## Erasure AC

CW – non graphic descriptions of anti queer violence and queer negativity

### Part 1 – To forget

#### It looks like the topic committee forgot the queer again, not surprising judging by how they, like politics, the state, and education as a whole seem contempt to erase queer identity from discussions of just about anything. The topic is haunted by the child, wherever I look whatever side of this debate I am on I can’t seem to escape the constant affirmation of a future that doesn’t include me, a world that I don’t belong to, and a topic that seems to forget I exist.

#### The topics focus on access to medicine begs the question of who that medicine is for. The health industry constantly erases queer folk via the heteronormative model of the “typical” patient that excludes queer bodies. It doesn’t matter if we get rid of IPP for medicine because that medicine was never built for us in the first place no matter what side of the topic we are on we are always the overlooked patient we are always forgotten from the discussion.

#### Macfife 19 THE NOT-SO-TYPICAL PATIENT: GYNECOLOGICAL TEACHING ASSOCIATES AND THE STRUGGLE TO QUEER MEDICINE A Thesis submitted to the faculty of San Francisco State University In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree Master of Arts In Sexuality Studies by Bex MacFife San Francisco, California May 2019

In medical education, students encounter lessons that anticipate the patients they should expect to meet over the course of their careers. Without explicit description of that patient or the normative assumptions guiding visions of ordinary people’s medical concerns, students readily rely on a default cultural imaginary of a “typical” patient, “average” person, and “normal” concerns. As Danielle describes in the epigraph above, the imagined “typical patient” easily comes to embody dominant understandings of “good sexuality” (Rubin, 1984). A heteronormative model easily prevails—one that extends beyond sexual preference to include sexual practice, gender identity, gender expression, gender roles, relationship style, size, ability, class, and race (Warner, 1991). This hegemonic cultural imaginary of a typical patient excludes many bodies, identities, and health behaviors, and these “othered” people come to seem irrelevant to medicine. Medical providers are unprepared to receive and care for stigmatized patients; health disparities are left unchallenged, if not exacerbated (Robertson, 2017). In the following pages, I explore how some Gynecological Teaching Associates (GTAs) try to interrupt understandings of this default heteronormative “typical” patient. GTAs are educators who teach pelvic and breast exams within healthcare schools by acting as both instructors and models (Kretzshmar, 1978). After addressing interpersonal aspects of the exam and patient interview and walking through the technical steps involved in an exam and interview, GTAs undress and invite students to practice those lessons on the GTAs’ bodies and with the GTAs’ guidance. Sessions are usually small, with three to five students per GTA, and last between two and four hours to allow for individualized feedback. GTAs have an unusual role in medical education: they are not themselves medical providers or faculty, and their expertise comes from embodied knowledge of their own anatomy and trainings by more experienced GTAs (Underman, 2011). Their dual role as educators and as exam recipients afford them a special position in medical pedagogy and special opportunities to discuss sensitive topics that may not otherwise be addressed. My focus is educators working with the GTA organization, The Applied Practice Collective1. Driven by their own queer experiences in conventional health care, Applied Practice educators incorporate left-out populations by including examples of othered behaviors, identities, and bodies in their interactions with healthcare students. Applied Practice GTAs advocate for excluded populations, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people, gender non-conforming (GNC) and non-binary people, sex workers, non-monogamous, kink-practicing, houseless, disabled, people of color, and post-menopausal people. GTAs’ challenge to the categories and assumptions that pervade systems of medical education constitute a form of social change activism and an effort to queer medicine. Though gender and sexual identities are central to Applied Practice’s work, “queer” functions as more than an identity category in GTA work. “Queer” is also a verb in this context—a theoretical opposition to categories at large and a political orientation as much as a sexual one (Cohen, 1997). Expanding the category of typical gynecological patient—and of “woman” in general—allows space for more fluidity and movement in sexuality and gender. Queer, trans, and GNC patients may more obviously be relevant to a gynecology-specific training, but overlooked patients who could benefit from a queer re-examination of inclusivity in medicine extend beyond LBTQ+ acronyms to include other marginalized patients. As Cathy Cohen explains, “in addition to highlighting the instability of sexual categories and sexual subjects, queer activists also directly challenge the multiple practices and vehicles of power which render them invisible and at risk” (1997, p. 439). GTAs resist the power of the medical institution and its history of categorizing and marginalizing people like them. And, as I will demonstrate, they also concede some of their queemess to do so. To queer medicine is to address real-life health disparities. Mounting evidence indicates that queer people face stigma in healthcare settings, resulting in stress, distrust of medicine, and poor health outcomes (Daniel and Butkus, 2015; Graham et al., 2011; Lambda Legal, 2010; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012). The 2011 National Transgender Discrimination Survey found that trans and gender non-conforming people postpone or avoid medical care due to discrimination, with 28% of respondents indicating that they delay care, 19% reporting having been denied care, and 50% of respondents stating that they have had to teach their providers about their own healthcare needs (Grant et al., 2011). Hanssmann, Morrison, and Russian found that increasing provider awareness and education around trans and GNC etiquette and needs is instrumental to addressing issues specific to those demographics (2008). Women who have sex with women also receive unequal treatment in medicine. For example, the erroneous assumption that lesbian sex does not carry STI risk leads to lower testing rates (Bauer and Welles, 2001). Severa1 professional associations have put forth reports about these LGBTQ+ health inequalities and guidelines for addressing them. Medical education is a site for the reproduction of social inequalities. In an ethnographic study of allopathic (MD) medical schools, Marie Murphy found that heteronormativity, or the default presumption of heterosexuality and normative behavior, is pervasive: sexual minorities are largely absent in the limited sex education that medical students receive (2016). Juno Obedin-Malever and colleagues found that one third of medical schools include no clinical training for addressing lesbian, gay, or bisexual health needs and that overall, sexual minorities are addressed for a median of five hours over an MD’s education (2011). With mixed results, LGBT-specific education often takes the form of cultural competency trainings, following a model originally designed to combat racial and ethnic health disparities (Betancourt, 2006). Trans-specific competency trainings can provide opportunities for trans-spectrum individuals to advocate for themselves and their communities; however, they may unintentionally tokenize marginalized people or give the attending medical providers the impression that they leave the trainings with an understanding of the entirety of trans experiences—experiences that are in fact diverse (Hanssmann, Morrison, and Russian, 2008).

