# Queer/Trans IR K

### Link - Hypervisibility

#### Society characterizes all trans-people as dishonest through hypervisibility AND violence inflicted by states themselves isn’t recognized. The only way progress can be made is to trans-theorize about the intricacies of visibility and invisibility.

Laura Sjoberg ‘12, [University of Florida, “Toward Trans-gendering International Relations?” International Political Sociology <https://watermark.silverchair.com/6-4> 337.pdf?token=AQECAHi208BE49Ooan9kkhW\_Ercy7Dm3ZL\_9Cf3qfKAc485ysgAAAs8wggLLBgkqhkiG9w0BBwagggK8MIICuAIBADCCArEGCSqGSIb3DQEHATAeBglghkgBZQMEAS4wEQQM7GuiIZj85gLwlHCCAgEQgIICgnGPsIsldioaX8vD1V1lPJne7FPWWTeaURxHrjwnyORsiVugPRjbH8xmDXOCAJXqjU6jmPIQASlmoTSm0F8nafeTF2hdX2\_3jRzgAx5b5TBQ682z410FIUrwFVQgb4ZYPada74dITOFP8dsKp3z3xqACNJQXi3XZbrxtYQLDT2fFgzHCCYlHQMZ\_BmGuovUZXI2wacyhmHa0\_f8sqjfEKO8nQO8iF2X3MsNBuDc0BCR7oR0f5iCPtiHdcBRq0JS\_OwNGoCdDdqGizqhFEcRg2J6ItEZgXGCoRp-N8X04ou73B7W7GvUEg1SAxEK2NIAb2EaK2z7OB6sYc90dnyn-aaIMvUvEZQ\_7JfhzgxKpAekI6jSwyV9ZybvFX8CyBQo3a8MU0m43cW6\_srumaSkkNW3sGg6p8xY9mA3CzlN2U2vLf4xhfyv2Scnm8JYeT3B9fZNI2Uno3WnasIQN51jer0F56iBAaIdj09RapRCJIAg4sWKrCzDkvRjvzeIjJuNKWA0sxVg5eu6tpflxwiHgYbyG53uq2KqNFA1\_3lGFaufM0lRLY8KjkXRFeKnMu97RTq5pjE3vPBD0Ooyfxs2zlU7ZhIyxYtCTsLepNrW3ryB9OqCMW2CkC7dRkKhr7jsjiKw1sRyvbPel4BxWwozLYvp0zf678LCTsI6gbLQab2MLrMjYRnILVhz6JLKEd1FjPJjqJnRZtfddK6hx2xUsqcnE6pPhymTSVxtiG9dk4RjpYq6GNgRZ2g2z7Q0mTUND7Bx9AXalsqNXPx89o2cnSwCQKxQzwz2ulA8C87xe6m-bd-WOYnR4jttrptS-xzFU4OPGXaA7FeemBQSdg//bxscijaclyn]

There are those who argue that “**in-ness” and “outness” do not make sense** for trans-people, since “trans-” is not something one is (and therefore not something one must out oneself as). Instead, “trans-” is the process of becoming what one is. Trans-theorizing has problematized the association between outness and visibility, arguing that the trans- and genderqueer bodies demonstrate the problems with assuming a clear “self” to be “out.” If being trans- is a process rather than a result, then it makes little sense to be “out” as trans-. Yet, trans-persons who do not immediately self-identify as trans- (which may or may not actually resonate with them) may be considered dishonest when their “passing” is discovered. The trans- theory problem with seeing people as “really a man” or “really a woman” (and therefore “out” as a “man” or “woman”) is that these discourses “reinscribe the position that genitalia are the essential determinants of sex” (Bettcher 2007:50). This runs directlycontrary to the lived experiences of many trans-people, who see their genitalia as either not representative of or only partly representative of their “actual” sex (Bettcher 2007:50). Trans-theorists express concern that the contin- ued emphasis on the difference between how trans-people look and what they “are” is “fundamental to transphobic representations” (Bettcher 2007:50).

Trans-people are often characterized as dishonest if they are not “out” as “trans” because they are seen as presenting as a sex they are “really not,” whereas trans-people who are not “out” are seen as lying for not admitting the unreality of the sex they present as. Trans-people’s options, then, comprise being dishon- est one way or another, “disclose ‘who one is’ and come out as a pretender or masquerader, or refuse to disclose (be a deceiver) and run the risk of forced disclosure, the effect of which is exposure as a liar” (Bettcher 2007:50). Visibility, then, is pretending, while invisibility is lying.

This creates a politics of hypervisibility of trans-identities. In these terms, “visi- bility yields a position in which what one is doing is represented as make-believe, pretending, or playing dress up,” while “to opt for invisibility is to remove one’s life from the domain of masquerade into actual reality... [which] generates the effect of revelation, exposure, or hidden truth” (Bettcher 2007:50). Each begets violence, but the violence is often unrecognized as such.8 Judith Butler sees it as important to think about:

Why violence against transgender subjects is not recognized as violence, and why this violence is not recognized as violence, and why this violence is sometimes inflicted by the very statesthat should be offering such subjects protection from violence. (Butler 2004:207)

Trans-theorists have explained this in terms of the violent enforcement of a settled gender, where transphobic violence is actually punishment for non- conformity with settled ideas of maleness and femaleness, phrased and understood in terms of dishonesty in order to hide that it is not honesty, but reality, being policed through hypervisibility (Lamble 2009).

Trans-theorizing about visibility could inspire important research directions for IR. For example, it might be useful to ask what norms we do not see being enforced violently, what realities are policed, and whose identities are labeled less valid or genuine by definition. It might be fruitful to theorize the ways in which public gazes silence or distort certain voices, and to look at the ways that attention traps certain people as public/publicized representational forces. How does being trapped in the public gaze affect certain people at the margins of global politics? How does that relate to being trapped outside of the public gaze? Do some people and/or groups experience both simultaneously?

### Link – State

#### The state functions on heteronormative symbolism of the straight man – using the state reaffirms those representations.

Cynthia Weber, 2016, "(PDF) Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality, and the Will to Knowledge, written by Cynthia Weber,” : Oxford University Press, 264 pp DOI:10.1163/2165025X-12340019 // WaVes

In Queer International Relations, Weber demonstrates this breadth of ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies by juxtaposing theoretical positions from both queer studies and IR, which she explains early in the book. She crafts two approaches that directs queer intellectual curiosity on IR. Her first approach melds classical texts in queer theory (Foucault and Butler), feminist technoscience studies (Haraway), and post-structuralist international relations (Ashley) into a procedure that can reveal the construction of “homosexuality” and sexual ordering in domestic and foreign political discourse. Rendering knowledge (and the beliefs, claims, and policies that emerge from which) as discursively constructed, Weber posits that all political claims made from the domestic to the international scale performs (in the Butlerian sense) certain sexual categories that in turn figure other bodies, communities, and institutions in the hierarchies that order such categories. She locates this procedure within IR by drawing from Richard Ashley’s suggestion that statecraft – the imagination of the state and sovereignty – is mancraft. Weber’s assumptions about the queerness of IR thus reach full circle: If the crafting of sovereignty relies on the crafting of a sovereign authority, and since the sovereign sign in patriarchal power relations is the heterosexual male, then the political contestation of states must also enter sexual ordering. In other words, states, in asserting sovereignty, must pathologize the other into categories dominated by masculinity, such as femininity and queerness. This she firmly demonstrates in action by exploring political discourses enunciated and/or performed by masculine and queer figures around the globe. A recent case Weber asserts is none other than Obama’s administration whose discourse on human rights, she believes, interprets the “human” as a civilized white masculine bourgeois man – a patriot – to use the former president’s term

