### 1AC

#### Part 1: Rainbows are just refracted white light.

#### To be queer in the US is to be caught in a catch-22: either engage in appropriate queer behavior or to be the subject to violence. Knowing you are not appropriately queer is to know that you are safe nowhere, it is to realize, as so many queer people have before you, that you do not own your body because at any given moment it can be taken from you.

Pensis 16 [Evan R. "Fugitive Faggotry: Queer Rage and the Limitations of Equality." Ethnomusicology Review. N.p., 10 Nov. 2016. Web.]

**1. To be gunned down in a club** **while** sipping the drink that was paid for on the off chance that **a conversation might offer connectivity in a world that hinges on extinguishing your connections or your ability to connect to someone** maybe just anyone who rides the rhythm of this Latin house track deep enough and responds to you moving the same way, pulsing the same way, feeling many things all at once **is deadening**.[[1]](http://ethnomusicologyreview.ucla.edu/content/fugitive-faggotry-queer-rage-and-limitations-equality%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn1%22%20%5Co%20%22) **To be gunned down in a space where** briefly every Saturday evening between the hours of 10 PM and 2 AM you can blur the line between that part of your mind that uncrosses your legs on the metro or looks away when **your eye contact hovers for too long with some man** in public **and that deprived part of your soul that seeks out** the linger or the lure or the gesture long enough to explore **a queer intimacy** or to merely feel like yourself for a few moments **is**, yet again, **deadening**. **It is deadening in the literal life-taking way, but it exceeds this too as the atrocity contests even the ability to speak up, to speak out and turns a queer communal space honoring its Latinx and Afro-Latinx patrons into a mass grave intended to annihilate any and all sounds or echoes of queerness. 2.To be queer in the U.S. is to be an aberration. To exist in the U.S. as a queer person is to be death-trapped between buying into the heteronormativity of survival on one hand** (if you can afford it) **and stealing**, on the other, **the fleeting moments of a life never meant or made for you**. **In the wake of a mass murder of forty-nine queer folks** and the shooting of more than one-hundred on Latin night at Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, **I had no words, only feelings. Reeling from the pain**, from the damage and desecration and anguish set into motion by one homophobic bigot with a big gun and a bigger ideology, **I cannot dilute or resolve my pain** into a hashtag or a broader message about the need for love. This sentiment is powerful, binding and collective and I appreciate everyone who can move directly between mourning and loving. At the moment of writing this, I cannot. **All I can feel is rage. This rage ricochets against all the ways of surviving** that us queers and femmes and trans folks assemble in order to brace the daily task of living, **of getting home safely or of escaping home safely.** **It grates against all the behavioral mediations** and affective labors **we devise in order to appear less gay, less faggy**, less queer, less femme, **more hetero**, more passable or **more normal** in order to not offend or affront the national fantasy of (cis-)heteronormativity. **I feel rage because this shooting does not stand out as an anomaly to daily life** for queer people, especially queer people of color, in the United States; **it is a horrific and familiar continuity of homophobia and discrimination that bedrocks** hegemonic masculinity in **the United States.** I brim with rage because the methods of public integration and inclusivity, both individual and collective, seem futile and aimless in light of this act of genocide. I want to use this defiant rage to question how this action of violence was even made thinkable, how it emerged from an ordinary realm of possibilities as the “worst” way to quell queerness, expression, liberation and, where most mainstream gay and lesbian cries of injustice have dwelled: equality. While there are many brilliant radical queer activists and scholars who have delved into various problematics of equality, I here want to offer my own confusions around the term and some of the term’s unexamined aftershocks. I am dumbfounded as to how, **after decades and generations of protests, actions and energies poured into gay liberation and equal rights**, **it [was]** could be **so easy** and so swift for one man to take it all away, so simple **to re-open the wounds** of homophobia and discrimination that every queer person, particularly every queer person of color, carries daily on their physical, spiritual and affective bodies. I am unconvinced that our current methods of reform will deliver any longstanding hope for queer people, particularly as that queerness intersects with and complicates Black, Latinx, Muslim, Puerto Rican, disabled, indigenous, trans, undocumented, Afro-Latinx, homeless, femme and/or poz identities that are currently being whitewashed and erased in mainstream media. Peering into the expediency of this catastrophe, we might come to understand how support functions reactively. **One must be endangered in some way to engender support; otherwise, support would not be necessary**. **Thus, equality** as a cry for equal measures of support **operates in this reactionary way**. **Equality is limited by its own very nature: a built-in act of governing that relies on the claim of difference and the visibilization of that difference. In this act of recognition** (and it is an act both in interplay and performativity), **the excluded must demand inclusion on the terms always-already determined by the (already) included**. More nearly, equality hinges on an ability to prove inequality. **But here’s the catch: the excluded** (or the oppressed) **is not the judge,** was never the judge **and** beyond that, **the game** of legitimacy **was never made for the excluded** or oppressed **to participate**. You must undergo and recount (in your most hetero-verbiage) an adversity in order to prove that you are in need of support: you must first experience an epidemic before being (semi-)legitimated by the CDC or related branches of the U.S. government; **you must first experience a mass shooting** (or hundreds) in order **to generate concern** for the ability of one person to use a firearm to expediently execute dozens and dozens of people; **you must first bear witness to the horror of a child texting his mother that he wasn’t ever going to make it back home that night**, that he wasn’t going to make it out of that club alive and that indeed his life would be ended, **before you can realize how unthinkable any dream of liberation is when you cannot even imagine a future**. **Violence against the excluded** begins to **serve** **functionally as moments of learning** for the included — **our bodies become** amendments to **a** grandstanding **list of wrongs**-turned-rights.

