

## Discussion

**Ellen Malenas Ledoux:** What were the women doing there in Waterloo? They were fighting. So, before the eighteenth century mostly women participated in military life as “camp followers” and also as a kind of support staff, but increasingly in the eighteenth century, women were actually fighting as combatants. And when I say “many” I mean “surprisingly many”... not that every third person was a woman in disguise, right? Of course I am not a historian, I am a literary person, so I can get all loosey-goosey with numbers and all that stuff, and these are mostly in the footnotes of history. But my point is that there’s a significant enough number of these women that they’re worth taking note of; but I’m not so much interested in the actual historical women as I am in them as rhetorical figures, right? That’s where I come at it from a literary standpoint. I think your big question was really about, “what are our expectations of them, or what are their duties?” I should explain that this project comes out of a year-long participation in a (de)colonial theory seminar that I did at the Institute of Research on Women at Rutgers. So I’m coming at it from a multidisciplinary, queer/feminist lens—not an eighteenth-century lens—and this is part of a much larger project in postcolonial theory to think about white women’s or European women’s complicity in the imperial project. I think that’s something that we don’t talk a lot about in the eighteenth century and I think we need to talk about that. So this idea that I do expect something from them... It’s not so much that I expect something from these particular women, but I expect something from us: to go back and look at history and think about the ways in which, up to this point, a lot of women’s history and the recovery project of women’s narrative voices has been about celebration. And I think maybe it’s time that we turn to thinking about how women are also invested in and involved in power structures. So that’s where my impetus comes from. I’m holding myself accountable, I’m not holding these two historical figures accountable—if that makes sense?

**Christy Pichichero:** Thank you very much for your comments; they were very eloquent and I couldn’t have said those things better myself, so thank you. You know, just to sort of dovetail with some of the comments that Erica made<sup>1</sup>... I’m agreeing that there’s this sort of thrust toward care that has Rousseauian overtones—there is this idea of something natural and something pure that should be given here—but the practical concerns of this are never far away. This care is for the purpose of being a better killing machine and it is for the purpose of preserving manpower (which is something that Erica has written about in the British context). So, you know, that has been sort of a struggle and as I presented this work, that’s where the fight sort of occurs: how can these two things coexist; where is the end of the feeling of compassion, where does it run out; why wouldn’t it be that—you know, after a battle—everyone wouldn’t get together and enjoy meals together and be a happy human community? Well we know it did happen with the officers, right? Because they were members of the European nobility and they knew each other; we have their correspondences that said, you know, before and after battles they would get together and have dinner. And so I think that, for us, there’s also that question of going back and understanding the ways that these different moral philosophies are happening at the same time: an ideology of sensibility and care; one of civility and humanity that has sort of newfound meanings, because of this turn of *sensibilité*, and also old meanings about aristocratic sociability. And so sort of what I’m interested in... David Bell has talked about the aristocratic code of war during this

---

<sup>1</sup> [Editor’s Comment] In the previous session.

time, sort of sees it as a continuation of what was happening before.<sup>2</sup> And what I'm drawing forth here is the argument that there is still a bit of an aristocratic code, but it's changing, and it's becoming enlightened. Because these gentlemen were sitting in salons, were active participants in Freemasonic lodges, we know about their libraries, we know what they were reading—and Sarah Knott has done important work on this in the American context—they were consumers of the Enlightenment and wanted to be participants. And I think, you know, that's where the sort of self-interest thing is also happening for these gentlemen who are writing the treatises that I read—I spent a year in the war archives at the Chateau de Vincennes so that's where a lot of my archival materials come from that I supplement with published treatises, like Maurice de Saxe's. They see themselves as men of the Enlightenment. They don't want to be pushed aside like some of the *philosophes* want to do: say "Look at these military heroes, what is a hero? You're blood-thirsty beasts. These are not people that we can admire." And so there's a desire to sort of reimagine their nobility—to sort of retake Jay Smith's idea—and this is part of doing that. And so there's a lot happening at once here in terms of combat effectiveness, in terms of preserving manpower, in terms of moral standing. My book (and this little piece of it that you're seeing here) is trying to follow all of these threads and give a picture of what military Enlightenment was about.

**Schneider:** Yes, Laura.

**Laura Stevens:** I really like both papers; just want to start off by saying that. I have questions for both, but I think I'll start with Christy. Your focus is primarily on the European theater of war, and I was just wondering about one thing that's going on in the eighteenth century, especially around the Seven Years War: Indian-French alliances.

**Pichichero:** Yes.

**Stevens:** Do you see any sort of way in which allying with various Indian tribes (fighting alongside them, learning from their patterns of combat, etc.): is that informing discussions over either the care of soldiers or atrocities and the rules of war?

**Pichichero:** Thank you for that question, it's an excellent one. Christian Crouch published a book I think last year or the year before, *Nobility Lost*, where she's looking at exactly this space of New France and these types of negotiations.<sup>3</sup> And so sort of (you know, I'm citing her a bit in answering these kinds of questions because she's done extensive work)... Where indeed you have these forces in New France that have sort of European-trained, French, continental-type troops; you have native troops; and then you have people who are already of mixed-race origins, who have Indian mothers—Native American mothers—and then French fathers, who are also following in the military profession. So there are these very interesting cases where, with the mixed cultures, people translate some of the acts and see them as atrocities. For example, there was a battle at Picawillanee... Gosh, I think it's the 1730s... No, no it's much later, excuse me... No, no... Anyways, it's in the 1760s, I'm sorry... And so what happens there—where

<sup>2</sup> David A. Bell, *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It* (Houghton Mifflin, 2007).

<sup>3</sup> Christian Ayne Crouch, *Nobility Lost: French and Canadian Martial Cultures, Indians, and the End of New France* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2014).

there are French and Native combined forces against Brits—is that the Native forces cut open the enemy Indian tribe leader and eat his heart in front of everyone. And so the Europeans are scandalized; they say “My God,” you know, “this is atrocious, this is barbarous.” But then there’s this sort of moment of translation, of saying, “No, you know, this isn’t an act of flagrant violence or desecrating a corpse; it’s a spiritual process of imbibing that tribe’s spirit and energies.” And so then they reach a sort of pseudo-understanding of “Well, you know, we don’t know how we’re going to talk about this to the folks back in France, in the metropole.” But there’s an understanding that the idea of humanity and humane behaviors is sort of different in different cases. So yeah, these colonial contexts are challenging for these classical European contexts of practicing humanity in war, but there are cases where there is cultural negotiation and understanding.

