## AT: Queer IR

### Queer State Reform Good

#### Absent structural change their project fails because it becomes locked into language-based opposition that fails to resolve social harms- means perm is only way to combat the violence they isolate
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(Max, professor of comparative studies at Florida Atlantic University, Queer Theory and Social Change, 2000, p.117)

Strategy in this context consists of the ways in which we organize energy to meet the ends we seek to achieve. Strategy as such is the mechanism by which true politics is generated, both on the personal and the political level. A true resistance politics has to incorporate both the micro and the macro levels of analysis to mediate differences and to confront effectively the forces of well-organized opposition. Lesbian, gay, and queer movements have, so far, depended on the involvement of individuals as the primary drivers of social change (and particularly the experience of labor movements) that individuals need to have structural representation in order to maintain the energy needed for sustained opposition. Individuals working against their oppressors, whether in the workplace or neighborhood, cannot succeed without a mechanism that can play a larger role in incorporating them into communities of resistance where mutual recognition is present. “We’re Queer and We’re Here” is a necessary declaration of identity. But it is only a moment. Required is a strategy that can institutionalize a movement towards resistance so that change may be recognized as a social necessity. Differences will continue to exist. Black women face the sexism inherent in their relations with men while confronting racism; lesbians are confrtoned with the hierarchy of sexual politics while dealing with arguments around pornography and sexual pleasure. And more economic issues such as the pervasive and growing feminization of poverty. Bisexual, transsexual, and transgendered peoples are often ignored by all. Queers, in general, encounter the real differences based on status and class as they experience the oppression of the dominant culture. But these are all in fact part of a larger class struggle which is borne out in the conflict of the uses and control of energy and, ultimately, human regeneration. They need to be recognized as such. The test of successful movement will be whether we might honor all these divergent interests and experiences while joining together to forge a successful attempt to redistribute the rewards of labor and to end the violence of prejudice. Resistance, then, involves more than language-based opposition to noxious forces. Real opposition takes place in the realm of reproduction of community and the larger social sphere, on the basis of daily existence and in the realm of social and productive power.

### Queer Theory Fails

#### Their focus on multiplicity and fluid identities leads to the erasure of materiality embedded in other identities, necessitating exclusion and no way to translate into a praxis that can be shared by other identities- makes solvency impossible and turns the K
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(E. Patrick, Text and Performance Quarterly, “"Quare" studies, or (almost) everything I know about

queer studies I learned from my grandmother,” November 5, 2010, Taylor and Francis//wyo-mm)

But to riff off of the now popular phrase ‘‘gender trouble,’’ there is some race trouble here with queer theory. More particularly, in its ‘‘race for theory’’ (Christian), queer theory has often failed to address the material realities of gays and lesbians of color. As black British activist Helen (Charles) asks, ‘‘What happens to the deﬁnition of ‘queer’ when you’re washing up or having a wank? When you’re aware of misplacement or displacement in your colour, gender, identity? Do they get subsumed [. . .] into a homogeneous category, where class and other things that make up a cultural identity are ignored?’’ (101–102). What, for example, are the ethical and material implications of queer theory if its project is to dismantle all notions of identity and agency? The deconstructive turn in queer theory highlights the ways in which ideology functions to oppress and to proscribe ways of knowing, but what is the utility of queer theory on the front lines, in the trenches, on the street, or anyplace where the racialized and sexualized body is beaten, starved, ﬁred, cursed—indeed, where the body is the site of trauma?6 Beyond queer theory’s failure to focus on materiality, it also has failed to acknowledge consistently and critically the intellectual, aesthetic, and political contributions of nonwhite and non-middle-class gays, bisexuals, lesbians, and transgendered people in the struggle against homophobia and oppression. Moreover, even when white queer theorists acknowledge these contributions, rarely do they self-consciously and overtly reﬂect on the ways in which their whiteness informs their critical queer position, and this is occurring at a time when naming one’s positionality has become almost standard protocol in other areas of scholarship. Although there are exceptions, most often white queer theorists fail to acknowledge and address racial privilege.7 Because transgendered people, lesbians, gays, and bisexuals of color often ground their theorizing in a politics of identity, they frequently fall prey to accusations of ‘‘essentialism’’ or ‘‘anti-intellectualism.’’ Galvanizing around identity, however, is not always an unintentional ‘‘essentialist’’ move. Many times, it is an intentional strategic choice.8 Cathy Cohen, for example, suggests that ‘‘queer theorizing which calls for the elimination of ﬁxed categories seems to ignore the ways in which some traditional social identities and communal ties can, in fact, be important to one’s survival’’ (‘‘Punks’’ 450). The ‘‘communal ties’’ to which Cohen refers are those which exist in communities of color across boundaries of sexuality. For example, my grandmother, who is homophobic, nonetheless must be included in the struggle against oppression in spite of her bigotry. While her homophobia must be critiqued, her feminist and race struggles over the course of her life have enabled me and others in my family to enact strategies of resistance against a number of oppressions, including homophobia. Some queer activists groups, however, have argued fervently for the disavowal of any alliance with heterosexuals, a disavowal that those of us who belong to communities of color cannot necessarily afford to make.9 Therefore, while offering a progressive and sometimes transgressive politics of sexuality, the seams of queer theory become exposed when that theory is applied to identities around which sexuality may pivot, such as race and class. As a counter to this myopia and in an attempt to close the gap between theory and practice, self and Other, Audre Lorde proclaims: Without community there is no liberation, only the most vulnerable and temporary armistice between an individual and her oppression. But community must not mean a shedding of our differences, nor the pathetic pretense that these differences do not exist. [. . .]I urge each one of us here to reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch the terror and loathing of any difference that lives there. See whose face it wears. Then the personal as the political can begin to illuminate all our choices. (112–13, emphasis in original) For Lorde, a theory that dissolves the communal identity—in all of its difference— around which the marginalized can politically organize is not a progressive one. Nor is it one that gays, bisexuals, transgendered people, and lesbians of color can afford to adopt, for to do so would be to foreclose possibilities of change.

