
THE LIBERAL AS AN ENEMY OF QUEER JUSTICE

CRAIG SCHAMEL

Abstract

Liberalism as a historical mode of the political is the context in which the movement and ensuing struggle for queer justice emerged in most Western countries. The terminology, practices, tendencies, beliefs, ethics, laws, and patterns of political and social life which have been determined by this mode of the political, it is argued, are inimical to queer justice and render its achievement impossible. Liberalism as a mode of the political is approached from below, from knowledge gained in practical experience in queer groups which considered themselves revolutionary at least to some degree, and from the effects on such groups and on the lives of queer persons of liberal tropes and processes. The liberal mode of justice is contrasted to the revolutionary mode across five elements of the liberal idiom of gay and lesbian justice which have found their way into the thought and nomenclature of much of the gay leadership of the U.S., and even into queer organizations that purport to be radical or revolutionary. These idiomatic elements are: the liberal-religious idea of nonviolence as a means to justice; the idea that gay and lesbian persons have made great progress since 1969; the idea that academic liberalism in its various forms serves queer justice; the discourse of 'hate'; and the discourse of rights. In this examination, elements of a specifically queer revolutionism are brought forth. The essay argues that queer persons must take up the revolutionary mode of justice as our political template, and it adopts a revolutionary style of conveyance of ideas which repudiates, in its rhetorical character and out of necessity, the disastrously false civility and false objectivity of liberal discourse, adopting the revolutionarily appropriate character of a manifesto.

It is difficult to write about queer justice because it is difficult to know it. We are so far from it now, that we are only able to scent it, as if were borne by the wind in rare moments. So much of what is said to be queer justice does not feel like the rightness we feel in one of those rare moments, but rather like a nightmare of denial, fear, and desperation. I believe that no queer person believes in his or her heart that the liberal “program” for queer justice is a good one, but that fear, ignorance of alternatives, hopelessness, and attrition have led queer persons to a falsely hopeful acceptance of its sad so-called achievements. I aim to show in this essay why the program and goals of gay and lesbian, or queer justice¹ as these are articulated and acted out by persons in liberal states are shameful and sad programs which kowtow to ideas and practices inimical to queer justice, freedom, well-being, and life. This work, though informed by years of theory and academic involvement, comes primarily out of much experience working within queer organizations in New York, and is primarily written for those who will form and constitute queer organizations in the future. Thus, it is an exercise in queer praxis. Though the concept of revolution which I continue to develop herein and elsewhere could be considered significantly leftist and Marxist, the essay takes as prerequisite a critique the left presented elsewhere, in an essay that can be considered a concomitance to this critique of liberalism,² and ultimately is revolutionary on queer terms and no other.

This essay skirts the edges of academic writing, and compared to it, will seem more tendentious, more like invective. The reason is that the models of disinterestedness and deconstruction in liberal academic research and writing are, while valuable in certain ways, failing queer justice, and I do not believe that these methods can be followed or trusted any longer. The contention between liberal thought and models and proto-revolutionary organizations manifests itself in such problems as the question of whether or not to organize around a mission statement or a manifesto, which is parallel to the question of whether to be

reformist or revolutionary. Since I consider reformism bankrupt for queer lives, and since I aim to speak to those who might form or carry out the work of revolution, let this essay be a manifesto.

Liberals³ have traditionally been the enablers of and doormats for agendas of abuse of all manner and variety. None of these agendas could have gained a foothold with revolutionaries⁴, but when liberals have power, reactionary⁵ attempts are guaranteed success. Thus, the main function of the liberal is to shield and enable the carrying out of agendas of injustice. The real and operative agendas for queers under liberalism have as their either intended or unintended end annihilation, and nothing less. Liberals serve as the security forces and buffers for these agendas, virtually guaranteeing the ultimate success of their attempts.⁶ Only revolutionaries have the power to demolish these agendas, and only revolutionaries have both successfully and fundamentally changed the political landscape in the direction of justice. Once this has been done, liberals, who are by nature reformist and thus counterrevolutionary, then carry out the long process of negotiation with each other, during which process queer persons gain a little ground here, lose a little there, gain a lot here, and lose a lot there. Since liberals only at best pay lip service to the legitimacy of revolutionary and radical attempts at justice, but never take revolutionary or radical action, they are permanently limited in what they can change, in what they can achieve, establish, guarantee, and prevent, even as their negotiation with the enemies of queer persons only became a possibility because of the work of revolutionaries, such as those involved in such modern democratic movements as the women's movement and the gay and lesbian justice movement, the work of those who went beyond civil disobedience in action and beyond systemic liberal-theoretical confines.

'Nonviolence' as a Means Directive

The foremost deception of liberalism,⁷ purveyed in hypocrisy and cowardice, and one of the greatest impediments to real justice for queer persons, is the liberal's sometimes inexpress, sometimes express stance against intrastate violence as a political means. While pacifism exists across the spectrum of political progressivism, from liberalism through radicalism, liberals are disingenuous and lacking in integrity with regard to pacifism, while revolutionaries, as the actors of radical thought, view it in a more realistic way, in a way that demonstrates an actual belief in the real possibility of peace. Although some persons who identify as pacifist also identify as revolutionary, an absolutist commitment to pacifism *as a means* is not revolutionary, but rather a muddleheadedness and historical unawareness that is endemic to liberalism. As such it is the theoretical component of liberal nonviolence sometimes confusedly imputed to revolutionism by some of those who appear in revolutionary queer organizations. The action component of this religion-infused outgrowth of economic liberalism known as political liberalism is "civil disobedience", and together religion (that is, raising the Judaic cults to protected and hegemonic status in the realm of the mystical and in the attack on reason, science, and justice) and nonviolent resistance form, respectively, the theoretic and action-based poles of liberalism, thus keeping its thought base entwined with the mystical and irrational while keeping its action toward justice null and void. An example is found in the liberal idea of preacher politics wherewith Martin Luther King, Jr. advocated an illusory progress which led for African-Americans a doomed, and now neutralized Civil Rights Movement consisting of seemingly effective, but ultimately ineffective acts of civil disobedience within a liberal system, acts which led merely to a more comfortable imprisonment - to adjustments in the manner of abuse.

The rejection of revolution itself is bound up in this lack of integrity when it comes to pacifism, for many liberals reject revolutionary measures out of hand. This rejection of revolution often presents itself in the form of a "commitment to nonviolence". Never mind that the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States and other ultrarightist organizations either within the government or in bed with it, promote the peace movement because they are afraid of those seeking justice might actually achieve it.⁸ Even though revolutionary action is rarely violent action on the part of revolutionaries, but is rather in part everyday actions of refusal and education along with radical means that may or may not employ violence, the kneejerk equation of revolution with intrastate violence nullifies thinking and closes it out of

consideration in the mind of the liberal. This equation of revolutionary action with violent action is rendered disingenuous moreover, by two aspects of liberalism. The first is the fact, already mentioned, that liberalism was not possible historically without revolutionary violence. Stonewall, the cornerstone of the “gay rights movement” for the liberal gay establishment, was a thoroughly violent rebellion, and talk of it by liberal-conservative⁹ gays and lesbians (that is, those who fall for the false political spectrum manufactured by liberal state media) over drinks or coffee or at parties and other such social events inevitably retells the violent stories with relish and pride. The second fact is that those whom liberals support, the members of the liberal establishment and their parties and cronies and ideologues, are rapaciously violent warmongers. Here, the problem may be said to be one of integrity, or the lack of correspondence between one's professed values and one's actions, and that lack of integrity has very real manifestations in death tolls. For example, the war on Iraq and Afghanistan, which has claimed at this writing, and in a very conservative death toll estimation, 500,000 lives. One must ask whether the legitimization of such establishment warmongers and mass murders through negotiation, request, voting, and involvement in their fraudulent, manufactured, and mendacious debates in any way compatible with a stance of nonviolence?