**Schneider:** Hook from Rebecca.

**Rebecca Spang:** When Christy mentioned David Bell, I was thinking of Colin [Jager]’s paper because David of course says that this aristocratic ethos of war is also one that assumes war is a sort of constant state of affairs: you’re never going to have a final war, and so you have to take care of your resources to be ready to fight again. And David says that this way of thinking about war is completely transformed by the French Revolution and the emergence of nationalism as a sort of cause to end all wars. So I was wondering if you could comment on that. But I was also so struck by the story that you just told, because there’s a story that circulates about the tenth of August 1792 (when the French monarchy is deposed). And supposedly some of the patriot republicans who besiege the Tuileries...After the fight with the Swiss Guards, it is reported that they cut open one of the Swiss Guards, boil his heart in brandy, and then eat it. So they’re not complete savages because they cook it [laughter], but nonetheless the movement of that story to the revolutionary context is extraordinary.

**Pichichero:** Yeah, that’s very interesting. I wonder if there are any sort of... Yeah, what actual ties could there be in terms of how these events got publicity in France?... What similar suspects were there from those colonial wars back... to the continent?... Yeah, so, basically I think that David Bell’s stuff about “the war to end all wars” has a lot to do with sort of engaging rhetoric and justifications for continuing to send that quantity of people out onto the field in the numbers that we see in the Napoleonic Wars.

But, you know, very quickly, it’s clear there’s not a war to end all wars and I feel like—and this is something that Hall and I were just talking about at the break—there’s sort of a sick way in which the Geneva Conventions and the Red Cross actually enable the continuation of war and, you know, sort of take for granted that it’s going to happen. So, you know, “You can go and fight each other and leave all these bodies on the battlefield and we’ll come and help clean it up; but don’t kill us.” So, you know, I think... You know, ultimately there’s evidence for David’s idea that the “war to end all wars” was precisely a sort of rhetoric to permit continued war and that our society today still kind of believes that. Even if we don’t say it, war is still part of our civilization and we’re trying to make it less bad. What we have right now is the same system that these gentlemen were working on—that sort of starts with Grotius in terms of “International war is going to continue, how can we make it less bad?”

I do not approve of war. [laughter] I just want you to know that. My advisors at Stanford always worried, you know, that I was going to march out with this project and people would be like, “Oh, she’s right wing, she wants to nuke them.” No, I really don’t.

**Schneider:** No apologies required.

**Pichichero:** But I think that the state we're still in is very much related to this stuff...

**Erica Charters:** I mean, I guess I have just a slight follow-up, and it's a question, I think, for both of you. Because my reading of Bell, in some ways, is not just that it's about the "war that will end all wars," but it's also about thinking about the role that war played in society. It's that war becomes an extraordinary experience as opposed to a common experience, and I think this has sense for how you read narratives of war. For both of your papers, I was thinking about this book written by—he's a historian, but it's about narratives of war, called *The Ultimate Experience*—Harari.<sup>4</sup> He talks about the transformation of narratives from the early modern period—in which people don't really bother writing about their experience at war because it would be like writing about going to the bathroom (it's not very interesting for anyone)—to what you see in the revolutionary period. And it's not that war itself changes, but this notion that war somehow "takes you outside." And so I think... I almost wonder... That's less a question about war ending, and more a question about whether we see war as being a normal state of affairs or abnormal. To me that feeds into this question about women and their role in war because Snell always... Snell's work strikes me as being very different from the kinds of narratives you get about women and war that come up in the revolutionary period and partly because, to me, Snell's narrative... The tradition, the trope we have of these women dressing up in this earlier period... It's nothing extraordinary; they might as well be dressing up as men and working at a pub or that kind of thing. And so that's why I was curious... Therefore why should we expect them to be any different than the men in some ways? Because, in that period at least, war is not an unusual circumstance; it's not that war and society, there's no difference between the two. And I don't know if there's a different way of reading them, the difference between... To me, the texts seem very different because they're talking about different narrative techniques and different approaches to the experience of war.

**Ledoux:** Yeah, I mean, that's what I found interesting about grouping these two. There are several memoirs to choose from, so the reason why I put these two together, you know, is because they're from two different war periods, right? We were talking about the rise of the sentimental mother in the eighteenth century, right? I'm actually writing a book about working mothers and I started thinking about her [Hannah Snell] in terms of compulsive heterosexuality: right, the fact that she was married before, two times after she came back, even though she said she would never get remarried, wanted to live as a man, etc.; but... whatever. That's how I got thinking about her and I got much more interested in what she was doing and how she was employed. To answer your question, I want to get back to this issue of the variety show, right: where she comes back and does this elaborate, pantomime variety show at the New Wells where basically the enticement to go see the show is to see how well she passes, right? that she's virtually indistinguishable from a man? But then by drawing attention to the difference between her and a man, what you're doing is actually saying, "Well if a woman can do this and do it so well, just imagine what the British military must really be like," right, because she's passing muster and whatever. And so, I think for her, the fact that she was able to come back and capitalize on [her time

---

<sup>4</sup> Yuval Noah Harari, *The Ultimate Experience: Battlefield Revelations and the Making of Modern War Culture* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

in the army] with the memoir and with this whole marketing plan she and Robert Walker have—it shows that, for her anyway, it isn't the same as going and dressing as a man in a pub, or being out in the field and threshing grain or something, or doing some sort of labor that we would consider male. I guess it's partly because of what we were talking about during the break, which is the way it's so sexed up, the way the narrative itself is so fraught with sexual tension: her with her other messmates; her with other women when she's on shore leave; and then this sort of constant threat of rape. So I guess in that sense the sexual violence aspect of it and also the idea of passing is what makes her story, I guess, more sexy and extraordinary than... Yeah.

**Schneider:** Erica, hook.

**Ledoux:** You have a hook?

**Charters:** I suppose the thought I had is...I suppose the passing... I agree, but I wonder if the interest is just that a woman can do things that men can do. In the same way that a female who could pass as a doctor would also draw in lots of people, for people to sit around and watch in the eighteenth century totally fascinated.... I think the rhetoric about Sally Mapp being a bone-setter and yet being female has the same aspect. This is where I wonder if it's really about the military per se or whether it's about this freakish woman who can be like men... It's just a thought.