#### Alt creates a monolithic view of queer bodies rooted in Western, privileged frames- this recreates dangerous hierarchies, forces normative dichotomies and prevents institutional change-turns the k
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(Robert C, Queer Peace International, Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, “Queer Global Education: Finding Me, Finding You,” 2008, Taylor and Francis//wyo-mm)

Additionally, Morland and Willox do not include formal education, which is a founding block of our anti-queer taboos and inhibitions. Addressing LGBT/Queer issues in education, however, is an intrinsic part of social and moral change. For instance, in rural Saskatchewan, a twelve-year old Two-Spirited youth is courageously attempting to attend and be successful at school in her/his preferred gender. The absence of culturally relevant material in the curriculum, support from educators, and a gender flexible state-controlled institution makes such efforts difficult. When discussing the shake-up of social and moral taboos, Queer Theory fails to acknowledge and analyze that some of our most severe battlegrounds are taking place within such institutions like this eighth grade rural Canadian classroom. Morland and Willox analyses what the closet door might be for different queers: Perhaps you become queer by being seen reading this book or Maybe you are hiding its cover behind Cosmopolitan or Men’s Health. Alternatively, if you are queer, are your actions queer enough? Are you in the closet or are you out and proud? (p. 1) Queer Theory sets the tone that being in the closet (whatever shape, size, colour or texture that closet door might be) is bad; being out is good. Paradoxically, this text on queer theory then perpetuates a binary position. In my work with Queer Peace International, I have worked with queers who are refugees, displaced persons, and/or live in a homophobic community. These individuals must remain in the closet in order to grow, remain strong, and ultimately survive. There, too, have been those who have “come out” but, when they didn’t fit into the foreign based LGBT culture, returned to the closet where they retained some form of normalcy and acceptance. There is a certain a-critical “promosexual” cultural viewpoint underlyingQueer Theory.It insufficiently addresses those on the periphery or those affected by North American or Western queer exports in different world regions and communities. The contributors call for acceptance and embracing plural identities and, although this book does present several realities, it does not venture outside of the white, middle/upper-class American psyche.Queer Theory lacks a post-colonial/globalization analyses that speaks to plural identities in developing world contexts that this book could have drawn from.

#### their project’s not strong enough to overcome oppression-
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(Raia, Senior lecturer in politics at the Open University, UK, “Rational woman: a feminist critique of dichotomy “2002. p. 134)

Walters’ conclusions are well-made. On the positive side she argues that ‘we should embrace [queer theory’s] recognition that much slips out of the rigid distinctions of hetero/homo, man/woman and that our theoretical and political engagements need to reckon creatively with the excess that dares not speak its name’. She also commends the ‘queer attempt to understand that sexuality and sexual desire is not reducible to gender’ (Walters 1996: 963). Nevertheless she is skeptical that destabilizing gender can ‘top the power of gender- a power that still sends too many women to the hospital, shelter, rape crisis center, despair’ (ibid.: 866). She observes, “we cannot afford to lose sight of the materiality of oppression and its operation in structural and institutional spaces’, and she suspects that queer theory fails to understand that ‘[d]estabilizing gender (or rendering its surface apparent) is not the same as overthrowing it’ (ibid.).