One has also witnessed the disgusting spectacle of armchair mass murder by those in the United States who, in with varying degrees of awareness, identify with liberal state ideology, but who, unable to bring themselves to revolutionary action, and unable even to ally themselves with an actually progressive liberal party such as the Green Party for “strategic” reasons, identify with the more reactionary Democratic Party, which is directly responsible for the murder of 1,000,000 persons in Iraq and Afghanistan in recent years¹⁰, and even more than this in Vietnam from 1958-1975¹¹, the plundering of the public treasury for corporate welfare handouts to those benefitting from this mass murder, the legitimization and waging of sectarian wars between the Judaic cults (Judaism, Christianity, Islam), and for the public and the private abuse, denigration, second-class citizenship, and murder of queer persons. The liberal sat in cowardly comfort and delusion, reading *The New York Times* and listening to *National Public Radio* as these and other reactionary media crafted a gigantic fraud in the form of a shockingly transparent exculpation of the Democratic Party and a legitimization of the most outrageous acts of abuse and murder, even as the self-identified liberal often (read: counterrevolutionary) pays lip service to “non-violence”.¹²

To make worse the murder and abuse committed by liberal state citizens from their armchairs, there is the moral high ground that liberals often attempt to take against revolutionaries when it comes to violence, in spite of the fact that it is only revolutionaries who are willing to take the real steps that are necessary to arrest violence immediately, rather than being dragged in the back door of violent situations by acquiescence, cowardice, and ignorance. By the time progressive liberals finish negotiating with conservative liberals and begging for “a place at the table”, a million people are dead, queers have gone from *de facto* to *de jure* second-class citizenship, and suicide rates for gay and lesbian youth are more than twice those of heterosexual youth, by a conservative estimate.¹³ Revolutionaries see what is coming and threaten murderers and abusers at the outset with immediate and severe consequences if they attempt to kill or abuse anyone, directly or indirectly, and revolutionaries back these threats up. The manufactured hysteria of the popular mind over revolutionism and the ownership of the narrative of revolution by counterrevolutionaries allows for a situation in which counterrevolutionaries preposterously attempt to take the moral high ground when it comes to an accounting of deaths from violence. For example, the false and incoherent concept of “terrorism”, which is, in our current historical circumstances, really warfare waged by those without the means to wage war in the style of nation-states, is shoved into the spotlight, while the very significantly more extensive slaughter committed under the legitimized liberal state method of international war, whether declared or undeclared, is supported by liberals either expressly, tacitly, or by equivocation. This is not to mention that hysteria about revolution causes critics of revolution to immediately conclude that creating severe, immediate, and deleterious consequences for those who abuse and denigrate queer persons necessarily means creating *violent* consequences. While liberals negotiated for thirty years for “shifts in spending priorities” in California so that poor persons could have easily accessible free meals, the freedom fighters of the Symbionese Liberation Army, which

began and ended in a lesbian love affair, accomplished this *in forty-eight hours* by forcing the hand of Randolph Hearst, with no one killed. The liberal now distances herself or himself from violence and disassociates from freedom fighters at the drop of a hat if violence is even mentioned or sensed. Exasperation with the combination of monumental historical ignorance and arrogance which this reaction demonstrates led Michel Foucault, whose work is the foundation on which queer theory is built, to say that the liberal establishment, in its normal everyday functioning through its institutions, is violence itself.¹⁴ Similarly, Naomi Jaffe of the Weather Underground described violence as being comfortable in the suburbs while outrageous crimes were being committed against the oppressed.¹⁵

The Liberal Idea of Progress Toward Gay Justice

A second way in which liberals stand in the way of queer justice is in their purveyance of the false idea that queer persons have made real progress in society since the Stonewall Rebellion (which was, again, a thoroughly violent rebellion). The disappearance of the gay movement and the hijacking of the queer political voice by conservative organizations such as Human Rights Campaign Fund and conservative individuals such as former New York City Council Speaker Christine Quinn and writer Andrew Sullivan, and by all sorts of “faith-based” political charlatans hiding their cowardice behind the power of churches, is held up by liberals as legitimate political representation. These traitorous representatives of queer persons uphold the legitimacy of the liberal establishment in many ways, but they themselves are illegitimate because they have been appointed by the enemy. One of the ways in which they serve as functionaries and buttresses of establishment frauds is in their attempt to erase historical knowledge from the minds of their “constituency”. Forty years ago, the gay movement in the U.S. and Britain was against marriage and it was considered an abusive and retrogressive institution, standing as it did and does as the pillar and imprimatur of the anti-gay establishment. The gay movement had power then, and all of the social traditions and practices that falsely propped up heteronormativity were actually called into question by large numbers of *straight* people. Revolutionary queer justice connects marriage and family, thoroughly rejecting both as pillars of the current political regime of heterosexuality.¹⁶ Aside from the general fact that most gay and lesbian persons who support liberal agendas for queer justice do so because they are ignorant of revolutionary ones, there is the fact that the liberal regime’s Family Values Campaign was, in its inception, intentions, and effects, thoroughly anti-gay. Success for queer persons in a liberal mode is then really a process of adjusting well to the anti-gay social agendas of our enemies and of, in a doomed attempt which comes out of ignorance and fear, adopting their manufactured values. Is there anything today that is more ridiculous to behold than the “family values” queer person?