**Ledoux:** Yeah, no, that's a great... That's something for me to think about for sure.

**Schneider:** Hall.

**Hall Bjørnstad:** This is a question I prepared in case of silence during the last session, trying to link Erica's and Christy's papers, and I discussed this with Christy at the break, but I think it would be interesting for general discussion. So there were several comments—I think Sarah, Michael, Johannes—about the purity or nonpurity of the notion of care and whether it changed. So it's fascinating to think about [inaudible] and the Red Cross and the Geneva Convention happening a hundred years after the Military Enlightenment that the two of you speak about, but could it *only* happen a hundred years later? Are there different notions of “care” in play? Can you reflect on what's going on?

**Pichichero:** We talked about this a little bit recently and I think...What we discussed is going back to David Bell again: about nationalism and the culture of war changing in the early nineteenth century; that the rules, these ideas of humanity and civility, there's sort of less stake in those during the Napoleonic Wars and the ones that follow. I think that culture of war is a real question in the evolving history of war. For me, putting my sort of literary scholar hat on, something that's very important is... It sort of goes to what you were mentioning, Erica, about the advent of stronger autobiographical narrative and of description and of literary realism, which sort of allows... This is why I have this big quote in the beginning of my article; to sort of see that a kind of language has begun to make this kind of spectacle visible, which is not something that was really happening earlier. You get it a little bit with this sort of proto-human rights movement, where they say “Imagine this body. Look at the body of this soldier that has been beaten 50 times with a sabre.” So there's some of that description, but, you know, by a hundred years

later, there are new conventions, *War and Peace* has happened, there are new ways of talking about violations of the human body and violence against it. I think that that sort of plays a role also.

**Schneider:** If I could add a hook here... I think the hundred years later might be a factor is a sense of a more self-conscious sense of the European nations vis-à-vis the rest of the world: that we are a civilized people and that the rest of the world is not. In fact, in the wake of imperialism, we're more self-conscious as to what Europe should be. Also, since from 1815 to 1914 there weren't that many wars in Europe, which allows for sort of conventions to be put in place to deal with the possibility of war.

**Pichichero:** What do you think, Erica?

**Charters:** Well I was going to say... I mean, I was going to agree, but maybe put it more much more bluntly and less eloquently, in the sense that these are called "international rules" of war, but they're not, they're forms of European imperialism. And I think to kind of tie in Laura's point more strongly, to me this whole rhetoric about how it's being human and humanitarian: it's not, it's about being European. Because cutting out hearts is the way that does not win; you don't cut out people's hearts according to the international rules of war. [laughter] It's no coincidence that international laws of humanitarian conduct are coming at the same time that other kinds of international congresses, which are very much about European imperial ideas, are set in place.

**Schneider:** I have Laura and Michael.

**Stevens:** So this is a slight shift back to the question of the female soldiers performing at Sadler's Wells. To what degree is this a reincarnation of a breeches role from, say, the Restoration theater? Mostly I'm wondering: are these women being viewed as just scintillating objects because they're wearing trousers? And if that's not the case, why? Why has that disappeared?

**Ledoux:** Yeah, that's a really good question. Thank you for asking me something that I know about. [laughter] Yeah, so I've actually done a lot on breeches roles because the previous chapter in this book is about actresses. So the breeches role, you know, is popular all the way through the beginning of the nineteenth century and it's for women who have particularly nicely turned legs or *un bon point*, they say. There's actually criticism against Sarah Siddons as she gets older and still does breeches roles because she no longer has a fascinating backside or whatever. So it's very sexual, right: it's just a chance to look at somebody's gorgeous legs as they're playing Rosalind or whatever.

But this [the female soldiers] is actually about the illusion of appearing as a man. And it's a different kind of theater, right: it's an outdoor theater; the cost of admission is a pint of wine (so I think it's a bit like a comedy club where you have to buy two drinks or whatever); before that, she's preceded by... We know there's a long program of entertainment in the eighteenth-century theater, but this is preceded by—I mean, it's non-patent theater—so rope-dancing, jugglers, and all this other... So it's more like a circus-type atmosphere. And this is a non-speaking role that she's doing, so she's literally just representing as a body who's going through military drill exercises. There are actual engravings of her doing the different stances and they are not sexual at all: arms akimbo, legs shoulder width apart, then with the rifle. It's not... When you see pictures of

like Abingdon or something dressed up as a boy, it's very like alluring, and this is a totally different feel from that. So I think it is about a proto-female masculinity as opposed to a titillating, "here's me in trousers" kind of thing.

**Schneider:** Michael.

**Michael Meranze:** Yeah, to follow up a bit on the back-and-forth between Christy and Erica on the humanitarianism and the gap of the hundred years of non-war... I wonder in this case if Christy's desire to separate from *Discipline and Punish* may mean that we should actually be turning to the first volume of *History of Sexuality* and the last part of that: that this sort of nation state—"life-within, death-without"—is what's going on in the nineteenth century. And if we think about that, not in its governmentality or its misreading by Agamben, but as a very historically specific moment: what you're describing in a sense is that first version of biopower and biopolitics. And in that case, the nurturing of the soldier so that they would kill other soldiers is perfectly coherent.

**Schneider:** In the later lectures at the Collège de France, he actually, I think, modifies that by sort of bringing in the pastoral, which sort of ends historically, but it still sort of segues into the disciplinary, so that even discipline is not as disciplinary ...

**Meranze:** Right.

**Schneider:** ... as it is formulated in *Discipline and Punish*.

**Meranze:** Right. Yes, I actually think that's right. But I also think there's a way in which... That's what I meant by "not governmentality." I mean, I think there's a way in which—between the first volume of *History of Sexuality* and the lectures on security and the lectures on *The Birth of Biopolitics*—he changes his formulation. And unfortunately it seems to me if you look at it as an intellectual history exercise, what's happened is that the first formulation has gotten co-opted by the Agamben types and stretched out to be all of Western history—because he wants to make it into Heidegger—whereas it's actually very historically-specific and is very appropriate for this argument, whereas most people, because of that governmentality stuff, find it more amenable than that first version of biopolitics and take it off into that pastoral... But there's a way in which the very last part of the *History of Sexuality* has never really been taken up on its own terms. It's either gotten diverted into, "this is Western civilization" or it's gotten displaced—by himself in some ways—into the governmentality stuff.

