

The Big Secret About Queer Theory...

Michael O'Rourke

Sex essentially exceeds itself, which is why it is
essentially exciting.

Jean-Luc Nancy, *Corpus II: Writings on Sexuality*, p. 15.

Queer *Parrhesia* and the New Pornography

Leo Bersani has quite the knack for producing grenade-lobbing, disturbance causing first sentences. His infamously titled essay "Is The Rectum a Grave?" begins with the now equally infamous line: "there is a big secret about sex: most people don't like it"¹ (Bersani, 2010, p. 3). And Bersani goes on to demonstrate that this aversion to sex can take on both benign and malignant forms. The argument I would like to make here is that queer theory has a similar secret. Or, rather, that queer theory is a little bit more than ambivalent about what it would like to *secrete*.

He wanted me to come first.

I like to jerk myself off while I'm being fucked.

My ass clenched down so hard it hurt his dick.

I scooped up some of my cum and stuck it inside his lower lip

(Stockton and Gilson, 2014, p. 22)

My incendiary Bersani-like opening gambit then is this: "There is a big secret about queer theory: it doesn't like to talk about sex". Or more precisely it doesn't like to talk about the *messy* kinds of sex bodies have or the fluids emitted from bodies whether alone or entangled with others. What interests Bersani "is something else" which is a certain "*aversion*, an aversion that is not the same thing as a repression and that can coexist quite comfortably with, say, the most enthusiastic endorsement of polysexuality with multiple sex partners" (Bersani, "Is the Rectum", p. 4). What

interests me about the sex-aversiveness of current queer theory is that it can coexist quite easily with queer theory's idea of itself as sexy, transgressive, transitive, fluid, dirty, unruly, and so on. But the truth of the matter is that queer theory has a lot to say about *sexuality* but very little to tell us about *sex*². It is so hung up on identity that it forgets about sex acts which have little or nothing to do with identity at all. Sex is what is unbearable, even humiliating, for queer theory and in saying that I agree with Lee Edelman and Lauren Berlant that it is not sex itself which is unbearable but rather the contradictory aversiveness which Bersani outlines above which it is difficult for queer theorists to bear⁶. The task of the queer *parrhesiast* is to *tell it like it is* (Foucault). *Parrhesia*, as Foucault describes it, is a form of truth-telling which engages the carnal and the body, the sensual and the sexual, sex and sweat. As Johnny Golding explains it *parrhesia* is a queer knowledge-practice which requires courage and involves risk:

it is the courage to speak out, to provoke, to incite into action without taking oneself out of the relationship; to invent anew by supposing 'it could be otherwise' and then figuring out how this 'otherwise' might become real, alive, take root and flourish, without preventing the 'telling it as it is' from being heard ... Not shock for shock's sake; not offence just because it could be done; not a sterile rationality backing any decision; but rather, a kind of connection, a certain kind of care and attention to detail; a certain kind of courage, curiosity, stylistics of existence, generosity, intellect, humor—call it what you will—a complex/heterogeneous logic of sense to *make* 'it' known; to make 'it' happen; to *make* manifest a 'certain kind of practice-knowledge' of that which may not 'fit in' exactly or precisely (or even at all), but in spite of that (or even because of it) , may put one's body and soul at risk to make that polemical condition of life itself accessible, hearable, readable, graspable, right here, right now". (Golding, p. 103)

This courageous, risk-taking, *parrhesiastic* knowledge-practice might no longer go by the name queer theory. Instead, as William Haver, whose work Golding is riffing off, suggests, we might call it "the New Pornography": "fragmentary, anonymous, perverse, always in flight from the rigor mortis ... and the flat line of gay and lesbian or queer studies" this might be the "instauration (at once renewal and founding; the reiteration) of the New Pornography... The work of the New Porn is at

once immemorially archaic, always yet to come, and yet nothing other than the impossibility (for knowledge) of: here, now, this" (Haver, 2002, p. xi).