There is also, within this liberal purveyance of the idea of progress, the idea that homosexuality is more often and more openly spoken about now than it was forty years ago, that this is *per se* a good thing, and further that this increased presence of homosexuality in the collective consciousness will surely lead to some kind of vaguely defined betterment of queer lives. The frequency with which one encounters an idea or a person, though, is not an indicator of the value or respect that one attaches to that idea or person.¹⁷ The knowledge of this is expressed in the idea of “toleration” within the classical liberal tradition, which recommends laws as necessary to protect persons in a limited way from abuse, without ever having to address culturally manufactured directives to and channels for emotions and feelings, which can only be changed by revolutionary means. Reformists love law, and liberals as a variety of reformist love the law and all derivations therefrom, such as rights movements. But the law is only a means to justice, and reformists continually confuse legal systems with justice. When a legal system is not serving to create justice for queer persons, or equality for any persons, and has in fact become our enemy, it should also be dispensed with *immediately*. Debates about the equality of gay and lesbian citizens are illegitimate and their appearance in a polity is the sign that the polity is malignant for queer lives. When a legal framework is built with its cornerstones in misogyny and heterosexism, no amount of reform will ever make it legitimate. There can never be any redemption for liberal legal systems of justice. Without the courage, love, anger, historical knowledge and respect which revolutionaries carry in their minds and hearts, queer persons, as victims of the liberal gay “leadership” of liberal societies are in

the absurd, sad, denigrated situation which these “leaders” have put us in, that of negotiating for our lives and equality as if this were some “good” involved in a barter, and as if queer equality were negotiable in any sense or in any circumstances, as if it were a market item or a legitimate question for political debate, akin to the question of whether or not to build a dam on a particular river, to build a playground on the east corner or the west corner. In fact, heterosexuals have no real rights to debate, question, comment on, or have opinions on queer lives. In our current historical milieu, heterosexuals have one right and one right only: to take up arms in the struggle for queer justice and to report for duty once they have learned how to use these arms. Any other “rights” heterosexuals might properly have would be determined by revolutionaries, both queer and queer identified (and, incidentally, what heterosexual in his or her right mind would not now identify as queer?) The legitimization of the questioning of queer lives exists because of confused liberal counterrevolutionism, and is legitimized by liberals with vague and inaccurate yet widespread ideas that queers have made real progress in Western “democracies” since 1969.

Because liberals rest their beliefs on a long and established modern tradition that includes eminent thinkers such as John Locke and John Rawls, one is tempted to assume that that this would itself ensure that the continuation of the liberal tradition is inevitable, or, more accurately, that its demise must be gradual. But this idea itself is part of the liberal delusion, which is a delusion with regard to historical fact and with regard to human psychology and political and social behavior, not to mention a lack of ability to see such figures as Locke and Rawls as, in part, translators of market-induced ideas. Besides the fact that revolutionaries believe in the necessity of the effectuation of *rapid* change, one can also point to the fact that people are influenced into changing their sociopolitical beliefs in a shockingly short amount of time, even with regard to contestations between liberals, and this influence is, in the main, a result of the propagandization of the people by media which support the liberal state.¹⁸ Most of the gay media in the U.S. are, for example, supporters of and propagandists for the Democratic Party.¹⁹ As such, these so-called gay media sources are anti-gay, and enemies of queer justice and freedom. Gay newspapers and magazines with large circulation work tirelessly to promote the Democratic Party, and, *eo ipso*, to perpetuate the power of the Republican Party, and every issue serves to legitimize a conservative political process stolen from the people by these two anti-gay, codependent, liberal state parties, a process which is illegitimate for all queer persons. The first tenet of a program of gay revolutionary justice in the United States is that the Democratic Party is anti-gay, illegitimate, and irredeemable. Any exception to this perspective has its roots in confusion, ignorance, and in the particular type of ignorance known as forgetting history. *Not* forgetting history is essential for revolutionary queer justice and for real progress. Revolutionaries like Subcommander Marcos of the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional and artist Karen Finley are valuable in their placing of importance on memory, on not forgetting,²⁰ though the attack on memory by the counterrevolution is as rabid as the liberal delusion that forgetting is valuable as an element of the politics of conciliation and reform is persistent. But we will not forget. As the sign I held up at the delegates’ entrance to the 2004 Democratic National Convention in Boston said, “*We’ll Never Forget the Democrats’ Compromises on Gay and Lesbian Lives.*” We as revolutionaries have a persistent memory, and indeed this not forgetting history is a trait of the revolutionary mind as much as is our refusal to compromise when we say that those who stand both for us and against us are our decided enemies. In the same way that the hallmark of the racist is the utterance of the words “I’m not racist, but....,” the hallmark of the liberal enemies of gay and lesbian justice is equivocation, which equivocation is measured in action and outcome, and not by intention, mealy-mouthedness, and double-dealing, all of which trade in memory for fake incremental progress.

Revolutionary memory also exists as a kind of Platonic feeling of recalling of something already known, or in the Nietzschean sense of a sort of primordial recognition of the soul, or, in the contemporary sense, in the immediate recognition of the rectitude of revolutionary arguments for queer justice, in the heartfelt knowledge that suddenly someone is speaking a truth that is already known but buried. People ask me, “What revolution?” and I answer them, “The one that’s right beside you,” and this response means that what was formerly known has been pushed by enemy forces to the outside of consciousness. The revolution exists in the minds and hearts of those who already know justice, inarticulable as it is in

the current milieu of queer life, in the minds and hearts of those who know the correctness of what is written here, and who, as they read, experience a feeling of recalling what they already knew, and of affirmation and exclamation, and of reclamation of a part of themselves pushed to the outside by liberal discourses of “justice”. It exists in the minds and hearts of those who exited the line of delegates²¹ at that 2004 Democratic National Convention and came to me with tears in their eyes and with contorted consciences, happy to find these fundamental doubts about the logic and value of liberal justice expressed in my sign.

The Academy as a Liberal Institution and 'Friend' of Queer Justice

The liberalism of the Western academy is a third obstacle to, and thus effective enemy of, queer justice. To the extent that the Western academy may be understood as liberal, it stands accused by revolutionaries of lacking integrity. One hallmark of the educated liberal is a lack of correspondence between theory and action when the action required for consistency is fundamental or dangerous. The academic attack on identity politics, which was begotten in part by Foucault's response to Nietzsche, presents a revolutionary path to queer justice with another essentially liberal problem and obstacle. The reality of the position of those making such attacks, whatever their purely theoretical value, is that they have not been able to translate themselves into real gains in justice for queer persons, no matter how much identity deconstruction and conversion of issues to pun, humor, and literary fodder has been theoretically directed by postmodernism. The fact that these critiques are expressed from within the walls of liberal institutions, where revolutionary *action* only gets tenure when it has been mollified and transmogrified into liberal respectability, and where the type of writing that calls people to dangerous or violent action when necessary does not get published anywhere that counts when it comes to the curricula vitae of academics, is important. Ironically, the very comfort zone of liberal academia and its favored theoretical tropes begins to slip away actually, as soon as its guarantor, revolutionary vigilance and action, is not taken as the path to justice.²² With regard to the permissible deconstruction of queer identity and its components within university curricula, one can argue that, even if one could succeed in ‘deactivating’ any queerness that has a broad and coherent identity using an always contingent episteme in which the deconstructed stands in the place of the known, would not something great be lost in such a process? Was there no value in the gay and lesbian liberation movement? In the Gay Liberation Front? In the Gay Left Collective? Was there no value in the fact that society was moving toward a collective gay identity in 1969, and not away from it? In other words, was not something great really lost in the loss of a gay movement? No amount of liberal-postmodern revision of identity will take away the real abuse and the real political loss that the loss of a revolutionary queer movement has been.²³ The liberal academic deconstruction of identity should remember its origins, which are firmly planted in anti-modernity, which anti-modernity is not at all benign. There is no way out through the back door. Even if, in an educated reality, deconstruction of identities has validity, such deconstructed identities exist no less actually within the realm of political and social abuse. One does not suffer less for being attacked as a lesbian because one has deconstructed one's sexual identity or, in the case of, say, the gay academician, because one has deconstructed sexual identity in general. Those in the process of personally questioning and deconstructing gender or sexuality are no less likely to be abused and degraded and left lonely and desperate. This salient fact could stand alone as a mandate for revolutionary justice as queer justice. Further, the working out of deconstructed identities cannot occur in a political milieu of oppression and abuse that is rather itself a byproduct of the malignancy of liberal thought on queer justice, a spectrum of thought and an academic attitude that nurtures postmodern deconstruction of identity and deconstruction of the modes of protest attached to what has now been “discredited” as identity politics, and the favoring of delusional ignorances as “art as protest” or worse, “performance as protest”. When these comprise the entire corpus of protest, they push out effective protest, and are fed by the ‘creativity’ and ‘queerness-as-not-necessarily-homosexual’ politics and all of their attendant petit bourgeois metatheories which, for all political purposes can be considered casuistries of disappearance.²⁴ The subsumption of same-sex desire under a new political theory properly comes *after* the gay revolution and after the liberal academy