**Schneider:** Ellen had a hook and then I have...

**Ledoux:** So I just... As a way to think about tying all of these ideas together, thinking about biopolitics... And this is anticipating the Foundling paper so I don't want to do too much with that... Thinking about all of these available bodies, right, that are there for this constant warfare going on from the 1740s through 1810s whatever... You need grist for the mill, right, and what can these different bodies do, and what can these disenfranchised bodies do, and how are they sort of useful to the state. And I think that's kind of where... You were talking about how many of these women were on the field; there were also these women who after the Battle of Trafalgar

asked for medals because there were women on these ships. There's the picture of August Earle's *Divine Service* where there's just like a lady sewing on the naval ship, you know, she's not even hidden at all... Even though the official rules are that women were not participating in the war machine, they actually are, whether they're doing it in supportive roles or whether they're actively fighting. I don't think it makes much difference if you're cooking the soup for the soldiers or you're firing a gun; you're still participating in the machinery of war. The state has to get more creative about who's going to be fighting, right. I was talking during the break about Israel; they have been very pragmatic about the fact that they're in that sort of constant state of warfare, so women have compulsory service in the same way that men do. They can't afford the kind of sentimental arguments that we've made in the United States about who can serve and what will happen, you know: "women can be raped if they're in combat," well men can be raped too, we know this. In fact, rape is a constant thread through all of these papers that talk about war, and one of the papers talks about total war and the use of rape as a military tactic. So I guess one of the ways to think about all of these things together is the idea of a body and caring for a body, but caring for a body only in the sense that it can be useful to the state. I think that's something that connects maybe five or six of the papers [at the workshop].

**Schneider:** Yeah, go ahead.

**Pichichero:** In France at this time, there are 47 women fighting that we have found, that we have cases for... So a good amount of work has been done on them and it could be interesting for you to look at them. But I think that, you know, since you're interested in gender and the idea of queering, I mean, I think that it is really important, and it was really important in the French case: what is the activity that the woman is doing? Because there are laws passed in France that say, "Women at war, you can wash the clothes, and you can be a *vivandière*: you can sell food if you have a patent that you usually don't get yourself, you get it from your husband who is a *vivandier*, and you can do it if he gets killed or is absent." So they—the state, that is—are really working hard in France to circumscribe the role of women. And so I think that is, you know, still something very important: what can a woman's body do and what are the appropriate roles for that body? But I think also that, you know... So, you know, I do a lot of gender and sexuality theory too and somebody who you might want to look at too is the work that's been done on the chevalier d'Éon...

**Ledoux:** Yes.

**Pichichero:** Yeah, there's great... Russell Goulbourne came out with a great sort of edited collection on that, and Marilyn Morris's work in particular in terms of bringing in stuff about transsexual narrative. And precisely part of that is embodiment and sort of the idea of skin and wanting to get out of your skin and into somebody else's skin. And in this case, what she argues is that clothes perform that function in terms of identity... And that's also part of the sumptuary laws: what women can wear and what men can wear. So I think that queering, the idea of queering, is maybe what's sort of fruitful and interesting about this. And I was worried about using that term, but I sort of have started to become more convinced that we can. Because you think of somebody like the chevalier d'Éon, who maybe was a man and became a woman at around 1764, but there was a bunch of play in there; where you didn't know if this person was going to show up dressed as a man or woman, if he or she—you don't know which pronoun to use in the end,

and I appreciated your attention to pronouns—that that person would maybe come dressed as a woman, but then do military moves. And this person was doing it not in the sort of low, popular theater context, but in salons and ambassador’s homes: the ambassador to Russia. Catherine the Great loved this: that the chevalier d’Éon would come dressed as a woman, you know, and do swordwork, and then come dressed as a man and dance as a woman. And so, you know, there’s something here about gender and play and queering that I think is very interesting. Certainly with the commercial concerns that you’re thinking about, it makes it difficult to sort of politicize it in the way that you are: this idea of what are we expecting from this women. I think knowing why they went into battle in the first place is sort of important. I think there’s a reason to put their biographies together with their performing narratives to see sort of what the change is, if there’s any ability to do that. And then to note that for the chevalier d’Éon, who was disowned by the French state, and also for these women, they were scraping for cash and sort of willing to do these things to be relevant, to make money, you know. Maybe not... I’m just wondering if we have to depoliticize it in some cases a little bit.

**Schneider:** I have a few people but Brendan has a hook.

**Brendan Gillis:** Especially this discussion right here has me thinking a lot about performance, which is explicit in Ellen’s paper. And I wonder to what extent the idea of performance can get back at the question of different types of care that are developing here. Because military duty is as much about performing drill as it is about performing humane, sensible identity.

**Pichichero:** Yes, that’s great.

**Schneider:** Okay, I have Robin, right?

**Robin Bates:** Can you say a word more, Ellen, about the relationship between Walker and Snell?

**Ledoux:** Yeah, well right. Robert Walker was like mother Kardashian in the sense that... [laughter] I know twenty years from now people will be like, “who was mother Kardashian?”... [laughter] He had taken several people that were sort of fads, or not... People who were famous for being famous, kind of, right, and taken them through this kind of PR onslaught that I described for Snell. And so her meeting up with him was fitting into his already established public relations role (and I’m using that term anachronistically obviously). And he, as I map out in the article, he had a real strategy for how things were going to be placed in newspapers, when the memoir would come out, when the stage show would arrive, and how they could all be mutually supportive marketing strategies. Snell is illiterate, right? So everything that is described... The memoirs are written in the third person: he calls her “our heroine,” “our adventurer,” etc. So everything that is described about her is filtered through his voice. I like to think about it in the way we think about Mary Prince’s narrative, right, where everything is sort of suspect and up for grabs and at one remove, so we can’t really know if this is her voice or if this is the way she describes herself. The way that I like to think about it is that, unlike what she describes in her stage show, she did not go off to war to look for her lover (which is in concert with this kind of balladic tradition of that); she goes because she has absolutely no money, her child has died, and her husband has abandoned her, and so she decides this is one way that she can make her fortune. And it appears to me that when she was in that military guise, she was quite happy to be with other wom-

en in her private life, and when she comes back Walker reports (at least in quotations in the narrative) that she is never going to get married again. Well her scheme sort of fails: she never gets the pension that she's promised (except this very small one from Chelsea Hospital); she ends up getting married two more times, and that's how she supports herself; and then ends up moving in with her grown-up son. So, I mean, I think of her as... My thing about mother Kardashian is a joke, but it's also not, in that I feel like she's almost sort of a pawn in a much larger structure about marketing this body. And the reason why I think that... Again I want to emphasize that I'm not sort of blaming her... Part of what I'm trying to show is that the stakes are really high here because she's so incredibly marginalized already. I think she's used as part of popular culture; she gets kind of chewed up and spit out in a way that we see with celebrities today, yeah.