#### This is especially true in the academic arena. Queerness is only tolerated as it is understood by the privileged – protections only apply to those who fill their role.

Fox 07 [Catherine. "From Transaction to Transformation:(En) Countering White Heteronormativity in" Safe Spaces"." College English 69.5 (2007): 496-511.]

During a post-panel conversation about the presence of LGBT issues in text books at a national conference, a group of queer folks were discussing the need to recognize the complexity of LGBT people and our experiences. Of particular note were the limited ways in which "LGBT issues" are placed in composition textbooks? usually in the "argument" section, with a pro/con pair of essays on "gay marriage," effectively reproducing a reductive and dichotomous representation of this social issue. During this conversation a white participant took it in a slightly different direction, explaining that he had done the work to build bridges with "other" races but that he was continually disappointed that "they" don't acknowledge LGBT folks in "their" scholarly work. He asserted that "we" need to insist that "they" begin doing the work of recognizing and including the contributions of queers in English studies. There was an awkward silence after his statement and the conversation proceeded about the presence of LGBT issues and voices in English textbooks. Emma Perez illustrates the kind of "false intimacy" created by discourses of "queer" and "LGBT community" when she argues **that "[t]he mistake made within any arena, whether academic [arena] or political, is that a common enemy bonds 'us' and makes 'us' all the same, while 'they,' the common enemy, are also all the same"** (95). Reflecting on this post-panel conversation, I began to wonder how **queers of color** were situated in this participant's statement about bridge work as part of the "we" or the "they"? My guess is that they weren't **[aren’t]** **situated at all, for to be "situated" is to be recognized; instead queers of color were rendered invisible within a discourse that relies upon singular and unified notions of identity and subjectivity.** I recount this situation because it illustrates how **queer white academics continue to render queer folks of color as "too 'alien' to comprehend"** (Lorde 117), **and** how **informal discourses around LGBT folks continue to operate within normalizing regimes of race and gender.** We have produced rich scholarship in the last ten years attuning us to the ways race, nation, sexuality, and gender are bound within a heteronormative order. William Spurlin suggests that queer theory has also enabled further exposure of the white, masculinist, middle-class, and West ern bias historically encoded in gay studies and helped to mobilize, over the course of the 1990s, a new corpus of academic theorizing that considered sexuality in relation to the persistent pressures of other normalizing regimes pertaining to race, class, gender, geopolitical spatializations, citizenship, nationalism, and the effects of economic globalization and transnational exchange. (9-10) However, in a recent introduction to a special issue of Social Text, "What's Queer about Queer Studies Now?" David Eng, Judith Halberstam, and Jos? Esteban Munoz insist **we need to be "ever vigilant to the fact that sexuality is intersectional, not extraneous to other modes of difference**" (1). Calling attention to Hiram Perez's and Judith Halberstam's critiques of the '"transparent white subject' [that remains] at the heart of queer studies" (12), they go on to argue that "**the political and intellectual promises of queer studies yet unfulfilled to the extent that queer too quickly collapses back into 'gay and lesbian' and, more often than not a 'possessive individualism' that simply connotes 'gay,' 'white,' and 'male'"** (12**).**

#### The history of Public Colleges and Universities is tied to that same method of whitewashing queer spaces.

Barnard 96 [Ian. "Fuck community or Why I support gay bashing." States of rage: Emotional eruption, violence, and social change (1996): 74-88.]