#### All forms of politics no matter how radical or moderate is in constant affirmation of the figure of the child and reproductive futurism one that is exclusive to queer bodies.

#### Baedan (1) “Not for the children” <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan#toc3>

Edelman’s critique of politics begins with the figure of the Child. All political positions, he argues, represent themselves as doing what is best for the children. Politicians, whatever their parties or leanings, universally frame their debates around the question of what policies are best for the children, who keeps the Child safest, or what type of world we want to be building for our children. The centrality of the Child in the field of the political is not limited to electoral politics or political parties. Nationalist groups organize themselves around a necessity to preserve a future for their children, while anarchist and communist revolutionaries concern themselves with revolutionary organizing meant to create a better world for future generations. Politicians concern themselves with different children depending on their varying from ideologies, but the Child stays constant as a universal Möbius strip, inverting itself and flipping so as to be the unquestioned and untouchable universal value of all politics. Politics, however supposedly radical, is simply the universal movement of submission to the ideal of the future—to preserve, maintain and upgrade the structures of society and to proliferate them through time all for the sake of the children. The Child must always name the horizon and the beneficiary of every political project. It is for this reason that Edelman contends that queerness finds itself missing from all political discourse: For the liberal’s view of society, which seems to accord the queer a place, endorses no more than the conservative right’s the queerness of resistance to futurism and thus the queerness of the queer. While the right wing imagines the elimination of queers (or of the need to confront their existence), the left would eliminate queerness by shining the cool light of reason upon it, hoping thereby to expose it as merely a mode of sexual expression free of the all-pervasive coloring, the determining fantasy formation, by means of which it can seem to portend, and not for the right alone, the undoing of the social order and its cynosure, the Child. Queerness thus comes to mean nothing for both: for the right wing, the nothingness always at war with the positivity of civil society; for the left, nothing more than a sexual practice in need of demystification. The Child, of course, has very little to do with real children. Like all people, children are enslaved under the political order of the state and capital, expected to bear the burden of being the innocent beneficiaries of political initiatives. No, rather the Child is the fantastic symbol for the eternal proliferation of class society. The Child represents the succession of generations and the continuation of this society beyond the lifespans of its living members. All politics, being concerned primarily with the Child, then reveal themselves to be only ever a process by which to manage and secure the continued existence of society. As enemies of society, we are also enemies of politics. To quote Edelman: The fantasy subtending the image of the child invariably shapes the logic within which the political itself must be thought. That logic compels us, to the extent that we would register as politically responsible, to submit to the framing of political debate—and, indeed of the political field—as defined by the terms of what this book describes as reproductive futurism: terms that impose an ideological limit on political discourse as such, preserving in the process the absolute privilege of heteronormativity by rendering unthinkable, by casting outside the political domain, the possibility of a queer resistance to this organizing principle of communal relations. If the varying discourses of politics are only ever about the Child (as society’s future), queerness must be anti-political because it marks a fundamental interruption of the societal norms and apparatuses that exist to mandate the reproduction the Child. Yes, queer sex can be non-reproductive sex, but we cannot define queerness through such overly-simple and naturalistic logics. Queerness, beyond being the negation of the heteronormative family matrix, must also be practiced as a willful refusal of the political imperative to reproduce class society. In a world where all social relations are enchanted by our obligation to the Child as the future of the social order, we must break those communal relations and break the stranglehold of politics over our daily lives. Queerness must be an outside to politics, an antagonism against the political, or it isn’t queer at all. By Edelman’s account: Queerness names the side of those “not fighting for the children.” The side outside the consensus by which all politics confirms the absolute value of reproductive futurism. The ups and downs of political fortune may measure the social order’s pulse, but queerness, by contrast figures outside and beyond its political symptoms, the place of the social order’s death drive: a place, to be sure, of abjection expressed in the stigma, sometimes fatal that follows from reading that figure literally

#### Narratives of combatting violence through state action is an example of pinkwashing- claiming that political actions make everything ok for queer folk while covering up the very real violence going on below the surface. It’s the worst kind of feel-good politics. As long as the resolution acts as a vehicle to champion inclusion through modern political institutions, affirming the resolution is violent towards queer folk.