**Bates:** Hunh. Because I think when he's introduced the first time, I think you call him an "amanuensis," which kind of implies subordination. Sort of like, you know, Samuel Beckett acts as James Joyce's amanuensis: he's not really got any input of his own; he's learning at the feet of the master. But then his role kind of becomes more shadowy, like a promoter. I guess a lot of your reading of the female soldier—this text—gives it a biographical meaning in terms of Snell. But do we know that we're dealing with Snell's ideas about Snell, or whether we're dealing with Walker's ideas about how to sell Snell? "Sell Snell..." [laughter]

**Ledoux:** Yeah, I mean...

**Bates:** Or does it matter?

**Ledoux:** I think it does, I think it absolutely does matter.

**Bates:** Yeah.

**Ledoux:** And I think maybe one of the ways that I can strengthen the paper is by talking about Walker's intervention a little bit more. It depends... So I originally conceived of this article as something for *GLQ*, in which case this idea is less important, right? But if I was pitching it more towards an Eighteenth-Century Studies journal, then yes, the idea of that intervention would be much more important. So I mean I guess it depends on what the audience is. I'm talking about her as a cultural product not as an authentic voice, and I think I need to make that more clear.

**Schneider:** I have a hook from Michael. Did I pass over you, Laura?

**Stevens:** No...

**Schneider:** And then I have Holly, right?

**Melissa Sodeman:** Melissa.

**Schneider:** Melissa! I'm sorry...

**Sodeman:** No, that's okay.

**Schneider:** ... and Laura.

**Meranze:** Just a quick thought since Ellen has now legitimated the mention of Kris Jenner. [laughter] In terms of the sort of the discourse of performance... One of the really interesting things about Bruce Jenner is that the narrative as it's come out is that he's been performing as a man, but he's actually naturally and irrevocably a woman. So this isn't really just a story about performance: there's in that an essential being that has been covered up by performance, which is not usually the way people think about performativity theory. There's supposed to never be an essence, but in this there is an essence that's been repressed. It's the other version of some sort of compulsory sexuality that didn't take, but has always been essentially different. So in terms of this play about the aristocrats and playing with gender roles, at least in the Jenner story there's an essence there that's been suppressed.

**Schneider:** Melissa.

**Sodeman:** I think I have maybe more of a comment than a question. But I was struck by Christy's point about the play of gender, and I was struck how in your paper, Ellen, sensibility is a limit to that play, right? It was really striking and interesting to me that sensibility can accommodate heteronormative bodies, but not queer bodies. So cross-dressed women can't be men of feeling, right? Which actually struck me as very interesting, and...

**Ledoux:** Can I use that as a title? [laughter]

**Sodeman:** ... And I also thought maybe there was a way you can separate out Snell and Talbot a little bit by pushing more on sensibility. Because one of the things that happens with sensibility over the course of the eighteenth century—particularly in the 1790s if you believe Claudia Johnson's argument, right?— is that gender becomes unmoored and moves significantly. And it seems as though that would affect how we read Talbot, who is living out this existence over a different timescale where gender is shifting significantly. So that's sort of an idea.

**Ledoux:** Yeah, I think you're getting at... There's a theoretical tension in this piece—and I'm glad you brought this up because I feel this is the main thrust of the argument and we haven't talked about it—which is Puar's argument about homonationalism, right, and can we talk about homonationalism in the eighteenth century, is that even like a valid way to think about stuff? And my argument is that yes we can, because basically what we're doing is talking about moving from margins to center by authorizing certain queer identities as being aligned with nationalism, right, and that legitimizes them, at least for that brief period in which they are culturally useful for the state. But at the same time... Let's say we can have a kind of homonationalism in quotation marks that's not an anachronism and exists, or at least that we can recognize, in the eighteenth century... At the same time, there's this competing discourse of sensibility, which the Robert Kier Porter example... But I was so happy when I saw Christy's paper, because I was like, "Yay, my weak examples about male sensibility are all bolstered by Christy's paper..." [laughter] I mean, Christy's paper beautifully documents this idea that the man of feeling can also be a military man, right? But you're right that if these figures want to appear as masculine, they're not afforded that sort of wiggle room that the man of feeling has. ... I brought up Casanova yesterday: this idea that there's this hyper-virile, super sexual man of feeling going about

Europe and seducing everybody in cabriolets and so forth. But we never questioned his masculinity even though he's crying—he's crying as he's making love to you, right. [laughter] But for these women who are occupying this liminal space, they latch on to this kind of Rambo-esque or Terminator-kind of masculinity where they're like... The part I talk about with the women in Madras, right, it's like, "Well, I didn't want them to rape me"—of course I'm paraphrasing—"so I decided to rape the colonial women so they wouldn't suspect that I was a woman." There's no way in which feeling could be shown in any way because that might... I guess the veil is so thin that to tear it away even a little bit by showing something that would have a feminine feature, to them it seems like the whole façade would fall. There's a part where Snell gets whipped—she gets flogged—and they pull her shirt off to flog her. And she says, "Well, you're probably wondering why they didn't recognize my sex." She says, "Because my arms were stretched out and I had a small bosom, it's just that my body was stretched in such a way that you couldn't really tell that there was a sexual difference there." But it shows you how tenuous the relationship is between passing and not passing and how quickly it could fall apart in unfortunately very run-of-the-mill military situation where this corporal punishment is going on. So, yeah, to them to show any kind of feminine trait dissolves this façade basically, yeah.

**Schneider:** Hook for Whitney and then Michael.

**Whitney Sperazza:** Thanks, yeah. That's a really fascinating point and well said, but I feel like I kind of want to offer a counter, especially coming out of the readings—or the sort of excerpts of the primary texts in the paper—because I feel like to some extent there's this definite sense of closing off any potential for sensibility within that masculine realm. But to me the references to rape weren't explicit; they were almost veiled, shadowed in a way that never really made it clear. I was wondering if maybe then in sort of closing off this masculine sense of sensibility, there's a potential for them to be opening up a space almost of finding room for other women in these situations (with this danger or rape threatening in this shadowy way), to sort of become sympathetic to the patriotic cause that these women were part of. So I guess my question really is: do you see a potential at all for these women to be identified with by other women in the British sort of colonial enterprise, that these women then become a model for a very interesting—I don't know—female call to arms?