and its petit bourgeois abstractions, and it comes dialectically; placing it before such a revolution is now the way to the grave for queer justice.

The great fear of liberal academic institutions is loss of state funding, and such a fear will allow for aspects of modernity, which have as their outgrowths and manifestations forms of political activity which are ineffectual for queer justice and non-threatening to the powers that be. Colleges and universities can produce “activists” because “activist” is an appellation given by the corporate media to what are merely responsible, (i.e. neutralized) citizens who are innocuous to the oppressor, but this appellation is of course readily accepted by liberals, who can always be counted on to be agreeable when it is imperative not to be so. Colleges and universities cannot, however, openly and intentionally produce or groom *revolutionaries*, that is, real and dangerous menaces to the powers that be who are not committed to non-violence, and colleges and universities themselves cannot take meaningful revolutionary stands against the government and society and expect to retain funding: end of story on the university’s liberal “openness” to all paths and possibilities. The only viable path to justice, and to actually creating a real community of mutual respect and equality in intellectual and scholarly life, is barred from a real existence in liberal institutions of higher learning, whose boards of directors are primarily comprised of bourgeois corporate welfare recipients who are often involved in interlocking directorates of persons with various degrees of separation from anti-gay abuse, and who, even in state schools, are beholden to Boards of Trustees which include deranged and maleficent anti-gay sociopaths whom the heterosexual regime of liberalism considers munificent. Such sociopaths include officeholders of the Catholic Church and fanatical privatization dogmatists who want to dismantle the state and turn it over to such profiteers as multi-billionaire Bill Gates, who hired as a “consultant” on gay “issues” (with hefty remuneration), the preposterous, business-suited, hillbilly charlatan and anti-gay crusader Ralph Reed.²⁵

The displacement of pain from queer loss onto academicized and often literary intellectual analysis is antidemocratic, apolitical and anti-justice. This kind of exercise makes sense only in a world where queer justice has already been achieved on the basis of a *collective* identity under oppression, a world where queer persons as they are understood as oppressed persons are leading society, not being dragged along by it or backed into a corner by it. Young queer persons, and indeed all persons, need inspiration and fire, not merely playful transmogrification of their identities à la petit bourgeois academic postmodernism, which tries to pass itself off as, or worse, take the place of, political or social progress. The feeling of justice inspired by dangerous action which is incompatible with comfort and success in the liberal establishment, a significant part of which is the Western academy, will know no end in the love-filled retrospectives and pride of future generations. How could deluded incrementalist negotiators and compromisers with our enemies *inspire* future gay and lesbian children, those coming up, those who will be looking at us? Liberal negotiation and the playing of good little boy or girl and begging vicious, ruined, psychologically unwell people for “acceptance” and rights, and trying to evade the problem in academic citadels in which evasive excurses and identity play abound may be a strategy for temporary survival and a way to lick one's wounds, but it is certainly no horizon, no fireball, no star in the sky, no source of pride. I agree with Dorothy Allison when she writes, “I need you to do more than survive.”²⁶

The Liberal Discourse of 'Hate'

A fourth enemy position which corrupts any progress toward queer justice is the liberal discourse of ‘hate’. The liberal gay leadership, the leadership legitimized by big money media, has purveyed confusion in the form of a discourse, and narrative of ‘hate’. The simplistic central idea of this discourse is that hatred of gay and lesbian persons is somehow the enemy of queer justice. There are many problems with this counterrevolutionary discourse, one of which is that whom one loves or hates is difficult to discern, partly because love and hate are probably different sides of the same emotion. In any case, these feelings are very difficult to discern, manipulate and control, especially via mechanisms of reform, and telling someone that hate is wrong is like telling him or her that the existence of rocks or minerals is wrong, as far as its effect. More importantly, all of the hate in the world cannot harm queer persons at all if the focus of a movement for justice and of a people and a government is on action, rather

than thought. Ironically it is here that one would expect liberals to pick up the idea of toleration in order to attack the problematic idea of controlling hate, that this has not been done. The liberal reliance on the law to achieve justice here shows a kind of lack of integrity in the form of an inconsistency in political philosophy. What matters, at least theoretically, in liberal legal systems is behavior, not feelings. One is entitled to have any feelings one wants toward another, as long as one does no harm to another. The problem with the liberal idea here of course is that it does not have the courage of its convictions, failing to stop dead abusive behavior, which behavior has severely deleterious effects on the queer psyche. I propose that the proper focus of revolutionary justice for queer persons is *abuse* and not "hate", and in this sense the revolutionary view can actually provide a correction in the form of greater consistency with liberal theory's holding that the proper focus of the law is on behavior, not on presumed feelings so that ironically, revolutionaries have the ability to supply, as it were, the courage of liberal convictions. Abuse, the proper focus of revolutionary justice, is the outward manifestation of which feeling it matters not. Laws, in their existence as pillars of the legitimacy of liberal society, cannot really change feelings, but revolutionary changes which are in essence radical programs and actions can change outward behavior, and create the social ideas and relations out of which laws are formed, in the spirit of a culture. In the same way that artists can change notions of light and color for generations of people, revolution changes feelings and creates new ones by clearing out the ground for the possibility of their existence, which possibility rests on absolute repudiation of falsely begotten and manufactured feelings. Laws are ultimately the work of solidification and justification of a homeostatic social order; justice is the work of revolution. Revolutionary justice comes first, and the law sets itself up in its light, as justice made manifest, codified, promulgated.

The liberal discourse of hate and hate speech is really a misbegotten and weak apologetics for queer persons, and one which serves us ill. What is it really that heterosexuals hate? What is at the bottom of the behavior that this discourse calls hatred of L.G.B.T. persons? The answer is that what heterosexuals who "hate" queer persons really hate is reality. They have staked their ideas of essence, personhood, the cosmos, nature, and of all of reality on one petty stupidity, on the gross aggrandizement of one picayune little corner of reality and on one paltry and false, idea: heterosexuality. The rage of heterosexuals is a rage against reality, and also against themselves for having believed so heartily and so fundamentally in the essentiality and universality of heterosexuality, and at the knowledge that they have been fools in their aggrandizing such a tawdry little idea into something omnipotent. What do nature, the universe, animals, plants, life, death, and time care about heterosexuality and its manufactured trappings? It is evident that they pay it no regard whatsoever.

