#### Welcome to Pharmacoporngraphic Biocapitalism, where contemporary production is not the production of “things” but the production of “ideas”, oscillating between the reinforcing force of the Pharmaceutical industry and Pornography, in which IP protections legitimize the sovereign authority to control subjectivities.

**Preciado 13( Paul B. Preciado, Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, And Biopolitics in the Pharmacoporgraphic era, The Pharmacoporngraphic Industry, pg 51-54)Lynbrook SY**

exCiTe and COnTrOl The gradual transformation of sexual cooperation into a principal productive force cannot be accomplished without the technical control of reproduction. There’s no porn with- out the Pill or without Viagra. Inversely, there is no Viagra or Pill without porn. The new kind of sexual production implies a detailed and strict control of the forces of repro- duction of the species. There is no pornography without a parallel surveillance and control of the body’s affects and fluids. Acting on this pharmacoporno body are the forces of the reproduction industry, entailing control of the pro- duction of eggs, techniques of programming relationships, straw collections of sperm, in vitro fertilization, artificial insemination, the monitoring of pregnancy, the technical planning of childbirth, and so on. Consequently, the sexual division of traditional work gradually disintegrates. Phar- macopornographic capitalism is ushering in a new era in which the most interesting kind of commerce is the pro- duction of the species as species, the production of its mind and its body, its desires and its affects. Contemporary biocapitalism at the same time produces and destroys the species. Although we’re accustomed to speaking of a soci- ety of consumption, the objects of consumption are only the scintilla of a psychotoxic virtual production. We are consumers of air, dreams, identity, relation, things of the mind. This pharmacopornographic capitalism functions in reality thanks to the biomediatic management of subjectiv- ity, through molecular control and the production of virtual audiovisual connections. ***The Pharmacopornographic era* 51 52 *The Pharmacopornographic era*** The pharmaceutical and audiovisual digital industry are the two pillars on which contemporary (of) biocapitalism relies; they are the two tentacles of a gigantic, viscous built- in circuit. The pharmacoporno program of the second half of the twentieth century is this: control the sexuality of those bodies codified as woman and cause the ejaculation of those bodies codified as men(The Pill, Prozac, and Viagra are to the pharmaceutical industry what pornography, with its grammar of blowjobs, penetrations, and cum shots, is to the industry of culture: the jackpot of postindustrial biocapitalism. Within the context of biocapitalism, an illness is the con- clusion of a medical and pharmaceutical model, the result of a technical and institutional medium that is capable of explaining it discursively, of realizing it and of treating it in a manner that is more or less operational. From a pharma- copornopolitical point of view, a third of the African popu- lation infected with HIV *isn’t really sick*. The thousands of seropositive people who die each day on the continent of Africa are precarious bodies whose survival has *not yet* been capitalized as bioconsumers/producers by the Western pharmaceutical industry. For the pharmacopornographic system, these bodies are *neither* dead *nor* living. They are in a prepharmacopornographic state or their life isn’t likely to produce an ejaculatory benefitwhich amounts to the same thing. They are bodies excluded from the technobio- political regime. The emerging pharmaceutical industries of India, Brazil, or Thailand are fiercely fighting for the right to distribute their antiretrovirus therapies. Similarly, if we are still waiting for the commercialization of a vaccine for malaria (a disease that was causing five million deaths a year on the continent of Africa), it is partly because the coun- tries that need it can’t pay for it. The same Western multi- national companies that are launching costly programs for the production of Viagra or new treatments for prostate cancer would never invest in malaria. If we do not take into account calculations about pharmacopornographic profit- ability, it becomes obvious that erectile dysfunction and prostate cancer are not at all priorities in countries where life expectancies for human bodies stricken by tuberculosis, malaria, and AIDS don’t exceed the age of fifty-five.43 In the context of pharmacopornographic capitalism, sexual desire and illness are produced and cultivated on the same basis: without the technical, pharmaceutical, and mediatic supports capable of materializing them, they don’t exist. We are living in a toxopornographic era. The postmodern body is becoming collectively desirable through its pharma- cological management and audiovisual advancement: two sectors in which the United States holds—for the moment but, perhaps not for long—worldwide hegemony. These two forces for the creation of capital are dependent not on an economy of production, but on an *economy of invention*. As Philippe Pignare has pointed out, “The pharmaceutical industry is one of the economic sectors where the cost of research and development is very high, whereas the manu- facturing costs are extremely low. Unlike in the automobile industry, nothing is easier than reproducing a drug and 43. Michael Kremer and Christopher M. Snyder, “Why Is There No AIDS Vaccine?” (Research Paper, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, June 2006). ***The Pharmacopornographic era* 53 54 *The Pharmacopornographic era*** guaranteeing its chemical synthesis on a massive scale, but nothing is more difficult or more costly than inventing it.”44 In the same way, nothing costs less, materially speaking, than filming a blowjob or vaginal or anal penetration with a video camera. Drugs, like orgasms and books, are relatively easy and inexpensive to fabricate. The difficulty resides in their conception and political dissemination.45 Pharma- copornographic biocapitalism does not produce things. It produces movable ideas, living organs, symbols, desires, chemical reactions, and affects. In the fields of biotechnol- ogy and pornocommunication, there are no objects to pro- duce; it’s a matter of *inventing* a subject and producing it on a global scale. pg332 While queer theorists formulated gender performa- tivity and queer activists resisted the disciplinary side effects of gay and lesbian identity politics, activists in ACT UP invented the first strategies of what, in the context of neoliberalism, could already be called “anti-pharmacopor- nographic activism”: fighting AIDS became fighting the biopolitical and cultural apparatuses of the production of the AIDS syndrome—which include biomedical models, advertising campaigns, governmental and nongovernmen- tal health organizations, genome-sequencing programs, pharmacological industries, intellectual property, bio pat- ents, trademarks, definitions of risk groups, clinical assays and protocols.

#### Potentia Gaudendi, the post-industrial mode of work, where the body is made bare and naked, in order to make it vulnerable for the production of the techno body and it’s oppression.

**Preciado 13( Paul B. Preciado, Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, And Biopolitics in the Pharmacoporgraphic era, The Pharmacoporngraphic Industry, pg 41-51)Lynbrook SY**