**Ledoux:** Yeah, so this is where it gets tricky thinking in terms about trans as a historical category. Because there's that one passage where her and her friends are talking about "battering Miss Catherine's fort." I talk about it as a break in female solidarity; there's no sense of female solidarity there, or at least not in how it's recounted to us. So she sees herself—or Snell sees herself—as the batterer or penetrator of the women of the fort... These are very traditional ways of thinking about penetrator or penitratee or thinking about sex as an act of domination. I think scenes like that foreclose a cisgendered female's identification with her. So other people talk about these narratives as basically shaming men into masculine aggression; so getting back to Claudia Johnson, thinking about "Well men have become women and the women have become hysterical messes, so we need the women to shame the men back into being men so we can continue our war that's been going on for (whatever!) fifty years." I see it as a kind of... I start the paper off with a denial of female solidarity and that's kind of how I'm reading it. It didn't seem like a feminine call to arms in the way that maybe a *GI Jane* type of movie is like, "Look, women, you can do it too; let's all join the military."

**Sperazza:** Yeah, I think that's a really good counter. I guess I read the battering of the fort, though, as almost trope-ic on purpose because it becomes then not as aggressive as like the sort of really detailed opening to Christy's paper, where we get those visceral details. Battering of the fort, it could just be a metaphor out of any sort of Petrarchan... You know... By taking it to that level of trope, it becomes a non... I don't know...

**Ledoux:** Yeah, and in the longer version of this I talk about Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* that uses this battering of the fort imagery over and over again as a pornographic trope. So I think that you're right that it is a set piece, so maybe I should rethink that—in the sense that even though, to me, it's so repulsive, it sort of is just a set piece and so it doesn't impact emotionally in the same way that another rape image might. So, yeah, that's a good counter, thanks.

**Schneider:** So I have a hook from Michael...

**Meranze:** No, no, no, I was just letting you know that she had a hook. [laughter]

**Schneider:** Oh, thank you, thank you. Then Laura...

**Stevens:** So this question is partly an effort to tie these two papers together. One phrase I hear a lot today in talking about the military—both in connection, say, with talking about gays in the military or women in the military, and also having to do with the cultivation of soldiers—is “unit cohesion.” So I was wondering, first for Christy, when this begins to have a prominent part in discussion about military training and why soldiers fight. This popped into my head partly because Waterloo is one of the battles discussed in Keegan's *The Face of Battle*, you know, with all these questions of why soldiers do stay in the battle and this question of their ties to each other. And then, for Ellen, I was just wondering... One issue we've kind of been circling around is the question of what the presence of a woman in the military—whether in drag or not—what that does to the ties among the soldiers or sailors; how it effects what a fighting unit might think of itself as a unit?

**Pichichero:** Okay... So, yes, this idea of unit cohesion becomes very important, especially in the idea about the sort of rise of—what I'm calling—the rise of military psychology (you know, the word isn't around when this starts). But, you know, the social... I have a separate chapter on this sort of social question, and it's something that came up yesterday and that I'm sort of battling with a little bit—sorry for the metaphor. So there's this ideology about sociability, and not about sort of traditional *honnêteté*, kind of seventeenth-century sociability; but more like natural law, Pufendorf, sort of salon etiquette as sociability. And that comes into military discourse and says, “Listen,” you know, “it's rational for us to form bonds. We should be able to live together and fight together; we're dying together.” And then sort of what happens is that looks like a threat to hierarchy and to subordination. So there's sort of... Even the *Société* article in the *Encyclopédie* is saying, “Remember, though, you know, in the end, we'll always have hierarchy in our society. Even if we're born equal, it doesn't mean we can sort of all have equal say in what's going on.” But I think in the army documents that I'm looking at, this is getting tenuous. Eventually they are instituting policies saying troops should be able to vote for who their unit leaders are going to be, because they know them and they know who's capable and who's not. And so

there's sort of this slippery slope in the ideal of unit cohesion in terms of what that means about: who should be credited for battle, who is a hero, and what is the social status of these people who are bonding through their sensibility and bonding through reasonable, sociable impulses. How does that affect social class in terms of nobility and everybody else (you know, the troops are just whoever off the street, by and large)?

**Stevens:** So, if I can follow up very quickly... In addition to these questions of hierarchy versus equality, I think one thing I'm getting at is that today, when you read a lot of soldiers' memoirs or Congressional Medal of Honor responses, one really common aspect of contemporary military discourse is this sort of "band of brothers" idea: that soldiers are ultimately not really fighting for their country, they're fighting because they care for the soldiers around them; they forge a kind of tie that's unlike any other kind of tie. And I'm wondering... That becomes, in turn, this really important part of military training: a lot of boot camp is about creating this sort of connection among the unit so that they will sacrifice for each other. Is that a later... Do you see this happening in the eighteenth century?

**Pichichero:** I see it there, but it's fraught—that's sort of what I was trying to say.

**Stevens:** I see.

**Pichichero:** You know, if this unit is a band of brothers, and one of them is a relatively high-ranking aristocrat, right, but who's young (that's why he's a lieutenant or whatever), is he allowed to be a brother with these provincial soldiers who are from a total different class? So people are testing it, and in an article I wrote in *French Historical Studies* a couple years ago, you know, I found stuff in the archive that said, "Yeah, we really are equal, we really are brothers in this." But then other people say, "Whoa, you know, no." Saying that means a lot for the entire foundations of Old Regime society, and the society of orders, and the justification for how the entire French society works; so it's very dangerous ground, actually, that question. But it's great and absolutely, that's why I'm sort of navigating the fraught-ness of it. Thank you.

**Schneider:** I have a hook from Sarah.

**Sarah Knott:** Yes, I don't mean to jump in... But it seems then that one of the invitations we have is to think about where are the scenes of mutual care in the eighteenth century? Where is that visible? Where are in fact people asked to feel solidarity with others, in this case, like themselves? I wonder... I wondered, in fact, Ellen, what the status was of your... That gesture to female solidarity and abolitionism could be read as: "This is culturally dominant, the invitation for women to think as themselves as in solidarity with other women." Or it could be read as: "This is one freakish, politicized, activist move that is not, in fact, actually typical of eighteenth-century culture." So I'm wondering what we think is the status of the call to solidarity and mutual care, based on the materials that we've got in front of us.

**Ledoux:** So I think there was something that I was supposed to answer from before, but I've forgotten what it was. I wanted to tie the two things together.

**Stevens:** Unit cohesion...

**Ledoux:** Oh, unit cohesion, yeah... So for Snell, there's a lot of unit cohesion. It culminates in this thing where after they come back from the first deployment, she reveals herself to her messmates as a woman, and they say, "Oh, you're fantastic!" One of them proposes marriage, right? She's the best of both worlds; she's like a bro and also a lady, right, like marrying your best friend, or something, right? There's a strange moment, and that's where she says, "No thanks, I'm never gonna get married again."