For revolutionary queers however, what heterosexuals think is irrelevant. The revolutionary way to justice is through the enforcement of outward behavior that is respectful and pro-gay, and through social norms which could not include family values or the validation of false concepts like pedophilia. What do we care if heterosexists and those addicted to a false idea of life throw hissy fits over queerness in the privacy of their own mind, or of their own room? In other words, the reversal of the closet is necessary for revolutionary queer justice. A focus on action, on outward behavior, on abuse, is revolutionarily necessary on the way to queer justice. Without queerness as normative, there is no queer justice. There is no other way. Heterosexuality as a mantra and allegiance must be itself problematized and, insofar as it is synonymous with anti-gay behavior, closeted during the revolution, a revolution which will set up a society in which queerness is the norm. No self-respecting queer person has an ounce of respect for anti-gay heterosexuals. The liberal discourse of hate is effectively begging to be liked, to be loved, or to be not "hated". But do we want respect from people we do not respect, to be liked by people we do not like, to be loved by people we do not love, especially when these people have power over us, and use it against us? The liberal discourse of hate is effectively the enabling of abuse, rather than its being named and punished and ended. Whom heterosexuals *hate* is beside the point. Whom they *abuse* is the point.

Critique of Rights-Based Justice

The liberal discourse of hate is accompanied by a more pedigreed but perhaps no less problematic discourse of rights, which discourse I would like to suggest is a fifth liberal impediment to queer justice, and perhaps the most significant one. This discourse of rights, and the attempts to achieve justice out of this discourse, are respectively, a counterrevolutionary discourse and a counterrevolutionary system of rights assertions and laws which will not achieve justice for queer persons. I present here some of the problems with rights-based justice.

Rights-based justice is a doormat for the disingenuous and for those who are abusive to others in society. This is evident now in the U.S. for example in the widespread belief in the idea that the right to free speech is absolute and includes the right to publicly abuse other persons. Liberal rights law may well indeed not necessarily have this kind of intention at its inception, let us say, in some sort of “original position”²⁷, but its inception, of course, was already infected with heteronormativity and with the invisibility and derogation of homosexuality, and no one has yet figured out how to get to an original position that is free from this. Free speech is now the club used by the neoconservative liberals to beat gay and lesbian people to death publicly through the legitimization of debates on our lives and equality. Further, consistent with the extreme cynicism, mendacity, and manipulative practices of the neoconservatives, who incorrectly consider themselves outside of liberalism, but whose retrogressive positions and whose very possibility have been produced by liberalism, liberals have been placed in the position of having their own clubs used to beat their own sentiments and precepts to death, and have been forced into yet another immoral and reprehensible activity, that of debating the public abuse and denigration of queer persons under the idea of the right of free speech.

Similarly, under the idea of “freedom of religion” lies the idea of the right to believe in and to practice any religion one “chooses”. The beginning and end of this fake tenet of justice is the support of parasitic, demeaning organizations which publicly abuse queer persons and which are inherently against the existence of certain persons and which are allowed to publicly slander and libel fellow citizens with not only the sanction of the liberal heterosexist regime's rights-based justice, but with its support in the form of state welfare for religions (as long as the religion in question is one of the Judaic cults, that is). Religious organizations pay no taxes and are handed beneficial and lucrative duties and opportunities of the state, such as the administration of food and shelter programs and schools, and are thus allowed to pose as supportive of the citizenry, when in fact they are vicious parasites preying on the life of the people, and illogical, unsound ideologues who engage in and legitimize such philosophastry as debates between “faith” and reason and who attempt to ignore history to preposterously reinvent themselves as “pro-gay”. Revolutionary practice is the refusal to abide liberalism's immorality of disingenuousness and dehistoricization, all along the spectrum of suffering from inconvenience to death. Thus, neither my boyfriend nor I, nor any of our friends, even when starving and trash-picking for food last winter, would allow ourselves to go to the church-administered “public” food banks in New York City.

A second and related problem with liberal, rights-based justice is that private organizations, even when these organizations are truly public and have great public influence; e.g. influence on social life and opinion, control over elections, political advocacy and manipulation, exist as entities with rights under law. The assertion of rights by such organizations gives them far greater power than would have an individual (a real person) asserting the same right. Individual persons, in the liberal system of law, are entitled to the same rights as “anyone” else to speak their minds and to have their opinions heard; they have just as much right to be heard as massive media conglomerates which can control and manipulate public opinion through their massive wealth and their ownership of the apparatuses of information, the means of the production of ideas. Liberal jurisprudence considers this kind of fake and preposterous equality to be just and condones, for example, the organized crime of usurers (banks), and those practicing the protection racket (the insurance industry). Through liberal legal fictions of personhood and other rights within the liberal legal system, such parasites and criminals are given much greater and unequal power as citizen-entities, and in turn this power cripples the possibilities for queer justice. What good are, for example, lawsuits tried before juries when these juries consist of propagandized slaves

manufactured by the media and other conglomerates, which corporations share equal rights with jurisprudentially equal individual persons? These slave-making corporations, in such a system, then enjoy a second order power in the power given by proxy to their fabricated slaves, who then in turn can claim the citizen's rights and duties of serving on juries and voting, thinking that they are free and independent thinkers, when in fact their entire personhood effectively exists as a second order, disseminated insurance against any attack on corporate and reactionary rule. The Mormon Church, as a corporate funding and propaganda syndicate, recently convinced a population de-educated by corporate pirates and their liberal intellectual mentors that public anti-gay abuse in the form of initiatives and referenda on our lives was a moral voter's right and duty.

At the more general level, and to bring to bear again the persistent memory of revolutionaries, I would argue that this is again the problem of petit bourgeois scholarly abstraction posing questions from its own hermeneutic circle of injustice. Throughout hundreds of years of liberalism and during its development, the best gay and lesbian persons could hope for was invisibility and life in hiding under the fear of death. Can such a jurisprudential, political, and societal record be excused, forgiven, reformed? To say that it can be is to again buy into the liberal immorality, irrationality, mysticism, and fear that are the liberal rejection of revolution and of totalizing critique. The deeper level of the problem, which in the hands of liberal scholars is always perverted and misunderstood, is the fact that sexuality *i.e.* woman, as a *problématique* within consciousness, has been a mainstay of liberal societies. Queer justice then as inextricable from feminism and from sexual justice, as a feminist process of the unproblematization of femaleness, is *prior* to bourgeois liberal justice and is the future *precondition* of political ideation and development. In a similar regard, the Sexual Revolution and the revolutionary components of the Women's Movement are as important or more important than the other democratic revolutions, whose sexual freedoms tended to get co-opted by the normative discourses, theory, and legislation of heteronormative liberal systems. In this historical process, gay men stand as the possibility of woman's existence on her own terms, and also the political prototype of male sociopolitical existence in a world freed from heterosexuality as an outgrowth of chauvinism and the abuse of women.