This new heterocentrism has been tellingly enacted in the recent spate of domestic-partnership policies adopted at college campuses around the nation, and the uncritical ecstasy with which most lesbian and gay academics have greeted them. These policies prove emblematic of a variety of processes of containment now being deployed against queer identities in the wake of the increased visibility of anti-homophobic activism. Most college campuses explicitly discriminate against queer students and employees in many ways; one component of this discrimi­nation is the benefit packages that provide, for example, health coverage to the spouses of heterosexual employees but not to the partners of lesbian and gay employees. The domestic-partnership policies that re­cently have been adopted by some cities, corporations, and academic institutions allow lesbian and gay employees to enjoy some of the bene­fits that had previously been the exclusive province of their heterosexual colleagues—I use the words "lesbian and gay" very deliberately here because I maintain that [but] these new benefits most definitely do not extend to queer employees; in fact, they are designed to domesticate and co-opt lesbian and gay employees as allies of the straight employees against their common enemy: the queer.I now want to discuss in some detail the domestic-partnership affidavit that applicants are required to sign at the University of Iowa, which, amidst much fanfare in the gay press, was one of the first colleges to implement a domestic-partnership policy in 1992.6 The Iowa policy is fairly representative, not only of domestic-partnership policies in general, but also of other conservative efforts to constitute, police, and delimit queer subjectivities.

#### This is empirically true for speech – safe spaces prove that restrictions on speech for the queer only protect those seen as appropriate and who fit the model.

Fox 2 [Catherine. "From Transaction to Transformation:(En) Countering White Heteronormativity in" Safe Spaces"." College English 69.5 (2007): 496-511.]

**These elisions and tensions are equally present in our departmental practices of posting safe-space signs. That is, insofar as the central organizing feature for queer folks is the eradication of homophobia and heterosexism, the term "safe space[s]" continue**s **to operate within normalizing discourses that reify a white, masculinist, middle class bias in LGBTA alliances, rendering queer subjectivity in a most simplistic and reductive manner. Such normalization elides how we are all multiply positioned in relation to power and privilege and the ways "identities" come into being relationally, or in other words, "how a variety of forms of oppression intertwine systemically with each other; and especially how the person who is disabled through one set of oppressions may by the same positioning be enabled through others" (Sedgwick, Epistemology 32). We lose sight of the relationality of our subjectivities and the necessity of building ally relationships outside of a hetero/homo binary that constructs a gay white male as the "object" of safe spaces and heterosexual allies as the "subjects" of those spaces** (more on this below).

#### Limiting speech on campus will likely be designed controlled by white, cis, neo-liberal so-called allies. This allows for the policing of “unacceptable” queer identities.

Fox 3 [Catherine. "From Transaction to Transformation:(En) Countering White Heteronormativity in" Safe Spaces"." College English 69.5 (2007): 496-511.]