But for Talbot, there is no unit cohesion. It's being taken by this captain... And Talbot is writing her own memoir; she is literate; and in fact, what she says is that she is the illegitimate daughter... She takes her name from the Earl Talbot, and she says, "I'm the natural daughter and I was educated and I have a much higher standing." She is working class, but she's positioning herself as being more elite than she is. She's taken by Captain Bowen and basically, you know, sexually traumatized for years posing as a boy. So they think Captain Bowen is engaging in this sort of sodomitical relationship, but she is actually female. But then once Captain Bowen dies, she decides to re-enlist. And so there's a very interesting moment where she kind of like glosses over the idea that she could go back to "regular life" and live as a female, but she decides that the military life is the one for her. And that's when she starts talking about things in the way that Snell does, where she's fighting for prize money and glory and all these things, but before she frames herself as being a victim of sexual violence. I think that for Snell, there's this really great camaraderie; but what I'm saying, is that this camaraderie is on the backs of indigenous people, cisgendered women, and colonial subjects. So part of what I'm trying to argue here is that: "the band of brothers"? Part of that bond is formed committing violence together upon other people. And so the cost and the buy-in to that "band of brothers" is extremely high, and that's kind of what I'm trying to point out in my piece.

**Schneider:** I have a hook here from Richard, right?

**Richard Nash:** I'm gonna try to track down at the lunch break an anecdote for you, Ellen, that I'm hoping will complicate what you're trying to push as the argument here. Because I want to answer Sarah's question about where do we locate community, and suggest that it may not necessarily have anything to do with the military at all. I want to suggest as a location the White Horse Tavern in, I think, Cheapside [laughter] where about a generation before your narrative, the tavern keeper winds up going to law... is somebody who has lived maybe crossgender, but certainly crossdressing and has taken... Somebody who has beaten up a client ends up prosecuted by the tavern keeper for extortion. Because when he was taken for beating up the customer, the customer tried to blackmail the tavern keeper with charging her for being an impostor because she had been cross dressing and running this tavern—and running a disorderly house. And instead of acquiescing to the extortion, the crossdressing tavern keeper ends up prosecuting for extortion. What comes out of this in the trial, as I recall it, is this sense of solidarity in the community of the longtime habitués of the White Horse Tavern rallying around in support of the crossdressing tavern keeper from Cheapside. [laughter] I don't know how this anecdote... But it does strike me that you have in the community, as I remember reading the account, a sense of community solidarity in support of the establishment with no martial component whatsoever, right; rather it may be a class issue, but it's more sort of a neighborhood... "This person has always run an orderly house that we like to resort to, that is part of our community."

**Schneider:** If I could... Do you want to respond?

**Ledoux:** No, but that sounds like it runs in with the argument about professionalism, basically.

**Nash:** Right.

**Schneider:** If I could just add a hook of my own... It seems to me this idea of cohesion or community or caring on the backs of the victimized, I mean, is a more generalizable notion that is actually very commonplace. Cohesion and caring come often through conflict: that is, it's us against them; we have to protect ourselves; we have to do something that defines us vis-à-vis someone else. So it's not just the military, and it's not the kind of purposeful caring—that "We care because we want people to do things"—but it's rather a collective notion of caring that emerges just for... For example, corporatism in France is often the result of different fiscal manipulations on the part of the crown. People buy up offices that the crown has imposed upon them, and that creates a solidarity among them; a caring, if you wish.

**Meranze:** You could say aggression leads to caring. [laughter]

**Schneider:** Yeah. Unless there was another hook, I have Colin. Colin?

**Colin Jager:** Yeah, this I think connects to a couple of things. But I wanted to go back to the battering of Miss Caroline's fort. Could we look at that closely because... It's on 156 and 157. Ellen, I haven't read these texts, so you can tell me if I'm wrong. But I guess my sense is that they're more nuanced literarily than you seem to think they are. And so my thought here is—thinking about Nick Bujak's paper from yesterday—that there's a kind of narratorial care especially of Miss Catherine. I guess we should take it for granted that we're dealing with a representation and we don't know what really transpired between these two people—although if we do know, I would be interested in that. So there's the language of the successful battering of Miss Catherine's fort... Dah dah dah dah... "She spends her hours in familiar conversation"—I assume that's a euphemism—"with Miss Catherine..." "Her amorous caresses were so engaging to Miss Catherine that she"—and I'm really interested in the "she" because I'm not sure to whom that pronoun is referring; grammatically it should refer to the "her" at the beginning of the sentence, but it almost seems like it might be referring to Miss Catherine. Anyway, "she fell victim to the young god of love." It seems to me that we're being asked to read this—a male readership maybe, prominently—as a sort of, you know, same-sex, quasi-pornographic scene that may be sort of titillating and pleasurable to imagine. But certainly the kind of violent language about the successful battering is designed to protect Miss Catherine, because what Miss Catherine actually gets is something that seems mutually pleasurable.

There's less nuance in the one on the facing page, which is when we switch to India. But even there... So just picking up in the middle: "However, she had no other way for the protection of her innocence and person than to show that her will was her law and that if"—and I'm really interested in the "if"—"if they offered"—these are the Indian women, if those women—"offered in the least to be rude, she had the courage and resolution enough to make them feel the weight of her resentment." It's all in kind of the conditional. So I don't think we're actually being asked... I don't think the reader is being solicited to imagine that she is actually participating in raping these women. I guess I'm just sort of feeling that in both cases there is a fair amount of narrative

nuance. The worst case is definitely put before us—a kind of worst case scenario is definitely put before us—but it’s being contrasted to, you know, kind of a variety of things that are very vague. One might hazard, I think, that there’s a certain kind of—I wouldn’t call it solidarity—but that there’s a certain kind of care being taken of the women who are the most vulnerable: a kind of, as a I said, sort of literary or narratorial care. Just setting aside what may or may not really historically may have happened.