Potentia Gaudendi To understand how and why sexuality and the body, the excitable body, at the end of the nineteenth century raided the heart of political action and became the objects of a minute governmental and industrial management, we must first elaborate a new philosophical concept in the pharmacopornographic domain that is equivalent to the force of work in the domain of classical economics. I call *potentia gaudendi*, or “orgasmic force,” the (real or virtual) strength of a body’s (total) excitation.33 This strength is of indeterminate capacity; it has no gender; it is neither male nor female, neither human nor animal, neither animated nor inanimate. Its orientation emphasizes neither the fem- 32. For an elaboration of this idea, see Rem Koolhaas, “Junkspace,” *October* 100 (Spring, 2002): 175–90. 33. My work here begins with the notion of “power of action or force of existing” elaborated by Spinoza and derived from the Greek idea of *dynamis* and its correlations in scholastic metaphysics; cf. Baruch Spinoza, *Éthique*, trans. Bernard Pautrat (Paris: Le Seuil, 1988); Gilles Deleuze, “Spinoza” (lecture, Université de Vincennes à Saint Denis, Université Paris 8, Paris, February 2, 1980). ***The Pharmacopornographic era* 41 42 *The Pharmacopornographic era*** inine nor the masculine and creates no boundary between heterosexuality and homosexuality or between object and subject; neither does it know the difference between being excited, being exciting, or being-excited-with. It favors no organ over any other, so that the penis possesses no more orgasmic force than the vagina, the eye, or the toe. Orgasmic force is the sum of the potential for excitation inherent in every material molecule. Orgasmic force is not seeking any immediate resolution, and it aspires only to its own extension in space and time, toward everything and everyone, in every place and at every moment. It is a force of transformation for the world in pleasure—“in pleasure with.” *Potentia gaudendi* unites all material, somatic, and psychic forces and seeks all biochemical resources and all the structures of the mind. In pharmacopornographic capitalism, the force of work reveals its actual substratum: orgasmic force, or *potentia gaudendi*. Current capitalism tries to put to work the *poten- tia gaudendi* in whatever form in which it exists, whether this be in its pharmacological form (a consumable molecule and material agency that will operate within the body of the person who is digesting it), as a pornographic repre- sentation (a semiotechnical sign that can be converted into numeric data or transferred into digital, televisual, or telephonic media), or as a sexual service (a live pharmaco- pornographic entity whose orgasmic force and emotional volume are put in service to a consumer during a specified time, according to a more or less formal contract of sale of sexual services). *Potentia gaudendi* is characterized not only by its imper- manence and great malleability, but also and above all by the impossibility of possessing and retaining it. *Potentia gaudendi*, as the fundamental energetics of pharmacoporn- ism, does not allow itself to be reified or transformed into private property. I can neither possess nor retain another’s *potentia gaudendi*, but neither can one possess or retain what seems to be one’s own. *Potentia gaudendi* exists exclu- sively as an event, a relation, a practice, or an evolutionary process. Orgasmic force is both the most abstract and the most material of all workforces. It is inextricably carnal and digital, viscous yet representational by numerical values, a phantasmatic or molecular wonder that can be transformed into capital. The living pansexual body is the *bioport* of the orgasmic force. Thus, it cannot be reduced to a prediscursive organ- ism; its limits do not coincide with the skin capsule that surrounds it. This life cannot be understood as a biologi- cal given; it does not exist outside the interlacing of pro- duction and culture that belongs to technoscience. This body is a technoliving, multiconnected entity incorporat- ing technology.34 Neither an organism nor a machine, but “the fluid, dispersed, networking techno-organic-textual- mythic system.”35 This new condition of the body blurs the traditional modern distinction between art, performance, 34. Haraway, *Modest\_Witness*. 35. Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 219. \* ***The Pharmacopornographic era* 43 44 *The Pharmacopornographic era*** media, design, and architecture. The new pharmacological and surgical techniques set in motion tectonic construction processes that combine figurative representations derived from cinema and from architecture (editing, 3-D modeling, 3-D printing, etc.), according to which the organs, the ves- sels, the fluids (techno-blood, techno-sperm, etc.), and the molecules are converted into the prime material from which our pharmacopornographic corporality is manufactured. Technobodies are either not-yet-alive or already-dead(we are half fetuses, half zombies. Thus, every politics of resis- tance is a monster politics. Marshall McLuhan, Buckminster Fuller, and Norbert Wiener had an intuition about it in the 1950s: the technologies of communication function like an extension of the body. Today, the situation seems a lot more complex—the individual body functions like an extension of global technologies of communication. “Embodiment is significant prosthesis.”36 To borrow the terms of the Ameri- can feminist Donna J. Haraway, the twenty-first-century body is a technoliving system, the result of an irrevers- ible implosion of modern binaries (female/male, animal/ human, nature/culture). Even the term *life* has become archaic for identifying the actors in this new technology. For Foucault’s notion of “biopower,” Donna J. Haraway has substituted “techno-biopower.” It’s no longer a question of power over life, of the power to manage and maximize life, as Foucault wanted, but of power and control exerted over a technoliving and connected whole.37 36. Ibid., 195. 37. Ibid., 204–30. In the circuit in which excitation is technoproduced, there are neither living bodies nor dead bodies, but present or missing, actual or virtual connectors. Images, viruses, computer programs, techno-organic fluids, Net surfers, electronic voices that answer phone sex lines, drugs and living dead animals in the laboratory on which they are tested, frozen embryos, mother cells, active alkaloid mol- ecules . . . display no value in the current global economy as being “alive” or “dead,” but only to the extent that they can or can’t be integrated into a bioelectronics of global excitation. Haraway reminds us that “cyborg figures—such as the end-of-the-millennium seed, chip gene, database, bomb, fetus, race, brain, and ecosystem—are the offspring of implosions of subjects and objects and of the natural and artificial.”38 Every technobody, including a dead techno- body, can unleash orgasmic force, thus becoming a carrier of the power of production of sexual capital. The force that lets itself be converted into capital lies neither in *bios* nor in *soma*, in the way that they have been conceived from Aristo- tle to Darwin, but in *techno-eros*, the technoliving enchanted body and its *potentia gaudendi*. And from this it follows that biopolitics (the politics of the control and production of life) as well as necropolitics (the politics of the control and production of death) function as pharmacoporno politics, as planetary managements of *potentia gaudendi*. Sex, the so-called sexual organs, pleasure and impo- tence, joy and horror are moved to the center of technopo- litical management as soon as the possibility of drawing 38. Haraway, *Modest\_Witness*, 12. ***The Pharmacopornographic era* 45 46 *The Pharmacopornographic era*** profit from orgasmic force comes into play. If the theorists of post-Fordism were interested in immaterial work, in cognitive work, in “non-objectifiable work,”39 in “affective work,”40 we theorists of pharmacopornographic capitalism are interested in sexual work as a process of subjectiviza- tion, in the possibility of making the subject an inexhaust- ible supply of planetary ejaculation that can be transformed into abstraction and digital data—into capital. This theory of “orgasmic force” should not be read through a Hegelian paranoid or Rousseauist utopian/dys- topian prism; the market isn’t an outside power coming to expropriate, repress, or control the sexual instincts of the individual. On the other hand, we are being confronted by the most depraved of political situations: the body isn’t aware of its *potentia gaudendi* as long as it does not put it to work. Orgasmic force in its role as the workforce finds itself progressively regulated by a strict technobiopolitical con- trol. The sexual body is the product of a sexual division of flesh according to which each organ is defined by its func- tion. A sexuality always implies a precise governing of the mouth, hand, anus, vagina. Until recently, the relation- ship between buying/selling and dependence that united the capitalist to the worker also governed the relationship between the genders, which was conceived as a relation- ship between the ejaculator and the facilitator of ejacula- tion. Femininity, far from being nature, is the quality of the 39. Paolo Virno, “La multitude comme subjectivite,” in *Grammaire de la multitude: pour une analyse des formes de vie contemporaines* (Paris: Éditions de l’éclat, 2002), 78–121. 40. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitudes*, 134. orgasmic force when it can be converted into merchandise, into an object of economic exchange, into work. Obviously, a male body can occupy (and in fact already does occupy) a position of female gender in the market of sex work and, as a result, see its orgasmic power reduced to a capacity for work. The control of orgasmic power (*puissance*) not only defines the difference between genders, the female/male dichotomy, it also governs, in a more general way, the technobiopolitical difference between heterosexuality and homosexuality. The technical restriction of masturbation and the invention of homosexuality as a pathology are of a pair with the composition of a disciplinary regime at the heart of which the collective orgasmic force is put to work as a function of the heterosexual reproduction of the spe- cies. Heterosexuality must be understood as a politically assisted procreation technology. But after the 1940s, the moleculized sexual body was introduced into the machin- ery of capital and forced to mutate its forms of production. Biopolitical conditions change drastically when it becomes possible to derive benefits from masturbation through the mechanism of pornography and the employment of tech- niques for the control of sexual reproduction by means of contraceptives and artificial insemination. If we agree with Marx that “workforce is not actual work carried out but the simple potential or ability for work,” then it must be said that every human or animal, real or virtual, female or male body possesses this mastur- batory potentiality, a *potentia gaudendi*, the power to pro- duce molecular joy, and therefore also possesses productive ***The Pharmacopornographic era* 47 48 *The Pharmacopornographic era*** power without being consumed and depleted in the pro- cess. Until now, we’ve been aware of the direct relation- ship between the pornification of the body and the level of oppression. Throughout history, the most pornified bodies have been those of non-human animals, women and chil- dren, the racialized bodies of the slave, the bodies of young workers and the homosexual body. But there is no ontologi- cal relationship between anatomy and *potentia gaudendi*. The credit goes to the French writer Michel Houellebecq for having understood how to build a dystopian fable about this new capacity of global capitalism, which has manufac- tured the megaslut and the megaletch. The new hegemonic subject is a body (often codified as male, white, and het- erosexual) supplemented pharmacopornographically (by Viagra, coke, pornography) and a consumer of pauperized sexual services (often in bodies codified as female, childlike, or racialized): “When he can, a westerner *works*; he often finds his work frustrating or boring, but he pretends to find it inter- esting: this much is obvious. At the age of fifty, weary of teaching, of math, of everything, I decided to see the world. I had just been divorced for the third time; as far as sex was concerned, I wasn’t expecting much. My first trip was to Thailand, and immediately after that I left for Madagascar. I haven’t fucked a white woman since. I’ve never even felt the desire to do so. Believe me,” he added, placing a firm hand on Lionel’s forearm, “you won’t find a white woman with a soft, submissive, supple, muscular pussy anymore. That’s all gone now.”41 41. Michel Houellebecq, *Platform*, trans. Frank Wynne (New York: Random House, 2002), 80. Power is located not only in the (“female,” “childlike,” or “nonwhite”) body as a space traditionally imagined as pre- discursive and natural, but also in the collection of repre- sentations that render it sexual and desirable. In every case it remains a body that is always pharmacopornographic, a technoliving system that is the effect of a widespread cul- tural mechanism of representation and production. The goal of contemporary critical theory would be to unravel our condition as pharmacopornographic work- ers/consumers. If the current theory of the *feminization of labor* omits the *cum shot*, conceals videographic ejacula- tion behind the screen of cooperative communication, it’s because, unlike Houellebecq, the philosophers of biopoli- tics prefer not to reveal their position as customers of the global pharmacopornomarket. In the first volume of *Homo Sacer*, Giorgio Agamben reclaims Walter Benjamin’s concept of the “naked life” in order to define the biopolitical status of the subject after Auschwitz, a subject whose paradigm would be the con- centration camp prisoner or the illegal immigrant held in a temporary detention center, reduced to existing only physi- cally and stripped of all legal status or citizenship. To such a notion of the “naked life,” we could add that of the phar- macopornographic life, or *naked technolife*; the distinctive feature of a body stripped of all legal or political status is that its use is intended as a source of production of *poten- tia gaudendi*. The distinctive feature of a body reduced to naked technolife, in both democratic societies and fascist regimes, is precisely the power to be the object of maxi- mum pharmacopornographic exploitation. Identical codes ***The Pharmacopornographic era* 49 50 *The Pharmacopornographic era*** of pornographic representation function in the images of the prisoners of Abu Ghraib,42 the eroticized images of Thai adolescents, advertisements for L’Oréal and McDon- ald’s, and the pages of *Hot magazine*. All these bodies are already functioning, in an inexhaustible manner, as carnal and digital sources of ejaculatory capital. For the Aristote- lian distinction between *zōē* and *bios*, between animal life deprived of any intentionality and “exalted” life, that is, life gifted with meaning and self-determination that is a sub- strate of biopolitical government, we must today substitute the distinction between *raw* and *biotech* (biotechnocultur- ally produced); and the latter term refers to the condition of life in the pharmacopornographic era. Biotechnologi- cal reality deprived of all civic context (the body of the migrant, the deported, the colonized, the porn actress/ actor, the sex worker, the laboratory animal, etc.) becomes that of the *corpus* (and no longer that of *homo*) *pornographi- cus* whose life (a technical condition rather than a purely biological one), lacking any right to citizenship, author- ship, and right to work, is composed by and subject to self- surveillance and global mediatization. No need to resort to the dystopian model of the concentration or extermination camp—which are easy to denounce as mechanisms of con- trol—in order to discover naked technolife, because it’s at the center of postindustrial democracies, forming part of a global, integrated multimedia laboratory-brothel, where the control of the flow of affect begins under the pop form of excitation-frustration.

#### Sexuality is largely fluid, testosterone level varies between everybody, and largely determines your physical and mental features. Yet within necro-biopolitics control identity always refers back to representation forcing non-binaries to fit into incorrigible binary conceptions of sex and sexuality.