Spade 15 Dean Spade (Dean Spade (born 1977) is a lawyer, writer, and Associate Professor of Law at Seattle University School of Law. In 2002, he founded the Sylvia Rivera Law Project, a non-profit law collective in New York City that provides free legal services to transgender, intersex and gender non-conforming people who are low-income and/or people of color. Spade was a staff attorney at SRLP from 2002 to 2006, during which time he presented testimony to the National Prison Rape Elimination Commission and helped achieve a major victory for transgender youth in foster care in the Jean Doe v. Bell case. More recently, Spade was involved with the campaign to stop Seattle from building a new jail) “Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, & the Limits of Law” Duke University Press Pg. 140-143 July 13, 2015 <https://books.google.com/books?id=GYgwCgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=bolsters&f=false> DOA:2.25.19 BAO

In the first edition, I argued that rather than freeing marginalized and endangered populations, gaining legal recognition and inclusion both fails to improve their material circumstances and bolsters the very apparatuses of violence that target them. In the period since this book was originally published, an important new way of naming and conceptualizing this dynamic has emerged in queer resistance discourse. The term pinkwashing has become a way for activists to talk about how lgbt legal equality is being used to legitimize and expand the apparatuses of state violence. Pinkwashing is most frequently used to describe the explicit strategy that the Israeli government has undertaken in recent years to market itself as a human rights leader based on its stances on same-sex marriage and lgbt military service. In 2005, after three years of development with US marketing executives, Israel announced a new campaign to rebrand itself to change its international image. Brand research had shown that all over the world Israel was a country associated with war and the oppression of Palestinians. Its new campaign, “Brand Israel,” was designed to portray Israel as a “modern democracy” in the Middle East, surrounded by countries with less enlightened policy and culture. Brand Israel would portray the country as a place of technological innovation, environmental awareness, and diversity.2 One element in the campaign is to portray Israel as a country that recognizes gay and lesbian rights and as an ideal destination for gay and lesbian tourism. It also aims to represent Palestinian society as homophobic and Israel as a “safe haven” for gays and lesbians in the region. Palestinian queer and trans activists brought the world’s attention to Israel’s strategic framing of itself as gay friendly and of Arab and Muslim people and countries as homophobic for purposes of covering over and distracting from its ongoing brutal colonization and occupation of Palestine by coining the term pinkwashing.3 As part of its efforts, Israel has provided financial resources to media outlets to produce news coverage about Israel as a gay and lesbian tourist destination. Israel has also funded tours of Israeli gay activists to the United States and Canada who frame conversations about gay politics in Israel that ignore and therefore normalize the context of colonialism in which these politics play out. Shifting the conversation about Israel to one focused on gay activism among those who benefit from the apartheid system in Israel helps make that system become taken for granted or invisible and ignores the plight of everyone suffering from that system. In short, it washes the conversation about Palestine and occupation out of the picture. The Israeli think tank the Reut Institute has published research endorsing this kind of strategy, arguing that Israel should support and fund content that is as far left as possible while still retaining a Zionist approach—that is, a commitment to never questioning Israel’s colonization of Palestine and control over Palestinian land and people.4 The Israeli government funds films, traveling delegations of activists, and other cultural and political events that promote discussion of Israel, even some that mildly critique some Israeli policy, as long the underlying message affirms and normalizes the occupation. This strategy helps bring audiences with otherwise left or critical politics, such as those who oppose homophobia and transphobia or support environmentalism, into affirming the Israeli colonial project and associating Israel with issues they see as progressive. The term pinkwashing has helped activists name and discuss the particular strategy of coopting the concept of antihomophobia to redeem the tarnished image of a government, or particular institutions of that government, such as the military, that are associated with violence, racism, and colonialism. The analysis of pinkwashing developed by Palestinian queer and trans activists is immensely useful for understanding the strategic uses of equality politics to forward state violence, by Israel and other governments. The United States under the Obama administration has also increasingly promoted a “progay” and to some extent a “pro-lgbt” image of itself to cover up and distract from the ongoing expansions of brutal racist violence undertaken by the administration.5 In recent years, outrage has been growing about Obama’s drone wars, his record-breaking deportations, his administration’s use of widespread surveillance technologies, his targeting of whistleblowers, the growing wealth divide and his scandalous upward transfer of wealth in the 2008 bailout, and police violence and the crisis-level expansion of imprisonment, including for-profit imprisonment, in the United States under his watch. The relentless revelations about the administration’s actions and agenda threaten the national fantasy that the election of a Black president heralds increasing equality, justice, and progressivism. Gay rights, as a symbol of left politics associated with freedom and liberation, has provided a false marker of progressivism for the administration as it works to maintain this fantasy. Conveniently, the public assertions that the administration has made of its commitment to gay rights, including the law and policy changes it has accomplished, provide little to no relief for queer and trans people facing increasing precarity as criminalization, austerity, and border enforcement expand. For the most part, the “lgbt” politics that the Obama administration have articulated have very little “T” in them and are instead about public support for legal recognition of same-sex marriages. Same-sex marriage is an ideal pinkwashing issue for Obama as well as other elected officials, businesses, and institutions. It allows these actors to claim a politics associated with equality and liberation while actually endorsing a legal change that does nothing to disrupt the existing harmful distribution of property, health care, and immigration status through the legal structure of the marital family. It offers the cover of progressivism for whatever else these players are doing, since they get to use this charismatic issue to portray themselves as promoters of equality, yet it in no way threatens the existing distribution of wealth that they seek to protect. Elected officials get to appear simultaneously “profamily” (a conservative mainstay now ubiquitous across all the parties) and “progay” through this issue. Because it provides this political opportunity for elites without actually endangering the brutal systems that keep them in power, same-sex marriage has become the visible “gay rights” issue of the day. Unfortunately, its recognition will be of little use to the queer and trans people facing the worst harms in immigration, health care, criminal punishment, and social welfare systems in the United States. Similarly, support for gay and lesbian military service, and the ending of “don’t ask, don’t tell,” allowed for a portrayal of the US military as a site of freedom and equality, which is a useful distraction from the realities of its brutality. Supporting gay and lesbian military service allowed politicians to simultaneously send a promilitary message and a pro–gay and lesbian rights message, useful to bolster warm feelings about the military during a period of long, expensive, privatized, unpopular wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Same-sex marriage and gay and lesbian military service have been the most visible sites of pinkwashing in US politics so far, but trans politics is beginning to join lesbian and gay rights as a site of pinkwashing. As I write today, in December 2014, trans politics is emerging as a new location of pinkwashing brutal state violence for two apparatuses in particular: the military and the prison system. In different ways in these contexts, a purported concern for trans well-being is producing advocacy that legitimizes these broadly harmful institutions, fails to support trans well-being, and further endangers trans lives. The mainstreaming of trans politics—the creation of a new image of who trans people are and what we want—goes hand in hand with the use of trans politics to pinkwash brutal systems and policies. The term mainstream has multiple meanings that can sometimes be misleading when it comes to queer and trans politics. Often, when people talk about “mainstream” gay politics, they mean the version of gay and lesbian rights advocacy that gets the most media attention and philanthropic support. Sometimes, however, it can sound like the version of lesbian and gay politics that is most desired by most lesbian and gay people. When I use the term here to talk about how trans politics is mainstreaming, I do not mean to suggest that the trans politics that is becoming most visible and most supportable by media, philanthropists, and politicians is also the one most desired by or most beneficial to trans people. In fact, I think the process of mainstreaming means that the key issues trans people care about get cast aside and to the extent issues trans people care a lot about get picked up, the most important resistance politics get evacuated from them so that they can be framed in ways that support the aims of the corporate media, politicians, and wealthy philanthropists rather than the survival needs of trans people. Antipinkwashing analysis helps us identify how this stripped-down, mainstreamable version of trans resistance can be picked up by elites and made to work against trans people and for the sustained power of those at the top. The mainstreaming of trans politics is concerning both because of how it fails to support trans people’s well-being and because of how what becomes the visible trans agenda is not based on what trans people want or need but on what is desirable and convenient to elites.