### Solves AI Ethics

#### Queer IR and queering solves a lack of AI ethics

Ann Light 11. School of Engineering and Informatics Doctor of Philosophy. “(PDF) HCI as heterodoxy: Technologies of identity and the queering of interaction with computers.” ResearchGate. 2011. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220055189\_HCI\_as\_heterodoxy\_Technologies\_of\_identity\_and\_the\_queering\_of\_interaction\_with\_computers //NM

Both examples show deliberately mischievous reclamation of the space provided by FB to present an identity. This playful resistance – neither hostile, nor demure – is the kind of intervention advocated by Butler as most effective at withstanding the tendency for norms to ‘congeal into givens’. So, users subvert tools. And Queer Theory gives us a means of recognising and scrutinising these dynamics. More powerfully for our purposes, it also offers a means of reflection on the discipline and a tool for design. I describe it as ‘analogy/method’ here, because its use in this paper is quite complex. First, it is a tool for analysis: by equating practices with queering, we learn more about the way they operate. Second, it is specifically a means for engaging with meta-values. By meta-values, I refer to a value system predicated on making space for divergent and evolving beliefs, principles, standards and morals. Thus, there is the intention to create resistance to an orthodoxy rather than seeking to assign predefined characteristics to a design outcome (in as far as it is ever possible to associate values with systems rather than the use of them). Queering, as it is used here, is predicated on letting (other) values and lifestyles surface – not the ones already in use, but ones that might come to be if allowed enough space to emerge. In this respect it differs from most critical practices: it is not concerned to ‘out’ the values of the designer or the socio-technical system, introduce new values, consider contextual socio-historical factors or reflect on ethical considerations. Agre (1997) suggests that a ‘critical technical practice will, at least for the foreseeable future, require a split identity – one foot planted in the craft work of design and the other foot planted in the reflexive work of critique’. But queering goes one stage further to a practical naughtiness based both on craft and reflection. It is a space-making exercise, using the means available at the time. And while critique is clearly one tool; hullabaloo, parody and inversion may also have their place. Its endgame is not an analysis to inform design, but an ongoing application of disruption as a space-making ploy and, thus, as a hands-on method. In a truly queered context there is no final arrival point, but an absence of dogma and a mutability that allows new truths, perspectives and engagements to emerge through a refusal to accept definition.4 If we use it as an analogy, it works to play up intersections and resist over-definition and so allows us to explore pluralist experience and remain off-centre, eccentric, critical, reflexive and self-analytic. It creates a space for change in the discipline of HCI. It offers the in-between-ness of Bassoli et al. (2007) by refusing to be wholly design or evaluation, technology or application, critique or experience. It presents an unstable zone for disciplines to meet and morph in post-disciplinary ways. To be queered out of alignment in this way is not to stand in opposition to parts of HCI or any other field, but to remain un-centred and open to new influences – such as Queer Theory itself – using the dynamics of these and other intersections. This stance allows a more fluid response to changes in the field of technology, to the methodological commitments of others and to the possible domains to be touched by developments in computing. As indicated, it can have a recursive quality. I am going to deal more thoroughly with queering as a design method because this is the more radical contribution to practice. Butler herself conceives of trouble as an action (1990). She points to theatrical practices such as parody and drag as mechanisms for troubling or throwing light on the workings of gender. I use the idea similarly, but to explore the workings of digital technology. Troubling/queering already takes place in the arena of technology design. There are critical art practices which reflect on society and technology through creating problem artefacts. They might ironicise practices: see, for instance, the instant democracy tool, repetitionr: ‘Looking for a petition service? Try a re-petition instead. Learn how to comfortably change the world from your armchair. Do-It-Yourself Democracy. A million people can’t be wrong. Improve your campaigns, get over one million votes with one click!’ (www.repetitionr.com), which mocks both social activism and parliamentary procedure without referring directly to either. There are designers whose products exist to question and raise questions, such as Dunne and Raby’s Designs for Fragile Personalities in Anxious Times: (www.dunneandraby.co.uk/content/projects/71/0), or Gaver’s studio and work on ambiguity (e.g. Gaver et al., 2003). In the same way as Butler points to the process of artifice, including her own self-stylization and role as trouble-maker, these creators make subversive entities to critique the norms of living and designing. But the trouble can be far more intrinsic. We can introduce the troubling as a process of design, not just of observation and use.

### Solves Biotech

#### Queering biotech solves a lack of cohesion on biotech

Elizabeth Reed 22. university Of Southampton, Uk Kate O’Riordan university Of Sussex, Uk correspondant . “Queering genealogies: introduction to the special section.” SAGE Journals. 3-27-2022. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/14647001211059523 //NM

Tangential to this nexus of queer theory and life story, but emerging in the same period, enter Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ART). This other kind of media is at once intensely heteronormative, and radically queer. ARTs both destabilise heterosexual reproduction and re-enforce it through access to fertility, gestation and biological genealogy. Surrogacy, gamete and sperm donation and IVF have become dominant modes in ART and have been made accessible to different populations, in very uneven but also potentially transformative ways (Farquar, 1997; Mamo, 2007). At the same time that trajectories in queer culture and other accounts destabilised biological kinship as the primary site of family, and affirmed and legitimated families of choice and made kinship, ARTs also made an industry of restoring biology as the material of kinship (Smietana et al., 2018). Although stories of biology as kinship are powerful and often represented as universal, they are also partial and linked to particular centres. Stories of inheritance and descent are bound up in European narratives of evolution, class and the circulation and inheritance of wealth. In the UK context, for example, working-class histories, histories of colonisation and slavery (McClintock 1995) and contemporary kinship stories from Black and Asian diasporas (Puar, 2007; Gunaratnam, 2014) challenge heteronormative assumptions that put biology at the centre (Lewis, 2019, 2020). In the context of scholarship in the USA, Black and indigenous feminism (Gumbs et al., 2016; Tallbear, 2018) and family abolitionism (O’Brien, 2019) also challenge heteronormative genetic kinship narratives. The scope of this special section remains fairly narrow in its White European/American focus. In this sense, it fails to inclusively open up the field and reproduces this lens. Scholarship that examines Black feminisms and queer intersectional feminisms of colour across this terrain includes that of Kim Tallbear, Allondra Nelson, Alexis Pauline Gumbs, Gail Lewis, Julia Oparah and Alicia Bonaparte. Tallbear's (2013) work on Native American belonging and genetic testing is generative in opening up critique of genetic science. The interplay of race and genetic testing is further examined by Nelson (2016) in their work on race and the genome. Examining political kinship and relation, Gail Lewis develops an object theory of Black feminism as ‘a project of ethical relation’ (2020: 8). Connecting across this issue's themes of mothering, Oparah and Bonoparte (2016) have curated a powerful collection, centring Black women, addressing maternal health care and developing a birth justice approach. Whilst attention has been paid to families, kinship of choice and new family-making, less work gives attention to the ways in which biotechnology has queered kinship relations and stabilises, disrupts or creates relationality. Notable exceptions include Queering Reproduction (Mamo, 2007), Mediated Intimacies (Andreassen et al., 2007), Making Parents (Thompson, 2007) and Bits of Life: Feminism at the Intersections of Media, Bioscience, and Technology (Smelik and Lykke, 2015). This special section attempts to redraw this focus to bring these areas together, sometimes in the same article, and to create a space of intellectual kinship for these different orientations to attend to each other. Through this section, we have aimed to craft an intervention that brings together biological and digital media forms; one that recognises, traces and amplifies the interconnection of medium specificity and biomediation. Borrowing from Dahl and Gabb (2020), we have aimed to craft this in a way that attempts to be mindful of context and is attuned to their analysis: “to not ignore the foundational questions of gender, sexuality, race, and nation that inform kinship. To […] think further about what queer intellectual kinship means, who we care for and who we consider ourselves related to […] and to how our geopolitical, sexual, gendered and generational differences and ties shape and make our affinities and solidarities” (Dahl and Gabb, 2020). Special section articles The section brings together articles which queer genealogical research and/or examine queer genealogies. Queering in this context can refer to any engagement with queer theory, and or engagement with LGBTQ+ genealogies and their intersections. We speculated that genealogy in this context might refer to ancestry, kinship, relation, reproduction, history, origin and naturalisation. The special section seeks to queer the existing field through both an attention to queering genealogical analysis and examining queer kinship across life story, media and biotechnology.