As the function of revolutionary economic justice is to bring about the dictatorship of the proletariat, the function of revolutionary queer justice is to bring about the dictatorship of queer desire, and to this function any legal or jurisprudential theory and practice must always be subservient. Philosophy, says Alain Badiou, is the "creation of new desire"²⁸ and Miguel Abensour says that utopian visions are the "education of desire."²⁹ Our desire is not for the sustenance of the frauds, cynics, and manipulators of liberal justice, but rather for the outrageous justice of full queer freedom, which necessitates the absolute death of heterosexuality as a political regime. The end of a liberal rights discourse as an avenue to justice is the freeing of an epistemology from its prison-world of heteronormativity, a world of the shunting of the creation of queer desire and its de-education thrive; a world where the legitimization of the "opinions" produced by the fabricated and delusional heterosexual political regime result in opinions which are buffoonishly issued *ex cathedra* in the form of heterosexual masturbation disguised as judicial pronouncements³⁰ about our legality or (special) "rights" or issued in the guise of scholarship, as when the political is "comprehended" within the terms of the heterosexual political regime, resulting in such formulations and legitimizations of the perverted straight mind and its opinions as occurs in the reification of "the politics of disgust"³¹ and further assertions and legitimizations of abuse, which, to revolutionary queer ears, and despite their trappings of offices and honors, or the sanction of the academy, always sound shockingly ignorant and delusional.

A third problem with rights-based justice is that it promotes slow justice at best. Liberal-identified persons love incrementalism, and the idea that one must struggle for years to achieve justice by whittling away at a legal edifice with lawsuits, lobbying, rhetoric, and campaigning; along with it goes the idea that it is acceptable to force abused groups to fight for their rights, just as everyone else is presumed to have done. Along with the fact that this incremental and pro-establishment approach to justice does not work (e.g. the Civil Rights Movement was a failure for African-American persons, and for all person in the U.S., having recently had its most cherished legislative accomplishment, the Voting Rights Act, gutted; gay and lesbian persons in 2013 have the same rights and protections at the federal level of the U.S. that

we did in 1969 – none), there is injustice at its core and foundation. That core injustice is in the fact that the established groups, social or demographic or identity groups such as heterosexual, white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant males did not establish their initial right to govern and to abuse using these methods, but rather by force, fiat, theft, and manipulation. These privileged and entitled groups in their existence as such then put the lie to the viability of reformist and establishment justice, even as most of them, not surprisingly, support its methods and avenues. After all, what have they got to lose? These rights-based approaches to justice will not threaten their power, and if they seem to be threatening to do so, the people can always be de-educated, defunded, programmed, and manipulated into believing that these tactics have worked, even as the “success” of such approaches is laughable to anyone who is aware. In such a vein, we now witness the pitiful sight of L.G.B.T. victims of liberal propaganda, who believe in the idea that (i.e. hold tenaciously and desperately to the manufactured opinion that) we have made progress in the area of justice because gay persons are now more prominently featured in the media and in public conversation, even as we L.G.B.T. persons are only present there as pawns in the game of heterosexual opinion and preference or as clownish caricatures or stereotypes provided to amuse heterosexuals and to play sometimes amusing, sometimes annoying, sometimes reviled, but always ancillary roles which flavor their prosaic existence.

A revolutionary queer discourse, which is only revolutionary if it includes concomitant action, does not adopt such well trodden doormats for the disingenuous as rights-based laws, but rather creates its own discourses, and undoes the discourses and verbiage of the disingenuous and mendacious, against whom liberalism always seems naive and hapless – at its very best a day too late and a dollar too short for justice. As queer revolutionaries we recognize that the liberal system of rights-based justice has become a system for the upholding of the most cherished right of social reactionaries, of cowards, and of those whose ethic is an outgrowth of their resentment: the right to abuse others. The mind of the modern conservative, with liberalism as both its progenitor and protector, is most enraged when the conservative’s right to abuse others is questioned or curtailed, while meanwhile the person under liberal hegemony is compelled by liberal thought and its heritage to take these disingenuous attempts to abuse others seriously as liberal justice. The liberal system of rights has now been thoroughly undermined in its intent and exists primarily and preponderantly as a system of the legitimization of public abuse for queer persons. The liberal state’s system of justice is a reactionary state of crying, whining, full-time conservative victims whose victimhood consists of impediments to their right to abuse, with liberal, rights-based justice serving as a facilitator for their always disingenuous, always guileful abuse and manipulation, and for the reclamation of this right to abuse, *the most protected right of the liberal state*.

A final problem with rights-based justice worth mentioning is the way in which it privileges positive law over negative law, and the freedom to do something over the freedom from something.³² If rights-based justice were neutral on this question, or balanced (i.e. with as many specific prohibitions in favor of queer justice as against), then it might be capable of serving justice, but this is not the case. Rights-based justice, in order to be effective, would have to have to make assertions of justness and fairness negatively, assertions such as: “No heterosexual has any right in any circumstances to use heterosexist or heteronormative language or language abusive to queer persons, under penalty of loss of office, employment, pensions and other benefits, of freedom or of life. All branches of the government at all levels and in all jurisdictions must prosecute all such known offenses, and shall at no time and in no manner have the right to excuse themselves from such prosecution. Mandatory sentencing rules are in effect for conviction for such offenses and judges’ rulings will be monitored.” Rights-based justice asserts the right of everyone to be treated with respect, with recognition, with civility, and with decency, and this is all well and good enough, but the final shortcoming of the liberal mode of justice is that, in its rights-based justice system, this right must be asserted, and this implies always and from the beginning the chance that there is a *need* to assert this right and to have it asserted also by courts and officials, but no real and true movement toward the alleviation of abuses or of the creation of the conditions under which such an assertion or even promulgation of rights would be unnecessary. The elimination of the *need* to assert a right is what revolution brings about and that which it calls justice. The assertion of positive and specific rights (e.g. the right to assemble for a redress of grievances), aside from the fact that

such a right can be rendered meaningless by disingenuousness and cynical disrespect for the law itself on the part of those in power (e.g. contracted “protests” in which the police serve as a theatrical production company which manages the props and staging [i.e. barricades and blocks] for a futile and invisible street protest), then contains already a presumption of the possibility, and even the likelihood, that abuse and disrespect will occur. Revolutionary means and ends tolerate no abuse, and a revolutionary state does not end until a new, i.e. queer, society exists, one in which not only have sentiments and beliefs which are inimical to gay and lesbian justice and to lesbian and gay well-being been extirpated, but also one in which their very possibility has been removed.

¹ In this essay I use 'queer' and 'gay and lesbian', and sometimes 'L.G.B.T.' rather interchangeably, and do so consciously and purposely because of the necessity for unity among those who conceptualize and describe our community differently, and also in order to work toward the disallowance of the cooptation of the concepts 'gay' and 'lesbian' and 'L.G.B.T.' and 'queer' by liberal discourses of justice. We need unity.