**Sexuality**, as a regime of truth, **is** partly **constructed through a hetero/homo dichotomy, whereby heterosexuality is considered normal**, natural, and inevitable **and homosexuality is constructed as its binary opposite**, abnormal and perverse. **The discourse of safe space reproduces this dichotomy through an inclusion model that focuses on homophobia, suggesting that allies give, provide, offer, and secure safe space for LGBT people.** **Such a model constructs the normative authority of an ally to be the agent configuring what these spaces might be.** While the inclusion model has been an important part of the development toward queer studies over the last thirty years, it tends to focus on visibility and countering homophobia. In an effort to theorize a performative pedagogy and its relationship to LGBT people, Karen Kopelson contends that **many scholars have operated from an inclusion model, seeking "to determine what classroom conditions and pedagogical approaches might best facilitate the comfort, safety, and optimal learning situations for lesbian and gay students themselves, so that they might 'come to voice' as writers**" (18). She contends that **centralizing homophobia leads to "personalizing and pathologizing the fear of homosexuality, rather than uncovering homophobia's implication in its wholesale dependence upon pervasive systemic heterosexism and heteronormativity"** (20). **Such pathologizing discourses**, according to Kopelson, **operate "only from the point of view of the one who fears, thus ultimately validating the fear itself, and recuperating** (a doubting and squeamish) **heterosexuality as norm"** (20). **LGBT issues thereby often revolve around how to help queer folks feel comfortable within existing frameworks**, within normative relations, thus **failing "to challenge the academic mindset that assumes the centrality of white, middle-class, male, heterosexual values and desire"** (Gibson, Marinara, and Meem 93). **Furthermore**, the sticker, because it is about protection from the harmful effects of oppression, **tends to define LGBT people singularly through oppression.** Alexander and Banks argue that **"[t]o discuss or appropriate LGBT people, lives, texts, and issues as only oppressed is to do harm; these lives and texts are more complicated than that"** (277). On the other side of this binary is the normativity of the heterosexual ally, which rarely is called into question. Alexander and Banks go on to argue that **"identities are always constructed" and that "such construction works both on the homo/bi/trans sexual [and on] the heterosexual; to leave the latter out of our equations as anything other than normal or oppressive means we miss a vital part of our analysis and continue to privilege the normative as normative" (285). Indeed, what seems most important in creating more conducive conditions for queer faculty and students at universities and colleges is not "inclusion" in existing frameworks, but a radical interrogation of the performance and normalization of white heterosexuality.**

#### Part 2: Not gay as in happy but queer as in fuck you

#### Thus, we advocate that public colleges and universities ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech so that queer rage can express non-white, non-heteronormative, non-neoliberal identities. Rage can take many forms and attempts to delimit it are attempts to destroy subjectivity.

Barnard 2 [Ian. "Fuck community or Why I support gay bashing." States of rage: Emotional eruption, violence, and social change (1996): 74-88.]

The other element in my contradiction is the discomforting multiplicity in queer, the difference within itself. My title "Fuck Community" denotes, of course, the community whom I fuck as well as the "community" and the idea of community that I say fuck you to. It is the recognition of this division that impels me to confess the multidirectionalities of my rage. Judith Butler has written, [“]The insistence in advance on coalitional "unity" as a goal assumes that solidarity, whatever its price, is a prerequisite for political action. But what sort of politics demands that kind of advance purchase on unity? Perhaps a coalition needs to acknowledge its contradictions and take action with those contradictions intact. (14)[“]Rather then the debilitating facade of unity, Butler calls for an articulation of difference. She emphasizes that this kind of action-in-contradiction is neither disabling nor apolitical—instead it calls for a rethinking of the political. Furthermore, by saying that I support gay-bashing I decenter heterosexuality, taking for granted my rage at explicit homophobes and institutionalized heterosexuality. By attending to debates among queers I ignore heterosexuals and thus marginalize homophobic rhetoric. These internecine debates fragment and multiply queer identity. Not only do I want to make it impossible for homophobic rhetoric to construct a singular gay stereotype, but I also want to destroy destructive conceptualizations of unity and community. I reject the notion that this type of infighting would be kept from public view—that I should not be airing dirty laundry in front of breeders. I insist on refusing identity politics and its coercive imperative of political unity. We must reconceptualize our notions of politics and political action. We must recognize and say that we don't get on. I refuse to construct any one organic subject as the repository for my rage. Don't try to pin down my rage."

#### **Rage is also a necessary protection for fugitive bodies that says “I’m mad as hell, and I’m not going to take it anymore. I deserve to be able to survive”.**

Pensis 2 [Evan R. "Fugitive Faggotry: Queer Rage and the Limitations of Equality." Ethnomusicology Review. N.p., 10 Nov. 2016. Web.]

