**Queer Language K**

**The qualifier ‘queer’ has a destructive history; your language can never protect the queer community when it’s based in their exclusion. Samuelson-Roberts 15:**

MIRIAM SAMUELSON-ROBERTS “WHY “QUEER”? IS IT A SLUR?” 2015. http://queergrace.com/queer/

Some research notes that the first appropriation of the word queer to degrade people in the LGBT community occurred in late 19th century Britain, in a letter from a man to his son denouncing his other son’s affair with a man. In the United States, it was used to debase and belittle the LGBT community almost from the beginning, highlighting the community’s “strange” or “other”-ness. Throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, queer has been used to refer degradingly to the LGBT community, and in its earlier uses, it was a dismissive label applied particularly to men who did not adhere to prescribed norms of masculinity. Queer also became more frequently used as a noun instead of just an adjective, often in contempt toward LGBT people. Current use of the term varies by community, but typically using the term as an adjective (“they identify as queer” or “they are a member of the queer community”) is considered less disparaging than using the term as a noun (“she is a queer”).

**The term ‘Queer’ is a reclaimed term, using ‘queer’ as a term of art means it will be put into the public discourse. The alternative is to say LGBTQIA+ to encompass the multiplicity of identities in an objective manner. Samuelson-Roberts 15 bracketed for clarity:**

Since then, many have reclaimed and reintegrated [queer] into their everyday speech, into the missions of their organizations, and into religious and secular LGBTQ educational materials. The website feministing.com explains that they use the word queer because it encompasses many expressions of sexual orientation and does not limit gender expression to two genders like the term “bisexual” does. The site also acknowledges that not everyone has reclaimed the word in a positive way. Outright Vermont, an organization that works to build safe and healthy environments for queer youth, dedicates a portion of their website to explain why they use the word queer. In parsing out the definition and the word’s history, the organization emphasizes that queer encompasses all lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer, and questioning identities, among others.

**Discourse is highly manipulative-the aff is a bad example of knowledge production**

**Dijk 6:**

Teun A. Van Dijk, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Pompeu Fabra, “Discourse and Manipulation”, Discourses, [www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse%20and%20manipulation.pdf](http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse%20and%20manipulation.pdf)