#### Educative spheres are the compulsory reproduction of the Child – debate is weaponized under the guise of ‘productivity’ to construct and maintain the apositionality of queerness.

**Edelman 17** Lee Edelman, 2017, “Learning Nothing: Bad Education,” Duke University Press, differences,
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Good education thus always intends and assures the social good by negating whatever refuses that good and so endangers the Child, even if that danger inheres in the very nature of the Child. Education becomes, like sexuality, compulsory reproduction, procuring the Child for an order of truth that denies the foundational negativity, deficiency, perversion on which it rests. In the aftermath of such an education, as Israël concludes, “one no longer knows anything about the universe of the drive, because the only small way to safeguard something of it is by knowing nothing about it” (87).6 This is the context in which he defines “education as antidrive [l’éducation comme antipulsion]” (87). Education, that is, as understanding, seals off and displaces the incomprehensible element, the ab-sens, that always drives its systematizations, while maintaining that element, dialectically, as the destabilizing other of education and knowledge. Not the negation of knowledge, then, this internal element bespeaks, instead, the negativity inherent in knowledge as such. Adorned with its innocence as privileged nonknowledge, the Child perpetuates through sublimation the enforced nonknowledge as and in which the “universe of the drive” insists, allegorically instantiating the Thing’s sublimation as the creation of something out of nothing, as the dialectical negation of negativity that generates presence through reference to futurity. Allegory, sublimation, and dialectic, then, share a logic with one another, each naming a mode of production that displaces into systematic knowledge a negativity impossible to comprehend and at odds with all totalized forms.7 It follows that a fourth term, education, belongs beside these three: the education that perfectly complements the Child as the promise of coherent totality—the education that is always, as Friedrich Schiller would have it, an aesthetic education. For Schiller the attainment of humanity to its proper moral state depends on this assumption of unity as an ideal: “Every individual man, it may be said, carries in disposition and determination a pure ideal man within himself, with whose unalterable unity it is the great task of his existence, throughout all his vicissitudes, to harmonize” (31). The process of this harmonization, for Schiller, as effected by the “cultivation of Beauty,” constitutes “the education of humanity” (55) and depends on the coordination of life in time, the life of the human as animal, with the development of moral possibility through and as the State. Schiller notes: The great consideration is, therefore, that physical society in time may not cease for an instant while moral society is being formed in idea, that for the sake of human dignity its very existence may not be endangered. When the mechanic has the works of a clock to repair, he lets the wheels run down; but the living clockwork of the State must be repaired while it is still in motion [. . .]. We must therefore search for some support for the continuation of society. (29–30) As Paul de Man points out, the Schillerian aesthetic aims at the unification of sensory content and abstract form, linking the “sensuous world to a world of ideas” (Schiller 115) for reasons that have everything to do with the future that the Child is meant to secure. “[T]he necessity of this synthesis,” de Man remarks, “is made in the name of an empirical concept, which is that of humanity, of the human, which is used then as a principle of closure. The human, the needs of the human, the necessities of the human are absolute and are not open to critical attack” (Aesthetic 150). Needless to say, the “human,” whose continued survival the Child guarantees, constitutes a recurrent site of ideological contestation. But insofar as “We are all Schillerians” (de Man qtd. in Warminski 7) according to de Man—which is to say, adherents, consciously or not, of an aesthetic ideology bound up with reproductive futurism—such contestation concerns the definition, not the value, of the “human.”8 Though the regime of aesthetic ideology protects that value from “critical attack,” queerness refers to whatever conveys the threat of such attack by opening a critical gap within the logic of the aesthetic itself, exposing thereby the negativity from which Schiller and the Schillerian tradition retreat.9 To confront such negativity would require a loss of the only ground on which the “empirical concept” of “humanity” could sustain the fantasy of its sovereignty; as Schiller puts it, “The person must therefore be its own ground, for the enduring cannot issue from alteration; and so we have in the first place the idea of absolute being grounded in itself, that is to say of freedom