**Preciado 13( Paul B. Preciado, Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, And Biopolitics in the Pharmacoporgraphic era, Pharmacopower, pg 224-230)Lynbrook SY**

**the t uber-male of the Future** Although the administration of microdoses of testosterone to cis-females is still rare, testosterone has been recom- mended for more than thirty years in hormonal substitu- tion therapies for cis-males. The most common method of administration is through AndroGel, distributed in the form of a testosterone gel comparable to the Testogel that I’m taking and produced by Unimed Pharmaceuticals in the state of Illinois. Anabolic steroids, derivatives that are more or less simi- lar to testosterone, have been used for thirty years to treat hypogonadism, a physiological condition in which the tes- ticles don’t produce “enough” testosterone. For the medi- cal establishment, testosterone functions as a substance for the manufacture of masculinity. But it isn’t defined as a molecule used to make up for a lack. The role of synthetic testosterone consists in producing the masculine subject that it pretends to supplement; however, the possibility of it being incorporated in a variety of bodies, and its transfer from skin to skin, also opens the way for postidentity drift. The Nazi government, followed by the American gov- ernment, were the first to experiment with administering doses of testosterone to animals, as well as to their own sol- diers, the civilian population in concentration camps, and prisoners of war. Technologies of gender and technologies of war—the same business. Necropolitics meets biopoli- tics under the skin. By the 1980s, the pharmaceutical use of testosterone became widespread. In 2006 in the United States, there were four million cis-males undergoing hor- monal substitution therapy formulated with testosterone. According to the medical establishment, thirteen million Americans over the age of forty-five suffer from what is now known as “low-T syndrome,” a condition character- ized by an insufficiency of testosterone. The symptoms: a decrease in libido, erectile dysfunction, fatigue, depression, and so on—eventually, the ordinary life of any average cis- male.114 Clinically, there is not enough testosterone being produced in United States. As seen in contemporary scientific discourse, it has become evident that estrogen, progesterone, and testoster- one are transverse substances produced by all bodies, inde- pendently of their gender (biopolitically assigned at birth), and that, like the molecules secreted by the pancreas and hypothalamus and by the parathyroid, thyroid, thymus, and pineal glands, function in a systemic and decentralized man- ner. Cis-females also produce testosterone in the ovaries and in the adrenal glands. Moreover, today we know that in cis-females, testosterone may be responsible for muscular development, the growth of bones, and sexual desire. The singularity of all hormonal systems (and not the difference between just two systems) resides in the micro- quantities of hormones occurring in each body, in the num- ber of hormonal receptors, and in systemic interactions with the other hormones and receptors. An examination of several clinical endocrinology manuals reveals that the question of the “normal” quantity of testosterone produced by cis-males and cis-females is closely related to the cultural and biopolitical definition of gender difference. For exam- 114. Vergel, *Testosterone*, 2. ***Pharmacopower* 225 226 *Pharmacopower*** ple, the average levels of testosterone in the blood of bodies politically considered to be normally male range from 437 to 707 nanograms per deciliter. But certain bodies produce no more than 125 nanograms per deciliter, and their sexual assignment is still male. According to another manual, also of clinical endocrinology, the “normal” quantity of testos- terone production in adult cis-males varies from 260 to 1,000 nanograms per deciliter of blood. It can rise as high as 2,000 nanograms during adolescence. In cis-females, it is 15 to 70 nanograms per deciliter of blood. To such episte- mological chaos we must add several absurd pieces of data coming from scientific research: testosterone increases the desire to smoke, but the consumption of cigarettes low- ers the production of testosterone; testosterone increases aggressiveness and libido, whereas sex and aggressive reac- tions increase testosterone levels. Stress inhibits the pro- duction of testosterone . . . In the end, we are brought face to face with a vast domain of nonknowledge and potential technopolitical intervention. Given such complexity, an implacable biopolitical rhetoric about gender, sexual, and racial differences, similar to that elaborated by Arnold Berthold at the beginning of the twentieth century, always dominates hormonal clas- sification and its technical management. Although the experimental programs that determine the production of marketable doses of testosterone, estrogen, or progester- one rely on an ultraconstructivist theory of sex and sexu- ality, the criteria for the commercialization and public distribution of these molecules continues to respond to a naturalistic metaphysics of sexual difference that claims the biologically and historically unchangeable existence of two sexes (man and woman), two sexualities (heterosexual and homosexual), and, more recently, two genders (male and female), from which springs the field of deviance and pathology. For the moment, no Western nation has accepted the legalization of testosterone for women and allowed it to be freely administered to them, understanding that such a sit- uation would risk a semiotechnical virilization of the female population on its both social and political levels. Two slight somato-political problems that would modify the visual and auditory deciphering of gender are facial pilosity and voice change. It is astounding that in the West, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, in a society that has extremely high-tech methods for the management of reproduction, the deciphering of gender is reduced to degree of facial hair and timbre of the voice. We can therefore say that the beard and the voice, and not the penis and the vagina or X and Y chromosomes, are the dominant cultural public signifiers of gender in our society. Let us cease to speak about men and women and simply say, hairy or smooth body, body with a high voice or with a low voice. These are not details but crucial sexopolitical signifiers with the ability to put into question the idea of virility as the natural prerogative of cis-males. The ultimate problem resides in revealing the politically constructed character of the genders, as well as of heterosexuality and homosexuality. While I am following my testosterone protocol, sev- eral European governments, including the French gov- ernment and the generality of Catalonia, are studying the ***Pharmacopower* 227 228 *Pharmacopower*** use of “chemical castration” technologies as a penal mea- sure (rather than a therapeutic one) for sex offenders (and especially for pedophiles). The French right-wing president Nicolas Sarkozy’s intention, made public on August 21, 2007, to create a law mandating the use of chemical cas- tration therapies for sex offenders, is one more step in the escalation of the use of biopolitical power to produce and control male sexuality. What processes of bodily transfor- mation are really entailed by such chemical castration? When, how, and on which bodies have similar means of the pharmacological management of identity been already used? What are the underlying political fictions of mascu- linity and femininity connected to this legal project, and what type of subject are we trying to produce collectively? Let us examine our pharmacopornopolitical archives: chemical castration consists in administering a cocktail more or less full of antiandrogens (cyproterone acetate, progestogen, or gonadotropin regulators), in other words, molecules that inhibit the production of testosterone. Although one of the effects of antiandrogens can be the diminishment of sexual desire (thought of in this case as excitation and erectile response), it is often not mentioned that the side effects of these drugs are a reduction in the size of the penis, the development of breasts, modifica- tion of muscle mass, and accumulation of fat in the hips. In other words, it is a process of “hormonal feminization.” We ought not be surprised to discover that substances with similar antiandrogen effects are used (voluntarily) by transsexuals who are beginning a process of feminization and are changing their gender. Despite its renaturalizing power, the pharmacoporno regime continually reveals its ultraconstructivist founda- tions. If we explore the political history of the chemical castration technology, we will learn that it was used in the 1950s in the repressive treatment of male homosexuality; it was, for example, the type of therapy prescribed by Eng- lish law for Alan Turing, one of the originators of modern computer science. Accused of homosexuality, grave indecency, and sexual perversion, he was compelled to submit to a program of hormonal therapy.115 One sign of a certain scientific confusion is the fact that the same drug is part of current research on a “gay bomb,” a hormonal compound that the American army intends to use to transform its ene- mies into homosexuals.116 While the United States needs testosterone, its enemies need hormonal feminization. What the facts show is that chemical castration is a pharmacopornopolitical mechanism aiming less to reduce sexual aggression than to modify the gender of the sup- posed aggressor. It’s important to draw attention to these therapies as existing exclusively to manage the male “sex- ual predator.” And the means of punishing and controlling male sexuality is to transform it symbolically and somati- cally into femininity. The double-edged effect of these pharmacopornographic policies connects with traditional modes of producing sex- 115. Alan Turing finally committed suicide in 1954. See Andrew Hodges and Douglas Hofstadter, *Alan Turing: The Enigma* (New York: Walker & Company, 2000). 116. For more about the homophobic fantasy of American war discourse, see Judith Butler, “Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of ‘Postmodernism,’” *Praxis International* 11, no. 2 (July 1991): 150–65. An excerpt from this article was also published with another title: “The Imperialist Subject,” *Journal of Urban and Cultural Studies* 2, no. 2 (1991): 73–78. ***Pharmacopower* 229 230 *Pharmacopower*** ual difference in the disciplinary regime: political crimi- nalization of male sexuality and victimization of female sexuality. Chemical regulation always portrays the erection, and as a corollary, masculinity, as a phenomenon that can be produced or heightened by vasodilators or controlled and repressed by chemical castration,117 thereby placing it in the category of an involuntary impulse that is suitable for political management. Meanwhile, feminine sexuality is constructed as a passive territory on which the violence of male sexuality is exerted. There is no biological destiny beyond pharmacopornopolitical programs. Democratizing the consumption of hormones, which continue to be viewed as sexual, would require a radical change of our gender and sexual topographies. Freely cir- culating and collectively used testosterone is dynamite for the heterosexual regime. It’s no longer only a question of asserting the existence of four or five sexes, as several sci- entists and theorists of sexuality desire,118 but of accepting the completely technoconstructed, undeniably multiple, malleable, and mutable nature of bodies and pleasures.

#### Drugs are the equivalent of a post-Fordist panopticon in which the eye of the apparatus lies not externally but internally, it’s fluidly circulating throughout the body producing affects to the pharmacoporngraphic regime reinforcing the molecular economy of desires.

**Preciado 13( Paul B. Preciado, Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, And Biopolitics in the Pharmacoporgraphic era, Pharmacopower, pg 193-214)Lynbrook SY**

