else it will leak out and spread and destroy everything); and (5) the lack of a concept of benign sexual variation (as Rubin puts it, “One of the most tenacious ideas about sex is that there is one best SOCIETY MUST BE DESTROYED 121 way to do it, and that everyone should do it that way”).115 Among other things, these five obstacles offer a useful map of the many ways in which sex and sexuality are moralized and, in calling for their elimination, Rubin effectively authorizes and demands a strictly political, nonmoral(ized) analysis of sex and sexuality. Of course, Rubin writes mostly in terms of “value,” not morality per se, noting the ways in which medical, legal, social, and religious discourses classify and rank different forms of sexuality and sexual activity. But she sees clear continuity across these different classificatory and ranking schemes, and she does at times use morality as a way of describing them. This is, in my view, the common element that gives these ranking regimes their power and coercive force. It is by now a commonplace that the seemingly more scientific or “objective” categories of pathology and neurosis are medicalizations of formerly moral categories and, as such, carry punitive and normalizing force. (Rubin suggests, for example, that the most recent edition of the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders serves as “a fairly reliable map of the current moral hierarchy of sexual activities.”)116 And whether religious, scientific, philosophical, or lesbian feminist, Rubin calls all such frameworks for ranking and classifying sex “systems of sexual judgment.”117 A central premise of the argument of “Thinking Sex,” then, is that politics and morality are mutually exclusive endeavors, and that we must refuse the moralization of sex and sexuality if it is to remain a site of contestation, interrogation, and dissent, rather than an uncovering of nature, value, or truth.118 These latter terms— nature, value, truth— are different modes of insulating otherwise contestable claims from interrogation or critique. Nietzsche has taught us that much, and further instructed that this act of insulation is simultaneously the operation of moralism, which attempts to bypass politics altogether even as it asserts its own will to power. As Judith Butler similarly pointed out in her early, embattled defense of poststructuralist feminism, the determination that a premise is beyond question because it resides in the realm of nature or truth is a quintessentially political act: “To establish a set of norms that are beyond power or force is itself a powerful and forceful conceptual practice that sublimates, disguises, and extends its own power play through recourse to tropes of normative universality.”119 In this same essay, she noted that “this movement of interrogating that ruse of authority that seeks to close itself off from contest . . . is, in my view, at the heart of any radical project.”120 122 SOCIETY MUST BE DESTROYED To follow on Butler and Rubin, then, and also borrow from Rubin’s terminology a bit, I want to suggest that queer theory’s contribution to left politics is its claim that **morality** itself can be **considered a “vector of oppression**.”121 Recognizing with Nietzsche that **all moralities** are more or less **elaborate systems of punishment and cruelty**, Edelman’s queer political theory is a critique of oppression insofar as it recognizes the operation of morality as the production of queerness and a reproductive stranglehold on the lives of everyone else. This is why, as Michael Warner observed in 1993, it cannot be determined in advance who or what queers are or what constituency they name, even as we can be sure that queerness is a radical, indeed “fundamentalist” resistance to the hegemony of the social order. As I have argued here, **queerness entails a rejection of moralism and** the moralist **pieties about survival and preservation that constitute political, social, and subjective intelligibility**. It is no accident, then, that queer theory focuses on and emerges from sexuality, itself a privileged locus of morality and moralisms of all sorts, as “Thinking Sex” aptly documents. **This emergence**, however, **is** **also** **a**n astute **recognition of the political importance of desire** and a crucial argument for the foregrounding of desire **as integral to liberation and liberatory politics**. Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, both Rubin and Edelman make the case for the seriousness, relevance, and import of political analysis of sex/uality and its importance to politics. Compare, for example, the opening of “Thinking Sex” with the opening of Edelman’s essay “Ever After.” First Rubin: The time has come to think about sex. To some, sexuality may seem to be an unimportant topic, a frivolous diversion from the more critical problems of poverty, war, disease, racism, famine, or nuclear annihilation. But it is precisely at times such as these, when we live with the possibility of unthinkable destruction, that people are likely to become dangerously crazy about sexuality. Contemporary conflicts over sexual values and erotic conduct have much in common with the religious disputes of earlier centuries. They acquire immense symbolic weight. Disputes over sexual behavior often become the vehicles for displacing social anxieties, and discharging their attendant emotional intensity. Consequently, sexuality should be treated with special respect in times of great social stress.122 SOCIETY MUST BE DESTROYED 123 And then Edelman, more than twenty years later: At a moment when violence as a first resort accentuates the fault lines of empire; at a moment when words like democratization accompany a brutal power grab that winks at torture, insists on secrecy, and trivializes civil liberties; at a moment when the poor and the powerless find their voices ventriloquized by the institutions that enforce their subordination; at that moment, which is also every moment, we’re invited to consider queer theory’s moment and to ask whether recent work in that field can be thought of as “after sex.” In so framing the question addressed by this special issue of SAQ, I have no intention of trivializing, discrediting, or dismissing it. I mean, instead, to underscore its genuine importance and to indicate what its stake is. I also want to fix a point of reference for my claim that the governing logic of the social insists on this “aftering” of “sex,” insists on the movement away from its all- consuming and unmasterable intensities and toward engagement with a world whose hold on us depends on such an “aftering.”123 While the terminology and theoretical approaches of Rubin and Edelman clearly differ, they nevertheless both insist on the importance of sex/uality to politics and refuse to abandon it, leave it behind, or somehow surpass or transcend it in order to move on to “more important” issues. Even more, both Rubin and Edelman suggest that consideration of sex/uality must be central to any interrogation of politics. What’s clear for both thinkers is that a radical politics of sexuality and a radical sexual politics depend upon not separating the two out as somehow exclusive endeavors and conclusively refusing to engage in moral judgments when it comes to both.124 For Nietzsche, moralism is a weapon of the weak, and that is how and why it is objectionable. From a queer/left perspective, however, moralism is the means by which morality is institutionalized; it is, in other words, the perpetuation of oppression. And as Cohen, Rubin, Butler, Nietzsche, and Edelman make clear, **politics is not** a **moral** enterprise. **Politics is a question of power:** who has it and who doesn’t. **It is not** a question of right and wrong or **good and evil, and only becomes so with the** oppressive **injection of morality into its sphere**, a place it resolutely does not belong (if, indeed, it belongs anywhere at all). **Moralism is both anathema to liberation and** 124 SOCIETY MUST BE DESTROYED **inapplicable as a critique of liberation struggles** that articulate themselves in terms of survival and futurity, since **the very definition of abjection is to have no future** and that status is itself the consequence of futurism’s moralizing machinations. Thus **the struggle against such elimination**, the struggle **for survival on the part of those never meant to survive**, **is** **itself** a resolutely **antimoral, antifuturist**, indeed “deathly” **and destructive** (if not nihilist and perverse) endeavor.