#### Every moment that passes more lives are being purged from our history by heterosexual rejections of the notion of queer violence. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best combats structures of queer erasure

Stanley 11 Eric Stanley (assistant professor in the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of California, Riverside) “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture” *Duke University Press Vol 29 No 2* Summer 2011 p. 7 <https://queerhistory.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/near-life-queer-death-eric-stanley.pdf> DOA: 8.30.17 BAO

Where statistics fail, scars rise to tell other histories. From the phenomenological vault of growing up different, to the flickers of brutal details, one would not have to dig deep to uncover a corpse. Yet even with the horrific details, antiqueer violence is written as an outlaw practice, a random event, and an unexpected tragedy. Dominant culture’s necessity to disappear the enormity of antiqueer violence seems unsurprising. Yet I suggest that mainstream LGBT discourse also works in de-politicized collusion with the erasure of a structural recognition. Through this privatization the enormity of antiqueer violence is vanished. Thinking violence as individual acts versus epistemic force works to support the normative and normalizing structuring of public pain. In other words, privatizing antiqueer violence is one of the ways in which the national body and its trauma are heterosexualized, or in which the relegation of antiqueer violence, not unlike violence against women, racist violence, violence against animals (none of which are mutually exclusive), casts the national stage of violence and its ways of mourning as always human, masculinist, able-bodied, white, gender-conforming, and hetero- sexual. For national violence to have value it must be produced through the tangled exclusion of bodies whose death is valueless. To this end, as mainstream LGBT groups clambe for dominant power through attachment of a teleological narrative of progress, they too reproduce the argument that antiqueer violence is something out of the ordinary.

### Part 2 – To erase

#### In the face of the topics erasure of the queer we erase the topic, and in its place we carve out a space that serves to re-write a history for queer folk one that isn’t defined by violence but defined by a negative refusal against systems that would perpetuate our erasure. The ballot is key in immortalizing the AC to negate the topics hope to erase queer discourse. And CX checks all T/theory without it grant me a I meet on their interp

#### We affirm as a form of negativity when faced with the double binding decision of the resolution both sides sharing in the affirmation of queer erasure we cast our vote for “none of the above” a refusal to engage in a topic that is complacent in a system of hope exclusive to queer folk

#### Edelman 04 “No Future: queer theory and the death drive”

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

#### Queer negativity is not only a survival strategy for queer folk but an active movement that can tear down the very systems that reproduce queer violence. We use negativity as a tool to shift queerness structural position and tear down the stable systems that we are denied a place in

#### Baedan 12:

<https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-baedan#toc7> *baedan.* Journal of queer nihilism issue one. Accessed 11/04/18. AQ.

Leftist notions of reform, progress, tolerance, and social justice always come up against the harsh reality that any progressive development can only mean a more sophisticated system of misery and exploitation; that tolerance means nothing; that justice is an impossibility. Activists, progressive and revolutionary alike, will always respond to our critique of the social order with a demand that we articulate some sort of alternative. Let us say once and for all that we have none to offer. Faced with the system’s seamless integration of all positive projects into itself, we can’t afford to affirm or posit any more alternatives for it to consume. Rather we must realize that our task is infinite, not because we have so much to build but because we have an entire world to destroy. Our daily life is so saturated and structured by capital that it is impossible to imagine a life worth living, except one of revolt. We understand destruction to be necessary, and we desire it in abundance. We have nothing to gain through shame or lack of confidence in these desires. There cannot be freedom in the shadow of prisons, there cannot be human community in the context of commodities, there cannot be self-determination under the reign of a state. This world—the police and armies that defend it, the institutions that constitute it, the architecture that gives it shape, the subjectivities that populate it, the apparatuses that administer its function, the schools that inscribe its ideology, the activism that franticly responds to its crises, the arteries of its circulation and flows, the commodities that define life within it, the communication networks that proliferate it, the information technology that surveils and records it—must be annihilated in every instance, all at once. To shy away from this task, to assure our enemies of our good intentions, is the most crass dishonesty. Anarchy, as with queerness, is most powerful in its negative form. Positive conceptions of these, when they are not simply a quiet acquiescence in the face of a sophisticated and evolving totality of domination, are hopelessly trapped in combat with the details of this totality on its own terms. In No Future, Edelman appropriates and privileges a particular psychoanalytic concept: the death drive. In elaborating the relationship of “queer theory and the death drive” (the subtitle of No Future), he deploys the concept in order to name a force that isn’t specifically tied to queer identity.

