

REFERENCES

- Lindemann, Hilde, Marian Verkerk, and Margaret U. Walker. 2009. *Naturalized bioethics: Toward responsible knowing and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pierce, Jessica, Hilde L. Nelson, and Karen J. Warren. 2002. Feminist slants on nature and health. *Journal of Medical Humanities* 23 (1): 61–72.
- Rockwell, W.T. 2005. *Neither brain nor ghost: A nondualist alternative to the mind–brain identity theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Tong, Rosemarie. 2010. Book review of *Disability Bioethics: Moral Bodies, Moral Difference*, by Jackie Leach Scully. *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics* 3 (2): 175–80.
- Twine, Richard. 2005. Constructing critical bioethics by deconstructing culture/nature dualism. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 8 (3): 285–95.
- . 2010. *Animals as biotechnology: Ethics, sustainability and critical animal studies*. London: Earthscan.

Post-Queer Politics. By DAVID V. RUFFOLO. Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2009.

Fenn Stewart

In *Post-Queer Politics*, Ruffolo attempts to re-queer queer; the title's hyphen signifies both a break from and an enduring tie to major texts in queer theory, such as work by Michel Foucault and Judith Butler. Though he's careful to recognize the important contributions made by queer theorists, Ruffolo argues that an "incessant involvement in identity politics" and a "narrowed interest in heteronormativity" have caused queer theory to stagnate (1). For Ruffolo, this is largely the result of a focus on subjectivity and discourse; he suggests that the notion of a subject formed through discourse depends upon a limiting notion of being, one that "maintains an unproductive commitment to meaning" (10, 15). This notion of being prevents the development of new "lines of flight" (that is, toward democracy and equity) that could be "stimulated by the potentialities and creativities of an intensive politics of becoming" (2, 6). Ruffolo aims to stimulate just such lines of flight by drawing on the work of Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, and Mikhail Bakhtin in order to theorize a range of topics not often associated with queer theory, such as the politics of post-secondary education, new "biotechnologies," and the materialities of neoliberal globalization.

Ruffolo begins by "plugging in" to Deleuze and Guattari's work to provide alternatives to what he sees as queer theory's unproductive pattern of binary resistance to heteronormativity: Ruffolo seeks to create new "flows of production" through the connection of several different political philosophies (41). Deleuzo-Guattarian concepts like the nomad, the war machine, and schizoanalysis all

figure largely in *Post-Queer Politics*, which “rhizomatically” connects to and disconnects from a variety of ideas, rather than referring back to any one “arborescent” theory or tradition (35). Ruffolo combines his use of Deleuze and Guattari with Bakhtin’s work—for instance, in presenting dialogism as an alternative to binarism (which Ruffolo claims has become endemic to queer theory) in order to theorize bodies as “dialogical-becomings,” rather than as individual, disciplined subjects who come to be through subjugating discursive regimes (60).

Post-Queer Politics aims to end queer theory’s emphasis (Ruffolo would probably say “reliance”) on Foucauldian notions of disciplinarity; for example, a “traditional” queer theory analysis might describe heteronormative discourse as a form of disciplinarity through which certain gendered subjects are rendered intelligible and empowered, while others are cast out and subjected to violence. In arguing against this kind of analysis, Ruffolo cites Deleuze’s claim that Western societies are transitioning from a “disciplinary” model (in which bodies are individualized through mechanisms that restrict them to certain spaces and activities) to one of “control” (in which bodies are “dividualized” through mechanisms of information and communication). Due to this shift, disciplinarity cannot provide an adequate framework to address neoliberal globalization (95).

Rather than conceptualizing contemporary social relations through disciplinarity, then, Ruffolo wants to “rethin[k] . . . life itself” in order to develop new possibilities in democracy and social justice (90). The necessity of rethinking life comes up again and again in *Post-Queer Politics*; for Ruffolo, it is futile to attempt new political strategies while continuing to perceive bodies in the same old way. In order to enable post-queer readings of neoliberal globalization, Ruffolo speaks to a variety of political situations that have not been (and could not be, according to him) adequately addressed by queer theory. For instance, in “Plateau Five,” drawing on Deleuze and Guattari’s “schizoanalytics,” Ruffolo theorizes post-secondary education as “schizo-academia.” Rather than developing a Foucauldian analysis that might show how student- or professor-subjects are produced through the discursive regimes of academia, Ruffolo proposes that these bodies become implicated in neoliberal capitalism as “indefinite tensions” or “desiring-machines that produce flows” (123). Ruffolo wants us to consider academic bodies as dialogical-becomings, and academic life as a series of connecting and disconnecting machines: hand-machine to pen-machine, mouth-machine to microphone-machine (127).

The point here is not that disciplinary practices no longer exist, but that a certain limit has been reached in conceptualizing experience and social organization primarily in terms of the way disciplinary inscription forms subjects, who then reiterate and/or resist these inscriptions (127). Ruffolo attempts to go beyond such analyses, as in “Plateau Six” in which he examines new biotechnologies (such as genomic research) not in disciplinary terms, but as “control mechanisms” that develop new “life forms” (151). According to Ruffolo, an

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5212144>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5212144>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)