Everything you wanted to know about sex (but queer theory forgot to tell you)

Robyn Wiegman tells it like it is in her conclusion to *Object Lessons* where she traces the slide within queer theory from sex to gender. She writes, "if Queer Studies now seems enthralled by gender, what might we say about the sex queer theory once sought so defiantly to have? Did its bold declaration for critical monogamy undermine its desire from the outset, igniting passion for the very thing (gender) that its commitment to sexuality categorically refused? Or should we craft a psychic account of the historical situation, one that traces how the investment in sex as analytic aim was so profoundly embedded in counterhegemonic rage against the homophobic nationalism of dominant responses to AIDS that there was no way *not* to become exhausted by it?" (Wiegman, 2012, pp. 338-339). Wiegman is surely right that sex and sexuality proved so central to queer theory in its earliest formations because of AIDS but that anger, rage and defiance is now largely forgotten, not quite repressed, but still a dim and distant concern for current queer theorizing. Wiegman goes on to wonder if "under the influence of the vertigo that has led us here, we might consider the possibility that queer theory's theoretical project to attend to sex was undone by the very political ambition that emerged to characterize it—that is, by the priority accorded to the critique of heteronormativity, which has made antinormativity, as I discuss above, the primary political gesture of the field" (Wiegman, pp. 339). Wiegman's is a cogent diagnosis and this is because, yes, in the shift of attachment from sexuality to gender we have seen sex drop out of the frames of analysis³. And in this slippage we have witnessed a move from the critique of heteronormativity to a desire for normativity (what has been called by Lisa Duggan among others *homonormativity*). Wiegman argues that it is precisely the problem of antinormativity which has pushed sex and the obscene off scene⁴. Wiegman asks: "Let's consider the paradox I am tracking here another way. Imagine attending with critical rigor to sex itself—to embodied acts, erotic forms, fantasies, affects, identifications, and cultural organizations of bodies and desire—while trying to ensure that our investigation takes political aim against normativity. Fist-fucking, BDSM, polyamory, sex with friends, erotic vomiting, stone femininity. What kind of critical attention can avoid the slide into analytic normativity?"⁵ (Wiegman, pp. 340). Her less than sanguine answer is that this theoretical slide is impossible because any critical attention to sex acts which lie outside the heteronormative can only reiterate and buttress the discursive and ideological position of the

heteronormative insofar as those acts which are considered perverse (which may indeed have had their own normative and ideological scripts) are considered so as a consequence of the presiding ideologies of heteronormativity: "Each resistant act is bound to its reigning definition; indeed there is no resistance without first establishing heteronormative definitions" (Wiegman, p. 341).

Wiegman's diagnoses may leave us less than hopeful. But there is something promising to be found in her final set of reflections. "At the heart of the antinormative enterprise, then, is a deceptively simple but as yet unanswered, perhaps, unanswerable, question: What is the sex that queers so queerly have? Or more pertinently, what is the queer sex that queers so nonnormatively have? And *how* will we know it when we see it? These questions are impossible to answer, in part because antinormativity is finally not about the object of study per se but about the relation of aspiration that discerns, prioritizes, and, yes, disciplines, it. For this reason, it seems possible to say that sex—by which I mean the specificity of acts, the diversity of identifications, the (de)materialization of desire, and the imbrications of soma, psyche, and sociality—is a rather queer object of study, even for the field that has come to claim and represent it" (Wiegman, pp. 341-342). The very premise of this issue on "Bodily Fluids" is the need to think sex in all of these ways which Wiegman has found it to be unthinkable as an object for queer studies. Again, it is worth recalling that for Berlant and Edelman it is the very contradictoriness of sex which makes it unbearable but that nevertheless we must bear (with) it. And in attending to sex, bodily fluids and the imbrications of acts, identifications, de-materializations of desire and the enmeshments of soma, psyche and sociality, the authors here are arguing for a critically *non-monogamous* queer theory, one as attached to gender as it is to sex as it is to sexuality. Another Bersanian Molotov cocktail of an opening line is instructive here: "psychoanalytically speaking, monogamy is cognitively inconceivable and morally indefensible" (Bersani, 1998, p. 3). Wiegman goes on to ruminate if this means "that queer critique has never quite had the sex it so famously is thought to have had? To say yes to all these suppositions makes it possible to think this: that under the tutelage of its project of antinormativity, queer critique has been animated less by sex than by its *proximity* to sex, a proximity that has proliferated objects, transformed identifications, and elaborated all kinds of analytic capacities not in spite of but because of the way that the field has been variously fascinated, unnerved, haunted, bored, overdetermined, or indifferent to sex, but never finally committed to it as its primary object of analysis, no matter how often it has tried" (Wiegman, p. 342).