In, ‘From the Families We Choose to the Families We Find Online’, Rikke Andreassen centres her analysis on connections made between donor siblings, facilitated through the sociality of digital media. This article draws on both the medium of semen, and social media to examine the way in which kinship is re-made through ‘finding’ donor sperm relations. In the context of a boom in queer and single families, made possible through access to sperm banks, Andreassen examines how new networks of donor siblings have emerged. These connect a relatively small number of donors to an extended network of potentially hundreds of recipients of donor treatments. This extends to a significant network of donor siblings and a generative context for new routes to kinship for the children of single and queer parents. Andreassen notes that single parents are more likely than queer parents to engage in extended donor sibling networks and argues that this offers another way of thinking about queering kinship. The article brings together donor treatments and social media to examine the convergence of these technologies as reproductive. In ‘Queering the Origin Story: Adults Raised by LBTQ Parents Narrate Kinship and Connection’, Eliza Garwood explores the experiences of adults raised by LBTQ parents. The origin stories that emerge combine genetic origin and queer kinship in the construction of narrative identity. These stories function as a resource to build connection and create family bonds, as well as to a broader sense of queer identity and politics. Garwood argues that although biogenetic ties remain central to understanding kinship, these origin stories are as social as they are biogenetic. Garwood looks at the way that ‘many adults raised in LBTQ households were interested in tracing their queer family histories, rather than solely their biological relations’. These queer family histories invoked a much broader sense of family history and identity than the immediate family. They drew on queer histories; coming out; community and activism; and media-making practices including film, documentary and memoir. These stories bring together genetic and social stories, and connect political, social and personal histories. Elizabeth Reed and Tanya Kant bring together digital and biological media in their article ‘One Donor Egg and “a Dollop of Love”: ART and de-queering Genealogies in Facebook Advertising’. They examine the targeted advertising of egg banking and egg donation through social media. Drawing on Kant's work on algorithmic targeting and Reed's work on the role of media in identity-making, they explore the construction of essentialised heterosexual femininity in the promotional culture of commercial ARTs. Their analysis demonstrates the ways in which egg donation is conjured as a relation between women, of gifts and reproductive hope. This imaginary is constructed in the service of the imperatives of biomedicalisation (Clarke, 2014) in an industry facing an undersupply of eggs. Sophie Lewis gives an account of mothers and mothering, in ‘Diary of a Family-Abolitionist's Year on Tour’, threaded together with an incredible reach of connective queer intellectual kinship-making and skill. Lewis combines political, social and personal histories through stories about her own mother, family abolitionism, xenofeminism and Black feminism, the latter particularly through the work of Alexis Pauline Gumbs (Gumbs, 2010; Gumbs et al., 2016). Lewis's manifesto Full Surrogacy Now also underpins this account, and the death of Lewis's mother in the period of writing the article frames the narrative. Lewis's account is of dystopia, reparation and kinship – or kith connection – figuring comrades, momrades, doulas and alien connection: ‘Kinship is always made, not given. By the same token, more often than we think, where kinship is assumed as a given, it fails to be made’. This premise, that kinship is always made, whether through biological relation, blood ties, adoption, political affinity or stranger-relations, furthers the conceptual reach of queering genealogy. Conclusion: genealogy and reparation Calls to radical relationality, and the recognition of new kinship patterns are emerging in the context of digital life, ecological crisis and intensifying social injustice. Techno-social structures have both transformed kinship relations and exacerbated their most reactionary formations, at the level of species, nation, kin and person. In this context, a critical re-examination of what it means to be related to life, to kin and to the world is central to understanding individual and collective identity. Bringing together this section in the context of the pandemic has necessarily pushed us all into very different timelines, even given the infamous length of time anticipated in academic publishing. This feels like a project spread over decades – in many ways it has been – and this introduction aims to give a sense of that longer timeline to enable a platform that in turn contextualises the excellent writing and thinking in the articles published here. Media-making, including the promotional cultures of biotechnology, the novels that structure Love and Cvetkovich's analysis and the media genres central to Reed's research, is a productive kinship practice (Pidduck, 2009, 2018). In tune with this thinking about media-making as kinship, and the importance of novels as connective objects, we alight on one further novel here as both appropriation and coda: Girl, Woman, Other (Evaristo, 2020). We started this project by looking for stories about intergenerational relation; stories are a technology of kinship, and ART and other biotechnologies are technologies of story: biomedia across text and test tube. These stories of the different voices across this novel speak to the challenge of reparative world-making in dystopian times, of generation and the making of hopeful genealogies of kith-ship, time, queerness and technology. Evaristo generously offers these stories to her readers, and Girl, Woman, Other came into print as the final comments were coming in for the peer review of these articles. Reading these together enabled an added passage through Evaristo's novel, which is about intergenerational kinship, telling the stories of twelve characters. It is (mostly) about Black women in the UK. It gives voice to feminism, families and friendship and draws together the past in the present, connecting and disconnecting mothers, sisters, lovers and children. It connects 1980s activism in the UK with women's land projects in the USA, and navigates gender identity, biology, queerness, feminism, class, nationality, ethnicity and racism. Towards the end of the novel, it also draws on genetic testing as a technology of life story, as a narrative device and as an agent in the story, making genealogy intelligible and opening up futures of kinship-making. For us, reading Evaristo together through the production of this special issue, writing this introduction and bringing together these excellent articles across the theme of queering genealogy has been part of a project of queer intellectual and political kinship.

### Alt – Disaporic Perspectives

#### The alt is an embracement of diasporic perspectives that portray the violent histories of imperialism that solve the root cause of forever wars

By Ronak K Kapadia 19. Associate Professor of Gender and Women's Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago.. “Insurgent Aesthetic: Security and the Queer Life of the Forever War.” Duke University Press. 2019. <https://read-dukeupress-edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/books/book/2637/Insurgent-AestheticsSecurity-and-the-Queer-Life-of> //NM