**Manipulation as defined here takes place through discourse in a broad sense, that is, including non-verbal characteristics, such as gestures, facework, text layout, pictures, sounds, music, and so on.** Note though that, as such, discourse structures are not manipulative; they only have such functions or effects in specific communicative situations and the way in which these are interpreted by participants in their context models. For instance, as stipulated, manipulation is a social practice of power abuse, involving dominant and dominated groups, or institutions and their clients. This means that in principle the ‘same’ discourse (or discourse fragment) may be manipulative in one situation, but not in another situation. That is, the manipulative meaning (or critical evaluation) of text and talk depends on the context models of the recipients – including their models of the speakers or writers, and their attributed goals and intentions. Manipulative discourse typically occurs in public communication controlled by dominant political, bureaucratic, media, academic or corporate elites. This means that further contextual constraints prevail, namely on participants, their roles, their relations and their typical actions and cognitions (knowledge, goals). In other words, discourse is defined to be manipulative first of all in terms of the context models of the participants. That is, as critical analysts, we evaluate discourse as manipulative first of all in terms of their context categories, rather than in terms of their textual structures. And yet, although discourse structures per se need not be manipulative, some of these structures may be more efficient than others in the process of influencing the minds of recipients in the speaker’s or writer’s own interests. For instance, as suggested earlier, headlines are typically used to express topics and to signal the most important information of a text, and may thus be used to assign (extra) weight to events that in themselves would not be so important. And, vice versa, **discourse about events or states of affairs that are very relevant for citizens or clients may eschew headlines that emphasize the negative characteristics of dominant groups and institutions.** To wit, the press never publishes stories about racism in the press, let alone emphasizes such information by prominent headlines on the front page (Van Dijk, 1991). The overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation is very typical in this biased account of the facts in favour of the speaker’s or writer’s own interests, while blaming negative situations and events on opponents or on the Others (immigrants, terrorists, youths, etc.). This strategy can be applied to the structures of many discourse levels in the usual way (for examples and detail, see, e.g., Van Dijk, 2003): ● Overall interaction strategies ❍ Positive self-presentation ❍ Negative other-presentation ● Macro speech act implying Our ‘good’ acts and Their ‘bad’ acts, e.g. accusation, defence ● Semantic macrostructures: topic selection ❍ (De-)emphasize negative/positive topics about Us/Them ● Local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global ones, e.g. statements that prove accusations. ● Local meanings Our/Their positive/negative actions ❍ Give many/few details ❍ Be general/specific ❍ Be vague/precise ❍ Be explicit/implicit ❍ Etc. ● Lexicon: Select positive words for Us, negative words for Them ● Local syntax ❍ Active vs passive sentences, nominalizations: (de)emphasize Our/Their positive/negative agency, responsibility ● Rhetorical figures ❍ Hyperboles vs euphemisms for positive/negative meanings ❍ Metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative properties ● Expressions: sounds and visuals ❍ Emphasize (loud, etc.; large, bold, etc.) positive/negative meanings ❍ Order (first, last: top, bottom, etc.) positive/negative meanings These strategies and moves at various levels of discourse are hardly surprising because they implement the usual ideological square of discursive group polarization (de/emphasize good/bad things of Us/Them) one finds in all ideological discourse (Van Dijk, 1998, 2003). Since social–political manipulation as discussed here also involves domination (power abuse), it is likely that such manipulation is also ideological. Thus, in the manipulative discourses that followed the September 11 and March 11 terrorist attacks in New York and Madrid, nationalist, anti-terrorist, anti-Islam, anti-Arab and racist ideologies were rife, emphasizing the evil nature of terrorists, and the freedom and democratic principles of the ‘civilized’ nations. Thus, if Bush & Co. want to manipulate the politicians and/or the citizens in the USA into accepting going to war in Iraq, engaging in world-wide actions against terrorists and their protectors (beginning with Afghanistan), and adopting a bill that severely limits the civil rights of the citizens, such discourse would be massively ideological. That is, they do this by emphasizing ‘Our’ fundamental values (freedom, democracy, etc.) and contrast these with the ‘evil’ ones attributed to Others. They thus make the citizens, traumatized by the attack on the Twin Towers, believe that the country is under attack, and that only a “war on terrorism” can avert a catastrophe. And those who do not accept such an argument may thus be accused of being unpatriotic. Much more detailed analyses of these discourses have shown that they are fundamentally ideological in this way, and it is likely that social–political manipulation always involves ideologies, ideological attitudes and ideological discourse structures (see the special double issue of Discourse & Society 15(3–4), 2004, on the discourses of September 11, edited by Jim Martin and John Edwards). If many Western European leaders, including former Prime Minister Aznar, and more recently also Tony Blair, want to limit immigration so as to increase support from the voters, then such **manipulative policies and discourses are also very ideological, involving nationalist feelings, Us/Them polarization, and a systematic negative representation of the Others in terms of negative values, characteristics and actions (delinquency, illegal entry, violence, etc.).** Although socio-political manipulation is usually ideological, and manipulative discourses often feature the usual ideological polarization patterns at all levels of analysis, the discursive structures and strategies of manipulation cannot simply be reduced to those of any other ideological discourse. Indeed, we may have social–political discourses that are persuasive but not manipulative, such as persuasive parliamentary debates or a discussion in a newspaper or on television. That is, given our analysis of the social and cognitive contexts of manipulative discourse, we need to examine the specific constraints formulated earlier, such as the dominant position of the manipulator (for instance), the lack of relevant knowledge of the recipients, and the condition that the likely consequences of the acts of manipulation are in the interest of the dominant group and against the best interests of the dominated group, thus contributing to (illegitimate) social inequality.