The same could be said of queer theory's relations to bodily fluids, that it has been animated more by its *proximity* to fluids rather than treating them as objects of enquiry in their own right. This issue takes up the fluids expelled, excorporated, ejected by queer theory as its primary objects of analysis. In focusing on fluids queer theory can give up on what it most wants (identity) in order to have what it thinks it wants (sex) but has not had up to now. There are no proper objects of queer inquiry, only improper ones. And in the anti-identitarian moves I am arguing for here we can bring about a more promiscuous queer studies which is not, in the end, always sutured to identity. Eve Sedgwick argues for just such a *messy*, untidy queer knowledge-practice: She says: "we need for there to be sites where the meanings don't line up tidily with each other, and we learn to invest those sites with fascination and love". We need, Sedgwick is arguing, to stay with and *in* the mess (Sedgwick, 1993, p. 3). She confesses that "becoming a perverse reader" invests a great deal in "the surplus charge of my trust in [texts] to remain powerful, refractory, and exemplary". This is for Sedgwick a rigorous "ardent reading" which is marked by love and only upon re-reading (perversely of course) her *Tendencies* did I notice that messiness is such a privileged feature of queerness for Sedgwick. Not only does she claim that "representation, identity, gender, sexuality and the body can't be made to line up *neatly* together" but (and on many readings and re-readings of "Queer and Now" I seemed to overlook this perhaps hidden piece of writing of hers) "sexuality" is also "the locus of so many showy pleasures and *untidy* identities" (Sedgwick, 1993, p. 20). This lack of neatness and the unruliness and untidiness of identities, genders, sexualities leads Sedgwick to conclude that "sexuality in this sense, perhaps, can *only* mean queer sexuality"(Sedgwick, 1993. p. 20).

If the secret (or truth) of queer theory is, as we have already noted, that it does not want to talk about sex, then we can go a little further and say that it is the messiness of sex which it is particularly keen to abject. Queer theory does not—despite what it tells itself—like the icky, sticky, yucky, viscous⁶, gloopy, gunky, mascara-streaked, wet, bloody, sweaty, pissy⁷, shitty, leaky, seeping, weeping, splashing, spurting, spasming, milky. It needs to carefully mop up the messy, the dirty, the sexually disgusting (Dollimore). In order to remain squeaky clean it has to cast out that which it deems too perverse.