**3. In this unbridled queer rage, I refuse to treat this violence as the unavoidable mortgage for queer living** in a country that builds its neocolonial house out of the very heteronormativity and homophobia that suffocates us, **that coalesces with racism and trans/misogyny to commit** gruesome acts and hateful **violence against queer bodies through assault, suicide, homicide, and genocide**. I refuse to let this attack become a bullet point in the litany of unconscionable events used for some reformist politics or for some greater takeaway about how we are failing the mission of equality. In this anger, I am beginning to understand more fully that it is a politics of equality that is failing us. **It is this unapologetic rage that guides me not only to deplore the mass atrocities committed against queer people and queer people of color every day but also to abolish a society in which such an atrocity would even be possible,** to borrow a frame of analysis developed by Fred Moten and Stefano Harney (2013**). While reformist politics may accomplish things, I am not interested in things that will only make my life easier**. I am motivated rather to prevent the lives of future generations from death at the hands of the state (or its militarized and privatized phantom limbs) and the deeply engrained ideologies of U.S. hegemonic masculinity, white supremacy, surveillance and weaponry, citizenship, racism, homophobia and trans/misogyny. And it is the helplessness I feel with our current modes of reform, with #ItGetsBetter, with visibility and with equality that drives me to seek out new methods of revolution and demolition when another fagbash or person of color or Black trans woman or school shooting or hate crime becomes a hashtag that becomes a scroll that becomes one more component of ordinary life in the United States of America. **We must listen to this queer rage. We must let this powerful surge of fugitive faggotry guide us to seek out new forms of living and loving in our worlds, where being out will not jeopardize being alive — because forty-nine deaths are no more or less important than the murder of one when you fiercely love them all.**

#### Our rage calls on past eras of liberation and continues to build upon movements like ACT UP and QUEER NATION. The 1AC brings back the flame of a dying movement extinguished by political passivity and a seduction by the elites.

Murphy 16 [Tim. "Queer Rage in the Era of Facebook." The Huffington Post. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 02 Aug. 2016. Web. 07 Apr. 2017.]

Moreover, **I thought**, perhaps **the queer community would never again face a crisis as life-threatening as AIDS** in the 80s and 90s―a crisis that would shake it out of its understandably human desire to simple carry on as though everything was okay, **that would force queers into the street to fight angrily for their lives.** We may be there now. **Orlando brought that home for us**. In recent years, the success of marriage equality and the surge of activism from transgender people demanding their rights has produced a terrible backlash from cultural conservatives, especially in southern states. Many felt that the queer community should fight for a national LGBTQ antidiscrimination law before marriage equality, else our community’s most vulnerable would be left out in the cold. They were right. And the Orlando massacre, carried out by a man said to be struggling with his own sexuality, proved that lingering cultural homophobia, including the internal variety, plus easy access to assault weapons is an especially deadly combination for queer people. But it was not the first time we’ve been outraged at continuing violence to our bodies. **Almost every day in America, it seems, a transgender woman of color is assaulted, often fatally. Queer youth of color experience high rates of harassment by school officials and by the police compared to their white counterparts**. Even the supposedly nonviolent act of insulting a transgender person trying to use the public bathroom that matches their gender identity is targeting someone in their most personally physical of places―that of simply having to pee. As a 47-year-old gay white man, this reality hits me in a visceral place. I spent my Boston-area adolescence under daily physical and verbal attack, back in the 1980s when “bullying” wasn’t a school-health crisis but merely something kids did, and the word “homophobia” didn’t exist outside of academia and gay bookstores. **As I chanted epithets at the NRA at** the **Pride** march a few weeks ago **alongside my queer siblings, I felt a deep catharsis that went deeper than my hatred of the NRA**. **It was really my hatred, rooted in childhood, of all bullies, mostly straight men, who would threaten the lives of the queer, the sensitive, the vulnerable**. It felt great to throw a collective public middle finger to those NRA bullies that day. And I know I wasn’t alone. Many of us in the crowd that day, like me, had lived for years with either HIV or as fighters against AIDS, and I know we were tapping into a fire that had long simmered. Our joyously supportive onlookers were startled when, en masse, we dropped to the hot Fifth Avenue pavement for a die-in. **Many** of them, like that LGBTQ reporter, **were too young to remember seeing ACT UP, Queer Nation and other groups** employ such a macabre tactic. **We are at a strange place in queer history when our president**, the queer-friendliest we’ve ever had, **declares the Stonewall Inn, where a bunch of ragtag queer youth and drag queens once turned on their NYPD harassers, as a national monument to the gay rights movement but where, nearby, the very hospital (St. Vincent’s) where countless gay people died of AIDS is becoming luxury housing selling into the tens of millions of dollars per unit.** In our gentrified, social-media-fied city, **we are in perilous danger of forgetting the seismic, street-level change we queer people are capable of demanding when the going gets tough. Because we are.** True, this time, what we’re fighting―gun violence enabled by a lobby that blocks strong preventive laws―is an epidemic that threatens all of us. But those of us targeted for hate, like queers or the black churchfolk gunned down in Charleston last year, are particularly vulnerable. It’s time for today’s queer generation to look at social media differently: not as a replacement for getting boots and lungs out in the streets, but as an organizing tool to make such acts of defiance more frequent―and more powerful―than ever before.