### AFF AT – War Turn

#### Sexual desires lead to arms buildup and subsequent war

Lloyd Demause 15 (April 1, 2015) Lloyd Demause, an American social thinker known for his work in the field of psychohistory. He did graduate work in political science at Columbia University and later trained as a lay psychoanalyst, which is defined as a psychoanalyst who does not have a medical degree. He is the founder of The Journal of Psychohistory. (Accessed 7/22/2022) {“Nuclear War as an Anti-Sexual Group Fantasy”} [https://web-s-ebscohost-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=e34b52a8-59d7-4513-aad4-82e4b9f27495%40redis]

Psychoanalytic writing on **nuclear war has, to date, mainly concentrated on the variety of defenses people have against the realization that a nuclear holocaust will mean the real death of hundreds of millions of people and the end of most of civilization**, as we know it. Lifton's work on "numbing," for instance, has eloquently described the numerous denials, evasions, idealizations, displacements and other defenses so often used by those in power and by the average person when thinking about the nuclear holocaust (Lifton and Falk, 1982). Mack (1981), Brenman-Gibson (1986) and other psychoanalysts have made telling cases for the proposition that most people have severe emotional resistances against acknowledging the ghastly realities of nuclear war. In each of these works, however, the assumption has been made that the reason people so badly distort their perceptions of reality in the case of nuclear weapons is that the reality of nuclear war is so horrifying. Yet I know of no other clinical **psychoanalytic studies that trace the source of psychic defenses to fear of reality. Defenses are usually thought to be constructed against wishes, against the unacceptable Id wishes, not against unpleasant reality.** If a patient denies the destructiveness of his or her current actions, it is because he or she feels guilty about the wish to destroy someone. The Journal of Psychohistory 42 (4) Spring 2015 Nuclear War as an Anti-S exual Group Fantasy 321 If this is equally true in thinking about nuclear war, then one must suspect that the defenses have in fact been constructed against a wish to have a nuclear holocaust. Could this be possible? **Could it be that the world's greatest fear is also unconsciously the world's greatest wish? Is it possible that we are mesmerized by nuclear weapons because the promise of a nuclear war is for some reason overwhelmingly attractive to us, and plays an extremely important intrapsychic role** in our lives? Carrying the parallel between the clinical and the social one step further, the following question might be asked: Is it possible that the world's addiction to nuclear weapons might be fueled by both aggressive and sexual drives, both destructive and erotic wishes, as in the case of other addictions? Most analysts do not usually consider that the drive toward a nuclear holocaust might have sexual origins. To begin with, it seems too obvious, too “pop-psychological," to point out that the language of those proposing nuclear war is filled with continuous phallic references, such as "standing tall," "displays of firmness," "stiffening of the national will," "making the Russians impotent." "knocking their balls off," and so on (Caldicott, 1984; deMause, 1985b). When those who imagine or witness nuclear explosions describe the "beauty" of the phallic mushroom cloud or the "orgiastic release" of the explosion (Chernus, 1986), it seems almost embarrassing to draw attention to the **all-too-obvious sexual language being used. And when a magazine describes a nuclear bomber as "a breathtakingly beautiful airplane with slim-silhouette wings that meld into a fuselage that breathes speed, the swanlike aircraft is designed to penetrate Soviet air defenses**, unleashing nuclear-tipped missiles at targets deep inside the country" (Time, 1987), it seems almost superfluous to point out that the bomber in question is in fact an ugly world-destroyer, not a "swanlike" phallus depositing its load "deep inside” its target. Sensitive reporters who interview hundreds of nuclear war planners are not too **embarrassed to observe that these experts are mainly people sublimating sexual—indeed, often homosexual—preoccupations.** Thomas Allen describes the world of those in the War College who play nuclear war games: There is a football-stadium excitement about the game . . . the players get together in a kind of locker-room camaraderie. (The towel-snapping image is not overly drawn. Women players are as rare in the male world of the war game as they are in football locker rooms. To further the jock image, players call their post game analysis a "hot wash-up.") (Allen, 1987) 322 Lloyd deMause Carol Cohn, in reporting on her experiences in observing the nearly all-male world of nuclear war experts, found their language dominated by sexual imagery. "**Feminists have often suggested that an important aspect of the arms race is phallic worship**," she begins. **"I have always found this an uncomfortably reductionist explanation and hoped that my research at the Center would yield a more complex analysis." Yet she found no way to sidestep the fact that while rational analysis was in short supply, the subject of male potency appeared to be the central topic of every lecture:** I thought that at least at some point in a long talk about "penetration aids," someone would suddenly look up, slightly embarrassed to be caught in such blatant confirmation of feminist analyses of What's Going On Here. Of course, I was wrong. There was no evidence that any feminist critiques had ever reached the ears, much less the minds, of these men. American military dependence on nuclear weapons was explained as "irresistible, because you get more bang for the buck." Another lecturer solemnly and scientifically announced, "to disarm is to get rid of all your stuff." Other lectures were filled with discussion of vertical erector launchers, thrust-to-weight ratios, soft lay downs, deep penetration, and the comparative advantages of protracted versus spasm attacks—or what one military adviser to the **National Security Council has called "releasing 70 to 80 percent of our megatonnage in one orgasmic whump**." There was serious concern about the need to harden our missiles and the need to "face it, the Russians are a little harder than we are." Disbelieving glances would occasionally pass between me and my one ally in the summer program, another woman, but no one else seemed to notice. (Cohn, 1987) If even untrained journalists notice that **nuclear war discussions are filled with "homoerotic excitement" (Cohn, 1987, p. 695), need the psychoanalyst be so inhibited in investigating the possible sexual sources of war?** What surprised me most in preparing this paper is that when I finished reading through most of the several hundred books and articles written by psychoanalysts on the causes of war since Freud's 1932 essay, **"Why War?" I found that clinical studies of the actual words and motivations of real people going to actual wars were exceedingly rare**. Most psychoanalytic theories of war are non-clinical and repeat in one form or another Freud's conclusion that war is caused by "the instinct for hatred and aggression" (Freud, 19321 p. 209). But this conclusion is not based on empirical studies of the actual words used by people as they bring about wars.