#### They continue

The symbolic deployment of queerness by the social order is always an attempt to identify the negativity of the death drive, to lock this chaotic potential up in the confines of this or that subjectivity. Foucault’s work is foundational to queer theory in part because of his argument that power must create and then classify antagonistic subjectivities so as to then annihilate any subversive potential within a social body. Homosexuals, gangsters, criminals, immigrants, welfare mothers, transsexuals, women, youth, terrorists, the black bloc, communists, extremists: power is always constructing and defining these antagonistic subjects which must be managed. When the smoke clears after a riot, the state and media apparatuses universally begin to locate such events within the logic of identity, freezing the fluidity of revolt into a handful of subject positions to be imprisoned, or, more sinisterly, organized. Progressivism, with its drive toward inclusion and assimilation, stakes its hope on the social viability of these subjects, on their ability to participate in the daily reproduction of society. In doing so, the ideology of progress functions to trap subversive potential within a particular subject, and then to solicit that subject’s self-repudiation of the danger which they’ve been constructed to represent. This move for social peace fails to eliminate the drive, because despite a whole range of determinisms, there is no subject which can solely and perfectly contain the potential for revolt. The simultaneous attempt at justice must also fail, because the integration of each successive subject position into normative relations necessitates the construction of the next Other to be disciplined or destroyed. Rather than a progressive project which aims to steadily eradicate an emergent chaos over time, our project, located at the threshold of Edelman’s work, bases itself upon the persistent negativity of the death drive. We choose not to establish a place for queers, thereby shifting the structural position of queerness to some other population. We identify with the negativity of the drive, and thereby perform a disidentification away from any identity to be represented or which can beg for rights.