Perversion's Seductions

Let me give a recent example of how perversely queer sex needs to get written out or screened out in order to make way for a more antiseptic scenario. The current issue of the psychoanalytically-inflected sexuality studies journal *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* includes an award-winning essay by Avgi Saketopoulou which aims to rethink perversion in anti-identitarian ways (Saketopoulou, 2014). One of the respondents to this essay is Tim Dean who applauds Saketopoulou for tackling via Jean Laplanche and Bersani the intransigence of the psychoanalytic understanding of perverse sexuality. In so doing, Dean suggests, she delinks perversion from identity politics and reveals sexuality to be "alien to selfhood: sex is not the expression of identity but its undoing" (Dean, 2014, pp. 270). This is hardly surprising coming from Dean who has consistently argued that perversion is the obscene undertow of normative (hetero)sexuality and who has always allowed bodily fluids to saturate his thinking and writing. In *Unlimited Intimacy* Dean intersperses theoretical (mostly Freudian-Lacanian) accounts of bareback sex with auto-ethnographical confessions of his own barebacking encounters, sex with strangers and the fluids they exchanged⁸. No wonder then that even *within* queer theory Dean's writing is considered to be a bit too much, a bit too perverse, too much information. This may be because, as Haver tells us, "to read the New Porn ...is to read as the stranger one becomes in pornographic invention—in other words: seriously to give oneself to the risks that art, fucking, imagination, love, and thinking are" (Haver, p. xi). And in his response to Saketopoulou Dean himself is quick to point out how easy it is for moralizing discourses to overwrite even the most positive interpretations of perverse sexuality. He says: "Once perversion is dissociated from sexuality for whatever reason, it resumes its moralizing force and reverts to a pre-Freudian meaning ...'Perversion' devoid of sex is not a psychoanalytic concept but an ineluctably normative one". In this reversion to a pre-Freudian understanding of perverse attachments Dean argues that we witness a retreat to a normativizing political, theoretical and ethical moral ground. He believes that Saketopoulou falls prey to this sanitizing danger.

But let's look at what amounts to a *double* clean-up operation on perversion here. In their introduction to the issue, Lisa Baraitser and Muriel Dimen give us their reading of Dean's reading of Saketopoulou. They say: "Dean is a provocative writer. Of sexuality, he says that 'in order to have sexuality you need a hole' but by 'hole' he means not only bodily orifices but gaps in knowledge and intimacy. And, not a clinician [this seems telling and an instance of moralizing in devaluing what a psychoanalytic critic who does not work clinically has to say. They are no doubt uneasy

about a line like "going to see an analyst is like getting sling-fucked by a filthy stranger" coming from a non-clinician (Dean, 2014, pp. 275)], still he dares to liken treatment to sex: 'Just as the transformative work of analysis entails stepping away from ... psychic comfort zone[s]', so diving into sexuality involves taking great, if also worthy, psychic risks. Indeed, he wonders whether Saketopoulou is herself pulled toward the safety of the normative. At a certain point, 'a veil of respectability descends to obscure crucial details' when Saketopoulou describes her patient as having 'had sex with the abject stranger'. Dean wonders whether this familiar euphemism manifests 'a residuum of shame or the return of repression" (Baraitser and Dimen, 2014, pp. 252-253). But a second veil of respectability in this very introduction obscures crucial details and manifests a *second* residuum of shame and return of repression.

Let us look at what it is exactly that Dean says: "The stranger who approaches our man in the sling may be physically repulsive but he is also endowed with an intangible quality—something enigmatic—that makes him desirable. At this point in the clinical narrative, however, a veil of respectability descends to obscure crucial details of the encounter. 'My patient' Saketopoulou writes, 'had sex with this abject stranger'. The phrase *had sex*, covering a multitude of possibilities, begs the question. Here *had sex* is a euphemism, possibly signalling a residuum of shame or the return of repression. This reader wants to know what kind of sex: did the stranger suck or rim or fist Adam or simply fuck him? Did he wear a condom or ejaculate inside? Did he cum or disappear without doing so. The intensity of Adam's experience raises the possibility that 'the abject stranger' fucked him bareback" (Dean, 2014, pp. 274-275). The questions Dean poses about the possible sex acts and fluids ejaculated are not "negligible" ones but Saketopoulou and Baraitser and Dimen cover over them leaving "holes" in the discourse of perversity.