Insurgent Aesthetics is about the creativity and fugitive beauty that emanate from the shadows of terrible violence incited by forever war. Of freedom dreams flecked by inscriptions of wartime’s death and dispossession.25 The forever war is an assault on the human sensorium for citizens, subjects, survivors, and refugees of US empire alike.26 A time of ever more state security and imperial violence, the historical present necessitates more sensuous ways of knowing and feeling that challenge the militarized imperatives of the state and exceed the visual register alone. The global circulation of images of violence and social suffering has also intensified in our public culture over the past three decades. As a privileged regime of power, the field of vision is central to the manufacture and global supremacy of US war-making regimes and to the violent regulation of racialized, gendered, and sexualized bodies under the conditions of state security and surveillance.27 Given the US state’s will toward quantified abstraction in counting, without ever being accountable to, those killed, diseased, displaced, traumatized, and/or maimed in its armed conflicts, how might we divine other, more sensuous and affective ways of knowing this forever war and its inhuman violences? This book asserts that we must demand a stranger calculus—what I term a queer calculus—that unsettles prevailing interpretations of the forever war, makes sensuous what has been ghosted by US technologies of abstraction, and endows the designs for seemingly impossible futures amid infinite aggression. A queer calculus of the forever war advances an account of both dominant knowledge apparatuses and data logics of the US security state as well as alternative logics, affects, emotions, and affiliations of diasporic subjects living and laboring in the heart of empire. One such embodied queer calculus can be found in the corpus of aesthetic forms created by contemporary diasporic artists from South Asia and the Greater Middle East. These imaginative works of art reassemble vision with the disqualified knowledges, histories, geographies, and memories preserved by the “lower” senses of empire’s gendered, racialized Others to fashion an insurgency against empire’s built sensorium. In so doing, these insurgent aesthetics craft a queer calculus of US empire that makes intimate what is rendered distant, renders tactile what is made invisible, and unifies what is divided, thereby conjuring forms of embodied critique that can envision a collective world within and beyond the spaces of US empire’s perverse logics of global carcerality, security, and war. This book engages a wide range of critical interdisciplinary paradigms to reveal the radical experiments, aesthetic strategies, and freedom dreams of contemporary Arab, Muslim, and South Asian diasporic artists. I argue that these works comprise a transnational constellation of visual art and aesthetics that together have animated new ways to think, feel, sense, and map the world amid US global state violence and its forever wars across the so-called Muslim world.28 Specifically, the book surveys the broader post–Cold War expansion of US militarism in the Greater Middle East (Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Palestine) and the domestic regimes of surveillance and repression in the US and other militarized sites mapped onto a transnational jihadist network. It contends that new and flexible forms of remote killing, torture, confinement, surveillance, and lawfare have built a distinctive post–9/11 infrastructure of gendered, racialized state violence both within and beyond US borders, which in turn marks the ongoing present as a distinct age within the longue durée of US settler colonial society. I explore this complex terrain through a contrapuntal queer feminist analysis of contemporary Arab, Muslim, and South Asian diasporic visual cultures and their critical intersections with the contemporary logics and tactics of global warfare.29 Although many scholars have studied the impact of liberal empires and late modern warfare in the Greater Middle East, including the militarized and racialized vision of US imperialism at its core, insufficient attention has been paid to how the state’s dominant necropolitical calculus of neoliberal security and warfare has been thwarted and reimagined.30 By contrast, this book foregrounds the conceptual works of contemporary artists from South Asian and Middle Eastern diasporas, whose insurgent aesthetic acts refashion ascendant ways of knowing and feeling the forever war. My chief premise in this book is that if we want to apprehend (so as to ultimately arrest) contemporary transnational security politics and carceral practices, especially the prevailing biopolitical regimes of surveillance, imprisonment, and killing perfected at the domestic and international fronts of the forever war, then we need an alternate approach to the maps of strategic thinkers and security analysts who have been telling us how we should look, think, and feel about the world and its violences. By privileging a wide range of diasporic cultural forms—namely, visual and sound installation, performance, painting, photography, new media, and video—as a generative site for critiquing American war and empire, this book illuminates what I term insurgent aesthetics, an alternative articulation of minoritarian knowledge produced by those populations and their diasporic kin most devastated by the effects of the homeland security state and its forever wars.31 This book illustrates how Arab, Muslim, and South Asian diasporic artists in the US and Europe, including Mahwish Chishty, Wafaa Bilal, Naeem Mohaiemen/ Visible Collective, Rajkamal Kahlon, Index of the Disappeared, Mariam Ghani, and Larissa Sansour, have grappled in their work with the neoliberal state of exception and the national security state’s use of gendered racial violence. Insurgent Aesthetics documents the impact of present-day militarized security practices and historical legacies of imperial violence on diasporic, (im)migrant, and refugee communities in the US who have been besieged both by domestic wars on terror, crime, drugs, and immigration as well as military and foreign policies directed at their homelands. These artists, in turn, have produced sensuous affiliations and political imaginaries that critique the simultaneous proliferation of gendered racism, neoliberal capitalism, heteropatriarchy, and Islamophobia in the post–9/11 period. These concepts represent intersectional systems of power and violence that fuel the ideological engines that legitimate the homeland security state’s use of global prisons, confinement technologies, overt killing, and permanent warfare as inevitable features of a political economy that seeks to “solve” our multifarious contemporary crises. In this context, what role can expressive culture and aesthetics play in struggles over hegemony of the contemporary neoliberal carceral, security, and warfare state? This book answers this question by centering the expansive world-making knowledge practices of diasporic visual and multimedia artists who hail from societies besieged by war but live and labor in the heart of empire. In short, the book investigates how South Asian and Middle Eastern diasporic artists challenge violent histories of US militarism, sustain critical opposition to the global war machine through the realms of art and culture, and create alternative systems of knowing, feeling, and living with and beyond forever warfare.

#### Embracing these “insurgent aesthetics” allows us to look beyond the surface level theories of realism

By Ronak K Kapadia 19. Associate Professor of Gender and Women's Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago.. “Insurgent Aesthetic: Security and the Queer Life of the Forever War.” Duke University Press. 2019. <https://read-dukeupress-edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/books/book/2637/Insurgent-AestheticsSecurity-and-the-Queer-Life-of> //NM

I return to the ongoing aesthetic and political collaboration of the Index of the Disappeared at the end of this book in order to revisit conceptual trajectories traced throughout and to signal insurgent aesthetic possibilities that expand those included in this study. Throughout Insurgent Aesthetics, I have mined this rich field of expressive culture and artistic responses to twenty-first-century global warfare in a search for forms of aesthetic possibility that open up alternative modes of knowing, sensing, living, escaping, and feeling in the forever war. If the forever war is an assault on the human sensorium for citizens, subjects, survivors, and refugees of US empire, I have chosen to center a queer feminist analysis of the performative body of the racialized and dispossessed to reveal a complex insurgency against empire’s built sensorium. The imaginative works of art that I call “insurgent aesthetics” reassemble vision with the disqualified knowledges, histories, geographies, and memories preserved by the “lower” senses of empire’s gendered racialized Others. In so doing, I show how the minoritarian body serves as a critical site for the acquisition of unorthodox and often unexpected political knowledge about security, terrorism, and warfare. A major goal of this book is not only to offer a diagnosis of how neoliberal security and warfare have constrained dominant lifeworlds and accelerated human suffering via the atrocities of war, but also to elucidate how these artists provide the designs for sensing other, more disobedient and arresting ways of being in the world. By foregrounding the phenomenological and sensuous dimensions of war-making in aesthetic practices of contemporary artists from the South Asian and Middle Eastern diasporas, I documented how ascendant archives of the US forever war have worked to bury, obscure, abstract, misrecognize, and misremember alternative accounts of the forever war and its gendered racial-colonial targets in the Greater Middle East. In my close readings of diasporic art and performance, I offered a queer calculus as a critical framework to account for the US state’s differential valuation of human life. If “calculus” implies a cold accounting of wartime facts and figures, these cultural works upend such an accounting, queering the process of archival production so as to constitute a different and more sensuous mode of reckoning with the ultimately unaccountable devastations of war. A queer calculus of the forever war advances an account of both dominant knowledge apparatuses and data logics of the US security state and alternative logics, affects, emotions, and affiliations of diasporic subjects living and creating in the heart of empire. In so doing, a queer calculus makes intimate what is rendered distant, renders tactile what is made invisible, and makes unified what is divided, thereby conjuring up forms of embodied critique that can envision a collective world within and beyond the spaces of US empire’s perverse logics of global carcerality, security, and warfare.