² Terror Show Bandito, 'Gay and Lesbian People And The Organized Left' *Gay and Lesbian Revolution Blog*. (<http://evolution10000.blogspot.com/>).

³ In this essay, 'liberal', 'liberals', and 'liberalism' all refer to classical political liberalism, especially as it is manifested in the U.S. today. The 'liberal' about whom I write is the person who thinks and acts in accordance with liberal-reformist ideas, with political and economic liberalism's implicit and express theories and ideas of justice. This term then would include most citizens and residents of contemporary liberal polities, whether they act and think these liberal ideas wittingly or unwittingly.

⁴ In this work, 'revolution' and 'revolutionary' are understood as both part of a radical lineage and as properly distinguished from 'reform' and 'reformist'. Radicalism is understood to be related to revolution in the same way as liberalism is related to reform. I propose to understand radicalism as not merely a term used to describe the degree or depth of a belief, argument, or philosophy, but rather as a tradition within political history, a tradition with a particular substance and a particular character. This substance or character of radicalism is one of progressive democratization, a valuation of democracy which sees it as a goal or precondition, one which aims at or which has the effect of increasing sociopolitical consciousness historically and in individuals and societies, or the attempt at such or the belief in such increase, and one which works against, or is intended to work against abuse and exploitation. I understand revolutions to be, properly speaking, only the result of *radical* ideas, philosophies, and plans. Revolution is then the actualization of radical ideas. The radical idea base alone is not enough to define revolution and the revolutionary however. What is revolutionary is also actively engaged in attempts to overthrow the current *political* system by changing its fundamental bases and content *rapidly*.

⁵ I use the term 'reactionary' in the basic sense of 'politically conservative', and thus here, though it is interchangeable with 'rightist' and 'right-wing', it is also helpful in its ability to serve as a second order antonym for 'liberal', when 'liberal' might be distinguished from 'conservative' merely for the purposes of explanation, even as this essay argues for a first order amalgamation of the concepts of 'liberal' and 'conservative' into one term, 'liberal-conservative', a term which better demonstrates how one of the characteristics of revolutionary thought is the necessary amalgamation of these concepts and their actors. Even this spectrum of liberal to conservative is of course fraudulent in the more important first order sense that all conservatives are liberals within the historical-political stage which has come to be known as liberalism. The term 'reactionary' here also carries the sense which is articulated in Alain Badiou's elaboration of its *modus operandi* (see for example Quentin Meillassoux's succinct description of Badiou's idea of "reactionary novelties" in Meillassoux, Quentin 'History and Event in Alain Badiou'. *Parresia* No. 12, 2011, 1-11; trans. by Thomas Nail, and Badiou, Alain. "What Is Philosophy?" Part I, YouTube.)

⁶ The Green Party of the United States, for example, in its very acquiescence to the propriety of systemic avenues to reform within liberal polities, such as elections and civil disobedience, and the exclusivity of its system-sustaining program for political change, legitimizes this system of acquisition of political power, even though it has been created unfairly and unjustly, and even though these avenues to reform have been a dismal failure. The lack of a revolutionary program or intention for the armed takeover of the government and of a developed understanding of oppressions as systemic forces the Greens, as a party exemplar of liberalism, into an effective role of support of the system and its impossible processes of coming into positions of power which would disallow the public abuse of queer persons. Thus, the Greens' very existence within the electoral and civil disobedience system supports the

legitimacy of this system and helps to corral effective opposition into pacific cooperation, thus actually abiding and securing this governmental system's ongoing abuse of queer persons.

⁷ My focus here is on political liberalism, which can properly be seen to emerge out of economic liberalism and to be its social and civil manifestation, however misbegotten any liberal development of a political idea base out of the non-comprehension of dialectical materialism may be. This focus on political liberalism over economic liberalism is parallel to my focus on sexual class over economic class. Part of this argument is that the left has failed gay and lesbian persons partly by its diminution of the importance of the historical results and outgrowths of the material conditions of life and the relations of the forces of production, the left having mistakenly focused only on the earliest origins of inequalities that are found in property relations, and not on the specific developments that arose from these original property relations as living forces in themselves which dialectically shape revolutionary identities and actions, and which must be addressed alongside, *and even prior to*, their origins. The most salient of these developments are now those which are essentially developments having to do with rectificatory justice for queer persons, the negative process of which is the setting up a thoroughly deheterosexualized queer future. This is now *the* nodal apogee of historical-dialectical movement and awareness. See note 1.

⁸ For an overview of some of these organizations and their interconnections, interconnections which point up starkly the existence of liberalism as a doormat for the ultraright, see Barker, Michael. 'Co-opting Intellectual Aggressors. The Progressive Face of the C.I.A. Swans.com 11/17/2008 (<http://swans.com/library/art14/barker08.html>). Relevant also is Parenti, Michael, 'The Nobel Peace Prize for War' michaelparenti.org, 2012 (http://michaelparenti.org/nobel_peace_prize_for_war.html)

⁹ The "conservative" "positions" on queer lives that I write of here are positions that are fundamentally a product of liberalism, and the neoconservative reaction itself, though thoroughly illiberal in its self-understanding, is entirely itself a product of the petit bourgeois mind of "liberal" society, and, at the popular level, revolutionaries must amalgamate with regard to liberalism and conservatism within more or less classical liberalism, refusing to differentiate between them. See also note 4 *supra*.

¹⁰ On Iraqi civilian deaths alone resulting from the American insurgency into Iraq, see Burnham, Gilbert et al. "Mortality After the 2003 Invasion of Iraq: A Cross-Sectional Cluster Sample Survey." *The Lancet*, Vol. 368, October 21, 2006 (Online Version), 1421-1428, which puts this number at over 600,000. Virtually all estimates of deaths caused by the U.S. insurgency are incorrect because they wrongly accept 2003 as the date when an invasion of Iraq began, rather than the correct date of 1990, when continued bombings of Iraq by the U.S. and a destabilization and "regime change" campaign which, inter alia, pitted Shi'ites against Sunnis, began. On deaths in Afghanistan, see the various reports to the United Nations of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan, published on the Mission's website semi-annually.

¹¹ On deaths resulting from the U.S.'s Vietnam War, see Hirschman et al., 'Vietnamese Casualties During the Vietnam War. A New Estimate.' *Population and Development Review* 21 (4) 1995, 783-812.

¹² The liberal stances against violence which are most salient here are those which I have seen sabotage potentially effective actions in radical queer groups and in other groups from within. Exemplary in this regard also is the Occupy gatherings, in which a confused amalgam of liberalism and radicalism existed, with pacifism being buttressed by liberal rhetoric and voiced by those with no experience in radical politics and by those who had not endured and who were unwilling to endure the violence against the nonviolent which comes with a sincere commitment to nonviolence. See Yassin, Jaime Omar, 'Two Kinds of Non-Violence', *The Electronic Intifada* Media Watch Blog, Post of 2/19/2012 (<http://electronicintifada.net/blogs/jaime-omar-yassin/two-kinds-non-violence>)

¹³ Russel, Stephen T., and Kara Joyner. 'Adolescent Sexual Orientation and Suicide Risk: Evidence From a National Study.' *American Journal of Public Health* 2001 August; 91(8):1276-1281.