The Holes in/of Queer Theory

The question of "holes" is a central one for any queer studies which would want to avoid the impulse to sanitize or mop up scenes of perverse sexuality. As Dean tells us it is Laplanche's concept of the "enigmatic signifier" which is crucial because it involves a penetration of the body by an enigma from the Other. It is this penetration (making a hole in the body) which is foundational for sexuality and in not privileging penetration but rather *being penetrated* Dean (via Laplanche) is suggesting that sexuality is dephallicized. In this psychoanalytic account "orifices

formed from the invagination of the cutaneous surface are what count, not the phallus or its correlates" (Dean, 2014, pp. 273). In deprivileging the phallus Dean is metonymizing the body as a cutaneous surface with so many penetrable holes for the emission or sucking up of eroticized fluids (by extension we might say that a demonolithicization of queer theory opens up its surfaces to many holes or gaps in knowledge). "Another way of putting it would be to say that in order to have sexuality you need a hole—prototypically a mouth for sucking (or an anus or a vagina, each of which performs its own version of sensual sucking). However, sucking represents a way of converting the passive position of being penetrated into an active position, or possibly a way of equivocating the distinction between active and passive. Sexual acts are themselves partial translations of the enigma. We should say, rather, that in order to have sexuality you need a hole in knowledge—a positive enigma—that creates a desiring hole in corporeality" (dean, 2014, p. 273). This openness to being penetrated by the other which founds sexuality as relational is, as Bersani and Dean acknowledge, potentially self-shattering. But it is in this self-shattering that new relational modes, *parrhesiastic* modes of connectedness to others and the world, are instantiated (Bersani, 2015). It is in this ineluctable relationality that we are opened up to others and tidying up these scenes of messy *jouissance*, making sex safe, can only lead to an unethicity in and of queer theory.

What Does Queer Theory Teach us about Se(x)?

Dean is right to suggest that "psychoanalysts, no more than the rest of us, are closer to perverse sexuality—to its abjection, its unjustifiable filth, and its strange pleasures—than a respectable profession would like to imagine"⁹ (Dean, "Uses of Perversity", 276). What I am arguing, and the contributors to this special issue are too, is that queer theorists are close to (remember Wiegman's argument about proximity) perverse sexuality but we need to get closer and exude in the sex and fluids which a hygienicized and domesticated queer theory would like to abject as its unjustifiably filthy remainders rather than its strangest pleasures. At the close of their prescient and wonderful essay "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us about X?" Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner write that "of course, we have deferred asking the crucial question: what does queer theory teach us about sex?" (Berlant and Warner, 1995, pp. 349) As we have already heard from Wiegman this question has been deferred time and again by queer theorists but the very unanswerability (or impossibility)

of this question harbours its promise for queer studies, if we are prepared to stay with the mess and are courageous enough to risk telling it as it is.

Let us look at a later essay by Berlant and Warner where aversion, perversion and bodily fluids play feature roles. At the end of "Sex in Public" they admit that "the project of thinking about sex in public does not only engage sex when it is disavowed or suppressed. Even if *sex practice is not the object domain*, sex is everywhere present" (Berlant and Warner, 1998, pp. 564, my emphasis). Why, we might ask, is sex practice *not* the object domain of queer studies? And why is it left until the final line of their *PMLA* essay on what queer theory can teach us? And why, again, is it left until the final pages of an essay on sex in public? Where, they themselves ask, "is the tweaking, thwacking, thumping, sliming, and rubbing you might have expected—or dreaded—in a paper on sex"? (Berlant and Warner, 1998, pp. 564). They then go on to describe two sexual scenes which bring up many of the tensions we have been talking about. It is the second scene—one of erotic vomiting—which particularly interests me here. They describe their wanderings:

Later, the question of aversion and perversion came up again. This time we were in a bar that on most nights is a garden-variety leather bar, but that, on Wednesday nights, hosts a sex performance event called 'Pork'. Shows typically include spanking, flagellation, shaving, branding, laceration, bondage, humiliation, wrestling—you know, the usual [but you won't find much queer theorizing about any of these practices, however *usual* they may be]: amateur, everyday practitioners strutting for everyone else's gratification, not unlike an academic conference. This night, word was circulating that the performance was to be erotic vomiting. This sounded like an appetite spoiler, and *the thought of leaving early occurred to us* but was overcome by a simple curiosity: what would the foreplay be like? Let's stay until it gets messy. Then we can leave" (Berlant and Warner, 1998, pp. 564, my emphases).