#### The alt allows us to solve for the root cause of forever wars

By Ronak K Kapadia 19. Associate Professor of Gender and Women's Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago.. “Insurgent Aesthetic: Security and the Queer Life of the Forever War.” Duke University Press. 2019. <https://read-dukeupress-edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/books/book/2637/Insurgent-AestheticsSecurity-and-the-Queer-Life-of> //NM

This book has centered the expansive world-making knowledge practices of Arab, Muslim, and South Asian diasporic multimedia artists and activists who hail from societies beset by war but who live and labor in the heart of empire in order to rethink the strategies, technologies, geographies, and strategic ambitions of contemporary US neoliberal security and warfare. It has pursued a queer feminist fugitive critique of the US military’s desire for “full spectrum dominance,” with a slantwise relation to the multiple disparate scales and sites of the body, land, air, spectrum, and sky, as well as affective and sensuous experiences that exceed the visual frame. My hope is that this close engagement with the insurgent creative practices of these conceptual artists will allow us to “disrupt neat narratives of freedom and escape” and compel us to think, feel, and imagine otherwise about the manifold violences of the social world.24 It may also help us reckon with and reimagine anew our own intimate affective relation and collusion with the militarized surveillance and securitization projects of US empire. If we follow the visionary lead of Okoumou, Sansour, Ghani, Ganesh, and the many other creative practitioners convened in these pages, we might be able to peer down at the ground queerly and with fresh perspective. We might begin to train our gaze on and stimulate our other senses with the felicitous cracks and folds and lines of flight in what the forever war has waged and to begin once again the work of exploiting and amplifying forms of fugitivity, refusal, and rebellion that take us as far and as high as we all can go.

### Alt - Celebration

#### The alt is to celebrate queerness, a stance that disrupts hierarchies of heteronormativity in a way that identity politics can’t.

Cooper-Cunningham, Dean. “Security, Sexuality, and the Gay Clown Putin Meme: Queer Theory and International Responses to Russian Political Homophobia.” Security Dialogue, Apr. 2022, doi:10.1177/09670106211055308. Accessed 7/22/2022 //ONHS IF

Queer international relations has demonstrated how sex(uality) connects to international politics, identifying, for instance, the sexualized logics through which international security works and how security discourses often rest upon gendered–sexualized–racialized constructions about what/who needs protection and what/who is a threat (Cooper-Cunningham, 2020; Leigh and Weber, 2019; Richter-Montpetit, 2014, 2018). Here, I (re)turn to queer theory through the politics of sexual shame and stigma to move beyond the identification of heteronormative power structures underpinning international politics. I bring into international relations a queer politics that is explicitly anti-normative, delights in sexual difference, revels in abjectness and embraces the disruptive force of queerness that flouts rigid and punitive norms around sex, gender and sexual desire. Queer theory acknowledges the deep connection between gender and sexuality. They intertwine in the sense that desire for the opposite sexed/gendered body is assumed natural and ‘normal’, whereas desire for the same breaks with normative sexuality and gender. We can therefore speak of a gendered heterosexual/homosexual dichotomy that is powerful, ordering and hierarchical. Heteronormativity – the structures of understanding that privilege heterosexuality – ensures that ‘if you deviate at any point from this program, you do so at your own cost’ (Warner, 2000: 38). All dichotomies privilege one side of a divide and thereby produce a hierarchical relationship between juxtaposed terms. Opposite-/same-sex sexual desires and behaviours have been constituted in hierarchical opposition as normal/perverse, natural/deviant. Consequently, those practising sexual behaviours that deviate from the heteronormative programme ‘are subjected to a presumption of mental illness, disreputability, criminality, restricted social and physical mobility, loss of institutional support, and economic sanctions’ (Rubin, [1984] 2011: 149). This has led to the persecution and securitization of supposedly deviant sexuality and gender performances. Queer theorists have shown that stigma, shame and moralism about appropriate sexual behaviour and erotic desire are essential in upholding this powerful dichotomy of sexual and gender difference. Michael Warner’s work on the politics of sexual shame is instructive: stigma is ‘a mark on the body’ that constitutes ‘the person, not the deed, as tainted’, whereas shame is linked more to the act (Warner, 2000: 27–28). To deviate from normative sexuality – which names appropriately gendered objects of desire and types of sex – is to engage in shameful acts. When these desires/acts are constituted as identities, as the essence of one’s being, they invite stigmatization. Destroying deeply entrenched and resilient systems of oppression such as patriarchal gender and heteronormativity is not as simple as pointing to their discursive, socially (re)produced, contingent nature. Destabilizing powerful discourses and showing their reliance on obedience, repetition and fear of transgression is only one step. On this, Cathy Cohen (1997) makes an important point: power and hierarchies can be rearranged and transformed but never fully eliminated. A queer politics that invites radical transformation of society and politics is itself eternally oppositional, anti-assimilationist, deliberately antisocial, attendant to every relation to power, and adopts an ethics that ‘cuts against every form of hierarchy’ (Warner, 2000: 36).9 Queer is therefore distinct from an identity-based LGBT civil rights agenda. It is a more radical and transformative politics that short-circuits the ‘hierarchies that allow systems of oppression to persist and operate efficiently’ by not only challenging how people understand sexuality but also creating oppositional space against all forms of domination and marginalization (Cohen, 1997: 437, 440). Queer is intersectional, coalitional, and rejects LGBT identity politics that turns sexual and gender ‘deviance’ (acts) into identities and assimilates lesbians, gays, bisexuals and trans people into heteronormative institutions that perpetuate cisheterosexuality as the norm. Identity-based politics fails to interrogate the politics of sexual shame and stigma that operates to quash deviance; how it is used to punish individuals for failing to conform to cisheteronormative demands, often in the name of the nation’s health (Rubin, [1984] 2011; Warner, 2000). A liberatory queer politics refuses to sanitize or morally legitimize sexual difference and instead takes delight in shame (Bersani, 1996; Warner, 2000). This is not the same as perpetuating discourses of queerness as ‘abnormal’ in insidiously phobic ways since queer does not work through a heteronormative epistemology (Sedgwick, 2008; Warner, 1993). In its refusal of normativity, queer is anti-assimilationist, oppositional, non-proscriptive, and, in rejecting society, takes ‘fierce pride in bucking political, emotional, and sexual norms’ (Gould, 2009: 264). Queer is therefore attentive to all those who endure the penalties of divergence from cisheteronormative culture. Its radical politics lies in its revelry in stigmatic and abject associations; its delight in flouting rigid and punitive norms around sex, gender and sexuality in ways that are constituted as perverse, immoral, unthinkable or fundamental threats to children, society, the common good and national security (see Bersani, 1996; Edelman, 2004; Gould, 2009). If being abject – generally a negative thing – is to stand outside of and/or fail to conform with dominant identities, systems and orders – in this case, normative sexuality and gender – then queerness, which works through a different epistemology, delights in abjection by deliberately flouting heteronormative demands. To be abject is favourable. Queer is therefore a political commitment to never being nor wanting to be constituted ‘normal’ for all the power that entails. It is an outlaw existence that is antisocial in its perpetual, unapologetic anti-normativity. Identifying and destabilizing oppressive regimes of ab/normalization that constitute particular bodies and their behaviours as normal/perverse is important (Butler, 1990; Warner, 2000). However, Bersani demanded more of queer theory and politics: we may discover, within the very ambiguities of being gay, a path of resistance far more threatening to dominant social orders than vestimentary blurrings of sexual difference and possibly subversive separations of sex from gender. There are some glorious precedents for thinking of homosexuality as truly disruptive – as a force not limited to the modest goals of tolerance for diverse lifestyles, but in fact mandating the politically unacceptable and politically indispensable choice of an outlaw existence. (Bersani, 1996: 76, emphasis in original) He suggested that ‘the value of sexuality is to demean the seriousness of efforts to redeem it’, for ‘if the rectum is the grave in which the masculine ideal (an ideal shared – differently – by men and women) of proud subjectivity is buried, then it should be celebrated for its very potential for death’ (Bersani, 1987: 222, emphasis in original; see also Bersani, 1996: 19). Problematizing how anal sex has been constituted as the aberration that ‘feminizes’ the ‘passive’ man – where the rectum is the sanctum where masculinity resides – Bersani proposes embracing queer abjection and using it as a force for shattering masculine/feminine ideals and attendant power structures that constrain erotic pleasure and subjectivity to rigidly gendered sexuality; short-circuiting heteronormative sociality by taking pride in deviant sex(uality); and liberation from repression. Queer is more than resistance to heteronormativity by showing how it works. It is more than mimicry, parody, troubling or a camp reworking of hegemonic forms of the social – the compulsory practice of heterosexuality – and is instead ‘a potentially revolutionary inaptitude . . . for sociality as it is known’ (Bersani, 1996: 75). It unapologetically embraces deviation and uses it as a vehicle for social transformation. This antisocial version of queer is tied to the politics of gay shame, stigma and respectability. Recognizing gay shame in deviance from the heteronormative programme, queer people/theorists/activists argued for pride in sexual difference. This is rooted in recognition that even the most morally defended sex is perverted: we are all subject to the spectre of desire and its uncontrollable, unpredictable workings (Bersani, 1987: 222; Warner, 2000: 2–3, 36–38). This queer pride differs from that associated with the ‘politics of respectability’ that emerged in the 1980s and remains central to the LGBT political project (Gould, 2009: 245). Instead of downplaying sexual difference for a shot at inclusion in ‘an oppressive and exploitative society’ (cue sanitized slogans like ‘love is love’) – a strategy that ironically achieves the phobic goal of eliminating difference – pride in sexual deviance ‘weaponizes’ the constitution of queer sex as abject for ‘righteous rebellion’ against sociopolitical norms (Gould, 2009: 249). It resists the trap of effusing moral justifications for sexual tastes and practices – as if erotic pleasure has to be defended. To playfully delight in abjection is to take joy in being abject and to tease those who take sex too seriously by attempting to moralize it or control desire. To celebrate queerness by taking endless, playful, ridiculing delight in it, rather than hiding what might hamper social acceptance, is political. In the case of Russian political homophobia, sex is geopolitical. Celebrating queerness is recognition that bodies are the battleground upon which geopolitical struggles are fought (Russia vs. Gayropa) through control of gender performance, sexual freedoms and bodily pleasures. Rather than resignifying transgressive sexual desire or gender performance as ‘normal’ and allowing it to be subsumed – accommodated, disarmed – into dominant society, queer shortcircuits the power of heteronormativity by embracing its abject label, refusing to (be made to) conform to cisheteronormative standards of social and political life, and finding joy from the trauma of the normal imposed. This refusal does not dissolve the hierarchical straight/queer, normal/abnormal binary as such but short-circuits its power. Acknowledging the hierarchical constitution of sexual practices/desires and certain erotic pleasures as perverse, queer challenges heteronormativity and homophobic hierarchies by rejoicing in queer aberrance, delighting in it and claiming dignity in supposedly shameful erotic pleasures – ultimately laying the groundwork for new forms of (queer) subjectivity that challenge what is deemed shameful.