### Part 3 – Under view

#### [1] Neuroscience proves Lacanian psychoanalysis is true and falsifiable
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I argue that these three Lacanian orders relate to the basic areas of neural anatomy: the left and right neocortex, plus the subcortical areas (from limbic system to brainstem).21 Humans share with all pre-existing animals, at least as far back as reptiles, a core brainstem that regulates internal functions and processes instinctual responses to outside stimuli, such as the body's instant, unconscious reaction to danger. We share with mammals a limbic system (including the temporal lobes at the sides of the head) that evolved around the brainstem to process more complex emotions and learned behaviors.22 Like other primates, we also have an expanded neocortex as the outermost layer of our brain (with occipital lobes in the back of the head, parietal lobes at the top rear, and frontal lobes).23 However, humans evolved distinct functional areas on each side of the neocortex. The left neocortex has audioverbal, linear, causal, executive, prosocial, routine functions, in contrast to the right hemisphere's visuospatial, holistic, intuitive, devil's advocate, anxiety- biased, novelty-detecting processes.25 Distinctive language systems (syntax and semantics) are in the left hemisphere, in Broca's and Wernicke's areas,2' in nearly all right-handed people and most left-handed.2. The right brain has further ties to the emotional limbic system and instinctual brainstem, but the left tends to operate separately (especially in men28), expressing or inhibiting limbic emotions and right-cortical intuitions, through its rational language and executive controls. Specifically regarding theatrical mimesis, the left inferior parietal lobe (IPL) is used for recognizing "pantomimes executed by others" because it stores the "complex digrams" or schemas used in the "higher level intentional planning" of actions, while the right IPL is used for interpreting spatial orientation (Jacob and Jeannerod 253). Thus, certain left-cortical functions correlate with Lacan's Symbolic order of language, rules, and social codes, the right with the Imaginary, and the limbic system and brain- stem areas with the Real. Yet these three orders arc "inmixed" dimensions (Ragland-Sullivan 190), as are the corresponding areas of our brains. The Symbolic order resides primarily, but not solely within and between left brains, like the Imaginary in and between right hemispheres, and the Real in limbic systems and brainstems.2- I say "primarily" because there are also aspects of Symbolic language, involving imagery and emotions, in certain right-brain functions: making and interpreting metaphors, contextual meanings, puns, prosody, and non- verbal gestures (Ornstcin 103-08; Cozolino, Neuroscience of Psychotherapy 109). Thus, the right brain is used more for language, along with the left, by "expert" readers (Wolf 162). While the right brains Imaginary order is crucial for "sell-image" (Ornstein 132, 175-76), the spatial sense of ego also depends upon the left brain's "orientation area," as I will consider in the first chapter The general correspondence of Real, Imaginary, and Symbolic orders to the brainstem/limbic system, right hemisphere, and left hemisphere is confirmed by research on developmental growth spurts in the neocortex during childhood. As in Lacan's theory of the mirror stage, with the infant's Imaginary ego initially developing through preverbal communication with the (m)Other, neuroscience shows that right-brain to right-brain "attunement" between the mother and child, during its first two years of life, profoundly shapes its emotional and perceptual pathways, especially its sense of self in relation to others (Cozolino, Neuroscience of Human 38, 66-75, 84-85; Neuroscience of Psychotherapy 191-92). The "prosocial self then shifts, through language development, into the left brain, with its growth in subsequent years (118; Wolf 185-88). This relates to the Lacanian Symbolic order of words and laws shaping the child more directly after the initial mirror stage, at 6-18 months. According to neuroscience, the self as a "distributed neural network that encompasses shared self-other representations" continues to be "right- hemisphere based" (Deccty and Sommerville 527). Recognition of one's own face can be lost when the right hemisphere is anesthetized (529)—demon- strating that the Imaginary perception of ego (or the Freudian "imago"), and its possible fading or Lacanian "aphanisis," is based in the right cortex.31 Regarding our potential for therapeutic and theatrical catharsis, there appears to be a crucial filter between Symbolic/Imaginary and Real orders (or superego /ego and id) in the prefrontal area of the neocortex, at the edge of the limbic system.3 Neurologists locate a "stimulus barrier" between the Freudian superego and id in the "ventromesial [or ventromedial regions of the prefrontal lobe [where it] merges into the limbic system" and protects the ego "from the incessant demands of instinctual life" (Kaplan-Solms and Solms 275-76).34 Here, cathartic changes may occur in how remnant natural instincts are expressed (or transformed through greater awareness), from mostly unconscious, limbic, Real emotions, through right-brain, Imaginary perceptions and fundamental fantasies, to the Symbolic order of language, rules, and self identity in relation to the social Other. Neurologists have also found four layers of the prefrontal cortex (PFC) with distinctive, nested, hierarchical functions (Koechlin et al.; Murphy and Brown 133-35). The premotor cortex, at the rear of the PFC, exerts sensory control, selecting specific motor (bodily action) responses to stimuli. The caudal lateral PFC, the next layer moving forward, adds contextual control regarding the current situation when stimuli are received. The rostral lateral PFC, a further anterior layer, then exerts episodic control over the other two, by tracking present and past information regarding general behavior, thus allowing for changing contingencies. (Murphy and Brown give the examples of answering the phone when it rings, not answering it at a friend s house, or answering it there because the friend IS in the shower and asks you to, as illustrating these three levels of stimulus response.) A fourth area is posited in the frontopolar cortex, used for cognitive branching and controlling the shifts between different episodes of behavior, while exerting control over the other three layers. Likewise, the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) determines "reward value" choices, including the selection of "stimuli on the basis of familiarity and [selection of] responses on the basis of a feeling of Vightness" (Elliott et al. 308). The lateral regions of the OFC arc involved with "the suppression of previously rewarded responses." Brain imaging studies find that these areas are "fundamental" in behavioral choices, especially in "unpredictable situations." One might argue that the Lacanian Symbolic and Imaginary orders of cultural rules and personal perceptions connect with the Real of stimuli and actions through these areas of the PFC (just behind and above the ventrome- dial). The brain responds to familiar or unpredictable stimuli with inner theatrical representations and outer performances, through shifting, time-bound, contextual, sensory controls. Such controls are shaped in each human brain through learned cultural experiences of the social Other, which create further top-down constraints utilized by the PFC's layered functions, in relation to bottom-up stimuli. And yet, theatrical performances are ways that the Other, as well as the individual, may change. A culture can explore extended possibilities of Symbolic and Imaginary shifts in situation, context, and sensation, using a collective dreamlike space. This may also involve divine and demonic characterizations of top-down or bottom-up forces, experienced in nature, in the body and brain, or in social networks. Lacan's three orders relate not only to the brain's anatomy, but also to cognitive psychologist Merlin Donald's theory about the evolutionary stages of cultural development in our hominid ancestors. About two million years ago, early hominids evolved beyond the "episodic" experience of other animals (and prior australopithecines)— with the "mimetic" stage of human evolution.3 Donald cites the evidence of increasing brain size in our hominid ancestors,-' the first stone tools, big game hunting, a more group-oriented way of life, and thus "a cultural strategy for remembering and problem solving" (Mind 261).' Instead of being "immersed in a stream of raw episodic experience, from which they ... [could not] gain any distance," early hominids developed a new cognitive capacity, "mimetic skill, which was an extension of conscious