As with Saketopoulou's patient who "had sex with the abject stranger" the rumor of "erotic vomiting" excites Berlant and Warner's curiosity (remember Golding's *parrhesia*) but not without initial aversion and a cautiousness about how messy things might get¹⁰. In Laplanchean terms they are initially reluctant to be penetrated by the implantation of the enigmatic signifier from the other, have reservations about the intermixture of pleasure and palpable sexual disgust (an "appetite

spoiler"). But their story goes on to allegorize an ethical openness to the enigma of the Other which queer theory can learn a valuable lesson from:

A boy, twentyish, very skateboard, comes on the low stage at one end of the bar, wearing lycra shorts and a dog collar. He sits loosely in a restraining chair. His partner comes out and tilts the bottom's head up to the ceiling, stretching out his throat. Behind them is an array of foods. The top begins pouring milk down the boy's throat, then food, then more milk. It spills over, down his chest and onto the floor. A dynamic is established between them in which they carefully keep at the threshold of gagging. The bottom struggles to keep taking in more than he really can. The top is careful to give him just enough to stretch his capacities. From time to time a baby bottle is offered as a respite, but soon the rhythm intensifies. The boy's stomach is beginning to rise and pulse.

It is at this point that we realize we cannot leave, cannot even look away. No one can. The crowd is transfixed by the scene of intimacy and display, control and abandon, ferocity and abjection. People are moaning softly with admiration, then whistling, stomping, screaming encouragements. They have pressed forward in a compact and intimate group. Finally, as the top inserts two, then three fingers in the bottom's throat, insistently offering his own stomach for the repeated climaxes, we realize that we have never seen such a display of trust and violation. We are breathless. (Berlant and Warner, 1998, pp. 565)

Freud claims in the *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* that "everything relating to the problem of pleasure and unpleasure touches upon one of the sorest spots of present-day psychology" (Freud, 1953, pp. 209). The curiously unpleasurable yet intensely erotic pleasure of the scene Berlant and Warner describe above is a sore spot for contemporary queer thinking which would prefer to have left early and not waited for the reflexifying, the fluids, and the intimate, breathless relationality. In staying with the mess, in remaining with unpleasure, Berlant and Warner as queer theorists are able to share in the top and bottom's sensual and sexual excitations and their destructuring and disorganizing of the soma, psyche and sociality. In coming undone in the face of the Other, Berlant and Warner's own erotic pleasures are self-shattering in a way which does not close off relationality but rather opens it up. Bodily and psychic shattering, here in a scene of erotic vomiting, facilitates a moment in intense bodily penetration (by the enigmatic signifier) and

opening up of psychic (and physical space as bodies come together). Perverse sexuality in all its filthiness is what allows for this psychic and somatic openness and transformative potential; it sketches blueprints for modes of access to new forms of relationality, styles of existence and generous openness to the unimaginable future to-come.

Among these various zones, the ones that distinguish and assert themselves are those that are sites of effusion, a spurt, a flowing of humor, liquor, that is a solution/dissolution of form in which an incessantly new possibility of form is sketched.

Everything is there, in the sketch of an indeterminate recomposition out of which another body would spring, another sharing of bodies, another mingling and unmingling of skins, a *liquidation* of organic and social contours and constructions.