**Government regulated strikes don’t separate us from capitalist modes of reproduction they only seek to further entrench us by using the political as a method of virtue signaling to ensure the growth of capital while those rejecting this desired future are excluded altogether**

**Baedan 12** [baedan-journal of queer nihilism-issue one. Summer 2012. TheAnarchist Library. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan>.

The **capitalist mode of production** must **respond** **to the situation** **which throws** **its** very **future into crisis**. It will respond, in part, **by proliferating** a wide array of **alternatives** and measures (austerity, re-adjustment, sustainability) **which** might **ensure its continued viability**. For all of us implicated in the ‘interference’ between capitalism and humans, these measures will confront us as the new conditions of our own immiseration and survival. All of **the options presented** for us are **always** already **held hostage by** the specter of **reproductive futurism**. In each case **we are forced to identify** the extension of **our** own **lives** **with** the **extension of** the **capitalist social order** eternally into the future. Austerity confronts us a new ethics to be integrated into our own being if we are to ever be assured a future within this failing civilization. We will be expected to work and suffer, and to be paid solely in the assurance that the future will continue its death-like march through time. The economists and **politicians** will **offer** a plethora of **false options** **and** will **foreclose** on **the possibility of a real break**. **While** the statist **managers of capital** must globally **enforce a regime** **of** austerity and **structural re-adjustment** in order **to maintain their future** (by whatever means possible), a new social movement has emerged which figures the future another way. In the United States, the Occupy movement can be understood as a form by which anti-austerity struggles could take shape and agitate for a different future. For some within the movement, **this means** arguing for **a return to a failed** Keynesianism, a structural **investment in a future for the welfare state**. They **argue** that **they** **are** not anti-capitalist but that they are specifically **trying to ‘save capitalism’** from the fundamental contradictions which ensure its failure. Against this reformist position, **the radicals** within the Occupy movement **argue** instead **for** a **prefigurative politics**, through which activists and other radicals demonstrate that ‘another world is possible.’ This position focuses on experimenting with and perfecting forms of struggle and organization which **they imagine to be blueprints for a utopia to come**. **Prefigurative politics**, as with all politics, **invests its energy** and faith **into** the **hope that if we** only **do the hard work** now, **our efforts will be redeemed in** **a future society**. And so the dialectic of reproductive futurism continues to unfold in the context of a deepening crisis. Whether arguing for the defeated project of social democracy, the reactionary strategy of a militarized privatization and re-structuring, or the prefigurative politics of the new encampments, **each position re-asserts** the ideology of **reproductive futurism**, **which demands** a lifetime of immiseration and **sacrifice for** the possibility of **a better world for our children**. And **yet** each option **delivers** us, again and again, to **deathly repetition**. We are asked to choose between the concentration camps of a neo-fascist austerity on the one hand and the self-managed poverty of the urban occupation encampment on the other, between an emaciated means of reproduction in the home or a ‘collectivized’ means to reproduce ourselves in the plazas. **One** option expects us to sacrifice so that the economy might survive and the other so that we might be redeemed by a constantly deferred utopia. Regardless, the Camp, as central figure of contemporary reproductive ideology, is situated at the horizon, eclipsing that unspoken option which would shatter the double-bind of futurity and austerity. This **unstated option**, the one laid out by Camatte and in a different way by Edelman, is that intensity of living which would break our domestication and end our investment in civilization’s future. This intensity of enjoyment (the literal translation of jouissance from the French) must be the same jouissance which shatters our subjective enslavement to capitalist civilization. It is that exact current which permeates all of society and **delivers** to the necessity of **insurrection against all that exists** and **for a joy** which **we cannot name**. This jouissance is the resistance which is hidden by, and yet integral to every social structure. Within the spectacles of the anti-austerity demonstrations and the plaza occupations lies the unnameable remainder which does not promise a better future. It is the unassimilable and ineffable tendency for people to self-sabotage any efforts at political organization. **It is the darkness** so **feared by the right** **and** so **denied by the left**. It is **what the police** must be called on to **repress** **and** the **organizer** to **assimilate**. If **the** activist milieus and the **Left** had staked their entire future on Occupy Wall Street (OWS), it is because its represented a desperate gesture of a social order whose future is falling away. The global capitalist media has been quick to **compare and contrast** the supposedly **peaceful,** democratic **movement** of the plazas **with** the **violent irruption of the** lumpenproletarian **youth in London**. Whatseparates one body of dispossessed youth from another is specifically their disposition to the question of futurity. For the indignant occupiers, their future is something gambled away by financial institutions, to be won back through righteous struggle. For London’s riotous scum, a future is something they’ve never been promised, save for one of poverty, boredom, police violence or prison. Behind the hopeful facade that was OWS, a thousand Londons lay concealed. Our insurrectional project is the erosion of that hope and the insistence against the possibility of the future. **This** insurrection **cannot be understood as another** **event deferred to the future, but** rather **a possibility to seize life** in spite of and **against the social order**. The promise of jouissance is not to deliver a more revolutionary futurity, but an irruption of irreducible negativity. While the activists sacrifice themselves at the police lines, **the youngsters** and ne’er-do-wells smash the unguarded windows of police cruisers and help one another through the shattered plate glass doors of cafes in order help themselves to the sweets within. While the assemblies determine how to articulate reproductive futurism ‘from below,’ the jouissiuers fuck, **vandalize, expropriate, and conspire**. Flash mobs in Milwaukee and Philly, demonstrations turned to looting, churches set alight, irresponsible sexual adventures, shipments blockaded, explosions of the gender distinction, street parties turned street fights, jail escapes, boulder-traps set for police officers, infrastructural sabotage: countless **moments where the** ideologies and **structures which ensure** the self**-reproduction of the social order are destroyed at the expense of an irrational** **enjoyment**; an enjoyment fixed in the present without a care for the future. What we term the commune **is not a model for another evasive utopia**, but rather the process which intertwines these diffuse moments of pleasure, pain, and joyous attack.