**194 *Pharmacopower*** According to historian of medicine Emilia Sanabria, the material aspects of packaging and pharmaceutical transfor- mation are often overlooked when the history of medical techniques is described: In the manipulation which occurs in the pharmaceutical process, liquid, semi-solid and solid pharmaceutical sub- stances are manufactured—or temporarily stabilized— into pharmaceutical “objects.” The possibility of effecting this handcrafting is understood to define the effects that these pharmaceutical objects can have, physiologically- speaking, on their “patients.” Pharmaceuticals have increasingly been analyzed as objects. This carves out a particular place for pharmaceuticals in the analysis of material things, and oft material things in the analysis of pharmaceuticals. Whilst material culture analyses provide elements to theorize drugs as “things,” it produces problems when these things are drugs. I argue that the consumable and changeable aspects of these “things” are left un-theorized. This problem stems from a common assumption in anthropological analyses of material cul- ture, which tends to take the object for granted. That is to say, the process of object-making is often eclipsed by the object itself.84 Insisting on the need to pay attention to the medical and social repercussions of pharmacological marketing, historian Patricia Peck Gossel has studied the packaging techniques that were used for the commercialization of the DialPak, the first compliance package of the Pill, pro- 84. Emilia Sanabria, “The Medicine, an Evanescent Object: Test on the Manufacture and the Consumption of the Pharmaceutical Substances,” *Techniques & Culture* 52–53, no. 2–3 (2009): 168–89. duced in 1963.85 According to Gossel, the Pill was not only a political and gender revolution but also a revolution in drug packaging. The Pill is the first pharmaceutical molecule to be produced as a design object. Gossel understands Wagner’s design of the Pill packag- ing as a couple’s “problem solving” process, in which the husband (and designer) aided his wife in managing a com- plex intake time schedule, reinterpreting the bond between husband and wife as a model of the designer-user rela- tionship.86 For Gossel, the DialPak appears to be the first “compliance package” for a prescription drug—one that intended to help the patient to comply with the doctor’s orders.87 For Gossel, the invention of the dispenser for the Pill indicates the emergence of a new model of pharmaceutical design, one that does not rely on the aims of advertising companies aims, but rather on the designer-user relation- ship. Following Gossel’s design history, we could argue that the Pill (taking into account the difficulties of the intake schedule) is not only a chemical product (the molecule iso- lated and marketed as edible capsule) but also an individual portable pharmacomechanism, able to discipline the tab- lets’ intake. The 1960s Pill, as a social domestic practice and individual hormonal prosthesis, cannot exist without the 85. Gossel, “Packaging the Pill,” 105–21. For more about the history of packaging, see also Stanley Sacharow, *The Package as a Marketing Tool* (Radnor, PA: Chilton, 1982); Thomas Hine, *The Total Package: The Evolution and Secret Meaning of Boxes, Bottles, Cans, and Tubes* (Boston: Back Bay Books, 1995); Steven Lubar and W. David Kingery, eds., *History from Things: Essays on Material Culture* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993). 86. Gossel explains, as if she needed to justify the Wagners’ decision for birth control: “Doris Wagner began taking the Pill after the fourth child, Jane, was born on November 14, 1961, and the Wagners decided that their family was complete,” Gossel, “Packaging the Pill,” 105. 87. Gossel, “Packaging the Pill,”105. ***Pharmacopower* 195 196 *Pharmacopower*** Ortho-Novum DialPak became the second oral contraceptive on the American market in February 1963. Advertising campaign, 1964, National Museum of American History, Behring Center, Smithsonian Institution. dispenser. Whereas a single tablet of an oral contraceptive, if separated from the container, would be recognized only by a pharmacist, the distinctive package of the Pill made it the most readily recognizable prescription drug on the mar- ket during the 1960s. Reversing the traditional relationship between content and container, the packaging *is* the Pill….scale: the contraceptive pill is an edible panopticon. Social orthopedics is mutating into pharmacopornographic microprosthetics. DialPak transformed the panopticon into a domestic, portable female hormonal compact. The panopticon, prefigured by the hospital plans of Ber- nard Poyet and C. P. Coquéau and by Louis Le Vau’s proj- ect for a menagerie at Versailles, first emerged as a model of industrial (but not yet penal) architecture, developed in 1786 by the philosopher Jeremy Bentham, brother of the naval engineer Samuel Bentham (in fact, it was Samuel who conceived the basic architecture of the building), in response to a commission from the Russian prince Grigory Potemkin. Originally, the panopticon was an industrial “inspec- tion house” designed to optimize surveillance, control, and worker production in a factory complex. Bentham’s archi- tectural structure was based on two concentric rings, with an observation tower at the center of the entire structure and a series of cells radiating out from it. Each of these cells had two windows, an external one to let in light, and an internal one facing the surveillance tower. The occupants of the cells were isolated from each other by walls and sub- jected to the collective and individual (audiovisual) scrutiny of a guard in the tower, which, as Foucault speculates, could have been empty or occupied by the abstract eye of God, which would remain hidden. As pointed out by Christian Laval: The panoptic is not only the eye of power, a kind of imagi- nary figure suspended over a splintered and isolated peo- ple, but also, in the reverse sense, the eye of the people that must remain constantly focused on the ruling class so that the latter won’t betray the interests of the great- est number. This double meaning of surveillance is based on the principle of the goal of generalized transparency. The model of the panoptic has the advantage of combin- ing what is usually thought to be distinct and separate: the most intrusive social control, the free market and the most advanced democracy.95 This original design became the model for internment and disciplinary centers built in the nineteenth and twen- tieth centuries, centers such as Rahway Prison in New Jer- 95. Christian Laval, “De l’utilité du panoptique,” afterward to *Panoptique: Mémoire sur un nouveau principe pour construire des maisons d’inspection, et nommément des maisons de force*, by Jérémie Bentham, trans. Christian Laval (Paris: Éditions Mille et Une Nuits, 2002), 64. ***Pharmacopower* 203 204 *Pharmacopower*** Left: Elevation, section, and plan of Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon, drawn by architect Willey Reveley in 1791. Right: First dispenser for the Pill, 1963. sey; national prisons in Dublin, Bogotá, and Cuba’s Isle of Pines; and the jail in Mataró, Spain, designed by Elies Rogent. For Foucault, the panopticon isn’t just a simple disciplinary device. It’s the *material model* of disciplinary knowledge-power as a form of “social orthopedics”:96 power and its specific modes of knowledge and surveillance mate- rialized in the form of physical architecture (whether of a prison, school, hospital, barracks, or factory) that auto- mates movement, controls the gaze, programs action, and ritualizes everyday bodily practices. In all such cases, disci- plinary power is, according to Foucault “exercised through its invisibility . . . and the examination is the technique by which power, instead of emitting the signs of its potency, 96. Michel Foucault, *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, ed. James D. Faubion, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: The New York Press, 2000), 57. instead of imposing its mark on its subjects, holds them in a mechanism of objectification.”97 The purpose of these forms of architecture is not simply to provide *habitat* or represent the individual—instead, like true *performative* devices, they tend to produce the subject they claim to shel- ter. The convict, the student, the patient, the soldier, and the worker are the political precipitate of these architec- tural *technologies of subjectification*. We can think of the Pill as a lightweight, portable, individualized, chemical panopticon with the potential to change behavior, program action, regulate sexual activity, control population growth and racial purity, and redesign the sexual appearance (by refeminizing it synthetically) of the bodies that self-administer it. The surveillance tower has been replaced by the eyes of the (not always) docile user of the Pill who regulates her own administration with- out the need for external supervision, following the spatial calendar marked on the circular or rectangular package. The whip has been replaced by a convenient system of oral administration. Henceforth, the prison cell has become the body of the consumer, which sees itself chemically modi- fied without being able to determine the exact effects or where they come from, once the hormonal compound has been ingested. Punishments and edifying sermons have been replaced by rewards and promises of freedom and sexual emancipation for women. The Pill is a miniaturized pharmacopornographic laboratory distributed within the domestic environment and destined to be placed inside 97. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 187. ***Pharmacopower* 205 206 *Pharmacopower*** the body of each consumer, thus fulfilling the demolition of imprisonment institutions predicted by Deleuze and Guattari in their epilogue to *A Thousand Plateaus*.98 The Pill works according to what Maurizio Lazzarato, following Deleuze and Guattari, calls the logic of “machinic enslave- ment.” “Machinic enslavement,” explains Lazzarato: consists in mobilizing and modulating the pre-individual, pre-cognitive and pre-verbal components of subjectiv- ity, causing affects, perceptions and sensations as yet un-individuated or unassigned to a subject, to function like the cogs and components in a machine. While subjec- tion concerns social selves or global persons, those highly manipulable, molar, subjective representations, ‘machinic enslavement connects infrapersonal, infrasocial elements thanks to a molecular economy of desire which is far more difficult to maintain within stratified social relation- ships,’ and these are the elements that mobilize individu- ated subjects. Machinic enslavement is therefore not the same thing as social subjection. If the latter appeals to the molar, individuated dimension of a subjectivity, the former activates its molecular, pre-individual, pre-verbal, pre-social dimension. It is no longer necessary to shut up individuals within state institutions in order to subject them to biochemical, pedagogic, or penal tests, because experiments on the liv- ing human being can now be carried out at home, in the valuable enclave of the individual body, under the watchful, intimate supervision of the individual herself. And all of it 98. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987). 99. Maurizio Lazzarato, “The Machine,” epilogue to *Tausend Maschinen: Eine kleine Philosophie der Maschine als sozialer Bewegung*, by Gerald Raunig (Vienna: Verlag Turia + Kant, 2008). happens *freely*, by virtue of the sexual *emancipation* of the controlled body. The biopolitical promise of governing *free* bodies that Foucault identified is here fully accomplished. Still, the differences between the panopticon and the Pill are significant. Within the length of hardly a century, they underline the transition from a disciplinary regime into a pharmacopornographic regime. In the first case, we’re faced with an external political architecture that defines the position of the body in a space that is collec- tively regulated, creating specific positions of power (moni- tor/monitored, doctor/patient, professor/student . . . ) and allowing the generation of a form of knowing (visual, sta- tistical, demographic) concerning those individuals being controlled. In the second case, we’re faced with a mecha- nism that—without any change in its effectiveness—has reduced its scale to that of a biomolecular technology that may be consumed individually and introduced by bodily ori- fices. In the pharmacopornographic era, the body swallows power. It is a form of control that is both democratic and private, edible, drinkable, inhalable, and easy to administer, whose spread throughout the social body has never been so rapid or so undetectable. In the pharmacopornographic age, biopower dwells at home, sleeps with us, inhabits within. The dominant manifestations of the pharmacopor- nographic era (pills, prostheses, food, images, fellatio, and double penetration) share the same relationship between the body and power: a desire for infiltration, absorption, total occupation. We could give in to the temptation of rep- resenting this relationship according to a dialectical model of domination/oppression, as if it were a unidirectional ***Pharmacopower* 207 208 *Pharmacopower*** movement in which miniaturized, liquid power from the outside infiltrates the obedient body of individuals. But no. It is not power infiltrating from the outside, it is the body desiring power, seeking to swallow it, eat it, administer it, wolf it down, more, always more, through every hole, by every possible route of application. Turning oneself into power. *Baise-Moi*, fuck me (Despentes), says the body, all the while seeking forms of autocontrol and autoextermi- nation: “Why do people always desire their own slavery?” (Spinoza). Biopower doesn’t infiltrate from the outside. It already dwells *inside*. But machinic enslavement also determines new possi- bilities for subversion. The Pill—defined by the need for an individual decision to take it and by the time-based calcula- tions of the user—immediately induces accident. It takes accident into account, programs it, sees accident as a sine qua non possibility of female sexuality. The heteronorma- tive logic of the Cold War period that dominates the Pill seems to respond to this double, contradictory require- ment: every woman must simultaneously be fertile (and be so through heterosexual insemination) and able to reduce the possibility of her own fertility at all times to levels asymptotically close to zero, but without reducing it alto- gether, so that accidental conception remains possible. But the accident is also the possibility of subversion and resig- nification: the fact that the Pill must be managed at home, by the individual user in an autonomous way, also intro- duces the possibility of political agency. The massive, high-dose administration of estrogens and progesterone to the bodies of Western cis-females after World War II permitted the production and reproduction of femininity as a standardized and ready-made biocode. This new microprosthetic femininity is a patented phar- macopornographic technology, which can be commercial- ized—or transferred to and implanted in—any living body at all. Gradually, it will be revealed that the estrogens and progesterone administered in high doses during this period are toxic and carcinogenic and to blame for various cardio- vascular changes, but such findings do nothing to lower consumption of the Pill (in fact, its consumption increased exponentially beginning in the 1970s); nor do they change recommendations coming from the World Health Organi- zation (WHO). The amount of estrogen and progesterone intended for a month of treatment has changed from 150 micrograms of estrogen and 200 milligrams of progesterone in the 1970s to 10 micrograms of estrogen and 15 milligrams of different variants of progesterone in today’s contraceptive treatments. As a measure to improve security, the current micropill (which is the most prescribed drug for periods of breast-feeding) administers a weaker dose during a greater number of days, reducing the number of days in which a placebo pill is taken, during which what we could call the *technoperiod* is produced—in other words, a technologically induced bleeding that produces the illusion of a natural cycle. These are technological methods of biodrag whose objective is the “mimicking of the normal physiological cycle.” From Pincus’s second pill to today’s micropill, these technologies of hormonal invention have been functioning according to a principle of biocamouflage: first, interrupt- ***Pharmacopower* 209 210 *Pharmacopower*** ing the natural hormonal cycle, and then, technologically provoking an artificial cycle that re-creates the illusion of nature. The first of these actions is contraceptive, the sec- ond is the consequence of an intended pharmacoporno- graphic production of gender—seeing to it that the bodies of twentieth-century technofemales perpetuate the illusion of being the outcome of natural, unchanging, transhistoric, and transcultural laws. A recent study carried out at Boston University reveals the relationship between consumption of the contracep- tive pill, the decline in the levels of bioavailability of tes- tosterone (a reduction from 40 percent to 60 percent), and the drop in women’s libido. The study warns that taking synthetic estrogen can modify hormonal production on a global scale and recommends administering testosterone gel in microdoses to increase “the sexual functioning of female consumers of the pill.”100 But today, administering testosterone to women still remains a hormonal taboo with political implications. The production of femininity in the pharmacopornographic regime functions according to a paradoxical logic: on the one hand, the Pill is being admin- istered to cis-females in a generalized manner, and on the other, a pharmacological way of overcoming depression and frigidity is the goal.101 The cis-female of the twenty- 100. Katrina Woznicki, “Birth Control Pills May Produce Protracted Effects on Testosterone Levels,” *MedPage Today*, January 3, 2006, http://www.medpagetoday.com/ OBGYN/HRT/2423; C. Panzer, S. Wise, G. Fantini, D. Kang, R. Munarriz, A. Guay, and I. Goldstein, “Impact of Oral Contraceptives on Sex Hormone-Binding Globulin and Androgen Levels: A Retrospective Study in Women with Sexual Dysfunction,” *The Journal of Sexual Medicine* 3 (January 2006): 104–13. 101. This logic is comparable to the relationship between the repression of masturbation and the production of fits of hysteria using mechanical means in the sex-discipline agenda of the nineteenth century. See an analysis of this paradoxical production in Beatriz Preciado, *Manifeste contra-sexuel* (Paris: Balland, 2000), 73–88. first century is the result of this somato-political short-cir- cuiting; her subjectivity grows within the narrow margin of freedom created by these fields of divergent force. The formation of the pharmacopornographic society was characterized by the two new vectors of production of sexual subjectivity at the middle of the twentieth century. On the one hand, as we have seen, there is the introduction of the notion of “gender” as a technical, visual, and perfor- mative device for sexing the body, the reorganization of the medico-judicial, educational, and medical system that until that time had been articulating the notions of “normalcy” and “perversion” in the context of the binomial concept of heterosexuality/homosexuality and will now begin consid- ering the possibility of technically modifying the body of the individual to “invent” a masculine or feminine “mind.” On the other hand, we are witnessing techniques of social control that are suitable for the disciplinary system gradu- ally filtering into the individual body. What is at issue is no longer only the punishment of the sexual offenses of individuals or the surveillance and correction of their aber- rations by means of a code of external laws or interiorized disciplines, but the modification of their bodies in their capacity as living platforms. We are treated as producers and consumers…difference between *bio-* and *techno-* is not a differ- ence between organic and inorganic. In this text, I am not evaluating a passage from the biological to the synthetic but identifying the appearance of a new type of corporal- ity. Recent technologies for the production of the body are not faithful to a classical taxonomy according to which each organ and each tissue corresponds to a single function and location. Far from respecting the formal or material total- ity of the body, biotechnology and prosthetic technologies combine modes of representation related to film and archi- tecture, like modeling and editing in 3-D. The new surgi- cal technology, which has made possible the application of pharmacopornographic ideas of sexuality (the techni- cal management of masculinity and femininity, the medi- calization of the orgasm and sexual desire, telecontrol of 107. Gilman, *Making the Body*, 249. the fantasy functions of sexuality, etc.) is authorizing processes of the tectonic construction of the body, according to which its organs, tissues, fluids, and, ultimately, molecules, are transformed into the raw materials from which a new incarnation of nature is manufactured.