In sex, bodies testify to a vocation for infinitizing oneself beyond all secondary determinations of a given order. This is why sex is the place of creation: of making children or forming forms, assemblages and configurations, rhythms and resonances. Starting from nothing, that is, opening wide what is already itself only opening: mouth, eye, ear, nostril, sex, anus, skin, skin indefinitely reclaimed and all its pores reopened. Spacings, generosities, captures and abandonments, comings and goings, swings: always the syncopated cadence of a gait that carries towards the confines of what is delimited, by the body first of all.

The body of pleasure (and its reverse, the body of pain) illimits the body. It is its transcendence. (Nancy, 2013, pp. 96)

Notes

¹ In an interview with Nicholas Royle, Leo Bersani ruminates on the effects of this line (and other memorable first sentences of his): "in that essay what I say about various kinds of terror of gay sex and the attitude toward pornography—and near the end of the essay, the celebration of an ascetic *jouissance*—is all connected, I suppose, to that aversion. I feel the first sentence is extremely important in almost getting a high, or at least I hope that it gives a kind of high—it gives me a high and I hope it gives the reader a high" (Royle and Bersani, 1998, p. 180).

- ² For a brilliant reading of how sex or the orgasmic force ("*potentia gaudendi*") has become technopolitically captured and managed in what she calls the "pharmacopornographic era" see Beatriz Preciado's *Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs and Biopolitics in the Pharmacopornographic Era*. Preciado also has a lot to say about endocrinal fluids and many other fluids, not least the testosterone gel she doses herself with every day.
- ³ This is the opposite of the shift Gayle Rubin called for in "Thinking Sex" which famously opens with the line: "The time has come to think about sex". See Rubin "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality", p. 137.
- ⁴ See Cara Judea Alhadeff's *Viscous Expectations: Justice, Vulnerability, the Ob-scene*.
- ⁵ Two recent exceptions (both of which, coincidentally, devote chapters to fist-fucking) to the critical inattention to sex are Annamarie Jagose's *Orgasmology* and Lynne Huffer, *Are The Lips A Grave? A Queer Feminist on the Ethics of Sex*.
- ⁶ On the stickiness, viscosity and yuckiness of various fluids see Lisa Baraitser's *Maternal Encounters: The Ethics of Interruption* and Elizabeth Freeman's *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, esp. pp. 95-136.
- ⁷ On cum, blood, urine and especially female ejaculate see Shannon Bell's *Fast Feminism*. For considerations of milk, blood, semen, urine and other fluids issuing from the liquescent body of Christ in metaphysical poetry see Richard Rambuss, *Closet Devotions* and "Sacred Subjects and the Aversive Metaphysical Conceit: Crashaw, Serrano, Ofili".
- ⁸ Tim Dean, *Unlimited Intimacy*. See also Dean, "The Biopolitics of Pleasure".
- ⁹ For a "downright shitty" reading of Lacan as abjection's biggest ally see Calvin Thomas' *Masculinity, Psychoanalysis, Straight Queer Theor*. His earlier *Male Matters: Masculinity, Anxiety, and the Male Body on the Line* is excellent on semen, piss and diarrhea. For another reading of male bodily fluids in the context of performance art see Fintan Walsh, *Male Trouble: Masculinity and the Performance of Crisis*.
- ¹⁰ For another scene of eroticized vomiting see Nikki Sullivan's reading of The Prodigy's video for "Smack my Bitch Up" in "Smacking My Bitch Up: Queer or What?" Giffney and O'Rourke, eds. *The Ashgate Companion to Queer Theory*. The Prodigy's current single "Nasty Nasty" should be considered the sound track to this issue of *InterAlia*.

Bibliography

- Alhadeff, Cara Judea, 2013. *Viscous Expectations: Justice, Vulnerability, the Ob-scene*. New York: Atropos Press.
- Baraitser, Lisa, 2009. *Maternal Encounters: The Ethics of Interruption*. London: Routledge.
- Baraitser, Lisa, and Muriel Dimen, 2014. "Introduction: 2014 Symonds Prize Essay". *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 15.4: 251-253.