**The impact is overkill - the desire for a moralistic future necessitates the creation and elimination of queerness as an ontological state - this transcends physical death b/c it attempts to erase the body from existence**

**Stanley 11** (Eric Stanley, “Near Life, Queer Death”, 2011, file:///C:/Users/ninja/Downloads/Stanley%20Article.pdf)

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**. I too quickly rehearse this argument in the hope that it might foreclose the singular reliance on the law as the ground, and rights as the technology, of safety. 23 “He was my son—my daughter. It didn’t matter which. He was a sweet kid,” Lauryn Paige’s mother, trying to reconcile at once her child’s murder and her child’s gender, stated outside an Austin, Texas, courthouse. 24 Lauryn was an eighteen-year-old transwoman who was brutally stabbed to death. According to Dixie, Lauryn’s best friend, it was a “regular night.” The two women had spent the beginning of the evening “working it” as sex workers. After Dixie and Lauryn had made about $200 each they decided to call it quits and return to Dixie’s house, where both lived. On the walk home, Gamaliel Mireles Coria and Frank Santos picked them up in their white conversion van. “Before we got into the van the very first thing I told them was that we were transsexuals,” said Dixie in an interview. 25 After a night of driving around, partying in the van, Dixie got dropped off at her house. She pleaded for Lauryn to come in with her, but Lauryn said, “Girl, let me finish him,” so the van took off with Lauryn still inside. 26 Santos was then dropped off, leaving Lauryn and Coria alone in the van. According to the autopsy report, Travis County medical examiner Dr. Roberto Bayardo cataloged at least fourteen blows to Lauryn’s head and more than sixty knife wounds to her body. The knife wounds were so deep that they almost decapitated her—a clear sign of overkill. **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 end**ing **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 intersection. 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 to embrace the death drive- queerness can never be defined by terms of being but only by disturbing the idea of meaning itself - engagement in the state was never an option, we must instead engage in a movement against the political and social order that disengages from the structures that create illusions of progress and futurity**

**Baedan 12:**

**baedan. Journal of queer nihilism issue one.** [**https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan#toc7**](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan#toc7)