#### We are a punk civilization; your pleasure is your death, violence collapses to mere representation, to mere mass consumption of spectacular snuff of your naked life. No secrets. No meaning. Pharmacoporngraphic representation screeches nothing but its own death. Extinction is only inevitable in the pharmacoporngraphic regime. It’s now a matter of how we record that death.

**Preciado 13( Paul B. Preciado, Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, And Biopolitics in the Pharmacoporgraphic era, The micropolitics of gender in the pharmacoporngraphic era, Snuff Politics, pg 344-347) Lynbrook SY**

snuFF pOliTiCs The fact is that we’re being fucked right off the bat: becoming a punk civilization.The sudden emergence of the punk movement in 1977 was not a simple microphenomenon, but the last lucid explosion of what seems today to be the only ideal shared by the members of what has been called the human species: the pleasure instinct as a death instinct. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, no cultural production has entailed such a punk dimension as much as snuff has—the filming of death as it happens. In popular culture, *snuff* refers to those films that show the murder of a person or animal with the unique objective of making that death visible, transforming it into public, marketable representation. ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 345** Everything, in fact, begins as something sham. In 1971, Z-series directors Michael and Roberta Findlay made *The Slaughter*, a small-budget film production that combined erotic scenes with horror scenes. That same year, Ed Sand- ers interviewed Charles Manson. Manson claimed to have recorded some of the celebrity murders perpetrated by his followers under his authority. No trace of such films were found, but the myth of snuff was born. In 1972, the dis- tributor Alan Shackleton got ahold of *The Slaughter*, added a last scene in which one of the actresses is disemboweled (fictionally) in front of the camera, and rereleased this new edit under the title *Snuff*. The premiere of the film took place in 1976 and provoked an unprecedented debate over the verity of the actress’s death. Antiporn groups, pro-cen- sorship feminists, and the media took part in this debate. The film, which had no other cinematographic or narrative interest outside the evisceration scene, would garner unex- pected profits. As a questioning of representational limits, snuff has served as a pornographic paradigm for both pro-censorship feminists and antiporn Christians, and also as a formal model of realism to which the dramatization of sex in por- nography must tend: a film is that much more pornographic if the sexual scene that is filmed is real, in the same way that a representation is snuff when the crime has *actually* taken place. Radically postmodern, the notion of snuff is opposed to the dramatic or simulated and mimetic quality of all rep- resentation. On the contrary, it affirms the performative power of representation to modify reality, or a desire for the real to exist in and by representation. This brings us **346 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** to the theatrical relationship between pornography, snuff, and politics. Today, some snuff film catalogs offer images filmed by Allied or Nazi soldiers in concentration camps, Zapruder’s film of the John F. Kennedy assassination, the film of the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin, videos of the executions of prisoners of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, vid- eos showing the American army destroying Iraqi villages, images of the destruction of New York’s Twin Towers and of the execution of Saddam Hussein. Politics has become snuff: extermination by and for representation. The mushroom cloud left in the sky by the atomic bomb, the photograph of the completely naked little girl running away from the Vietnam village Trang Bang in flames after a napalm attack, the sperm-filled lips of Linda Lovelace, piles of mutilated limbs in Rwanda, double penetration, the terri- fying feats performed in *Big Brother* and the surgical scenes in *Nip/Tuck*, the liters of fat suctioned from the buttocks of American housewives for the cameras of *Extreme Make- over*, murders at the maximum-security San Quentin State Prison filmed by security cameras—all of them say more about the current state of our species than any philosophy book of the twentieth century, from Husserl to Sartre. The distinctive feature of the *techno-porno-punk* moment is *snuff politics*: rip away everything from life to the point of death and film the process, record it in writing and image, distrib- ute it live over the Internet, make it permanently accessible in a virtual archive, an advertising medium on the global scale. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, our spe- cies had literally stuck good philosophical intentions up our ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 347** ass, filming the thing before marketing the images from it. The philosophy of the pharmacopornographic regime has been reduced to an enormous, dripping butt-plug camera. In such circumstances, the philosophy of such high-punk modernity can only be autotheory, autoexperimentation, auto-techno-penetration, pornology. When surmising about the future of the planet, Donna J. Haraway encourages us to avoid two kinds of narrative traps of the metaphysical and semiotico-fascist kind. First, there is the messianic temptation: someone will come to save us—some unique religious or technical force, an all- powerful understanding that possesses all the answers needed to transform the human condition(systems of power, util, commi, socialism, etc). Second, there is the apocalyptic temptation: nothing can be done, and the disappearance of the species is imminent.(Fiat, just assuming someone else will do it, the usfg will do it, a system, wto will do it, we will look for them to do it, when itn reality we need to think about what WE can do. Fiat illusory; unproductive we are being other people, but that’s not what should do) Haraway tells us, “We might profitably(beneficial) learn to doubt our fears and cer- tainties of disasters as much as our dreams of progress. We might learn to live without the bracing discourses of salvation history.”11 The problem resides precisely in the fact that no one will come to save us and that we are still some distance from our inevitable disappearance. It will thus be necessary to think about doing something while we are on the way out, undergoing mutation or changing planets, even if this something consists in intentionally accelerating our own disappearance, mutation, or cosmic displacement. Let us be worthy of our own fall and imagine for the time left the components of a new pornopunk philosophy. The prinCiple OF The auTO–guinea pig The first principle of a trans-feminism movement capable of facing *porno-punk* modernity: the fact that your body, the body of the *multitude* and the pharmacopornographic networks that constitute them are political laboratories, both effects of the process of subjection and control and potential spaces for political agency and critical resistance to normalization. I am pleading here for an array of poli- tics of physical experimentation and semiotechnology that (in the face of the principle of political representation, which dominates our social life and is at the core of politi- cal mass movements, which can be as totalitarian as they are democratic) will be regulated by the principle that—in accordance with Peter Sloterdijk’s intuitions—I will call the “principle of the auto-guinea pig.”12 In China, in 213 BC, all books were burned by order of the emperor. In the fifth century, after a series of wars had ransacked and decimated the library at Alexandria, it was accused of harboring pagan teachings contrary to the Christian faith and was destroyed by the decree of Emperor Theodosius. The greatest center of research, translation, and reading disappeared. Between 1330 and 1730, thou- sands of human bodies were burned during the Inquisition, thousands of books were destroyed, and hundreds of works related to the expertise and production of subjectivity were relegated to oblivion or to the underground. In 1813, 12. In his interview with Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs, Peter Sloterdijk evokes “voluntary intoxication” and “auto-guinea pig” techniques in reference to Samuel Hahnemann; see Peter Sloterdijk, *Neither Sun Nor Death*. With Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs, trans. Steven Corcoran (New York: Semiotext(e), 2011). ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 349** American soldiers took York (now Toronto) and burned the parliament and legislative library. A year later, the Library of Congress was razed. In 1933, one of the first actions of the Nazi government was the destruction of the Institut für Sexualwissenschaft (Institute for Sexual Research) in Ber- lin. Created in 1919 by Magnus Hirschfeld, this center had for years played a role in the research and dissemination of progressive ideas and practices concerning sex and sexual- ity. Twenty thousand books from the Hirschfeld Institute were burned on May 10, 1933, on Opernplatz on a gigantic pyre whose flashing flames were imprinted on the camera film of Hitler’s reporters. On the night of March 9, 1943, an air raid on a library in Aachen destroyed five hundred thou- sand books. In 1993, Croatian militia destroyed dozens of libraries (among them, those in Stolac). In 2003, Ameri- can bombs and Saddam loyalists sacked and destroyed the National Library of Baghdad13 . . . The theorico-political innovations produced during the past forty years by feminism, the black liberation move- ment, and queer and transgender theory do seem to be last- ing acquisitions. However, in the context of global war, this collection of scholarship could be destroyed also, as fast as a microchip melting under intense heat. Before all the existing fragile archives about feminism and black, queer, and trans culture have been reduced to a state of radioac- tive shades, it is indispensible to transform such minority knowledge into collective experimentation, into physical 13. On the destruction of the books, see Fernando Baez, *A Universal History of the Destruction of Books: From Ancient Sumer to Modern-day Iraq*, trans. Alfred MacAdam (New York: Atlas & Co., 2008). **350 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** practice, into ways of life and forms of cohabitation. We are no longer pleading, like our predecessors in the 1970s and 1980s, for an understanding of life and history as effects of different discursive regimes. We are pleading to use dis- cursive productions as stakeholders in a wider process of the technical materialization of life that is occurring on the planet. A materialization that each day resembles more and more a total technical destruction of all animal, vegetable, and cultural forms of life and that will end, undoubtedly, in the annihilation of the planet and the self-extinction of most of its species. Alas, it will become a matter of finding ways to record a planetary suicide. Until the end of the eighteenth century, self-exper- imentation was still a part of the research protocols of pharmacology. Animal experimentation was not yet called into question, but an ethical precept dictated that the researcher take on the risk of unknown effects on his or her own body before enacting any test on the body of another human. Relying on the rhetoric of objectivity, the subject of scientific learning would progressively attempt to gen- erate knowledge outside him- or herself, to exempt his or her body from the agonies of self-experimentation. In 1790, the physician Samuel Hahnemann self-administered strong daily doses of quinine in order to observe its effects in fighting malaria. His body reacted by developing symp- toms that resembled the remittent fever characteristic of malaria. The experiment would serve as the basis for the invention of the homeopathic movement, which, based on the law of similars, maintains that it is possible to treat ill- ness using minute doses of a substance that, in much larger ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 351** amounts, would provoke the same symptoms of that ill- ness in a healthy body, in the manner of a therapeutic mir- ror. Peter Sloterdijk, inspired by Hahnemann, will call the process of controlled and intentional poisoning “voluntary auto-intoxication” and will sum it up as follows: “If you intend to be a doctor, you must try to become a laboratory animal.”14 In order to transform conventional frameworks of the “cultural intelligibility”15 of human bodies, it is necessary to evolve toward practices of voluntary autointoxication. From Novalis to Ritter, the romanticism from which Sloter- dijk draws his inspiration for a counterproject to moder- nity will make autoexperimentation the central technique of the self in a dystopian society. Nevertheless, romantic autoexperimentation carries the risk of individualism and depolitization. On the other hand, two of the discourses around which the critique of modern European subjec- tivity will develop—those of Sigmund Freud and Walter Benjamin—will begin under the form of the invention of new techniques of the self and repertories of practices of voluntary intoxication. But the dominant discourse of disciplinary modernity will brush them aside; the process of institutionalization that both psychoanalysis and the Frankfurt School will experience will go hand in hand with the pathologizing of intoxication and the clinical industri- alization of experimentation. “It would be a good thing if a doctor were able to test many more drugs on himself,” declared the young doctor 14. Peter Sloterdijk, *Neither Sun Nor Death*. With Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs, trans. Steven Corcoran (New York: Semiotext(e), 2011), 8. 15. I’m reclaiming Judith Butler’s term here. See *Undoing Gender*, 35–46. **352 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** Mikhail Bulgakov in 1914, in “Morphine,” a text in which the protagonist describes the effects of morphine on his own body.16 Likewise, it seems urgent today, from the perspective of a trans-feminist project, to use our living bodies as biopolitical platforms to test the pharmacopor- nopolitical effects of synthetic sex hormones in order to create and demarcate new frameworks of cultural intelli- gibility for gender and sexual subjects. In an era in which pharmaceutical laboratories and corporations and state medico-legal institutions are controlling and regulating the use of gender and sex biocodes (the active molecules of pro- gesterone, estrogen, and testosterone) as well as chemical prostheses, it seems anachronistic to speak of practices of political representation without going through performa- tive and biotechnological experiments on sexual subjectiv- ity and gender. We must reclaim the right to participate in the *construction* of biopolitical fictions. We have the right to demand collective and “common” ownership of the bio- codes of gender, sex, and race. We must wrest them from private hands, from technocrats and from the pharmaco- porn complex. Such a process of resistance and redistribu- tion could be called *technosomatic communism*. As a mode of the production of “common” knowledge and political transformation, the auto–guinea pig principle would be critical in the construction of the practices and discourses of trans-feminism and the coming liberation movements of gender, sexual, racial, and somatic-political 16. See Mikhail Bulgakov, “Morphine,” in *A Country Doctor’s Notebook* (New York: Melville House, 2013), 134. ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 353** minorities. To echo Donna J. Haraway’s expression, it will consist of a positioned, responsible corporal political prac- tice, so that anyone wishing to be a political subject will begin by being the lab rat in her or his own laboratory.

#### Thus, I affirm the resolution. Two future scenarios in the Punk-Neo-Liberal development: First, the preservation of the theological-humanist political state. Second, an abstract deterritorialized nation-state of the pharmacopornographic industry. Both scenarios give IP protections legitimacy for specific codes of usage of the drug, leading to a bio-political inaccessibility and restriction of these drugs. Copyleft movements on drugs ruptures institutional regulations on consumption, entailing an emancipation for self-experimentation.

**Preciado 13( Paul B. Preciado, Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, And Biopolitics in the Pharmacoporgraphic era, The micropolitics of gender in the pharmacoporngraphic era, Traps of Neo-liberalism, pg 389-394) Lynbrook SY**