#### Part three: Somewhere over the rainbow there’s a pot of Goldman Sachs

#### We refuse the binary state good bad debate and instead understand that different people form their identities differently-the 1AC is an act of disidentification that allows for a multiplicity of subjectivities.

Muñoz 99 [José Esteban. Disidentifications: Queers of color and the performance of politics. Vol. 2. U of Minnesota Press, P. 10-12. 1999. ~Professor of Performance arts at NYU]

The theory of **disidentification** that I am offering is meant to **contribute to an understanding of the ways in which queers of color** identify with ethnos or queerness despite the phobic charges in both fields. The French linguist Michel Pécheux extrapolated a theory of disidentification from Marxist theorist Louis Althusser's influential theory of subject formation and interpellation. Althusser's "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" was among the first articulations of the role of ideology in theorizing subject formation. For Althusser, ideology is an inescapable realm in which subjects are called into being or "hailed," a process he calls interpellation. **Ideology is the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. The location of ideology is always within an apparatus and its practice or practices, such as the State apparatus**. 12 Pécheux built on this theory by describing **the[re are]** **three modes in which a subject is constructed by ideological practices**. In this schema, **the** **first** mode **is** understood as "**identification," where a "Good Subject" chooses the path of identification** with discursive and ideological forms. "**Bad Subjects" resist** andattempt to reject the images and identificatory sites offered by dominant ideology and proceed to rebel, to "**counteridentify" and turn against this symbolic system**. **The danger** that Pécheux sees **in such an operation would be the counterdetermination that** such a system installs, a structure that **validates the dominant ideology by reinforcing its dominance through the controlled symmetry of "counterdetermination**." **Disidentification is the third mode** of dealing with dominant ideology, one **that** **neither opts to assimilate within such a structure nor strictly opposes it; rather**, disidentification is a strategy that **works on and against dominant ideology**. 13 **Instead of buckling** under the pressures of dominant ideology (identification, assimilation) **or attempting to break free** of its inescapable sphere (counteridentification, utopianism), **this "working on and against" is a strategy that tries to transform a cultural logic from within, always laboring to enact permanent structural change while at the same time valuing the importance of local or everyday struggles of resistance**. Judith Butler gestures toward the uses of disidentification when discussing the failure of identification. She parries with Slavoj Zizek, who understands disidentification as a breaking down of political possibility, "a fictionalization to the point of political immobilization." 14 She counters zizek by asking the following question of his formulations: "What are the possibilities of politicizing disidentification, this experience of misrecognition, this uneasy sense of standing under a sign to which one does and does not belong?" Butler answers: "it may be that the affirmation of that slippage, that the failure of identification, is itself the point of departure for a more democratizing affirmation of internal difference." 15 Both Butler's and Pécheux's accounts of disidentification put forward an understanding of identification as never being as seamless or unilateral as the Freudian account would Both theorists construct the subject as inside ideology. Their models permit one to examine theories of a subject who is neither the "Good Subject," who has an easy or magical identification with dominant culture, or the "Bad Subject," who imagines herself outside of ideology. Instead, they pave the way to an understanding of a "disidentificatory subject" who tactically and simultaneously works on, with, and against a cultural form. As a practice, disidentification does not dispel those ideological contradictory elements; rather, like a melancholic subject holding on to a lost object, a disidentifying subject works to hold on to this object and invest it with new life.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best creates space for the formation of subjective identity as it relates to the regulation of speech on campus. Without a counter-methodology, the 1NC will necessarily fail as per the arguments in part one that describe the status quo. If they fail to produce this methodology, they are only saying that me and people like me do not deserve access to the debate space or a life free from violence, and that itself constitutes harassment towards bodies like mine. The role of the judge is to be professionally unprofessional.

Strouse 15 [A. W. "Getting Medieval on Graduate Education Queering Academic Professionalism." Pedagogy 15.1 (2015): 119-138.]