- Bell, Shannon. 2010. *Fast Feminism*. New York: Autonomedia, 2010.
- Berlant, Lauren, and Lee Edelman, 2014. *Sex, or the Unbearable*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Berlant, Lauren, and Michael Warner. 1995. "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us about X?" *PMLA* 110: pp. 343-349.
- Berlant, Lauren, and Michael Warner, 1998. "Sex in Public". *Critical Inquiry* 24.2: pp. 547-566.
- Bersani, Leo, 1998. "Against Monogamy". *Oxford Literary Review* 20: 3-21.
- , 2010. "Is the Rectum a Grave?" *Is the Rectum a Grave? And Other Essays*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- , 2015. *Thoughts and Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dean, Tim, 2012. "The Biopolitics of Pleasure". *South Atlantic Quarterly* 111: pp. 477-496.
- , 2009. *Unlimited Intimacy: Reflections On the Subculture of Barebacking*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , 2014. "Uses of Perversity: Commentary on Saketopoulou's 'To Suffer Pleasure'", *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 15.4: pp. 269-277.
- Dollimore, Jonathan, 1998. "Sexual Disgust". *Oxford Literary Review* 20: pp. 47-77
- Foucault, Michel, 2011. *The Courage of Truth: The Government of Self and Others II: Lectures at the Collège de France 1983-1984*. Trans. Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave, 2011.
- Freeman, Elizabeth, 2010. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Freud, Sigmund, 1953. *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, Standard Edition Volume 7. London: Hogarth Press.
- Giffney, Noreen, and Michael O'Rourke, eds., 2009. *The Ashgate Companion to Queer Theory*. Farnham: Ashgate Press, pp. 435-450.
- Golding, Johnny, 2014. "The 9th Technology of Otherness: A Certain Kind of Debt" in Henry Rogers, ed. *Queer Texturealities*. Birmingham: Article Press, pp. 100-105.
- Haver, William, 2002. "The Logic of the Lure and the New Pornography", foreword to John Paul Ricco, *The Logic of The Lure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. xi-xiv.
- Huffer, Lynne, 2013. *Are The Lips A Grave? A Queer Feminist on the Ethics of Sex*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jagose, Annamarie, 2013. *Orgasmology*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc, 2013. *Corpus II: Writings on Sexuality*. Trans. Anne O'Byrne. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Preciado, Beatriz, 2013. *Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs and Biopolitics in the Pharmacopornographic Era*. New York: Feminist Press.

- Rambuss, Richard, 1998. *Closet Devotions*. Durham: Duke University Press
- , 2004. "Sacred Subjects and the Aversive Metaphysical Conceit: Crashaw, Serrano, Ofili", *New Literary History* 71.2: pp. 497-530.
- Royle Nicholas, and Leo Bersani, 1998. "Beyond Redemption: An Interview with Leo Bersani". *Oxford Literary Review* 20: pp. 173-190.
- Rubin, Gayle, 2011. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality" in *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Saketopoulou, Avgi, 2014. "To Suffer Pleasure: The Shattering of the Ego as the Psychic Labor of Perverse Sexuality". *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* 15.4: pp. 254-268.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, 1993. *Tendencies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Stockton, Will, and D. Gilson, 2014. "Rawr; or, Narcissus Spends the Summer Texting Matt". *Crush*. New York: Punctum Books.
- Thomas, Calvin, 1996. *Male Matters: Masculinity, Anxiety, and the Male Body on the Line*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- , 2008. *Masculinity, Psychoanalysis, Straight Queer Theory: Essays on Abjection in Literature, Mass Culture and Film*. New York: Palgrave.
- Walsh, Fintan, 2010. *Male Trouble: Masculinity and the Performance of Crisis*. London: Palgrave.
- Wiegman, Robyn, 2012. "The Vertigo of Critique", in *Object Lessons*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 338-339.