Traps of pharmacopornographic neoliberalism Contemporary biodrag activism is confronted, fifty years after Agnes, with a new set of violent neoliberal economic and politic strategies, including the privatization of the **390 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** health system, government deregulation, deep cuts in social spending, and the militarization of social life. In the present context, it’s possible to imagine (at least) two tracks of development for the pharmacopornographic economy in the face of which different modes of activism could be articulated. The first is the preservation of theological-humanist political states that regulate the action of the neoliberal (meaning free trade, either democratic or totalitarian in the context of globalization) pharmacopornographic econ- omy. Current pharmacopornographic corporations would function as free market tentacles inside contemporary nation-states (which would continue to see themselves as sovereign and patriarchal)) and would negotiate with them to determine the directives for the production, use, and consumption of chemical prostheses and semiotic gender and sex codes. The second transformation is one into an abstract deterritorialized nation-state of the pharmacoporno- graphic industry. We could also be witnessing a process of privatization of contemporary nation-states, which would be progressively absorbed by the pharmacoporno- graphic industry. This would be the strategy employed by the pharmacopornographic companies to escape pre-1970s regulations imposed by states (to avoid the gradual trans- formation of pharmaceutical patents into generics, the more or less severe regulation of the production and distri- bution of pornographic audiovisual material, and attempts to abolish prostitution), as these companies engage in the political direction of new national entities (via the FDA; the ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 391** International Monetary Fund; the European Union; and the governments of the United States, China, or India) and purchase state institutions (for example, the Department of Health or Department of Justice or the prison-industrial complex) and put them to work to their benefit, refilling such archaic institutions with new content whose only objective would be increasing consumption and pharmaco- pornographic profits. In fact, the pharmacopornographic industries are already in competition with the domestic affairs of the old nation-states . . . The war to come isn’t a war between states (Israel vs. Palestine or the United States vs. the oil-produc- ing countries) but more probably a war of pharmacoporno- graphic multinationals against the multitude of vulnerable bodies, a war of the pharmaceutical multinationals that hold the copyright for active principles against the traditional gatherers of plants and their specific forms of knowledge, a war of the military-prison-industrial complexes against the racialized and pauperized populations, a war of mafia states against the users of “illegal” drugs, a war of the multinational conglomerates that coordinate the management of medical and legal institutions and free market consumption against bodies deprived of nationality, a war of the systems of control that construct docile sexual subjects to achieve the total and limitless exploitation of their *potentia gaudendi*. The history of the transformations of production, dis- tribution, and consumption of heroin offers several leads about the probable evolution of the legal and political man- agement of sex hormones. Although their common origins **392 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** don’t seem obvious, heroin and aspirin were synthesized in the same year, 1897, and in the same laboratory, by Hoff- man and Eichengrun, by means of the same process. It involved the simple acetylation of morphine (in the case of heroin) and salicylic acid (in the case of aspirin). Heroin and aspirin were legally marketed by Bayer the following year for the treatment of various pulmonary affections, because of their analgesic properties. Although restrictions on the production and distribution of heroin went into force in the 1920s, it was still possible to find heroin-based pills in an English pharmacological catalog in 1949.59 After fifty years of the repression and criminalization of the marketing of heroin, which resulted in the deterioration of fields, which weren’t being tilled, the adulteration of the substance, and the corruption of its trafficking networks, medical special- ists today are developing a gradual reintegration of heroin into the legal pharmaceutical market. For example, Macfar- lan Smith Limited in Edinburgh is making yearly advances in the experimental and therapeutic use of this substance.60 The changes in the legal status of a substance and the description of a consumer as criminal or mentally ill (addicted in the case of heroin, and gender dysphoric in the case of sex hormones) facilitate the establishment of a political relationship between illegal drugs and biocodes of the production of gender. Sex hormones, whose consump- tion is strongly regulated by the state, are drugs whose use is, if not illegal, at least politically controlled; and their use, considering their potential for transforming gender and 59. Carnwath and Smith, *Heroin Century*, 31. 60. Ibid., 30–31. ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 393** sex, is subject to specific restrictions that espouse adminis- trative criteria and channels of distribution comparable to those of narcotic substances. How to react in the face of states’ resistance to legal- izing the sale of pharmaceutical heroin or removing the consumption of sex hormones from psychiatric protocols? If we consider the close relationships maintained by the neoliberal nation-states, the pharmaceutical corporations, and the networks of drug trafficking, it appears urgent that those dismissed as junkies (the users of illegal drugs) and those diagnosed with gender dysphoria (the potential users of sex hormones) must organize into associations of copyleft drug consumers and force the state-industry- pharmaceutical-drug-trafficking networks to facilitate free access without restrictions to these biocodes of the produc- tion of subjectivity.)Just as the users of Agreal prosecuted Sanofi-Aventis laboratories for the serious side effects61 of this medication (origin ally intended to disguise the symp- toms of menopause by blocking the action of the dopamine neurotransmitters), the users of heroin could prosecute the state in instances of withdrawal or overdose for that state’s having prevented the production, distribution, and consumption of that substance for users in a trustwor- thy and legal manner. This political pressure would lead gradually to the production and distribution of heroin (or cocaine, MDA, etc.) as generics that could be first bought freely on the pharmaceutical market and, in the long run, be produced and managed collectively as *chemical prostheses* 61. Some side effects include Parkinsonian syndromes, symptoms of anxiety, and depression. **394 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** *commons*. This would ultimately entail a process of a mul- titude-in-the-making, not only of a lobby of consumers of gender and sex biocodes but also a network of trans-junkie experts, a monster-multitude-in-the-making. gender and sex hackers The cis-males and cis-females (indiscriminately hetero- sexual or homosexual), as well as transsexuals, who have access to surgical, endocrinological, or legal techniques of the production of identity, are not simple economic classes in the Marxist sense of the term, but genuine “pharmaco- pornographic factories”—existing simultaneously as raw materials, producers (but rarely proprietors) of biocodes of gender, and pharmacopornographic consumers. Porn actors; whores; the transgender; genderqueers; and producers, traffickers, and consumers of illegal drugs inhabit different cultures, but all are used as living phar- macoporn laboratories. All of them sell, buy, or get access to their biocodes as pharmacopornographic property. The sudden emergence of new gender statuses is creating a novel type of conflict between owners and managers of the patents of the microtechnologies of subjectification (sex hormones, psychotropic molecules, audiovisual codes, etc.) and the producers and traffickers of these techno-bio- codes. The pharmacopornographic entrepreneurs, who are among the contemporary leaders of global capitalism, are trying to restrict and privatize the biocodes of gender and convert them into rare and naturalized objects by means of legal and market techniques. Computer hackers use the web and copyleft programs as ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 395** tools of free and horizontal distribution of information and claim that they should be in reach of everyone. The pharma- copornographic *gendercopyleft* movement has a technoliv- ing platform that is a lot easier to gain access to than the Internet: the body, the *somathèque*. Not the naked body, or the body as unchanging nature, but the technoliving body as a biopolitical archive and cultural prosthesis. Your mem- ory, your desire, your sensibility, your skin, your cock, your dildo, your blood, your sperm, your vulva, your ova . . . are the tools of a potential gendercopyleft revolutionThe various producers of sexual biocodes are very differ- ent from one another. Some get off on economic and social privileges, such as the models through whose bodies the dominant codes of male and female beauty are produced. Others, such as porn actors or sex workers, suffer from the lack of regulations for the open market of their biocodes. But all of them depend on the pharmacopornographic industry and its local alliances with the police forces of the nation-states. One day, they will all become hackers. Agnes, mother of all the techno-lambs: Del LaGrace Volcano, Kate Bornstein, Jacob Hale, Dean Spade, Mauro Cabral, Susan Stryker, Sandy Stone, King Erik, Moises Mar- tínez—all are master hackers of gender, genuine traffickers of semiotico-technological flux, producers and *tinkers* of copyleft biocodes. Gender copyleft strategies must be minor but decisive: the survival of life on the planet is at stake. For this move- ment, there will be no single name that can be transformed into a brand. It will be our responsibility to shift the code to open the political practice to multiple possibilities. We could **396 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** call this movement, which has already begun, Postporn, Free Fuckware, BodyPunk, OpenGender, FuckYourFather, PentratedState, TotalDrugs, PornTerror, AnalInflation, UnitedUniversalTechnoPriapism . . . This book, a legacy of Agnes’s self-experimentation poli- tics, is a protocol for self-tests carried out with testosterone in gel form, exercises of controlled poisoning on my own body. I am infecting myself with a chemical signifier cul- turally branded as masculine. Vaccinating yourself with tes- tosterone can be a technique of resistance for bodies that have been assigned the status of cis-females. To acquire a certain political immunity of gender, to get roaring drunk on masculinity, to know that it is possible to look like the hegemonic gender. Little by little, the administration of testosterone has ceased to be a simple political test and has molted into a discipline, an asceticism, a way of restoring my spirit by means of the down growing on my arms, **an addiction, a form of gratification, an escape, a prison, a paradise**. Hormones are chemical prostheses. Political drugs. In this case, the substance not only modifies the filter through which we decode and recodify the world; it also radically modifies the body and, as a result, **the mode under which we are decoded by others**. Six months of testosterone, and any cis-female at all, not a should-have-been-boy or a les- bian, but any girl, any neighborhood kid, a Jennifer Lopez or a Rihanna, can become a member of the male species who cannot be told apart from any other member of the hegemonic class. ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 397** I refuse the medico-political dose, its regime, its regu- larity, its direction. I demand a virtuosity of gender; to each one, its dose; for each context, its exact requirement. Here, there is no norm, merely a diversity of viable monstrosi- ties. I take testosterone like Walter Benjamin took hashish, Freud cocaine, or Michaux mescaline. And that is not an autobiographical excuse but a radicalization (in the chemi- cal sense of the term) of my theoretical writing. My gen- der does not belong to my family or to the state or to the pharmaceutical industry. My gender does not belong to feminism or to the lesbian community or to queer theory. Gender must be torn from the macrodiscourse and diluted with a good dose of micropolitic[s]al hedonist psychedelics. I don’t recognize myself. Not when I’m on T, or when I’m not on T. I’m neither more nor less myself. Contrary to the Lacanian theory of the mirror state, according to which the child’s subjectivity is formed when it recognizes itself for the first time in its specular image, political sub- jectivity emerges precisely when the subject does not rec- ognize itself in its representation. It is fundamental not to recognize oneself. Derecognition, disidentification is a condition for the emergence of the political as the possibil- ity of transforming reality. The question posed by Deleuze and Guattari in 1972 in *Anti-Oedipus* remains stuck in our throat: “Why do the masses desire fascism?” It’s not a ques- tion here of opposing a politics of representation to a poli- tics of experimentation, but of becoming aware of the fact that the techniques of political representation always entail programs of the somatic production of subjectivity. I’m not **398 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** opting for any direct action against representation, but for a micropolitics of disidentification, a kind of experimenta- tion that doesn’t have faith in representation as an exteri- ority that will bring truth or happiness. In order to accomplish the work of therapy for the mul- titudes that I have begun with these doses of testosterone and with writing, I now need only to convince you, all of you, that you are like me, and not the opposite. I am not going to claim that I’m like you, your equal, or ask you to allow me to participate in your laws or to admit me as a part of your social normality. My ambition is to convince you that you are like me. Tempted by the same chemical abuse. You have it in you: you think that you’re cis-females, but you take the Pill; or you think you’re cis-males, but you take Viagra; you’re normal, and you take Prozac or Paxil in the hope that something will free you from your problems of decreased vitality, and you’ve shot cortisone and cocaine, taken alcohol and Ritalin and codeine . . . You, you as well, you are the monster that testosterone is awakening in me

#### The Kritik is an attempt to alliance the debate space with the plan of the drag-king workshop, to energize an immanent discussion of gender and thus disidentify and decodify systems of pharmaporngraphic bio-political controls. Creating networks of micropolitical communities in which gives rise to new epistemologies of gender and their potential for emancipation.

**Preciado 13( Paul B. Preciado, Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, And Biopolitics in the Pharmacoporgraphic era, The micropolitics of gender in the pharmacoporngraphic era, The drag king plan of action, pg 365-389) Lynbrook SY**