We might note, also, that Grote’s misogyny existed, properly speak­ing, before the invention of modern sexuality.13 His **professionalism has to do with gender norms**, but it existed before our own gender norms were normal, as Karma Lochrie (2005) might say. Grote wrote about professionalism before the concept had been monolithically constructed — there was no “normal” yet in these norms. Indeed, his professionalism is entirely unprofessional: “If the profession is not all the man, and we do not wish it to be so, then, of course, it will be our object to make education as unprofessional as possible” (1856: 87). Grote’s discussion suggests the queer possibility that **education must be both professional and unprofessional — the norms need to be abnormal.** “Are we to educate the growing man simply for the business and particular position in which he is to do his service to the world,” asks Grote, “or are we to educate him, perhaps mainly, for what he is besides this?” (1856: 76). For Grote, **educating the whole individual, beyond the particular posi­tion, requires that education be unprofessional, that is, pertaining to each student’s character**. Studying classical literature is not defensible according to professional standards (78); it is “liberal, that is, unprofessional” (90), and precisely for this reason, Grote found it valuable. Education for Grote was, while professional, always simultaneously unprofessional, and a humanistic education is exactly the best way to be “unprofessional.” Indeed, as Marjorie Perloff (2000) suggests, the study of literature requires a good deal of sym­pathy for Homo rhetoricus, and as Brian Stock (1974) points out, medieval literature almost inherently runs against the grain of academic norms: “the Middle Ages” is a romantic construction, whereas the scholarly medievalist must approach medieval culture through the allegedly objective methods of an academic discipline. **To study** literature **means**, then, **always to be just beyond the bounds of professionalism** — a fact that Grote acknowledged and embraced. Grote, in his very early use of the word professionalism, did not work toward creating strict professional roles. As John R. Gibbins (2005: 252) writes, Grote “refused to produce an essentialist answer” in his essay and was “elusive” on questions of the academic profession. Grote’s remarks on **profes­sionalism** are tentative, confused, filled with second-guessing. In contrast to today’s **frequent injunction that a graduate student must “be a professional”** (as though the term has a precise referent and represents a straightforward identity), Grote did not pretend to prescribe a norm, and he saw no unity of purpose among educated individuals (1856: 74). To examine the history of professionalism through Grote, then, is to “teach the conflicts,” as Gerald Graff (1992) might say. **A professional education**, of course, has its virtues, since, as Grote writes, “a profession anyhow **requires certain moral habits, and,** in fact, per­haps **habits of body too**” (1856: 89). **These habits are acquired through a process that one could describe** — borrowing a term from Judith Butler’s (1990) early work — **as “performative [process]**.” **Such habits**, Grote writes, “**will be best formed by beginning even a sort of play practice of it,”** (89, emphasis added). **Such moral, intellectual, and bodily habits, through which one creates a professional identity by performative citation and repetition**, represent what for Grote is the more professional aspect of education. It may be this aspect of education that **creates for queers the most trouble**. But **if queer students** can **get into professional trouble, this** also **holds liberatory potential**. Professional trouble opens up possibilities: we might do a drag of professionalism, **queer­ing professionalism**. We **might** **try**, as Grote advocates, **to be professionally unprofessional**, to make a profession out of ambiguity, liberality, dilettan­tism. **Then not only could we get into trouble — we can start to make trouble.** Dilettantes, weirdos, amateurs, lovers: we might be able to create the kind of university that Langland dreamed of when he wrote: “In scole there is skile, and scorn but if he lern / And gret love and liking, for ech of hem lereth oother” (X; 1995: 303 – 4).14 Grote’s essay raises far more questions than it answers, and this could be just the way in which we should educate today’s graduate students: we might allow that our professional norms are arbitrary constructions, that they deserve to be analyzed critically, that there is room for **unprofessional pro­fessionalism**. In this vein, Virginia Crisco and colleagues (2003: 361) **argue for a pedagogy of “institutional critique” in which graduate programs focus more on how students can change the profession than on how the profession can professionalize students**. D. A. Schon (1995: 29) argues for **developing a new scholarly epistemology grounded in the “spontaneous, intuitive perfor­mance of the actions of everyday life,” as part of a broader project of creating an academy more readily engaged with our culture at large.** Following Grote, we might see how the history of “professionalism” gives us license to create doctoral programs in which students can “make the most of themselves.” **Rather than coercing students into unthinkingly taking up academia’s norms, we might invite students to develop their own values and goals.**