### Alt – Embody Queerness

#### The alternative is to embody queerness – only that solves traditionally gendered approaches to IR and deconstructs the binaries of masculinity and femineity

Cynthia Weber, 2016, "(PDF) Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality, and the Will to Knowledge, written by Cynthia Weber,” : Oxford University Press, 264 pp DOI:10.1163/2165025X-12340019 // WaVes

“The end of man,” as Foucault boldly announced in 1971, will be the end not only of the dominance of men over other sexes but also of the foundations of Western knowledge: individuality, consciousness, the ego. Looking at the international queer liberation movements since the 1960s, the primacy of masculinity surely has been challenged, confirming the observation that the figure of man historically cemented by Western civilization and expansion is “in the process of disappearing.” Cynthia Weber’s most recent contribution to inter-national relations (IR) scholarship, Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality, and the Will to Knowledge, both believes in and inadvertently belies this prophecy. Weber’s book primarily argues that sovereignty and its sexualization play a key role in domestic and international games of power (p. 5). Statecraft, she surmises, equates to mancraft, or the “art of fixing a paradigmatic interpreta-tion of sovereign man that the state can mirror and serve” (Ashley 1989, 203). In tracing the rich scholarship of IR and global queer specialists from around the world, Weber has not only produced a sweeping investigation of sexualization strategies in foreign policymaking and interstate relations. By intuiting a novel way of understanding the queer in global politics, she also exposes how new logics of statecraft have appropriated the erstwhile radical movement of the lgbtq+ community, revealing that the end of ~~man~~ [humans] is off the beaten path. Nevertheless, the quintessentially queer episteme Weber proposes, embodied in the logic of either/or, may shed much light on what other paths must be taken towards queer liberation and, as Foucault once dreamt, the end of ~~man~~[humankind]. Weber’s unsettling – that is queer – propositions are made even more radical by the very existence of the book. Fascinated less in interstate relations and more on microlevel experiences of power, gendered approaches to inter-national politics is still met by pockets of resistance in the field of IR. Queer, as understood by pioneering queer theorist Eve Sedgwick, is “the open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meaning when the constituent elements of anyone’s gender, of anyone’s sexuality aren’t made (or can’t be made) to signify monolithically” (1993, 8). Queerness embodies an invasion, an unsettling of fictional categories, such as binarized sexes and genders, that have been frozen in history through exercises of hegemonic state and institutional power. IR scholarship is generally articulated through a masculinized parlance; it speaks of states, wars, weaponry, and world leaders who are commonly bourgeois, white, heterosexual males. Queer IR resists this occupation by introducing a “sexuality variable” into the equation, offering refreshed ways of mapping phenomena “as diverse as colonial-ism, human rights, and the formation of states and international communities that provide vastly different renderings of international politics” (Weber 2016, 23). Themes that would interest Filipino IR specialists such as gendered sovereignty discourse, sex(ualized) tourism, and lgbtq+-allied policymaking, to name a few, may be enriched through this novel lens.

### Alt – Queer Monstronsities

#### The alt is to embrace the monstrosity within queer identities as a means to disrupt the societal idealism against us—only through rejection of empowerment and the embracement of revolutionary identity politics can we integrate the societal other

Julie Reshe, Phd, 10-16-2018, Medium, Revolutionary Monsters: the death ~~Suicide~~ of Identity Politics, https://juliereshe.medium.com/identities-can-be-emancipated-and-empowered-but-only-queer-monsters-can-liberate-18667779b7c3, /Wooster-RFS

In their discourse on the revolution, Negri and Hardt use the concept of a positive generative monster. Monstrosity arises as otherness, something contrary to the existing order. It is a freak child who differs from her mother. Monstrosity implies imbalance and terrifying excess. The framework of existing rationality is too narrow to accommodate the excess of its creative forces. It is this terrifying monstrous excess that points towards an alternative.