**In No Future, Edelman appropriates and privileges a particular psychoanalytic concept: the death drive. In elaborating the relationship of “queer theory and the death drive” (the subtitle of No Future), he deploys the concept in order to name a force that isn’t specifically tied to queer identity. He argues that the death drive is** a constant **eruption of disorder from within the symbolic order itself.** It is **an unnameable and inarticulable tendency for any society to produce the contradictions and forces which can tear that society apart. To avoid getting trapped in Lacanian ideology, we should quickly depart from a purely psychoanalytic framework for understanding this drive. Marxism, to imagine it another way, assures us that a fundamental crisis within the capitalist mode of production guarantees that it will produce its own negation from within itself. Messianic traditions, likewise, hold fast to a faith that the messiah must emerge in the course of daily life to overthrow the horror of history. The most romantic elaborations of anarchism describe the inevitability that individuals will revolt against the banality and alienation of modern life. Cybernetic government operates on the understanding that the illusions of social peace contain a complex and unpredictable series of risks, catastrophes, contagions, events and upheavals to be managed. Each of these contains a kernel of truth, if perhaps in spite of their ideologies. The death drive names that permanent and irreducible element which has and will always produce revolt. Species being, queerness, chaos, willful revolt, the commune, rupture, the Idea, the wild, oppositional defiance disorder—we can give innumerable names to what escapes our ability to describe it. Each of these attempts to term the erratic negation intrinsic to society. Each comes close to theorizing the universal tendency that any civilization will produce its own undoing. Explosions of urban rioting, the prevalence of methods of piracy and expropriation, the hatred of work, gender dysphoria, the inexplicable rise in violent attacks against police officers, self-immolation, non-reproductive sexual practices, irrational sabotage, nihilistic hacker culture, lawless encampments which exist simply for themselves—the death drive is evidenced in** each **moment that exceeds the social order and begins to rip at its fabric. The symbolic deployment of queerness by the social order is always an attempt to identify the negativity of the death drive, to lock this chaotic potential up in the confines of this or that subjectivity. Foucault’s work is foundational to queer theory in part because of his argument that power must create and then classify antagonistic subjectivities so as to then annihilate any subversive potential within a social body. Homosexuals, gangsters, criminals, immigrants, welfare mothers, transsexuals, women, youth, terrorists, the black bloc, communists, extremists: power is always constructing and defining these antagonistic subjects which must be managed. When the smoke clears after a riot, the state and media apparatuses universally begin to locate such events within the** logic of **identity, freezing the fluidity of revolt into a** handful of **subject positions to be imprisoned, or, more sinisterly, organized. Progressivism, with its drive toward inclusion and assimilation, stakes its hope on the social viability of** these **subjects, on their ability to participate in the daily reproduction of society. In doing so, the ideology of progress functions to trap subversive potential within a particular subject, and then to solicit that subject’s self-repudiation of the danger which they’ve been constructed to represent. This move for social peace fails to eliminate the drive, because despite a whole range of determinisms, there is no subject which can solely and** perfectly **contain the potential for revolt. The simultaneous attempt at justice must also fail, because the integration of each successive subject position into normative relations necessitates the construction of the next Other to be disciplined or destroyed. Rather than a progressive project which aims to steadily eradicate an emergent chaos over time, our project, located at the threshold of Edelman’s work, bases itself upon the persistent negativity of the death drive. We choose not to establish a place for queers,** thereby **shifting the structural position of queerness to some other population. We identify with the negativity of the drive, and thereby perform a disidentification away from any identity** to be represented **or which can beg for rights. Following Edelman further: To figure the undoing of civil society, the death drive of the dominant order, is neither to be nor to become that drive; such a being is not the point. Rather, acceding to that figural position means recognizing and refusing the consequences of grounding reality in denial of that drive. As the death drive dissolves those congealments of identity that permit us to know and survive as ourselves, so the queer must insist on disturbing, on queering, social organization as such—on disturbing, and therefore on queering ourselves and our investment in such organization. For queerness** **can never define** an **identity**; it **can only ever disturb one. And so, when I argue, as I aim to do here, that the burden of queerness is to be located less in the assertion of an oppositional political identity than in opposition to politics as the governing fantasy of realizing identities, I am proposing no platform or position from which queer sexuality or any queer subject might finally and truly become itself, as if it could somehow manage thereby to achieve an essential queerness. I am suggesting instead that the efficacy of queerness, its real strategic value, lies in its resistance to a symbolic reality** that only ever invests us as subjects insofar as we invest ourselves in it, clinging to its governing fictions, **its persistent sublimations, as reality itself. This negative queerness severs us from any simple understanding of ourselves. More so, it severs us from any formulaic or easily-represented notions of what we need, what we desire, or what is to be done. Our queerness does not imagine a coherent self, and thus cannot agitate for any selves to find their place within civilization. The only queerness that queer sexuality could ever** hope to **achieve** would **exist in a total refusal of attempts at the symbolic integration of our sexuality into governing and market structures. This refusal of representation forecloses on any hope that we ever have in identity politics or positive identity projects. We decline the progressive faith in the ability for our bodies to be figured into the symbolic order. We decline the liberal assurance that everything will turn out right, if we just have**

**The role of the judge is to evaluate questions of ontology first, Questions of being are pre-req to questions of implementation ie. if we win a link or society can’t get better for queer folk that should be sufficient to vote negative there are a few reasons to prefer embed in the cards above**

1. **Queer Overkill Outweighs - It occurs at the very level of being that tries to eliminate queerness as an identity, this functions more violently than extionion or structural violence and is obscured through other framings - that’s stanley**
2. **Sequencing - Injections of moralistic futures cause policy freeze because we only ever debate what’s good and evil between the sides, this means there framing fails to create change and only creates hollow hope - That’s Schotten**
3. **Any counter Roll of the Ballots are inherently violent because they create hegemonic interpretations of how debate ought to be that exclude queerness for a “more productive” debate**