¹⁴ There are many articulations of Foucault's idea of violence being inherent in the rationalities of the political as it has developed in modernity. See for example Carrera, Sergio, et al., eds. *Europe's 21st Century Challenge: Delivering Liberty*. Farnham, Surrey, U.K.: 2010, p. 243.

¹⁵ *The Weather Underground* Sam Green and Bill Siegel, Dirs., 2002

¹⁶ The idea of heterosexuality as a political regime is taken from Monique Wittig. See Wittig, *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1992, p. xiii.

¹⁷ This is because political acts and policies, that is, the political context of intergroup relations, is more determinative of these intergroup relations than any particular internal group dynamics or any intergroup relations considered separately from the sociopolitical power context. See Marilyn B. Brewer, 'The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations: Can Research Inform Practice?' *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1997, p. 203; Ulrich Wagner et al. 'Social and Political Context Effects on Intergroup Contact and Intergroup Attitudes'; Wagner, Ulrich

et al. *Improving Intergroup Relations: Building on the Legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008, pp.195-209.

¹⁸ For a specific example of this in a U.S. senatorial election see Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. *Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction, and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 97-98. I personally experienced an overnight change in opinion which was brought about by liberal state media in France in 2007. On the night of May 2, 2007, during the French presidential debate between Ségolène Royal, the candidate of the Parti Socialiste, and Nicolas Sarközy, the candidate of the Union Pour Un Mouvement Populaire, I visited several *tabacs*, stand-up bars and smoke shops in which many persons traditionally gather to watch these debates, in Paris. I talked to persons in each *tabac* and overheard comments and crowd reactions to the debates that night. The overwhelming consensus of the *tabac* audiences during and immediately after the debate was that Royal had done far better in the debate than Sarközy. Later that night at home and the next day I watched and read the French liberal state media's coverage of the debates, which declared that Sarközy was the clear victor. Going around to the same *tabacs* on ensuing nights, it was clear to me that the French liberal state media, which had bombarded the French with what was really a public relations campaign on behalf of Nicolas Sarközy had spun opinion out of its natural and initial impressions. Every person I spoke to in these same *tabacs* on these ensuing nights insisted that Royal had not made a good showing, and that Sarközy had "won" the debate, which opinion was clearly and patently contrary to the overwhelming consensus of these and comparable viewers' initial opinions.

¹⁹ I name as four prominent examples *The Advocate* magazine at the national level, *The Washington Blade* in Washington, D.C., *Gay City News* in New York, and *Frontiers* magazine in Los Angeles.

²⁰ "Memory is how we call justice here." Memory has been a frequent them of Marcos, and in the preceding quotation he even equates it with justice. See in 'To The Relatives of the Politically Disappeared' in Hayden, Tom, ed. *The Zapatista Reader*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2002, 310. For Finley on not forgetting, see, for example Hart, Lynda. 'Reconsidering Homophobia: Karen Finley's Indiscretions' in *Fatal Women: Lesbian Sexuality and the Mark of Aggression*. London: Routledge, 1994 89-104. I encountered Finley's profound and uplifting statements about not forgetting and not forgiving in her performance work called 'Shut Up and Love Me' at the Westbeth Theatre Center in New York City in the summer of 2001.

²¹ None of these were delegates themselves; the delegates were already too invested in the power structure to give attention to fundamental doubts.

²² This is true in more ways than one. The initially radical uprisings and acts that gave rise to gay justice did not and do not arise from within the liberal academy. In addition to this, liberal institutions are able to use their co-optation of radicals and revolutionaries as, ironically, evidence of their true progressivism. See in this regard James, Joy, and Edmund T. Gordon. 'Activist Scholars or Radical Subjects?' in Hale, Charles, ed. *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* Berkeley, CA: U. of California Press, 2008, p. 372; Rand, Erin. *Risking Resistance: Rhetorical Agency in Queer Theory and Queer Activism* Diss. U. of Iowa, 2006, pp. 74-75.

²³ Not to mention the question of the priority of homophobia as even 'pre-structural', that is, as even more fundamental than the objects and subjects of poststructuralism. See Crimp, Douglas, 'The Boys in My Bedroom' in *Melancholia and Moralism. Essays on A.I.D.S. and Queer Politics* Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press, 2002, p. 216. Rereferenced from Danbolt, Mathias, 'Front Room - Back Room. An Interview With Douglas Crimp' *Trikster* No. 2, September 2008. (<http://trikster.net/2/crimp/1.html>)

²⁴ Although I differ from her perhaps in not seeing rights as a viable central element of a revolutionary program for justice, Catherine MacKinnon describes well the desolation of abused lives that goes on while the favorite pastime of petit bourgeois victims of liberalism and their students theorize. One could easily, as is often the case with feminist texts, substitute the word 'queer' for 'women' in MacKinnon's words: "In the early 1970s, I (for one) had imagined that feminists doing theory would retheorize life in the concrete rather than spend the next three decades on metatheory, talking *about* theory, rehashing over and over again in this disconnected way how theory should be done, leaving women's lives twisting in the wind." MacKinnon, Catherine, *Are Women Human? And Other International Dialogues*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006, p. 62.

²⁵ Strauss, Steven, 'The Robber Baron as Lord Bountiful. Bill Gates and the Capitalist Philanthropy Scam' *Freedom Socialist* (Online Version) August, 2006 (<http://socialism.com/drupal-6.8/?q=node/649>)

²⁶ Allison, Dorothy. 'Survival Is The Least Of My Desires' in *Skin: Thinking About Sex, Class, and Literature*, New York: Firebrand Books, 1994, 216.

²⁷ I refer to the idea of the 'original position' in the liberal political philosophy of John Rawls as expressed in *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970) and subsequent emendations thereto, an idea which has wide currency among scholars and students of political theory.

²⁸ Badiou, Alain, *What Is Philosophy? Part I* Videotape of Lecture at the European Graduate School, 2010 (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z6FQkTajudY>)

²⁹ For Abensour's concept of the 'education of desire' described in English see Nadir, Christine, 'Utopian Studies, Environmental Literature, and the Legacy of an Idea. Educating Desire in Miguel Abensour and Ursula K. LeGuin' *Utopian Studies* Vol. 21, No. 1, 2010, pp. 24-56.

³⁰ There are many examples. One is Antonin Scalia's opinion in *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833 (1992).

³¹ Nussbaum, Martha C., *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

³² My conception of positive and negative freedom here is not the same as the well-known conception of Isaiah Berlin, and in fact is quite different, with 'freedom from', in my own conception, associated with negative laws and considered a negative freedom incorporating the idea of freedom from restraint, which freedom from restraint Berlin accords to 'positive liberty'. For Berlin's idea of positive and negative law, see Berlin, Isaiah. 'Two Concepts of Liberty' in *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.