The example of a struggle against monsters, that Negri and Hardt suggest, are witch hunts in Europe and America in the 16th and 17th centuries. “Witches” is a way of naming those who transgress the framework of the dominant religious dogmas at that time. As an example of the modern forms of monstrosity, Negri and Hardt point to the image of a woman whose behavior does not coincide with the role traditionally attributed to her. These are, for instance, women who are not willing to do affective labor on call (“smile appropriately, tend to hurt feelings, knit social relationships, and generally perform care and nurturing”), for this reason they are perceived as a kind of monster.

Although Negri and Hardt emphasize the positivity and generativeness of monsters, one can argue with them, noting that monsters are in no way positive or generative from the point of view of the existing rationality framework — they are exclusively destructive and dangerous (this is what the word “monster” means) . Once they gain a characteristic of generativeness and positivity, they can no longer be considered monsters.

According to Negri and Hardt, “Revolution is monstrous”. They introduce a terminological distinction between emancipation and liberation. The revolution pursues the goal of liberation, while identity politics — the goal of emancipation. The latter, if focused on itself, contradicts a truly revolutionary goals. Identity politics suggests that there is something universally shared by all members of a particular oppressed group: a shared nature or essence (for example, feminism is based on the imputed unity of female gender).

Identity politics leads the struggle towards emancipation of a certain group united based on the shared identity, but at the same time it imposes this identity. Because of this imposition the struggle for the emancipation of a certain class, race, gender, sexual identity can serve as a means for rebellion and emancipation, but ultimately it contradicts the social metamorphosis necessary for truly revolutionary changes. Identity politics is revolutionary only if, paradoxically, is committed to the abolition of identity, that is focused on self-destruction.

Emancipation sets as its goal freedom of identity, freedom to be who you “really are”, liberation is revolutionary and seeks freedom of self-determination and self-transformation, freedom to determine who we can be

In other words, identity politics in itself implies the struggle against social subordination, its aim is empowerment of the oppressed identity, but not the struggle aimed at transformation and self-elimination of identity. Any identity that is established and empowered, becomes dominant.

A revolutionary politics can start with the emancipation of identity, since all the revolutionary movements, as Negri and Hardt believe, are launched by the struggle against the oppression of a certain identity, but but cannot end there.

Negri and Hardt explain this as follows:

“Black nationalism in the United States, for example, which takes inspiration from the anticolonial struggles and their goals of national liberation, is seldom configured in territorial terms but is aimed rather at the sovereignty of the racial identity, which implies separation and self-determination, controlling the economy of the community, policing the community, and so forth. It is easy to think of certain streams of feminist politics that are characterized similarly by gender nationalism, or gay and lesbian politics by gay and lesbian nationalisms, and there is a long and complex history of worker politics that takes the form of worker nationalism. The metaphor of nation, in each of the cases, refers to the relative separation of the community from the society as a whole and suggests the construction of a sovereign people. All these nationalisms, in contrast to the multiculturalist struggles for recognition, are combative formations that constantly rebel against structures of subordination. Such nationalisms do, however, end up reinforcing the fixity of identity. Every nationalism is a disciplinary formation that enforces obedience to the rules of identity, policing the behavior of members of the community and their separation from others.”

The task of identity politics is to render violence and subordination visible, rebel against them and struggle for for emancipation, but after that one cannot return to an emancipated identity and dwell on it. To become revolutionary, identity politics must find a way to keep moving forward. The task of liberation prevents annihilation of the revolutionary movement and keeps the rebellious function of identity, leading identity politics to the revolutionary project: its self-abolition.

Negri and Hardt introduce a conditional distinction between emancipatory and revolutionary feminism. The former is aimed at consolidating and empowering of the identity of a woman, the latter is aimed at abolishing of a woman as identity.

Donna Haraway describes such revolutionary project as “the Utopian dream of [. . .] a monstrous world without gender.” A revolutionary project goes beyond the purely reformist perspective of emancipation: instead of the goal of preserving sexual differentiation, while depriving it of its hierarchy (here lies a trap, because identification based on sexual differentiation itself implies hierarchy), the revolutionary project seeks to abolish identification based on sexual differentiation as such. This does not mean that all differences will be erased, monstrosity carries the potential of new differences, but nothing that we now recognize as gender.

Negri and Hardt simultaneously flirt with identity politics, asserting its necessity and criticize it. They resort to a subtle tactic, explaining that every time they claim that revolutionary stage must follow the struggle of identity politics, do it only for the sake of convenience, while in reality, the task of emancipation and the task of liberation must be carried out simultaneously, since there is the risk that a revolutionary project will be postponed indefinitely.

Considering all the absurdity of this tactic (the identity politics is necessary, but only for its self-abolishment), one should think about whether the need of such a tactic is the result of the identity politics in action: identity politics which not only postpones the revolutionary project to infinity, but fundamentally opposes it. Negri and Hardt idealize (are forced to?) identity politics, suggesting that it can voluntarily commit suicide.

What indicates a dominant position is a ban on criticism. Maybe something is wrong with feminism, since in today’s world it cannot be directly criticized? If one doesn’t resort to such tactics, she will be automatically considered to be an accomplice of patriarchy, with all the ensuing consequences in the form of social ostracism.

For Negri and Hardt, the most obvious revolutionary form of identity politics is queer politics, since it inextricably links identity politics with criticism of identity. Queer is not an identity, but rather a process of disidentification, that is, destabilization of an identity that is not interested in its consolidation or stabilization. The question arises if queer politics should be considered a form of identity politics, or maybe it is an independent revolutionary phenomenon opposing it?

It should be noted, however, that the term “queer” is increasingly used in public discourse not as a critique of identity, but as one of the identity categories technically included in LGBT community, such understanding of it deprives the term “queer” of its monstrous revolutionary potential, reducing it to emancipation.

Identities can be emancipated and empowered, but only queer monsters can liberate themselves. The reverse side of the struggle for the assertion of identity is the trauma of oppression (one can even claim that it forms this identity). The identity politics acts “on behalf” of the trauma and carries the risk of full reduction of a self-determination process to it. The primary mode of such acting is purely reactive, it’s motivated by a justified desire to take revenge on a universalized source of trauma.

Monsters act differently, they do not reduce themselves to an existing trauma and do not act on its behalf. Being a monster means to proceed on an endless journey of searching for a new traumatic experience (what is new is inevitably traumatic).

“This revolutionary process of the abolition of identity, we should keep in mind, is monstrous, violent, and traumatic. Don’t try to save yourself — in fact, your self has, to be sacrificed! This does not mean that liberation casts us into an indifferent sea with no objects of identification, but rather the existing identities will no longer serve as anchors. Many will pull back from the brink and try to stay who they are rather than dive into the unknown waters of a world without race, gender, or other identity formations. Abolition also requires the destruction of all the institutions of the corruption of the common […], such as the family, the corporation, and the nation. This involves an often violent battle against the ruling powers and also, since these institutions in part define who we now are, an operation surely more painful than bloodshed. Revolution is not for the faint of heart. It is for monsters. You have to lose who you are to discover what you can become” (Negri and Hardt).

### FW

#### The alt is key to effectively analyze IR and prevent violence- anything other than centering our queer research pushes queer bodies to the side and regenerates violence.