control into the domain of action. It enabled playacting, body language, precise imitation, and gesture" (120, 261). This also included prosody, which is processed today in the brain's right hemisphere: "deliberately raising and lowering the voice, and producing imitations of emotional sounds. About a half million years ago, archaic Homo sapiens gradually evolved a "mythic" stage of culture and brain development, culminating with the emergence of our own subspecies, Homo sapiens sapiens, about 125,000 years ago (Donald, Mind 261). The mythic stage is evidenced by a much higher rate of innovation than in prior hominids: sophisticated tools, "beautifully crafted objects, improved shelters and hearths, and elaborate graves" (261-62). This stage included oral traditions of language and narrative thought — beyond the gesture, mime, and imitation of prior mimetic hominids, or the basic awareness and event sensitivity of episodic primates (260)." It thus involved a fundamental change in the human brain (and vocal tract): an "invasion" of the left parietal lobe by language, replacing spatial perception and movement, which then became a more distinctive function of the right parietal lobe (LcDoux, Synaptic 303, 318).40 Donald's mythic stage shows the evolution of the Symbolic order of mind and society, as well as our current left hemisphere functions. The mimetic stage correlates to right brain processing and the Lacanian Imaginary. Today's human brains also bear the remnant animal emotions and drives of primal episodic awareness in the limbic system and brainstem, as a lost yet disruptive Real or chora\*1 Indeed, each child moves through similar developmental stages, recapitulating hominid phylogeny: from primal episodic awareness to the mimetic "interlinking of the infant's attentional system with those of other people" and then to narrative speech (Donald, Mind 255). Or, in Lacanian terms, a child moves from the Real of natural being to the Imaginary order of mirrored illusions of ego in the (m)Others desires and then, through verbal language, to the Symbolic order of superego incorporation, with the Others discourse and social rules, via the Name and No of the Father. This basic outline of Lacanian orders, brain anatomy, and hominid evolution shows that "theatre" (and dance) in the most primal sense — as Imaginary, mimetic performance —began about two million years ago. At that time, our ancestors developed a new skill that eventually became specialized in the visuospatial, prosodic, Imaginary functions of the right hemisphere, with ties to the emotional/instinctual Real of the limbic system and brain- stem. Later hominids developed oral language and myth-making, as further Symbolic orders, through distinct areas of the left brain about a half million years ago. As with the modern child's development from primary to higher- order consciousness, through the Real and Imaginary dimensions of the mirror stage and the later Symbolic acquisition of language and rules, these layers of the brain and of hominid culture continue to interact today — with each human being transformed by a particular family and society. As Donald points out, primal mimesis in early hominids relates not only to the current playacting of children (Mind 266), but also to the "many institutionalized versions of pretend play in theater and him, and [to the] imaginative role playing [that] is integral to adult social life" (263). A crucial aspect of this evolutionary skill is emotional regulation, which involves the germ of self-consciousness, through a "mimetic controller" in the brain, "a whole-body mapping capacity ... under unified command" (269). Thus, early hominids developed larger frontal lobes, setting the stage for the later evolution of a distinctive left hemisphere (271).'15 Like children today (starting with the Imaginary dimension of the Lacanian mirror stage), our hominid ancestors developed a "kinematic imagination" with the physical "image of self" becoming an anchor to experience and awareness (273). This involved rhythmic body movements, expressing temporal relations, through the intersubjective medium of performance, as a "public theatre of convention" (272-74). However, the full emergence of theatre as narrative performance began with oral storytelling during the hominid "mythic" stage, starting about a half million years ago. Then, about forty thousand years ago, humans evolved a further, "theoretic" stage, through the "externalization of memory ... [using] symbolic devices to store and retrieve cultural knowledge" (Donald, Mind2G2). During this current stage of hominid evolution, the tradition of recorded theatre and drama developed, along with other artistic technologies,44 a "Symptom" of being human that has vastly expanded in recent centuries.45 Thus, theatre in the theoretic sense may have started with Paleolithic cave art (as considered in the first chapter). Eventually, the theoretic technologies of theatre, externalizing and interconnecting the performance elements of the human brain, developed in various ways through different cultures — culminating in the current globalism 01 virtual media screens, often dominated by Western paradigms. Our theoretic stage with its evolving technologies continues to reshape the skills of prior stages and "liberate consciousness from the limitations of the brains biological memory systems" (305). However, such an external memory field can also be a "Trojan Horse," Donald warns, "a device that invades the innermost personal spaces of the mind. It can play our cognitive instrument, directing our minds toward predetermined end states along a set course" (316). Such a Trojan Horse potential, with good and evil effects, becomes even more significant through divine characters and godlike ideals, at various points in Western history, from stage to screen performances, as explored throughout this book. Donald's stages of cognitive psychology match with Stephen Mithens archeological theories and research.4fl According to Mithen, the early hominid social intelligence of Homo erectus> 1.6 million years ago, involved the communication of "contentment, anger or desire" through a "wide range of sounds (Prehistory 144) —as with the mimetic prosody theorized by Donald. Human verbal language with "a vast lexicon and a set of grammatical rules" began 500,000 to 200,000 years ago, with Neanderthals and archaic Homo sapiens, as evidenced by brain and throat structure, indicated in fossils of their bones (140-42, 208). This corresponds to Donald's mythic stage of hominid evolution. Mithen also cites archeological evidence that a dramatic shift occurred 40,000 years ago. Early humans in the Upper Paleolithic period changed from having separate types of intelligence—natural history intelligence (such as interpreting animal hoofprints), social intelligence (with intentional communication), and technical intelligence (producing artifacts from mental templates) — to a new cognitive fluidity between them, creating artifacts with "symbolic meanings ... i.e. art" (163-65).47 This shows the begin- ning of Donald's theoretic stage and relates to the possible shamanic visions and performances evidenced by Paleolithic cave art.48 The evolutionary stages, neurological layers, and psychoanalytic orders of self and Other awareness, developing through shared cultural performances, reflect what might be called an "inner theatre" of the brain.49 By this, I do not mean a "Cartesian theatre" with the mind inside the brain as a single ghostly spectator watching the machinery of inner scenes, or as a play-wright-homunculus inhabiting a central control area (the pineal gland, according to Descartes. 400 years ago). This theory has been fully critiqued by cognitive philosophers, from Gilbert Rylc to Daniel Dennett, as well as by current neurological evidence. However, cognitive scientist Bernard Baars uses theatrical terms in other ways to explain the global workspace of human consciousness. Less than 10 percent of brain activity is conscious, like a "spot- light" on the visible actors and scenery (Theater 46-47).5 The rest involves unconscious agents, like a legislative "audience," competing and collaborating to focus attention on particular perceptions and ideas onstage. There are Deep Goal and Conceptual Contexts, like "backstage" workers, as well as immediate expectations and intentions, forming an unconscious sense of self as "director" of the brains inner theatre (144-45).52

#### [2] Indicts to our authors don’t prove our TOP wrong we incorporate multiple queer theory authors in order to create a cohesive theory of power that includes intersectional harms IE white supremacists securing a future for the white child or a millionaire trying to horde wealth for their future generations are both examples of futurism so not only do we explain intersectional issues but we explain them best