**Ledoux:** Yeah, so I have like sort of a tri-layered response to that. The first is I have kind of a knee-jerk reaction just that I want to get out there: that, as a woman, the idea of another woman talking about battering the fort, there’s like a revulsion that occurs there; so I have to get over that. Just as an intellectual, I kind of have to get over that, right. But the second part of it makes me think about the first part of the papers yesterday where we’re talking about narratorial care, and about turning away, and about privacy. So if I calm down, and then I think about that, right... I can think about her carousing, yes, as a protective function; like, “Sure, I’ll give you the rhetoric of battering in the tavern, because that’s what you expect of me.” But then when I go, “Miss Catherine and I are going to have familiar conversation that’s going to be pleasurable, it’s going to be consensual, and it’s going to be mutually fulfilling in some way; and I’m actually not going to tell you about that. I’m just going to fall victim to the god of love and let you imagine...” It’s actually, in the context, it’s Miss Catherine who does...

**Jager:** Okay, okay... interesting.

**Ledoux:** ... Because when the quotation goes on, it talks about how Miss Catherine keeps writing her letters, and Snell’s like, “Been there done that, whatever...” Maybe edit that out. [laughter] So Snell is a kind of like rake, like she sort of has a girl in every fort. So yeah, I could see that as being protective.

But then with the Indian women, this idea of conditionality... Yeah I’m really interested in that. Because the “if they offered to be rude”... In my close reading of this passage, what I say is: at minimum, she’s countenancing and being a sort of accessory to these crimes. And when we get back to the main impetus behind this article, which is thinking about European women’s participation in the imperial project, most of it is through this bystander capacity. And what I’m trying to say is that there’s a violence in that that is really problematic; maybe in some ways it’s insidious, it’s pernicious, maybe it’s worse, right? Because you can actually... The people who are actually perpetrating the sexual violence, you can point that out and say, “This is bad, that needs to be reformed.” And all of the ways thinking about the Geneva Convention or the Red Cross: “Please don’t mutilate corpses; please return our prisoners to us; you know, all of these things that we can agree should be done.” But the other type of violence (sort of like what people are calling microaggression, right, where you’re just sort of standing by or you’re not speaking up or whatever) is in some ways more powerful because it doesn’t immediately rise up as something that needs to be condemned. Does that make sense?

**Jager:** Yeah, of course, yeah. It just seems to me that the text in the second case is making precisely that type of analytic distinction. I think it’s asking the reader to judge one kind of violence, the actual violence, as worse than the violence of the standby. So it seems to me, if you want to run the reading that you want to run, I think you have to read it against the text? Which is of

course a perfectly legitimate thing to do... But it's just that the text itself seems to me to sort of have that very distinction in mind, which is kind of remarkable.

**Schneider:** Okay, depending on how punctilious we want to be, I have three minutes left and we have several hooks and now one intervention... Now four hooks. Here we go: we'll have Rachel, Oz, Michael, Christy, Fabienne... All hooks, so quick, quick.

**Rachel Seiler-Smith:** I was just gonna make a comment that might help out Ellen a little bit and press against that reading. It doesn't matter that the narrator ends up not saying anything in the first passage. In the context of eighteenth-century moeurs, to bandy about a woman's name in a tavern is itself a violence to her reputation and character. [laughter] The idea that you would actually talk randily about and name a specific woman is not only rakish, but it's damaging to a woman rhetorically. So even if the narrator is like, "Well I'm not necessarily going to represent it or go that extra way," the being in a tavern or brothel to me already sets up a sort of violence in and of itself in the context that might be lost on us now... But actually not, right: if you're gossiping and talking shit about a woman that you want to do something to, that's pretty shitty, right? And in a very problematic way. In the way, you know, we see people posting pictures of themselves potentially violating women at parties, right, and they're talking about it even if they're not doing it, they're doing it in a particular ...

**Schneider:** Okay...

**Seiler-Smith:** ... "conversational" way.

**Schneider:** Okay, I'm gonna go right to Oz.

**Oscar Kenshur:** Well just to weigh in on this dispute... I did not read "battering" and "taking by storm" to be synonymous; I read the "battering" part to mean seduction, and "the taking by storm" to mean rape. There's a disagreement about how to read this text, but for me it seems, oh yeah, she's fitting in by saying, "Oh yeah, I'll drink to the battering," but then she's not gonna drink to the storming. It seems as if there is a distinction there.

**Schneider:** Fabienne.

**Fabienne Moore:** I just wanted to bring up *Dangerous Liaisons* just because those women are engaged in "dangerous liaisons" in many ways. And when you mention "rake" as a sort of attribute of the character, there's a libertine style of writing here, which is exactly the *sous-entendu*, which makes it distinct from the pornographic style of writing. So I think, for instance, you might want to look again at the letter where Valmont actually rapes Tourvel because, you know, the subtlety of the way it's written makes it almost, "Did something happen? I'm not quite sure." And students often miss out on that. So I think, you know, there's an interesting sort of stylistic, libertine feature there, in my view.

**Schneider:** I think the last hook is Michael's.

**Meranze:** Just two quick things... I think your comment depends on which part of eighteenth-century culture you're talking about. I don't necessarily think that that sort of bantering going on in a tavern is necessarily going to be seen in quite the same way as it would be if you're thinking in the sense of a sentimental novel.

But my actual hook was that I'm confused now by your ethical stand. Because you started off saying that you weren't in fact judging these people, that you were judging contemporary critics. But your response to Colin is that you're judging these people because she was standing by and therefore enabling and engaging in a microaggression. And I don't really see how you can have it both ways.

**Ledoux:** Well, I don't even know why the issue... I guess I am judging, because it's obviously caught people up that I am judging. But yeah, I guess there is a human in me... Yeah, of course I'm judging.

**Meranze:** But it's in your text, too.

**Ledoux:** Is it? Okay, yeah, I guess I gotta try and work on that. The scholar me is trying not to judge, and so maybe that's something I kind of need to edit out. But also, again, this goes to audience: if I publish this in a journal like *GLQ* it's almost incumbent on me to be judging them. In some senses, that's just sort of the nature of the discourse, right?

**Meranze:** Okay, but then you have to make an ethical choice whether you want to publish it in *GLQ*. [laughter]

**Ledoux:** Well... I don't want to go over time, but part of me does, right. Part of me holds to a higher standard, I guess, and maybe thinks about that as an ethical intervention; it's not okay, right. Because, up to this point, these queer figures have been celebrated, right, as groundbreaking; and what I'm saying is, "well even the marginalized are responsible for care." Getting back to the master-slave dialectic, how are we supposed to understand how oppression occurs unless we hold accountable on the margins the people that keep buying into the dialectic, right? So yeah, maybe I don't want to edit out my judging; maybe I am judging; and you helped me with that, so thank you.

**Schneider:** Well thank you and thank you to both of our speakers.  
[applause]