Weber, Cynthia. “Queer Intellectual Curiosity as International Relations Method: Developing Queer International Relations Theoretical and Methodological Frameworks.” International Studies Quarterly, vol. 60, no. 1, 2016, pp. 11–23. JSTOR, [http://www.jstor.org/stable/43868302. Accessed 22 Jul. 2022](http://www.jstor.org/stable/43868302.%20Accessed%2022%20Jul.%202022). //ONHS IF

By placing queer intellectual curiosity about figurations of "homosexuality" and "the homosexual" at its methodological core, my proposed Queer IR methods refuse to take for granted personal-to-international institutional arrangements, figurations of "homosexuality" and "the homosexual," attachments (and detachments) of these figurations to/from material bodies, and the mobilization of sexualized bodies in international politics. This article makes three key points. It demonstrates the historical instability of figurations of "homosexuality" and "the homosexual" by illustrating how discourses of power/knowledge/plea- sure put sex into discourse to figure "homosexuality" and "the homosexual" as perverse (for Victorians), normal (for the Obama administration), and normal and/or per- verse (for Neuwirth and/as Wurst). It shows how figurations of "the homosexual" (might) function as both a singular logos and a plural logoi of statecraft as mancraft. And it makes clear how figurations of "the homosexual" participate in both the deconstruction and construction of political communities and international orders. Because figurations of "the homosexual" and other potentially plural logoi - from the variously normalized (Towns 2010) to the variously stigmatized (Zarakol 2011; Adler-Nissen 2014) - affect the organization and regulation of international politics, they constitute important objects/subjects of study in IR. Rather than detracting from the serious business of analyzing international practice and producing IR theory, investigating these figurations furthers understandings of core IR concerns. For example, Adler-Nissen' s insightful analysis of Austria's rejection of stigma is complicated by the Austrian state's embrace of the pluralized normal and/or perverse figure of Neuwirth and/ as Wurst. This plural figure calls schemata of stigmatization themselves into question. It thereby erodes and displaces how "stigmatization helps clarify the boundaries of acceptable behavior and identity and the consequences of nonconformity" for states (Adler-Nissen 2014:149). Additionally, understandings of human rights that equate "the norm" and "the normal" with "the good" and "the beneficial" (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998) are complicated by Queer IR analyses of "homonormative" foreign policies - such as those of the Obama administration. For these analyses expose the (potential) violence of not just excluding plural subjects but also including plural subjects as singular subjects. These practical, empirical concerns deepen IR understandings of state and nation formation, human rights policy, and diplomacy more generally. Yet they cannot be interrogated if IR excludes from its consideration plural logoi and logics, or if IR reduces them to a singular logos or logic. IR methods that attempt to analyze plural figures as if they were historically static or singular - either by reducing them to a variable or by analyzing them exclusively through an "either/or logic" of statecraft as mancraft - miss opportunities to appreciate what plural(s) constitute(s) these figures and how plural (s) make and unmake national, regional, and international political communities that anchor various arrangements of international hierarchy and anarchy. The Queer IR methods proposed here provide techniques, devices, and research questions to investigate singular and plural figurations, including those of "the homosexual." It thus offers ways to further IR analyses seeking to investigate how both a singular logos and a plural logoi effect the conduct of international politics

#### Queer visibility demands the alt – without paying close attention to the ways queerness operates in IR, the newly visible queer body is subjected to the violent whims of the state.

Lind, Amy. “‘Out’ in International Relations: Why Queer Visibility Matters.” International Studies Review, vol. 16, no. 4, 2014, pp. 601–04. JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/24758505. Accessed 22 Jul. 2022. //ONHS IF

Like SSM, anti-gay laws can also be seen as global sites of both dispute and (ironically) celebration. How hegemonic states respond to anti-gay laws fascinating in itself: David Cameron has publicly linked countries' LGBT rights record directly to UK foreign aid conditionality. Likewise, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has linked LGBT rights to countries' "democratic records,” and the US AID Global LGBT Development Partnership is now the largest state-sponsored initiative of its kind. Uganda, in particular, has been threatened with foreign aid suspension due to the passage of the 2014 Homosexuality Act, which broadens the criminalization of same-sex including life in prison for those found guilty and penalties for activist groups that support LGBT rights. Indeed, while the brutality of the law fortunately was dismissed by Uganda's Supreme Court, merits a response has to ask "why Uganda?" and not other countries. Interestingly, when Cameron and Obama were faced with international pressure to boycott the 20 Olympics following the passage of Russia's "gay propaganda" law, both publicly opposed a boycott. Cameron stated, "I believe we can better address prejudice if we attend, not by boycotting..." (Xydias 2013); Obama opted not to attend himself but invited LGBT celebrities to be part of the US delegation. Threats suspension or boycotts are seen as exceptionalist when clearly neither the UK nor the United States have achieved such "modernization" at home. How, then, can scholars and activists best navigate these political landscapes and understand the ambivalent nature of globalized queer visibility? Here I offer three preliminary thoughts: First, recognizing how queer visibility becomes a tool of hegemony and empire is key: As I've outlined above, queer visibility in global arenas has brought with it a series of paradoxes that involve the legitimization of a "new gay normal" (read: Western, middle class, white, masculine, gender-normative) over all else, and which often serves as fodder for broader struggles for/against colonialism, westernization, and empire. Rao (2012) has described this tension as involving those who claim to be on the "right side of history” (the normative move toward global gay rights, launched primarily by Wes and global institutions) vs. those who are simply "on the wrong side of empire”, including queers in countries deemed "uncivil," "dangerous," or "backward” according to hegemonic standards. Being "on the right side of history”, implies, then, serving empire as well. Currently, this "new gay normal" is being played out in foreign policy, security, and development arenas and is embedded in state as well as market ideologies linking gays to growth and neoliberal modernity. Second, because states and global institutions are now finally "paying attention to us" (Scott Long, quoted in Rao 2012), bringing heightened visibility to LGBT rights, it is imperative that "we" pay attention to states and global institutions as they continue to legislate, advocate, and/or construct discourses concerning LBGT rights in a global context- this being only one, albeit important aspect of thinking “queerly” and critically in our queries of IR. Major groundwork has been done to understand how hetero- and homonormativities are embedded in state practices of securitization (for example, Weber, Duggan, or Puar) and law and policy making (for example, Weiss and Bosia), yet much needs to be carried out to better understand how and why states craft both homophobic and homopositive strategies as they relate to their national political economies as well as their positions vis-à-vis other states and regions, and to address the very real consequences of pro and anti LGBT rights discourse in people’s lives. This certainly applies to nonstate communities as well (for example, Palestine) and to nonhegemonic states that invoke a heteronormative notion of nationalism (for example, Ecuador, Cuba). Finally, although here I have focused on queer visibility in relation to state practices, it is crucial, of course, that we pay attention to how other hegemonic institutions such as institutions of global finance and development convey heteronormative and/or homonormative logics in their supposedly neutral (and/or modernization) discourse, with very real effects for citizens and policy recipients (Cornwall, Correa, and Jolly 2008; Bedford 2009; Lind 2010). The World Bank's suspension of US $90 million in aid to Uganda in March 2014 is a case in point, alongside the Bank's "Economic Cost of Homophobia" project, which aims to monetize the cost of discrimination and link it to aid distribution, economic growth, and modernization. While advances in LGBT rights are important steps the political messiness of queer visibility offers IR scholars an opportunity to think more critically about how state practices contribute to and indeed power fully shape the (hetero)normative landscape in which we conceptualize our work.