The drag king plan OF aCTiOn The first time I take part in a drag king workshop is in 1998 at the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Com- munity Center on West Thirteenth Street in New York. I sign up for the workshop with a mixture of voracious curi- osity and confusion, characteristic of someone who comes fm post-Franco Spain. I also participate in some lesbian sadomasochism workshops for fist-fucking, public sex, and coming out via writing; some workshops for pre-op and non-op transsexuals and NOHOs (those who take no hormones) and their partners; and some workshops to pro- mote the visibility of sexual minorities. During the years when I inhabited the city of the living dead, I turned, in my struggle against an endemic loneliness, to a system for that training and construction of identity techniques developed by queer and trans micropolitics that, I am now convinced, not only helped me overcome the depression common to metropolises but also ended up as elements of a disci- pline of the mind, replacing the *exercises* of Saint Ignatius de Loyola from my Catholic childhood. This technique of the self is what would next allow me to resist being disap- pointed in politics, to resist succumbing completely to dis- enchantment and to your death. ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 365** My first drag king workshop is an initiatory exercise, the first step in an open process of mutation. There are a dozen of us cis-females, assigned the female gender at birth; each of us gives her name and explains where she comes from and what her experience with gender and sexual norms has been. The organizer is a butch woman with short hair who is wearing leather pants, with the face of a young boy and a soft voice. She listens attentively to our stories, but without awarding them too much psychological weight. Although we are in the LGBT Community Center, not all of us iden- tify as being lesbian, butch, or bisexual. There are also some cis-females who go out with transsexual men and a hetero actress who has come for theatrical training on how to con- struct a male role. Going around the group twice produces enough talk to verify the fact that dealing with cultural and political codes of femininity and masculinity is not exclu- sively a lesbian or transsexual matter. The group members speak about their first time, rape, abortion, incest, the dif- ficulties of having to feel different from other girls, the shame experienced at being pointed at in school for being a tomboy, or having too large a chest, or not having enough of one, or having one too early or too late, about not being able to sit the way they want or where they want, about not being able to spit or shout or hit back when others hit. I talk about never having felt like a woman, about thinking at the age of seven that I’d travel from Spain to Sweden like Christine Jorgensen with my first savings and get a penis grafted on, then about the operation on my chin when I was eighteen, about the feeling of not recognizing my body or **366 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** my face. Little by little, a denser and denser fabric of voices is created; it surrounds us and allows us to cover ourselves with shared words, creating a collective second skin. Under that protective membrane, through a political magnifying glass, we can see that femininity and masculinity are the gears of a larger system in which every single person par- ticipates structurally. Knowledge liberates. It produces a certain political joy that I have never experienced before. This first part of the workshop could be defined as a col- lective induction into *gender suspicion*, in reference to the hermeneutics of Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud as described by Paul Ricoeur.36 It encourages us to examine what we assume are stable foundations of our identity (sex, gen- der, and sexuality) and see them as the opaque effects of cultural and political constructions and, consequently, as potential objects for a process of intentional, critical, and insubordinate intervention. This shared gender suspicion provokes a subjective shift that Teresa de Lauretis and José Muñoz have called “disidentification.”37 The drag king workshop doesn’t begin with dressing or making up our face [tryin] to look like a man, but in becoming aware of the cul- tural orthopedics that construct everyday femininity, and by disidentifying from the normative nature of politically assigned gender. Transformed by this knowledge, we put on men’s cloth- ing and learn how to fashion a *packing* with condoms filled 36. Paul Ricoeur, *De l’Interprétation: Essai sur Freud* (Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1965), and Paul Ricoeur and Olivier Mongin, *Le Conflit des inteprétations: Essais d’herméneutique* (Paris: Le Seuil, 1969), 149–50. 37. On disidentification, see José Esteban Muñoz, *Disidentification: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999). ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 367** with cotton and how to bind our chest. By flattening the chest and making the pelvis bigger, you can modify the axis of the body and the balance of proportion between the shoulders, arms, and legs. Thus, the body’s center of gravity—culturally located in cis-females at the level of the breasts (the sexualizing site par excellence and focal point of the hetero-male gaze)—is displaced to the pelvis. The legs are slightly spread, thus changing the distance between the feet and providing a more stable support for walking. Once verticality has been reinforced, freedom of movement of the trunk and extension of the arms is increased. Following the instructions of our drag king orchestrator, I clip off a lock of hair and cut it into smaller pieces, then rearrange it on a sheet of creased white paper so that the hairs are aligned in the fold. I create my first beard. At first, I don’t know exactly what kind of beard I want or which kind suits me, the one that goes the best with my face or with the type of drag king that I am. It will be the same thing with testosterone later on; the transfer of the hair pertains to illicit trafficking, to the smuggling of a political signifier. Subject fiction in a flash: these hairs applied to the face of a cis-female offer a glimpse of the possibility of another life. It’s a certainty that wearing a beard provides an accelerated image of what the administration of testosterone produces in a cis-female’s body after four to six months. Such artifice is therefore not merely a masquerade, a disguise, pure exte- riority, but a revelation of a pharmacopornographic possi- bility already existing in my genes, and it has the ability to take on a cultural and political signification. On my face I outline the shape into which the beard will need to fit: a **368 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** Mexican-style mustache that descends from the corners of the mouth to the edge of the chin. I think of Pancho Villa, of Walter Benjamin. I think of you. Suddenly I see it in the mirror out of the corner of my eye: Bob. No mystery to that; it’s just me, but it’s also a man. I’m not inventing it; he’s not a stage character; he is emerging out of what I am, the way I’ve always seen myself. The difference between now and before is that from now on it’s visible to others. I’m not hiding any longer behind the name that was given to me, or the weighty supposition that I am or ought to be a woman. The important thing is not to be dressed as a man— anyone at all can do that in his or her private space—but to have had the *collective experience* of the arbitrary and constructed dimensions of our gender. During the first drag king workshop, we’re not trying to produce a theat- rical effect or a caricatured stereotype of gender, but to construct a commonplace, all-purpose form of masculinity. Surprisingly, from this perspective, a minimal transforma- tion produces an effect of maximum realism. Obviously, it’s possible to think about the varieties of kitsch or camp in a drag king performance, in which the goal is to bring out the constructed dimensions of masculinity with hyperbolic style, as would be the case in drag king incarnations of Elvis Presley, the over-the-hill skirt chaser, the vulgar macho guy, or the cliché of a plumber in porn. In any case, the drag king destiny of each participant is an insoluble enigma until the moment when the transformation is produced. The pro- cess evolves in the course of performative exercises in the workshop and often extends into daily life. What struck me about that first experience was the power of the work shop as a collective plan of action for the reprogramming of gender, its potential to function as a political laboratory, its denseness in its capacity as public space. I immediately knew that I wanted to do it with others, reproduce this plan of action, and that a single time wasn’t enough for me. There is a ritual dimension, a psychopolitical magic in the drag king workshop and its performative process of becom- ing, something that I cannot shirk, that intrigued me from the beginning, and that led me with the passage of time to become the drag king MC. This is how I was given access to a culture of resistance against the normalization of gender organized around an array of drag king micropolitics that generated platforms to create and distribute knowledge. Drag king culture made its appearance in New York and San Francisco in the mid- 1980s, in the workshops of Diane Torr, Annie Sprinkle, and Jack Armstrom;38 the performances of Moby Dick, Dred, Split Britches, and the Five Lesbian Brothers; and the photographic work of Del LaGrace Volcano.39 This cul- ture hasn’t found its niche in universities or archives; it has spread through a network of bars, clubs, and organizations that today reaches from San Francisco to Istanbul. Drag king practices create a space of visibility peculiar to fag, dyke, and trans culture by recycling and by parodic declension and deconstruction of models of masculinity coming from dominant popular culture. Man and woman, masculine and feminine, and also homosexual and hetero- 38. Sprinkle, *Post-Porn Modernist*, 131. 39. See Del LaGrace Volcano and Judith “Jack” Halberstam, *The Drag King Book* (London: Serpent’s Tail, 1999). **370 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** sexual seem to be insufficient codes and identity locations for describing the contemporary production of the queer, trans, and crip body. Performative politics will become a field for experimentation, a place for the production of new subjectivities, and, as a result, a true alternative to tradi- tional ways of doing politics that surpasses resignifying or resisting normalization. 2000. I spend six months at Princeton University and six months at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Soci- ales in France. Drag king practices are nearly nonexistent in France, Spain, and Italy; I decide to start organizing workshops. Obviously, this takes me to the heart of the drag king mafia: Diane Torr and Del LaGrace will become my first mentors. When I do a workshop with Diane Torr in France or in Spain, I’m the one who takes care of the commissions and acts as translator, the kid who picks up the cigarette butts and shines the shoes; and Danny King becomes the “master.” I’m there to learn from the boss and, according to the ethic of “drag king *oblige*,” to make him feel that he is the boss. In my workshops, obviously, I’m the boss. And this power is not to be shared; if you share it with another person or several others, you’ve lost your cachet as a *king*. This is one of the first lessons about mascu- linity—everything depends on the way power is managed: making another person believe that he has the power, even if, in reality, the person has it only because you’ve conceded it to him. Or else making the other believe that power, as something natural and nontransferable, is yours, and that ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 371** you and only you will be able to endow him with the status of masculinity, which he needs to belong to the dominant class. Foucault put it best when talking about sovereignty: power doesn’t exist beyond the techniques involved in its theatricalization. Masculinity, an old biopolitical fiction constructed within the sovereign society before the eigh- teenth century, depends on an orchestration of power and body techniques, on a system in which power circulates through shared performative codes that are transmitted from body to body via semiotic signs and material rituals. Diane Torr’s technique of the deconstruction of femi- ninity and apprenticeship in masculinity depends on a the- atrical analytic method, on the breaking down of learned body gestures (a way of walking, speaking, sitting, getting up, looking, smoking, eating, smiling) into basic units (dis- tance between the legs, opening of the eyes, movement of the eyebrows, speed of the arms, fullness of the smile, etc.) and examining them in their capacity as cultural signs for the construction of gender. In a second synthetic moment, different cultural codes are rearranged to construct a dif- ferent gender fiction.40 The goal of Diane’s workshops is to experiment physically and theatrically with the ways in which masculinity is produced by an array of performa- tive cultural codes learned and incorporated through what Judith Butler has called “regularized and constrained rep- etition of norms.”41 40. See Diane Torr and Stephen Bottoms, *Sex, Drag, and Male Roles: Investigating Gender as Performance* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2010). 41. Judith Butler, *Bodies that Matter*, 95. **372 *The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era*** In order to construct my own workshops, I have learned from Diane’s performative analysis of action, combined with a psychopolitical method that is closer to posttrau- matic reeducation of the body and to the training of politi- cal minorities for survival, starting with *gender suspicion* and the elaboration of a collective narrative. There is no anatomical truth independent of the cultural and politi- cal practices of constrained repetition that lead us toward being men or women. From this perspective, which I would call postqueer—because it has experienced Butler’s per- formative theories but also AIDS, Dolly the sheep, and the intentional consumption of hormones—desire, sexuality, and erotic and political pleasure reside precisely in *hav- ing access* to these performative biocodes. I suppose it’s a matter of my generation and the fact that I’ve had it up to here with the dominant feminist politics and their restric- tions: prohibitions about using dildos, prohibitions about watching pornography, prohibitions about fucking with everything, prohibitions about wanting money and power, prohibitions about succeeding, prohibitions about amus- ing yourself at the expense of those close to you, prohibi- tions about destroying the house of the master with the tools of the master. For me, being a drag king is inhabiting the potential that it is my prerogative not to deny, without apologizing, and fulfilling my sexual and political desire to be the master, to incorporate those performative codes, to attain this type of specialization of power, to experiment with the city, the body, sex, public speech the way a cis-male would. Without excuses. Without naturalization. Once the initial construction of a drag king imperson- ***The micropolitics of Gender in the Pharmacopornographic era* 373** ation is over, a performative practice guided by exercises of self-observation, recodification, and improvisation can begin. Becoming a drag king is a process that could be called a gender “chance operation,” using the well-known technique developed by Merce Cunningham: finding a way between norm and improvisation, between repetition and invention. When the participants have succeeded in con- structing a masculine fiction that is sufficiently convincing and commonplace, they can confront the “naturalistic” gen- der ecology in the outside world. One of the most intense and transformative workshop techniques is experienced when you explore the city as a drag king. Walking around, getting a coffee, going down to the subway, hailing a taxi, sitting on a bench, smoking a cigarette leaning against a school wall . . . A new cartography of the city takes shape;