### AFF AT – Not Intersectional

#### Typical queer international relations ignores the opinions of queer POC and BIPOC politics.

Nishant Upadhyay 14. Their dissertation received the [National Women’s Studies Association/University of Illinois Press First Book Award](https://www.press.uillinois.edu/books/NWSAPrize.html) in 2018. Prior to joining CU Boulder, Nishant taught Women's and Gender Studies at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth and Northern Arizona University. “Pinkwatching Israel, Whitewashing Canada: Queer (Settler) Politics and Indigenous Colonization in Canada on JSTOR.” No Publication. 3/4, 2014

. <file:///Users/nehamahesh/Downloads/24365002.pdf> //NM

Queer organizing against Israel's deployment of gay rights discourses to mask the occupation of Palestine—referred to as "pinkwashing" within academic and activist circles—has raised pertinent questions about the relations between settler colonialism, sexuality gender, race, and (gay) imperialism. Such campaigns have directed attention to the realities of occupation in Palestine/Israel while simultaneously obscuring the historical and present-day colonial processes that enable transnational political intervention on Turtle Island—or what is commonly known as Canada and the United States.1 In this essay, we ask how critics of Israeli pink washing—known as pinkwatchers—varyingly challenge, engage, negoti ate, perform, or reproduce settler colonialism on Indigenous lands. We examine debates over the participation of Queers Against Israeli Apart heid (QuAIA) in Pride Toronto (Pride) in 2010 and the subsequent for mation of the Pride Coalition for Free Speech (PCFS). By focusing on these debates, we seek to critically explore how certain queer praxes have worked to normalize and invisibilize settler colonialism in the Canadian context and to reproduce Canada as a progressive queer-friendly liberal state. While our discussion focuses on QuAIA, PCFS, and Pride 2010, the objective of our essay is not to single out groups and organizations but to contribute to conversations about the broader political stakes of anti racism, anticolonialism, and decolonization in radical queer organizing. These examples serve as the entry point for us to consider in what ways the articulation of "radical queer perspectives" might be complicit with the white settler state project, wherein the casting of Canada as a gay-friendly nation invisibilizes past and ongoing processes of colonialism. Our essay suggests that criticism of the use of queer rights and liberal tolerance to justify governmental, industrial, and military actions often works to limit discussions of settler colonialism to places, nations, and peoples who are already invisible within that frame. Describing how queer groups naturalize notions of belonging and Canadian identity, as well as how queer cri tiques ofpinkwashing fail to address settler colonialism in Canada, we seek to underscore the way Indigenous struggles for sovereignty are invisibil ized in activists' attempts to address issues of free speech, homonational ism, and occupation in Palestine/Israel. Where the pinkwashing of Israel has been criticized by queer activists who effectively surveil and organize against, or pinkwatch, such activities, the complicity of their activist efforts with settler colonialism ultimately whitewashes colonization in Canada. We argue, therefore, that the pinkwatching of Israel enables the pinkwash ing, or rather whitewashing, of Canada.